

**SR #22: RESOLUTION ON CALCULATING THE CUMULATIVE
GRADE POINT AVERAGE WHEN COURSES ARE REPEATED**

Revised March 19, 2008

1. WHEREAS the issue of how to calculate cumulative GPAs when courses are repeated was remanded to the Student Faculty Policy Committee for further study; and
2. WHEREAS the Student Faculty Policy Committee has gathered additional information on the impact of alternative methods of calculating the GPA when courses are repeated; and
3. WHEREAS the Student Faculty Policy Committee has reviewed the policies used at peer institutions for calculating cumulative GPAs when courses are repeated; and
4. WHEREAS the Student Faculty Policy Committee wishes to provide equal treatment for all students in the calculation of cumulative GPA values when courses are repeated courses; and
5. WHEREAS the Student Faculty Policy Committee wishes to limit the number of credit hours for which courses may be repeated with only the higher course grade being counted in the cumulative GPA; therefore, be it
6. RESOLVED that the Academic Senate recommend to the Provost that undergraduate students be permitted to repeat up to 12 hours of courses with only the higher grade being calculated in the cumulative GPA, and the average course grade be included in the cumulative GPA for all repeated courses beyond the 12 hour limit; and be it further
7. RESOLVED that this change in calculating the cumulative GPA when courses are repeated courses be implemented as of the beginning of the for students first entering Arizona State University during or following the fall semester of 2008.

Double underlined words are added and strikethrough words are deleted from the original resolution.

Draft Academic Senate Summary

Monday, March 24, 2008

3:15 – 5:00 p.m.

EDC 117

Present: Allen, Allison, Anderson, Bodman, Broman, Burg, Bush, Colburn, Comfort, Elliot, Facinelli, Fromme, Gonzalez-Santin, Grace, Hajicek, Harp, Heys, Ingalls, Jackson, Karcher, Keim, Kingston, Kinnier, Konomos, Kopta, Koshinsky, Kostelich, Margolis, Maris, Mathur, McEwan, McPhee, Minter, Moorhead, Ossipov, Restrepo, Rez, Roen, Romero, Rose, Saenz, Searle, Shaeffer, Shaw, Simonhoff, Thompson, Tompkins, Trotta, Tsakalis, VanderMeer, Vaughan (at Poly), Verdini, Watson, Wheeler, Wutich

Absent: Allenby, Alpers, Barclay, Blanchard (excused), Blasko, Brewis, Campbell (H), Carter, Christiansen (excused), Cobas, Coffman, deLusé, DiFelice, Doty (excused), Drucker, Ellis, Fabricius, Gopalan, Guerin, Guleserian, Happel, Henn, Hoffmeister, Komnenich, Lara-Valencia, Liu, Magana, McNeill, Morton, Mossman, Ovando, Pardo, Pinholster, Roedel, Rush, Schneller, Schultz, Shah, Sloane, Sousa, Stewart, Strom, Stump, Sullivan, Teye, Thomas, Vernon, Whitecotton, Wiesel, Williams, Ye

1. **CALL TO ORDER** (Bill Verdini).

2. UNIVERSITY PRESENTATIONS AND REPORTS

A. Senate President's Report (Bill Verdini)

I hope you received my note of thanks and gratitude for your staying late—and coming often to the Senate this semester. We have accomplished a lot. We have one more important thing to accomplish and that is to get what we passed before the Academic Assembly, which is everyone at all the campuses. George Watson will help facilitate that with a Senate action to call a special meeting of the Tempe Assembly members.

I mentioned to you last time about the pre-collection during April-May paychecks for faculty on 9-month contracts, so when you see that don't panic—just know that it is coming.

There is a tri-university benefits design committee being formed. I have secured two people to volunteer for that, Doug Johnson, president of the Retirees Association, Emeritus College and Personnel Committee chair, Bob McPhee is willing to serve on that if needed as well. They have some interesting work to do on the 403 B optional retirement plans. We currently have about 20 options for that. Each university in the state has about 20 options, and they believe that the intersection of those plans is small—so there about 60 that the university system is managing and there a desire to do what in my discipline is called “supply based rationalization”—getting the number of suppliers of optional retirement plans down to a manageable number so that is what this task force will work on.

