Senate Council

Monday, November 28, 2022

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3:00 PM on Monday, November 28, 2022, in 103 Main Building, although a video conference link was also available for members. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken electronically otherwise specified. Specific voting information can be requested from the Office of the Senate Council (SC).

Senate Council Chair DeShana Collett (HS) called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:00 PM. The Chair welcomed those present. She informed everyone that the session was being recorded for notetaking purposes and noted that it was an open meeting. She asked that all attendees, online and in person, state their name and affiliation prior to speaking, to ensure everyone knew who was speaking. The Chair asked SC members to be ready to vote via Poll Everywhere. The Chair reminded SC members that regarding the ability to speak, members must raise their hand to be called upon. The Chair also reminded everyone that SC members would have priority speaking, noting that others may be called upon as needed and given a chance to speak only if there were no additional comments from SC members.

The Chair asked SC members and guests to introduce themselves. SC members and guests introduced themselves.

1. Minutes from November 7, 2022 and Announcements

The Chair informed SC members that clerical edits were received to the November 7, 2022 minutes. There being **no objections,** the minutes from November 7, 2022 were **approved as amended by unanimous consent.**

The Chair announced that Undergraduate Council (UC) Chair Kristine Urschel had asked UC members to track time spent on UC work. The Chair noted that the time allocations would provide a better understanding of how the academic council worked and could be used to determine if more members were needed and if distribution of effort (DOE) time allocations were sufficient.

The Chair asked SC members to recall that she shared with SC a couple weeks ago the results of SC's Faculty Evaluation of President Capilouto, which she had previously presented to the Board of Trustees. The Chair informed SC members that she had recently met with President Capilouto, who asked her several questions. The President followed up with a series of emails to the Chair, requesting further information related to survey results, statistical methodology, and committee composition. The Chair explained that she would be reconvening the subcommittee to provide a follow-up report regarding the President's requests that would be presented to SC members, and then shared with the President.

2. Degree Recipient

a. Honorary Degree Recipient - University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees Chair Martha Peterson

The Chair invited University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees (UJCHD) Chair Martha Peterson to provide information about the honorary degree recipient candidate. The Chair reminded everyone present that the information about degree recipients, including honorary degree recipients, is confidential and embargoed until such time that it is announced by the University. Peterson provided information to SC members about the honorary degree recipient candidate.

The Chair stated that although there was a recommendation from the UJCHD, a motion and second were needed from SC, as the UJCHD was not a Senate committee.

Marilyn Duncan (ME) **moved** that the elected faculty members of SC recommend that Senate approve WLP the recipient of an Honorary Doctor of Humane Letters, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Bob Grossman (AS) **seconded.** The Chair asked if there were any questions of fact or debate.

Kaveh Tagavi (EN) commented that he would prefer to have additional notice of the degree recipient to provide a more informed opinion and asked what the rationale was for not revealing the candidate to SC members sooner. A thorough discussion took place during which SC members discussed the current process in place for how honorary degree recipient information was transmitted to SC members. SC members asked Peterson a variety of questions.

The Chair reminded SC members that only elected faculty members of the SC could vote on honorary degree recipients. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed and three abstained.

Peterson asked SC members if the slides she provided that summarized the honorary degree recipient were sufficient for SC members, and the Chair commented that they were. Grossman **moved** that the SC ask the UJCHD Chair to provide the honorary degree nominees at least four days' in advance of a meeting at which the SC or Senate would be voting on an honorary degree recipient. Tagavi **seconded.** A few comments were made regarding timing for the action from the UJCHD. A **vote** was taken by show of hands, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

3. Proposed Change to *Senate Rules 6.5.2.2 ("Composition of the University Appeals Board," "The Student Membership")*

The Chair explained that SC members had recently seen this proposed change and thought the then-proposed language was still not sufficiently inclusive for UAB student membership. The Chair reminded everyone that SC members provided feedback to make the language more inclusive. The Chair noted that since that meeting, she had reviewed *Governing Regulation (GR) XI.E.2* and realized that the *SR* language had drifted. After further review, it became apparent that the *SR* language was different from the *GR.* The Chair suggested copying the language from the *GR* verbatim and adding it to the *SR.*

