

  
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

M E M O R A N D U M

To: Gary Grossman  
President, University Senate

Date: October 1, 2010

From: Elizabeth D. Capaldi  
Executive Vice President and University Provost



Re: Motions from Senate

In reviewing the motions forwarded by the senate this year, I am pleased to advise you that the curricular motions have all been adopted and implemented. These are motions numbered 5-16, 25-26, 34-42, 47-64, 66-68 and 71.

Motion 78 (addressing the prospect of legislative action concerning guns on university campuses), 85 and 85a (addressing Senate Bill 1070 concerning enforcement by police of illegal immigrants) and the unnumbered Senate resolution on tuition and fees (supporting the university's position) were appreciated and helpful to the university this past year. While Senate bill 1070 did pass (and has for the time being had the most of the controversial aspects struck down by the court), we were successful in ensuring guns on campuses were not allowed under state law and the Arizona Board of Regents adopted a substantial portion of our request concerning tuition and fees for this current fiscal year. Such support by the University Senate as the voice of the faculty is instrumental in advancing our positions collectively. It is particularly helpful for the Arizona Board of Regents to hear your expression of support for matters like tuition and fees as they need to hear from the faculty on these important issues.

Motion 77 addressing teaching resources on campus raised the concern about individual instructors not having access to the necessary supplies to deliver the requisite instruction and in particular, graduate teaching assistants and non-tenure eligible faculty. This is a serious matter as effective teaching is a very high priority for ASU. I will remind the deans that any restriction on resources for teaching should be carefully considered with respect to the impact it may have and that such restrictions should not be selective based on the employment category of the instructor for the course. As you know, some limits are necessary in light of our financial circumstances and are appropriate especially where effective alternatives exist (e.g., posting syllabi on Blackboard rather than making photocopies for distribution). Nonetheless, teaching is at the heart of what we do and I will discuss this with the deans to ensure we make our best efforts to avoid unnecessary limitations on resources for teaching.

Motion 76 concerned affirmative action and contained a number of recommendations. First, was the urging that the search for a new director of the Office of Diversity (now the Office of Equity and Inclusion) be completed. I am pleased to advise you that Ms. Kamala Green has been hired to serve as Senior Director of the Office of Equity and Inclusion. Kamala comes to ASU from the Lawrence Berkeley

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST  
OF THE UNIVERSITY

300 EAST UNIVERSITY DRIVE  
PO BOX 877805 TEMPE, AZ 85287-7805  
(480) 965-4995 Fax: (480) 965-0785

National Laboratory where she has most recently served as their Senior Manager for Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action. As you may know this National Lab has over 3800 employees and includes over 1700 scientists. Kamala begins September 20, 2010. Second, it was recommended that diversity data transparency be enhanced and it be made available to the Senate. While it is not clear what is perceived as not available or transparent, we can report annually on the hires made and the diversity of the new faculty members. This past academic year we hired 100 new faculty (some starting in AY 11-12) and of that total, 40% were female and 35% were minorities. The third recommendation refers to reporting on targeted and non-targeted hires. I am not aware of when this reporting might have been done as it has not been done since I became Provost. Generally, we restrict the use of targeted hiring to senior appointments or individuals whose abilities and background are such that it would be unlikely that we could recruit such talent in a search. However, we can summarize that data for you annually when we report on our hiring outcomes. The fourth recommendation sought to increase the percentage of faculty in each academic unit that has completed training in effective search practices. We offer these workshops annually on all campuses and would ask that you encourage your colleagues to attend so we can increase the percentage of individuals who have taken the training. We also make the presentation available on the Provost's website for those who want to consult on their own. The fifth recommendation is to require an Affirmative Action trained member present at every search meeting or interview. This is not practical as many meetings are individuals, selected constituency groups, or with administrators. We certainly expect the search committees to have as many trained people as possible from our effective search workshops so the visit for candidates is designed with an understanding of those principles but it is not feasible nor necessary to mandate it at every meeting (I would add that we have had no complaints about our hiring processes in quite a few years and last year we had over 5500 applicants for all positions posted). The sixth recommendation is to identify the procedures that verify at the unit and system level that affirmative action hiring practices and procedures are in place. These are practices are mandated in ABOR and university policy and by federal government statute. We review all applicant lists for positions in my office prior to authorizing interviews to ensure the search plan was broad in scope to attract a diverse pool, that the applicant pool is diverse or there is a reasonable explanation as to why it is not (e.g., availability data indicates there are few potential minority candidates), and that the explanations for who is to be interviewed or not are consistent with the evidence and job description. Finally, the last recommendation is for a report to the senate annually on policies, procedures and data. While I am pleased to provide a report on our annual hiring activity, I cannot see why we would recapitulate policy and procedures in such a report but would alert you to any changes or proposed changes. As I mentioned earlier, we will provide the data on our hiring activities annually.

Last but not least, the senate through a resolution, forwarded a task force report on tuition remission concerning graduate students employed as research or teaching assistants. I appreciate the work of the task force as we share a commitment to strong graduate programs as they are a key element to achieving the goals of the university. In fact, we want to identify and strengthen programs that contribute to our goals for top-rated graduate programs. In order to do so in economic times like these, we must use strategies that promote program strength without compromising our financial position. Following your report, I requested an analysis of the financial impact of continuing the existing policy compared to the recommendation of the Task Force to charge tuition remission on the basis of the resident tuition rate. The analysis compares (a) the revenue impact based on the number of RAs and

the model in place last fiscal year (mix of grants grandfathered in at the rate based charge and new grants charged at the AY rate of \$11,554) to resident tuition rate based charges and (b) the revenue impact of full implementation of the blended rate compared to resident tuition rate based charges. Based on the number of RAs/TAs last year, charging at the resident rate would have generated \$1.5M dollars less than was generated using the blended rate. When fully implemented, the difference amounts to \$11.5M in less revenue generated using the resident tuition rate. At this time, when the budget is in a precarious state due to unknowns associated with the state contribution to the university and the tuition to be charged in the future coupled with the knowledge that the stimulus funding ends in August 2011, the university must weigh decisions that potentially decrease revenue carefully. Even with the potential for fewer RA positions being funded by research grants, we simply cannot implement a policy change that has the potential to reduce revenue at this magnitude, at this point in time. In fact, if we did, it is certain to have a greater negative impact on our ability to fund graduate education as we do now.

For FY 2010-11, we will reset the base charge, which will be maintained at the blended rate charge of 11,554 for the AY rate. In future years, we will consider rate increases in the context of graduate tuition rate increases adopted by ABOR, using this reset rate as the basis for future calculations.

On the issue raised regarding grants that face an NIH cap, we will consider on a case-by-case basis how to fund tuition remission. In these cases, all other potential sources of funding (e.g., investigator incentive funds, RID funds, other local funds) must be considered as the first alternative source of funding.

As you know we are still working through all of the proposals concerning the ACD manual changes and will respond to you at a later time on the status of those recommendations.

Thank you and your senate colleagues for their work last year on all of these matters. I am looking forward to our work together in the coming year.