Provost Capaldi could not attend today so, I have no remarks from the Provost unless someone has those announcements. We managed not to connect with Richard Gitelson and Linda Vaughan told me earlier at the President's Academic Council that she might say hello to us today.

Any report today, Linda? No, thank you, we are just going to separate off and conduct our business here today.

I will ask Mark Searle and Delia Saenz who are just entering now if they have any announcements. Hearing none, I will now say adieu to Linda at Polytechnic and turn over the floor to George Watson.

B. AFC and Downtown Council Report (George Watson).

The Arizona Faculties Council has been gaining on a few legislative issues. 1) The so called textbook bill which has passed both the house and the senate and is going to a conference committee because there was a difference in the section on definitions. One had something on it as a b and the other had it on there a c, so they needed to figure out what to do about that. The Language we were particularly concerned about was that the textbook publishers would have to supply information only on request. That would burden faculty to make a request in order to get information from them. The "on request" language has since been stricken. That is a plus. On the other hand, the legislation still instructs the Board of Regents to adopt policies that will in fact insure that faculty do timely submissions [things the Board is already doing.] I think that the legislation is not too bad for us now and not too bad even from the student perspective in that they were supposed to benefit in the first place.

There is another bill but we are going to do more on that just a little bit later and that is the Concealed Weapons Bill, and that is still sitting in the Senate as far as I know and has not made much head way in the House. There is a good chance it is not going to go to the floor and get through but even if it does get through there is a distinct possibility the Governor could veto it. That does not mean that even if later there is a resolution introduced, that we should not go on record about how we feel about such legislation now

The Arizona Faculties Council is still working on some benefits aspects and we will just have to report back to you on that.

In terms of the Downtown Council report, we are meeting on April 10 as an Academic Assembly scheduled to discuss the constitution and bylaws. You at the Tempe campus also need to do that because the constitution states currently states that all members of the academic assembly need to meet at least once before an election can take place and the assembly members need to have been referred to the amendments--and the amendments have to be sent out to them three weeks in advance of the assembly meeting. What I have is an action to propose and that would involve also a motion that we can vote on now.

The motion says this—**"That a meeting of Academic Assembly on April 15, 2008, the time and location to be determined by the President of the Tempe/Downtown Senate be called for the purpose of discussing the proposed revisions to the Constitution and Bylaws."** That is a motion that I am making to this body.

Senate President Verdini: Do I have a second to that motion? (Seconded)

Senator Watson: The Tempe Senate members need to call a special meeting and that meeting cannot take place for at least three weeks that is why I specified April 15th as the date for the meeting. Election can come within a week after that meeting, but the election has to be for two weeks, that is the minimal time that the ballot has to be open for the assembly members to vote. It we go by that it will be the end of April at the earliest before we finish the election.

Senate President: The purpose of this meeting will be to really discuss what the vote on this motion will entail? It is not a business meeting where a quorum is necessary to conduct business or resolutions, so we will hold the meeting at time and place beginning at 3:00 pm. here, hopefully. (It was later scheduled to held in MURDOCK 101, beginning at 3:00 p.m.).

All in favor signify by saying aye. Any opposed? None. Abstentions? None. The motion passes, thank you very much. April 15, hmmm that is the day taxes are due. Are there questions?

Senator: You indicated that we would have a resolution on Weapons presented later in the meeting and I have to leave for class at 4:30 p.m.

Senate President: We have a resolution that will be coming before you a bit later regarding that and if it is the desire of the body to act on that today, we can waive the rules for that particular motion and be on record as whether we opposed or favor the resolution.

C. Student Government Reports

Undergraduate Student Government (Liz Simonhoff)

Good Afternoon Everybody. I have a handout to give you. We have a lot going in the next few weeks. I would like to ask you to share this handout or post it for your students so they can participate in these events that are sponsored by the student body.