Tagavi **moved** to approve the proposed change to *SR 6.5.2.2* to be consistent with *GR XI.E.2.* Andrew Laws (SGA) **seconded.** The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate. SC members discussed the following:

- Adopting a practice of putting all *GR* language included in the *SRs* in quotation marks
- A lack of clarity in the *GR* regarding student membership
- Striking the language entirely and referencing the *GR* instead
- Whether this was a common practice among other sections in the *SRs*

Grossman **moved** to amend the current motion to keep the first proposed sentence that stated GR XI.E.2 describes the student composition and delete the remaining proposed text. SC Vice Chair Leslie Vincent (BE) **seconded.** The Chair asked if there was any discussion.

Tagavi commented that the same practice for other portions of the *SRs* that contained language from the *GRs* should be implemented. Sandra Bastin (AG) noted that she appreciated redundancy for some things, but that simplification may be better in this instance. Grossman suggested hyperlinking the *GRs* in the *SRs*, since Senate did not have control over the language in the *GRs.* A **vote** was taken by show of hands to amend the original motion, and the motion **passed** with one opposed and none abstained.

The Chair stated the motion on the floor was now the amended motion for *SR 6.5.2.2.* The Chair asked if there was any other discussion. Tagavi commented that there were more procedural issues regarding the *GR*

description of the UAB decision. Senate Parliamentarian Gregg Rentfrow (AG) ruled Tagavi's comment **out of order** as it did not pertain to *SR 6.5.2.2.* A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

The Chair commented that Tagavi's concern could be sent back to SREC for additional cleanup. Tagavi noted that he would send additional comments to her.

4. Committee Reports

a. Senate Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAASC) - Leslie Vincent, Chair

The Chair invited SAASC Chair Leslie Vincent (BE) to provide a committee report to SC members.

i. *Proposed Change to BA/BS Communication*

Vincent described the proposed change to the BA/BS Communication.

The Chair stated that there was a recommendation from the committee for the Senate to approve the proposed changes to the BA/BS Communication. Because the **motion** comes from committee, no **second** is required.

The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate. Grossman asked if the changed GPA requirement was just for pre-major classes. Proposer Kelly McAninch (CI) confirmed this was correct. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

b. Senate Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) - Sandra Bastin, Chair

The Chair invited SAPC Chair Sandra Bastin to provide a committee report to SC members.

i. *Proposed New USP between BS Computer Science and MS Data Science*

Bastin explained the proposed new USP between the BS Computer and MS Data Science.

The motion from committee was for SC to recommend Senate approve the proposed new USP between BS Computer Science and MS Data Science. Because the **motion** came from the committee, no **second** was required.

The Chair asked if there were any questions of fact or debate. Grossman stated that he supported the proposal, along with the next six proposals on the agenda that Bastin would present to the SC. Bastin explained the seven proposals were similar in nature and provided a brief overview. Grossman **offered a substitute motion,** to consider all seven proposals from the SAPC as a single item. Vincent **seconded.** There being **no objections,** the motion to consider the seven proposals under a single vote **passed** with unanimous consent.

ii. *Proposed New USP between BS Biomedical Engineering and MS Biomedical Engineering*
iii. *Proposed New USP between BS Biomedical Engineering and PhD Biomedical Engineering*
iv. *Proposed New USP between BS Aerospace Engineering and MS Aerospace Engineering*
v. *Proposed New USP between BS Aerospace Engineering and PhD Aerospace Engineering*
vi. *Proposed New USP between BS Mechanical Engineering and MS Aerospace Engineering*
vii. *Proposed New USP between BS Mechanical Engineering and PhD Aerospace Engineering*

