

Senate Council

Monday, April 18, 2022

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3:00 PM on Monday, April 18, 2022, in 103 Main Building, although a video conference link was also available. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken electronically using Poll Everywhere unless otherwise specified. Specific voting information can be requested from the Office of the Senate Council (SC).

Senate Council Chair Aaron Cramer (EN) called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:00 PM. The Chair welcomed those present. He informed everyone that the session was being recorded for notetaking purposes and noted that it was an open meeting. He asked that all attendees, online and in person, state their name and affiliation prior to speaking, to ensure everyone knew who was speaking. He suggested that anyone attending via phone use a headset, as using speakerphone made it difficult for audio to be captured and others to hear.

1. Minutes from April 4 and Announcements

The Chair reported that no edits were received for the minutes from the April 4 SC meeting. There being **no objections**, the minutes from April 4 were **approved as distributed by unanimous consent**.

The Chair informed SC members that the SC retreat would take place on Friday, May 13 and would be located off-campus. The Chair asked SC members to send any dietary preferences to Katie Silver by Friday, April 22.

The Chair invited Acting Provost Robert DiPaola to provide an update to SC members. The Provost noted he wanted to keep everyone up to date about the College of Arts and Sciences dean search. The Provost informed SC members that a series of candidates would begin to arrive next week and asked SC members to contact Anna Chalfant if they had not already received invitations for meetings with the candidates. The Provost explained the search process, noting numerous meetings with the candidates who were recommended by the search committee. The Provost commented that he met with the search committee as well to provide a progress update and to inform the search committee that their recommendation had been followed in terms of candidate selection. The Provost explained that in addition to meetings with SC, the Senate, and the College of Arts and Sciences, forums would take place for additional input and interaction which could be submitted up to 48 hours after the forum. The Provost informed SC members that information about the candidates would be available 24 hours prior to their campus visit.

The Chair informed SC members of a query from the Provost's office about the search for the Chellgren Chair and Director of the Chellgren Center for Undergraduate Excellence and whether there should be an open forum. The Chair explained that after discussion with Vice Chair and Chair-elect DeShana Collett (HS), he communicated with the Provost that a forum was not necessary for this particular search at this particular time.

The Chair informed SC members that Acting Dean of the Graduate School Martha Peterson was not yet able to join and asked that SC members postpone the second agenda item until Peterson was available. There were **no objections**.

3. Proposed Change to College of Medicine 2022-23 Calendar

The Chair explained the proposed change to the College of Medicine 2022-23 Calendar. The Chair noted there were incorrect dates submitted for spring break and explained the change would move the first day of spring break from April 1, 2023 to April 9, 2023. The Chair asked if there were any questions and there were none.

Grossman (AS) **moved** to approve the proposed change to the College of Medicine 2022-23 calendar. Vincent (BE) **seconded**. The Chair asked if there was any debate and there was none. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

4. Committee Reports

a. Senate Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) – Gregg Hall, chair

i. Proposed Move of Institute for Biomedical Informatics from Provost to Vice President for Research

The Chair invited SAOSC Chair Gregg Hall to provide a committee report. Hall explained the proposed move of the Institute for Biomedical Informatics (IBI) from the Office of the Provost to the Vice President for Research. Hall noted that Jeffrey Talbert (PH) was attending as well. The Chair asked if there were any questions.

Oltmann (CI) asked Collett if the proposal was aligned with the conversations that were had by the Ad Hoc Committee on Courses without Faculty Oversight. Collett asked Talbert if there were faculty or courses housed in IBI. Talbert noted that there were neither faculty nor courses currently housed there.

The **motion** from committee was for SC to recommend Senate endorse proposed move of Institute for Biomedical Informatics from Provost to Vice President for Research. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair asked if there was any debate and there was none. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed and two abstained.

b. Senate Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) – Leslie Vincent, chair

The Chair invited SAPC Chair Leslie Vincent to provide a committee report.

i. Proposed 4+1 between BHS Clinical Leadership and Management and Master of Health Administration (CLM + MHA)

Vincent explained the proposed 4+1 between the BHS in Clinical Leadership and Management and the Master of Health Administration (CLM + MHA). Vincent noted that Sarah Wackerbarth (HS) and Maureen Jones (HS) were attending as well. The Chair asked if there were any questions and there were none.