- This Tuesday and Wednesday (March 25-26) we are having the Undergraduate Student Housing Fair. Thirty complexes are coming and there will be a huge fair on Hayden Lawn. If you know of students who are looking for campus housing next year, we have 9,000 students living on campus and we have a lot of apartment complexes off campus that want to rent to students next year. We will have free concerts, free food, prizes, and are looking forward a lot of information and opportunity for students to take advantage of.
- On Wednesday night we are hosting the first ever Tempe City Council Runoff Candidate Debate. Usually Tempe City Council has its elections during spring break so a lot of students do not get the opportunity to take an active part in City Council elections. Right now there are four candidates running for two TCC positions. We will have students able to ask the candidates questions and we hope this sets a precedent for the future. We want to keep on top of what is going on in the City of Tempe.
- We are having the first ever USG Green Week and we have a series of events to participate in next week. The first one is on April 1, we are bringing a Bio Bus to campus. There will be a presentation (location TBA) to educate the student body on the environment and sustainability. On April 2, we are bringing Jeff Corwin from Animal Planet, he will have a presentation at PE West from 6-8 p.m. and we are hoping that students will take advantage of this opportunity. April 3, we are having an Environmental Fair at PV Beach and we will have interactive games, more education, just getting the word out to the students that students take pride in the environment and sustainability.
- On March 29th the student government is heading up the "Devils' in Disguise" – USC Tempe Campus Clean-Up. We are cleaning up the entire ASU campus! There are 15 locations that will have doing clean up work throughout all of the Phoenix Area—Devils in Disguise--and we are heading up the effort at Tempe Campus so we are excited about that.

I also want to talk to you about an event that is coming up in the next couple of weeks. The Centennial Professorship Award. This year we are holding it on April 17th in this lecture hall (EDU C117). Jennifer Brougham and Pamela Stewart are going to be lecturing and they are the Centennial Professorship winners from last year. They will be talking about excellence in teaching and developing student leadership in the future.

The last item I have is a message on Senate Resolution #22 on calculating cumulative GPA. The Student Faculty Policy Committee has been working with us on this and we have had meaningful debate about what is the best academic policy for calculating cumulative GPA on grade replacement. I wanted to let you know the undergraduate student viewpoint is that we are absolutely in favor of having a separation on the amount of credit hours a student can take up to 12 hours in order to have a uniform policy for all students.

"...allowing the 12 hours to include upper division as well as lower division credit hours whereas the current grading system allows only lower division courses to be repeated (with the higher grade, rather than the average grade, used to calculate the student's cumulative GPA."

I know from one of the discussions we have had with the SFPC and with students when we reached out to discuss this--that the first couple of years a student comes to ASU they are getting acclimated, and then they should be acclimated by the time they get into taking upper division classes. This new policy actually calls for that, because in the event that a student comes in their freshmen year and they stay on top of things but something happens in their junior or senior year that was unforeseen, this policy would be pertinent to all student needs, not just freshmen and sophomores. We are definitely in favor of this resolution.

D. Graduate and Professional Students Association (Bree McEwan)

Beginning the week on March 31st are having our Graduate Appreciation Week. There are 300 students who plan to attend our main event on Friday that week, and Senator Burton Cahill will be there. We have also done quite a bit of work on professional development this semester which was in the funding grant for GPSA that was written in when we started. We really did not get an opportunity to do anything with that for several years, and this year it has really taken off in that several seminars for graduate students have been held on stress relief, ergonomics, basic web design—[for students to figure out how to put a nice web site online.] We are looking forward to having that branch of our organization continue working with teachers. One of the things we are looking at doing before the end of the semester, what George Watson talked about in the legislature, GPSA has taken a position that we are against concealed weapons on campus. We are looking into having a different training for graduate instructors and possibly faculty as well on this topic.

3. Approval of the Previous Minutes

Senate President: Next we need to approve minutes from the February 18th meeting. They were posted and distributed to you with the agenda. Do I hear a motion to approve these meeting minutes? Thank you. (Seconded). Any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of approving the February 18, 2008 Summary signify by saying aye. Opposed? None. Abstentions? None. The minutes were approved.

The March 17th special minutes are just posted so we will hold them and talk about those at the April 21st meeting. Next will be the CAPC report.

4. Consent Agenda Items

A. Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee (Duane Roen)

Is there anyone who wishes to remove either of the consent items from the agenda? This comes as a seconded motion from the CAPC committee, so I will ask all those in favor of approving the two consent agenda items to signify by saying aye. Opposed? Abstentions? Unanimously approved.