The Chair stated that the motion was for SC to recommend Senate approve the seven proposals from SAPC. Because the **motion** was from the committee, no **second** was required. The Chair asked if there were any questions. Faculty Trustee Aaron Cramer (EN) suggested SC also add the seven proposals to

the Senate agenda as a single agenda item as well. A **vote** was taken by show of hands, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

c. Senate Calendar Committee (SCC) - Richard Charnigo, Chair

The Chair invited SCC Chair Richard Charnigo (PbH) to provide a committee report to SC members.

i. *Proposed Nonstandard Calendar for Physician Assistant Studies*

Charnigo explained the Nonstandard Calendar for Physician Assistant Studies to SC members. Charnigo also explained that the request was made for in perpetuity, but that calendars were no longer being approved in perpetuity. Charnigo noted that the proposal indicated the request was to be approved through June 2024.

The motion from committee was a recommendation from the SCC for the SC to approve the proposed nonstandard calendar for a series of PAS courses listed in the proposal (PAS 660, 661, 662, 663, 665, 669, 670, 671, and 680). In this context, SC recognized that it is also necessary to grant *SR* waivers for Reading Days and Prep Week (*SR 5.2.5.6*), as well as a waiver (*SR 2.1.3*) of University holidays for Thanksgiving Friday (the day immediately following Thanksgiving), and a waiver of academic holidays (Fall Break, Spring Break, the Wednesday immediately before Thanksgiving and the Saturday immediately following Thanksgiving). The effective timeframe should the request be granted will be through June 2024. Because the **motion** came from the committee, no **second** was required. The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate.

SC members asked a variety of clarifying questions about the proposal. Senate Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) Chair Roger Brown (AG) noted that the *SR 5.2.5.6* was now called "Prep Days and Reading Days," and recommended the clerical change be made accordingly. University Registrar Kim Taylor described the conditions for being permitted to overlap semesters or terms and asked the proposal representative, Shelly Irving (HS), if the course offerings met all three conditions for. Irving confirmed that the PAS courses involved in the request met these conditions. The Chair asked Irving to update the proposal to make the clerical change suggested by Brown and send the revised proposal to the SC office. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

ii. *Request for Waiver of SR 2.1.2.3 ("Summer Session")*

Charnigo described the request for the waiver of SR 2.1.2.3 ("Summer Session") for the 2023-2024 University Academic Calendar. Charnigo explained this was for the University 2023-24 Academic Calendar, noting that the request pertained to the general University calendar for 2023-24. The Chair noted that University Registrar Kim Taylor was attending. The motion from committee was a recommendation that on behalf of the Senate, SC approve a waiver of *SR 2.1.2.3* and *SR 2.1.2.5* regarding when the summer session begins. Because the **motion** came from the committee, no **second** was required.

The Chair opened the floor for questions of fact and debate. SC members asked a variety of questions. A discussion took place regarding the recommended timelines from the registrar's office for which part-of-term summer courses should be scheduled. Vincent asked to call the question, to which there no objections. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with one opposed and none abstained.

iii. *Proposed 2023-24 University Calendar*

Charnigo explained the proposed 2023-24 University Calendar. The motion from committee was a recommendation that in accordance with SR 2, SC approve the proposed 2023-24 University Calendar and present the calendar to the Senate for final approval (i.e., a web transmittal). Because the **motion** came from the committee, no **second** was required.

The Chair opened the floor for questions of fact and debate. Two clerical errors were noted. SC requested that the Registrar change "Prep Week" to "Prep Days" and correct "Prep Days" to fall on "Monday - Wednesday" instead of "Monday - Friday. The Registrar agreed to make the appropriate clerical changes. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

In the interest of time, the Chair asked SC members if there were any objections to considering agenda item number 5 next. There were **no objections.**

5. Proposed Changes to Senate Rules 1.3 ("Councils of the Senate") and SR 1.4.1 ("Structure of University Senate Committees") and SR 3.1.3 ("Procedures for Processing Academic Programs and Changes") - Discussion Only

The Chair reminded SC members that this activity was to update and standardize the *SR* language to regarding charges and compositions of the Senate's academic councils and committees. The Chair informed SC members that the SREC identified a number of issues that needed to be resolved that were posted with the agenda for today's meeting. The Chair noted that the SREC noticed other areas that needed attention as well, but that those were substantive and would be placed before the SC in the spring. The Chair asked SC members to use the track changes version of both proposed changes during the discussion. The Chair reminded SC members that this activity was discussion only. The Chair informed SC members that each issue identified by the SREC would be discussed.