The **motion** from committee was for SC to recommend Senate approve the proposed 4+1 between BHS Clinical Leadership and Management and Master of Health Administration (CLM + MHA). Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair asked if there was any debate. Grossman noted the proposal was very similar to the University Scholars Program. The Chair noted the SAPC had been tasked with the known issue of similar proposals. Cagle (AS) commented the attachments to the proposal indicated awareness of the issue as well. The Chair asked if there was any further debate and there was none. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

ii. Proposed Change to MPH

Vincent explained proposed change to the MPH to SC members. The Chair asked if there were questions and there were none.

The **motion** from committee was for SC to recommend Senate approve the proposed significant change and add online delivery to MPH. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair asked if there was any debate and there was none. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

Oltmann asked if it was permitted for SC to vote on motions with dual implications, such as the significant change and addition of online delivery. The Chair noted that this was permitted, but a motion could be

made to separate such actions if necessary. The Chair thanked Vincent for the report and for her committee's ongoing hard work.

c. Senate Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) – DeShana Collett, chair

i. *Proposed Changes to Senate Rules 5.2.6.5.1.6 (“Prep Week and Reading Days”)*

Collet explained the changes to *Senate Rules 5.2.5.1.6 (“Prep Week and Reading Days”)* to SC members, noting that changes were addressed, reviewed, and voted in favor by the SREC. The Chair clarified that such changes were mechanical implementations that did not require action from SC or Senate. The Chair noted that the SREC was drawing the attention of SC broadly to the policy itself and whether a take home exam should be distributed during Prep Week so long as it did not require reaction until the date of the final exam. Committee member Roger Brown (AG) asked SC members to observe a substantive change that while Prep Week was understood as a five-day week, it was not concretely defined in the rule and asked whether this should include Saturday and Sunday.

SC members and guests discussed the following:

- The definitions of “prep days” and “reading days” and whether voluntary review sessions should be permitted on reading days, when classes were not permitted
- The Senate approved calendar did not refer to Prep Week, but referred to three prep days and two reading days
- Sending the issue to a calendar committee would be beneficial
- The original language indicating when take home exams issued during Prep Week could be collected should be added back to the rules for clarity

Oltmann **moved** that the SC refer the issue of weekend days being part of Prep Week to an ad hoc calendar committee. Grossman **seconded**. The Chair asked if there was any debate. Tagavi (EN) asked if the SREC could determine the question referred to the ad hoc calendar committee, but the Chair comments on the apparent disagreement expressed by members within the SREC. The Chair noted that he expected the SREC did not find such a definition to be clear. The Chair noted he would assume it to be his responsibility to compose the ad hoc committee and identify its chair unless SC members indicated otherwise. Grossman suggested soliciting membership of such a committee from members of the previous committee that introduced reading days. Hawse recommend students be solicited for the committee as well. There being **no objections**, the motion to refer the broad question of a defined Prep Week to an ad hoc calendar committee was **passed by way of unanimous consent**.

Cagle **moved** to restore the language that specified the collection date for a take home exam distributed during Prep Week to be no earlier than the final exam date. Grossman **seconded**. The Chair asked if there was any debate. Brown asked if the motion intended to constrain the ad hoc calendar committee. The Chair noted that the motion would specify that exams could not be collected on Saturday or Sunday, as final exams did not occur on Saturday or Sunday. Cagle clarified that the language also prohibited instructors from collected exams earlier during Finals Week, which could negatively impact a student's final exam schedule. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed and two abstained. It was clarified that the proposed edits did not need Senate review and would be incorporated into the SRs by the SREC.

In response to a question from Vincent about whether a student could ask to take a make-up exam on a reading day or request to give a presentation on a reading day, the Chair opined that it was acceptable to accommodate a student.

2. Honorary Degree Recipient

The Chair introduced Acting Dean of the Graduate School Martha Peterson to provide information to SC members about the Honorary Degree Nominee. Tagavi raised a concern regarding the agenda item because the name of the nominee was not provided to SC members prior to the meeting. Tagavi requested the rationale for not entrusting SC members with the names of the nominees before the actual presentation to members. The Chair noted that he would secure the request for justification for SC. Tagavi continued expressing concern that the agenda item was too vague and secretive; the Chair noted that as a matter of parliamentary inquiry, he was ruling that the agenda item was in order. The Chair clarified for SC members that if there was disagreement about his ruling, it would be appropriate to move and second a motion to that effect, but no such motion was made.

Peterson presented information to SC members about honorary degree nominee BV. The Chair asked if there were any questions. Grossman asked if the nominee was being considered for the May 2022 commencement. The Chair specified that nominations were not necessarily associated with a specific commencement date. There are restrictions within the SRs about how many honorary degrees may be awarded in an academic year, as well as how many may be awarded at a single commencement ceremony. In accordance with those restrictions, the president was free to schedule Senate-approved honorary degree recipients as he sees fit.