Senate Motion #26 (2007-2008): College of Liberal Arts & Sciences – School of International Letters & Cultures for the Implementation of a New degree Program – B.A. In International Letters & Cultures.

Senate Motion #27 (2007-2008): College of Liberal Arts and Sciences: Establishment of an Undergraduate Certificate in Religion and Conflict.

Then under unfinished business, item #6 on the agenda we have information items to report out from our February 28 meeting and for our March 27 agenda items: <http://www.asu.edu/provost/CAPC>

Fulton School of Engineering

Department of Computer Science and Engineering

Establishment of an undergraduate concentration

BSE Computer Systems Engineering

Information Assurance

Fulton School of Engineering

Department of Computer Science and Engineering

Establishment of a graduate concentration

Master of Computer Science

Information Assurance

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Authority to Plan a new graduate Degree Program

PhD in Behavioral Biology

College of Nursing and Healthcare Innovation

Graduate Education & Advanced Practice Programs

Establishment of a graduate concentration

Doctor of Nursing Practice:

Geriatric Nurse Practitioner

Action item:

Senate Motion #28 (2007-2008) (First Reading):

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

School of Human Evolution and Social Change

Implementation of a New Graduate Degree Program

Ph.D. in Applied Mathematics for the Life & Social Sciences

5. Unfinished Business

A. Personnel Committee Report (Bob McPhee)

It may be better to look at the summary of points that is on the web page than looking at the entire article on the overhead screen--Bob's summary was accessed on the Senate Web page.

<http://www.asu.edu/provost/asenate/documents/SummaryofmajorchangeinACDSections.doc>

Senate Motion #19 (Revisions to ACD 002 "Definitions")

The first page is a summary of the revised definitions. The main change is a change from talking about departments, colleges, and other academic units to having (2) main labels now—1) college which is going to be used throughout the ACD Manual for any dean led organization, and the next level down units are going to be called 2) academic units. Their key defining features are being led by directors; departments, schools, centers, some divisions are included and the key difference is that these academic units eventually report to a dean, and are therefore part of a college with a few exceptions. We have changed from this first part to the new language and that simplifies things more. That is the main change. Is there any discussion or questions?

Senate President: This is Senate Motion #19 ACD 002 Definitions we are talking about right now on the agenda at the bottom of page 1. In the attachments it is pages 5-7 for today. All in favor of approving the ACD 002 please signify by saying aye. Any opposed? Abstentions? The motion carries.

Senate Motions #19 was passed by a voice vote of those present.

Senate Motion #20 (2007-2008): Revised ACD 110: Reporting Lines for Centers and Institutes) in the attachments it is on pages 8-11.

This is an older version I must confess and the Personnel Committee has made major progress since then. There are a number of changes—some are pretty minor, others are pretty substantial. One action that I have contemplated that might be undertaken by the Senate, is to put off a vote on this motion until the next meeting on April 21st because you won't have had a chance to look over the current version, and there is some new provisions that aren't on the screen in front of you, so I will halt at this time and not bring it to the floor, and in the meantime we will distribute the corrected version of ACD 110—there are still some provisions we have to do though. So I will bring those back to you next time.

Senate Motion #21 (2007-2008) (Revisions to ACD 111-01 “Faculty Voting Rights IN HIRING POSITIONS.” In the attachments it is on pages 12-14.

There are a couple of major changes and items that might need discussion. One change is the original purpose was very grand to implement the principle of shared faculty administration and governance—but the actual section of the ACD is much less encompassing in its scope, so **we revised it to say define voting rights in hiring decisions.** Even this is not the only provision that deals with voting rights. The second change of interest that we made from the old version of the ACD is in dealing with “University Librarian” the title that now is, we changed the provision to have one which is parallel to the language that governs the searches for deans, since the University Librarian is technically the same rank as dean in the organizational structure of the university. And both **for deans and for the University Librarian, the provision says every search committee shall include an academic senator, appointed by the chair of the university academic council.** That is exactly the same provision as provision for “Search Committee for Deans.” The question came up in our committee and it might involve a substantive change, so we did not try to edit this in a substitute way, but it is altogether possible that the academic senators appointed to be part of the search committee would not be an academic professional, would not have any particular convention in the library, etc. We were not completely sure that this was an optimal change. So, I want to ask are there any comments about this? (None.)