The Chair asked if there were any general comments about the proposed changes to sections 1 and 3 of the *SRs* and there were none. The Chair then asked SC members to provide feedback on each issue identified by the SREC. The following feedback was provided for each item:

A. Language on Recommending
   - SC members recommended that the language to be used should be the given committee "shall recommend to the SC on…" for committee recommendations

B. How Student Members are Placed on Committees
   - There were no objections from SC members to the recommendation from the SC office for the student members of academic councils and committees to be nominated by SGA (and ultimately appointed by the SC)

C. How Ex Officio Nonvoting Members are Included
   - There were no objections from SC members to the recommendation from the SC office for the administrative ex officio members to be nominated by the office they represent (and ultimately appointed by the SC)

D. Language Describing Vacancies
   - SC members recommended that the language describing vacancies should be "members shall serve until the expiration of their terms or until their successors have been named."

E. Final Decision-Making Authority for Graduate Council (GC)
   - There were no objections from SC members to the recommendation from the SC office to change the language to "the GC does not have any final decision-making authority, except as related to individual student situations and as described in *SR 3.1.1.3.1.1* and *3.1.1.3.2.1 - 3.1.1.3.21.2."*

F. Filling Academic Council Vacancies
- There were no objections from SC members to the recommendation from the SC office to change the language to "if there is no such individual, the chair of the academic council shall, after consulting with the Senate Council Chair and the Senate Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), appoint an eligible member who fulfills the requirements of the vacant seat"

G. Non-Voting Status of Ex Officios
- SC members discussed where to place language to describe the nonvoting status of ex officio members for committees and academic councils and whether that language should be included in every committee's composition language
- The SC Chair asked Brown (chair of Senate's Rules and Elections Committee) to revisit the issue
- Brown agreed to look at alternative language to be used

H. Comprised vs Composed
- There were no objections from SC members to the recommendation from the SC office to use "composed of"

The Chair described two additional issues that had been raised by the SREC pertaining to the routing of courses to the GCCR Committee and the Senate UK Core Education Committee (SUKCEC). The Chair explained the Undergraduate Council (UC) was currently working on proposed changes to this section, so it was reasonable to not make any changes at this time. The Chair also explained that SREC noticed there was a disconnect in how UK Core courses moved through the Senate. The proposed language to resolve the second issue would replace "the UK Core Program" with "UK Core Courses" in *SR 3.2.3.3.2.4.* There were no objections to this change.

The Chair asked SC members to look over the changes again and send any edits or concerns to Sheila Brothers (SC Office). The Chair noted that next week would be the last week for discussion before the proposed changes would go to the Senate.

In the interest of time, the Chair stated that the remaining agenda items would come back to SC as old business at the next SC meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:12 PM with **no objections.**

Respectfully submitted by,
DeShana Collett

Prepared by Katie Silver on Tuesday, November 29, 2022

SC Members Present: Sandra Bastin, Susan Cantrell, Richard Charnigo, DeShana Collett, Aaron Cramer, Olivia Davis, Marilyn Duncan, Bob Grossman, Andrew Laws, Kiarah Raglin, Hollie Swanson, Kaveh Tagavi, Akiko Takenaka, Leslie Vincent

Invited Guests Present: Kelly McAninch, Sheila Brothers, Roger Brown, Katie Cardarelli, Robert DiPaola, Shelly Irving, Alexandre Martin, Sue Nokes, Martha Peterson, Gregg Rentfrow, Brent Seales, Sridhar Sunderam, Kim Taylor