The **motion** from committee was for that elected faculty senators approve BV as the recipient of an Honorary Doctor of Humane Letters, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair asked if there was any debate. Trustee Lee Blonder (ME) spoke in favor of the nominee. SGA President Michael Hawse noted a point of order regarding the anonymous nature of the use of Poll Everywhere for polling purposes for a vote restricted to elected faculty members, noting that it did not appear students and faculty were differentiated. The Chair clarified all votes could be traced with the Poll Everywhere software, and informed SC members that only elected faculty SC members were permitted to vote on the honorary degree recipient nomination. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

The Chair asked Peterson if there were any other reports from the Graduate School. Peterson requested input from SC members about the possibility of removing the GRE requirement as part of the University requirement for the Graduate School. Peterson explained that currently only 25% of the University's graduate programs required GRE scores and that the requirement itself created barriers for students to apply. Peterson noted a more diverse pool of applicants was available for programs that did not require GRE scores. Peterson informed SC members that the University's Directors of Graduate Studies were polled and resulted in 50 in favor of removing the requirement and 10 opposed. Peterson noted any change would need to be simple to maintain the current status for programs that currently require and would continue to require GRE scores. Peterson noted the Graduate Council supported the removal of the requirement unanimously. SC members briefly discussed the possible removal of the GRE requirement as part of the University requirement for the Graduate School. Peterson asked if a change would need to be made to the *Senate Rules* if the removal was proposed. The Chair confirmed and also clarified that a proposal would need to include what *Senate Rules* needed to be changed.

4. Committee Reports (continued)

d. Ad Hoc Committee on Courses without Faculty Oversight – DeShana Collett

i. *Final Report*

The Chair invited Collett to provide a final report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Courses without Faculty Oversight. Collett provided an extensive report to SC members. SC members asked some questions for points of clarification about where some of the courses were homed and what some of the course prefixes stood for.

The **motion** from committee was for SC to recommend that Senate approve the recommendations in the report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Courses without Faculty Oversight. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair asked if there was any debate. Tagavi asked for a point of clarification regarding the subcommittee recommendation for the SC to endorse the designation of the Provost's Office as the "college" for courses without faculty oversight; he wondered if the language should refer to approval rather than endorsement. The Chair observed that due to constraints by SAP, the identifier "college" itself was likely outside of the Senate's direct realm of approval, which was the basis for an endorsement recommendation. Collett concurred that an endorsement was appropriate, since Senate did not have control over this function of SAP. Grossman thanked Collett for the incredible amount of work that went into the report.

Grossman commented that requiring an assessment yearly may be excessive and stated that every three years may be more appropriate. Vincent noted that the assessment described would assess the makeup of the faculty body to ensure composition matched what the committee felt was appropriate. Oltmann commented that the committee was concerned about drift occurring if programs only assessed and reported on the makeup of the faculty body every three years. Oltmann noted that by requiring such a report annually, this issue could be avoided. The Chair noted the recommendation did not specify assessment, but rather a report to ensure courses were being governed appropriately.

Grossman **moved** to amend the report to change the word "annual" to "periodic," so the recommendation was not specified as occurring every year. Hawse **seconded**. The Chair asked if there was any debate. Vincent stated that she preferred a timeline to be specified, noting that the committee did not believe an annual review of composition would be too burdensome. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **failed** with two in favor, eight opposed and none abstained.

The Chair asked if there was any further debate on the motion from committee and there was none. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

The Chair thanked Collett and the committee for their extensive work.

e. Ad Committee on Academic Policies for Unscheduled Closings – Akiko Takenaka

i. *Final Report*

Due to time constraints, the Chair suggested the final report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Policies for Unscheduled Closings be placed on the April 25 SC agenda as old business. There were **no objections**.

5. Items from the Floor

The Chair noted the time was past 5:00 PM and that there was not sufficient time for items from the floor. The Provost expressed thanks to Vice Chair and Chair-elect Collett for the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on Courses without Faculty Oversight.

The meeting adjourned at 5:06 PM with **no objections**.

Respectfully submitted by,
Aaron Cramer

Prepared by Katie Silver on Wednesday, April 20, 2022

SC Members Present: Blonder, Cagle, Cantrell, Collett, Cramer, DeCorte, Duncan, Hawse, Grossman, Oltmann, Swanson, Tagavi, Takenaka, Vincent

Invited Guests Present: Sheila Brothers, Robert DiPaola, Gregg Hall, Martha Peterson