The last change of any substance is a **change to this language from the paragraph that dealt with confidentiality in the hiring process.** What we did was essentially boil it down to this sentence which is clear and accomplishes the same thing. Those are the changes in ACD 111 that are substantial.

Senate President: This is Senate Motion #21 (ACD 111) Faculty Voting Rights. Is there any discussion on this motion? Seeing none, all in favor of approving the motion as written please signify by saying aye. Any opposed? Abstentions? The motion carries.

Senate Motion #21 was passed by a voice vote of those present.

New Business Items

Proposed Senate Motion #30 (2007-2008): Section 111-02 “Unit Bylaws” (attachments, pages 15-16).

On this section we changed the wording nearly everywhere in the article to say not unit bylaws but “the bylaws.” It was both academic unit bylaws and college bylaws and that could be and should be covered by the provision here. Things like votes, etc. Another thing we did was to introduce new language in the very first sentence of the document. It used to say all colleges, departments, and other academic units must have bylaws. We **changed that to say “all college and academic units”** (getting rid of departments) because we specified that in the definitions. More importantly, the bylaws must be at least initially approved by a majority of the unit faculty, which was never a provision in the ACD manual before, and to allow for cases where departments or units within colleges that are very small and may prefer not to develop and maintain bylaws, the right to utilize the college bylaws as their unit bylaws with the consent of the college dean, the faculty unit can choose that option. Those are the main substantive changes except that in this article especially there were lots of provisions that are not specific and concrete enough to be procedures, and they will be located elsewhere than the ACD manual.

Q: Isn't it common that a bylaw change must be approved by 2/3rds—seems like you have passed a bylaw to avoid having some kind of obstruction. Robert's Rules say 2/3rds.

Senator McPhee: The provision is set up to get the bylaws into motion. In a department's and college's bylaws they can say "to amend these bylaws you must have 2/3rd majority," or they can say...

Q: Shouldn't the ACD wording mention this.

Senator McPhee: No, once they get approved they govern the unit's activities. It is just that they initially need to be approved and voted on in the unit, and that is what we are trying to do here also. The concern was that they could be imposed by a unit head, adopted by a minority, or a plurality of people present, etc.

Senate President: If I may just interject that if there is a new department established and bylaws had to be written for it, the initial set of bylaws would be established by this process, but if they change the bylaws it would be changed according to the rules they have adopted locally. If you think this is a problem, this could be an amendment that we could bring up at the second reading.

Q-inaudible.

Senator McPhee: I think it would be sensible to say "approved by a 2/3rds majority", it would be sensible to say "initially approved by a majority," it is just that we wanted to have a provision in there to allow for initial faculty voice. This does that in a minimalist way. Are there other questions?

Proposed Senate Motion #31 (2007-2008) (First Reading): ACD 506-??: Faculty Membership, Appointment Categories, Ranks, and Titles. We changed the title and the purpose to be parallel with the title. We changed under policy we took out a sentence that was redundant with later provisions regarding faculty associates. It didn't seem to belong in that place in the overall document. **Regarding "fixed term appointments,"** since there is a set of reasons or grounds for which external appointment might not occur, yet there is a provision that unit bylaws or the individual employment contract must specify criteria for renewal or non-renewal, and a possible sentence to add might say in addition, "such provisions might require hiring officers to say to any fixed term appointee who is not getting renewed what the reason for non-renewal is." The reason for this whole set of provisions is that renewal can be for good reasons but can also be for academic reasons or otherwise, but that we need to guard against arbitrary and especially legal grounds for non-renewal and without having any reason provided it is very difficult to do that. This is being introduced and it might be worthy of deeper discussion next time.

Q: This sentence is dropped.

Senator McPhee: Then there are two other things—1) under **Professor emeriti**—the old language said the president will confer upon retired faculty members who served the institution for a substantial length of time the title of Emeritus. In parallel with ABOR policy, we have changed it to say the **president "may confer"** and this was also the subject of discussion and disagreement in the committee and this might be the topic that the Senate would want to discuss because on the one hand it is debatable about whether we would want to obligate the president to award every retired faculty member who has been here for some number of years the rank of emeritus, but on the other hand there is no provision in the document for any particular review process to take place for that appointment. So this may be considered substantive change. The last issue that we dealt with was the replacement of a lot of language in this document which went to the ACD manual as it stands now and compared the new document to it—you would see that a lot is gone and not substantive changes, but a lot of that was done before I started to review these policies. Are there any questions about either of these two documents?

Q: It is not a question and I represent the **Emeritus College**. **Our council is opposed to changing “will” to “may” in this document.**

Senate President: This will get a second reading on April 21st. You will be able to offer amendments. Are there other questions or informational issues? Hearing none, thank you. Next we will hear from Jerry Kingston on old business first then new business.

6. Unfinished Business.

A. Student Faculty Policy Committee (Jerry Kingston)

We are bringing you five resolutions for your consideration. The first four are Second Readings and we will vote on them. The next one you have not seen before this meeting. Since the last time that these first four resolutions were introduced—since that time we have received and sought substantial input with respect to Senate Resolution #22, so I would like to take a couple of moments to review this resolution as revised. I did not get the time to put it on the web site.

Senate Resolution #22 (2007-2008)(Second Reading) Caculating the cumulative grade point average when courses are repeated.

The first thing I would like to point out is, that the resolution we are proposing doesn't change the rules about whether a student is able to repeat a course. Under present university policy if the student receives a grade of D or E, they may repeat that course at least once. There are other rules in some colleges about whether you can repeat a class more than once with or without action of the Standards Committee—this is college specific—resolution #22 has nothing to do with the opportunity for students to repeat courses but only how they their cumulative GPAs will be calculated if they do repeat courses. The proposal that we are putting forward would put a limit of 12 credit hours on the number of credit hours that a student may repeat and count only the higher grade. There is at this time no limit on the number of courses that a student may repeat and have only higher grade included in the cumulative GPA however, the present rule restricts the possibility to use the higher grade only on 100 and 200 level classes—so there is a give, and there is a take in this resolution.

You could limit the total number of hours which the higher grade may be used up to 12 hours, but it allows those 12 hours to be at any level 100, 200, 300, or 400 level courses, so that is the major change that we are introducing. You will note that there is a revision of the original resolution we are suggesting to you, I have shown that on page 4 of the handout (orange).

First of all we have changed and would like you to approve the **amendments** that we are submitting here. We want to make clear that the opportunity to repeat a course and have the higher grade count within that 12 hour limit is only available to undergraduate students.

We must be able to use the higher grade rather than have the average grade counted in their cumulative GPA because of a number of other complexities feedback that we had received, the committee is now suggesting that the new resolution if it is approved would become effective for students first entering Arizona State University for the fall semester 2008 or after. The prospect of trying to grandfather some student or students some of whom had not repeated any courses, others had already repeated more than the limit. The endless complexities simply drove us to say if we want to do this we think the cleanest way to do it is to say, for students who are entering ASU in the fall or thereafter, their cumulative GPA will be calculated on these rules -- for students who are currently at a cumulative GPA they will have their cumulative GPA continually calculated under the old set of rules. The thing that has troubled the committee most is that this resolution if passed is going to make a substantial amount of additional work for the Registrar's Office. The Peoplesoft system that we have at the present time allows only a single method to calculate the cumulative GPA, when

courses are repeated, yet we have two different rules that the current system has to implement. You can use the higher grade if it is a 100 or 200 level class but you have to use the average grade if it is a 300 or 400 level class. What the Registrar does is that they have programmed Peoplesoft to use the higher grade for everything because most of the repeated courses are 100-200 level classes and then they are going back and they have a manual process that they have to use to average the two grades when a 300 or 400 level course is involved. What we now restricted to undergraduate students only and we restricted to students who enter on or following the fall semester, the degree of the manual complexity rises exponentially and after that discussion we decided that we should make policy about how grades are determined, not on the basis of mechanical difficulties and troubles in Peoplesoft, but rather base it on what we think the right thing is for the way we grade students at the university. They should be given, calculated, and reported. So, despite all of the complexities and difficulties that we know will be involved, which we understand could delay its implementation, we are recommending that it be done and for students entering as of fall—we believe that could be done, but our committee is not the one that handles resources to the Registrar's Office, so we are recommending this because we think a single limit of 12 hours for all students makes sense, but we recognize the implementation could be delayed. Bill do I need to move to amend our own resolution here?

Senate President Verdini: Yes. Senate Resolution 22 as written on page 4 of the salmon colored handout has two amendments that we need to act on. The first one is in item 6 with insertion of the word "undergraduate." That amendment has been made by the SFPC. Any discussion on that particular amendment? Seeing none, all in favor of adding the word undergraduate as indicated on page 4 to item 6 signify by saying aye. Any opposed? None Abstentions (1). That amendment carries. The second amendment is to item 7 and it strikes the words as of the beginning of the —and inserts the words "for students first entering Arizona State University during or following..." Any questions?

Q: A clarification. Students first entering Arizona State University is ambiguous.

Senator Kingston: A student who transfers in from another place would be first enrolling at Arizona State because they have not yet taken any credit hours, have not earned any credit hours, did not have a cumulative GPA and therefore transfer students as well as entering freshmen would be students who would be entering ASU for the first time in the fall of 2008 or after. That was our intention.

Q: Would it be more appropriate to refer to the catalog year.

Senator Kingston: We considered the issue of catalog year, but that contains its own small set of nightmares because students are allowed to change their catalog years about as often as they change their clothes. That means their cumulate GPA would fluctuate depending on how many declarations of graduation they chose to file and having considered that we decided to back away from that.

Dean Allison: It could be that we have students who are taking courses who are not enrolled, who are undergraduates, and so it could be the institution might want to say "if you are first admitted to an undergraduate degree program." That is just a possibility if you want to address any students taking courses in whatever capacity when they register at ASU count, and that could include a larger group.

Senator Kingston: My response would be that unclassified graduate students are still graduate students so they still could take so many of their hours and move them into a degree program, even though they are classified as students in other enrollment categories. We can't foresee whether or not any of the credits they have earned would ultimately become degree related credits and so our intention was—to say it another way as I could have said – as for students who do not have a GPA at ASU before the fall semester of 2008, if they don't have one then nobody got grandfathered, and everybody who did not have one is now subject to the new rule and that is why we decided on this language.

Senate President: Is there discussion on this amendment to the amendment? Seeing none, I will call for a vote on that—all in favor of the changes as indicated on page 4, item 7, signify by saying aye. Opposed? None. Abstentions (1). Thank you, that brings us back to the original #22 as amended. Any discussion?

Q: Will a student who gets an XE be allowed to repeat?

Senator Kingston: A student who receives a grade of XE is permitted under existing university policy to repeat a course, then the student who after that a cumulative GPA is calculated as the motion indicates—this resolution has nothing to do about who does and does not get to repeat a class. It has to do with how to calculate the cumulative GPA if in fact they do repeat a course.

Q: I understand your student's content about not wishing the motion to take a stand on whether courses should be repeated, but I guess I am still troubled by the resolution in part 6 "resolved that the Academic Senate recommend to the Provost that undergraduate students be permitted to repeat up to 12 hours, and when I read that I get the sense you are recommending in favor of repetition of courses. And I was going to suggest an amendment to say "if college and unit rules allow for repetition of courses for grade then only the higher grade will be calculated for up to 12 hours and after that..." I am not in conflict with your intent, I am just concerned that the provision as I read it is going beyond your attempt.

Senator Kingston: I would also try to amend my motion again myself, but I don't know if others are troubled by this issue. Our intent is clear—right now there is an unlimited number of credit hours that can be repeated at the 100 and 200 level in which students earn grades of D or E and this caps it at 12, so if you are concerned as Bob is, we could insert the word "only" to say that undergraduate students only be permitted to repeat up to 12 hour, and that would be closer to the concern that was expressed, but I don't feel it is necessary because 12 hours is 12 hours, as opposed to unlimited numbers of hours, which exist right now but I will leave it to you to decide to amend the motion.

Q: I would like to strongly discourage repeating courses. I would like to propose that GPA means GPA and you take the average no matter what courses students have taken. Students have many opportunities to drop, withdraw, I really worry about students who might use this as a type of game and these are behaviors that I would like to discourage. I think that we should demand high academic standards the whole way through and I would like to go on record in opposition to this motion.

Senator Kingston: You may vote against this motion but my comment would be I could not figure out if you do not want courses repeated--because you might want to vote in favor of the motion as it actually limits the number of courses from which the higher grade is counted rather than the average grade, and presumably that would be a disincentive for repeating courses, if the number of courses the students can repeat is limited to 12 hours. There has been a lot of confusion, but this motion has nothing to do with the number of hours that students repeat it is about how you calculate the cumulative GPA.

Q: Wouldn't it be simpler if to just prohibit retaking courses without petitioning the Standards Committee. We extended the drop period, etc.

Would you be speaking for or against the motion as to how we calculate the cumulative GPA?

Q: I think a simple rule would be better, so, this is well intended but too complicated.

Q: This has to do with part 6 that students should be permitted to repeat up to 12 hours of courses. The way that I read this is that they can repeat up to 12 hours of courses earning the higher grade, and then they can go on and repeat courses afterwards.

Senator Kingston: That is exactly right, under the present university policy and under this policy, this resolution has nothing to do with the number of hours students can repeat, it only relates to how the cumulative GPA will be calculated if we want to do so.

Q: Can we make a friendly resolution saying that “to get the average course break included for all the courses beyond the 12 hours limit”—because what I understand here is that his concern is with too many hours being repeated. Can’t we ask to limit students to just 12 hours of repeated courses.

Senator Kingston: If we do not pass this resolution, and if it is not implemented by the Provost then the existing system continues. The existing system will allow a student to repeat 50 hours of 100-200 level courses if they got D’s or E’s in all of them. We are attempting to limit the number of courses for which a student may repeat and count the higher grade as opposed to the average grade. Could someone else say it differently? This is a resolution about calculating GPAs.

Q: If we want to say something about limiting the number of hours that a student can repeat that would have to be a separate resolution.

Senator Kingston: Yes, and I would appreciate it if you did not send it to the SFPC.

Parliamentarian Vandermeer: If you want to talk about the number of hours that students are actually repeating, maybe we need to see some data on this, because we are talking about policies—I suggest that we vote this measure up or down as it is and then get into the harder question on courses as another new business item.

Senate President: Are there further comments?

Q: Wasn’t that data that you were just suggesting that we see last spring I believe, that we had a Task Force devoted to this issue that was going to get the different data for us? What happened on that?

Senator Kingston: The T.F. last spring that was appointed by the Provost to my knowledge had no data and one or two meetings by email, and issued a report that came to the Senate and the Senate was not happy and somewhat unsure of the foundations of their proposals, and that is when it got assigned to the Student Faculty Policy Committee. We went back and got the data on all of the students who graduated in May of 2007 and went back and calculated the number of repeated courses, how their cumulative GPAs were to come out on the number of different grading scenarios and all of that data was presented to you at the last meeting, and has been up on the Senate Web page for about 6-8 weeks now, and out of all of that data came this resolution as the best proposal in the judgment of the Student Faculty Policy Committee to try to balance a lot of important concerns.

Senate President: Is there further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of Resolution #22 as amended in item 6 and 7 signify by saying aye. All opposed, like sign? None. Abstentions (3). The motion carried by a voice vote of those present.

Senate Resolution #22 carried as amended in item 6 and 7.

Senate Resolution #23(2007-2008) (Second Reading): Extending the drop period.

We next want to present SR #23 as in its original form without further amendment found on page 5 of the handout. This is a resolution to cure, in a micro-setting, a particular problem that occurs when for the spring semester Martin Luther King Day takes place on a Monday and then school begins on Tuesday in the spring semester—Drop/Add ends on Friday at 5:00 p.m. or maybe online it is extended through the weekend—but a student who enrolled in a Monday only class would not have an opportunity to drop the class before attending that class for the first time. Without trying to change any other part of drop add, what we are