

Senate Council Meeting  
April 16, 2007

The Senate Council met at 3 pm Monday, April 16, 2007 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 pm. The minutes from April 2 were not ready for approval. Finkel, Grabau and Wood alerted the Office of the Senate Council that they would be late; Finkel and Piascik needed to leave early. The Chair announced that the election for the faculty trustee began at noon.

2. [New Program: New Anthropology Track MA to PhD](#)

The Chair asked Department of Anthropology Director of Graduate Studies Lisa Cliggett to offer a summary of the proposal for a new track (MA to PhD) in Anthropology. Guest Cliggett said that the new track would be an addition – the MA and PhD options would still remain. She said that the new track would allow students to apply directly to the PhD program and receive the MA upon successful completion of examinations. In addition, students would be able to focus on research from an earlier point. Cliggett explained that a PhD could take a long time to earn, due in part to the customary one year of required research, which could often take place outside of the country. Many of UK's benchmarks offered programs similar to the proposed track. Part of the rationale was an increased efficiency and consolidation of resources.

Yanarella spoke for the proposal. He said that a similar degree in the Department of Political Science served the department well; it allowed the department to focus on an orientation toward the PhD and provide certain students with an MA en passant.

The Chair noted that the proposal came from the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) with a positive recommendation. In response to Randall, Cliggett said that the amount of effort put forth by the student for an MA was about the same – there was preliminary work required by the student but the amount of work was approximately the same. It also would allow for the student to begin working on PhD research sooner, also encouraging continuity for the research. In response to the Chair, Cliggett said that a student could choose an MA thesis option. Provost's Liaison Greissman thought that the qualifying exam would, in part, satisfy requirements for a masters degree. Greissman mentioned that to teach, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) requires a master's degree plus 18 hours of course work. He recalled a situation in which a specific anthropology student wanted to teach and had earned many, many credit hours, but was not allowed to do so because she had not yet received a master's degree.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** from the SAPC to approve a new track for MA to PhD in Anthropology. The motion **passed** unanimously.

### 3. [Rule Change, College of Pharmacy: Disallow Repeat Option](#)

The Chair invited College of Pharmacy Associate Dean for Academic Affairs Bill Lubawy to share some information about the proposal to disallow the repeat option in the College of Pharmacy (CoP). Guest Lubawy suggested that the rules in CoP changed somewhat like a pendulum swing. The rules had once been very strict, but exceptions were regularly made to accommodate students. After five or six years, faculty members requested more rules, resulting, in part, in the proposal. Lubawy said in the process of revising the rules, he realized that students were given no information about the effect a “D” grade would have. While there were guidelines for what types of grades would result in which penalties, repeat options were not addressed.

Lubawy explained that there had been instances in which a student was required to repeat a course and subsequently received more Ds. After multiple Ds due to continued difficulties, what was to be done with such a student? Faculty raised concerns that the ability to master information and use it in a reasonable manner was important for continuing competence. While it was understandable that a student experienced complications and stumbled occasionally, it was problematic if the student repeatedly stumbled. Lubawy said that when the CoP changed from offering a BS to a PharmD, repeat options were not dealt with. Lubawy said that although it was not included in the proposal, the suggested language would become number eight in the list of (currently) seven requirements. If nothing were specified, students would be (and had been) under UK’s repeat regulations.

Finkel noted that the Graduate School allowed one repeat – he offered it as a comment, not a suggestion. He asked what would happen if a student took the same course multiple times for personal pleasure – would the grade received be counted? Lubawy replied that CoP students were given a list of elective courses that relate to an eventual career goal – students were encouraged to pursue many external-CoP courses for which the repeat option rule would not apply.

In response to the Chair, Lubawy said that not allowing the repeat option would only apply to students enrolled in the CoP, not to students in pre-pharmacy – those students would be subject to UK’s regulations for most programs. He said that students admitted into the college came from upwards of 25 different institutions, at which various repeat rules were in place, making such a requirement difficult to enforce at the pre-pharmacy level.

The Chair stated that he brought language from the current [University Senate Rules \(SR\), Section 5.3.1.1](#), in which the exception in the CoP was noted. Lesnaw said that CoP should not be singled out – more inclusive language would be better. Lubawy suggested language such as “professional and graduate

schools may have other requirements” be inserted at the end of *SR 5.3.1.1*. Yanarella supported that suggestion. Finkel offered “the Graduate School and professional degree programs may restrict repeat options.” Wood joined the meeting at this time.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** from the Senate’s Admissions and Academic Standards (SA&ASC) to allow the College of Pharmacy to disallow the repeat option for students enrolled in the PharmD program. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Finkel **moved** that the Senate Council recommend to the Senate that *Senate Rules 5.3.1.1* be modified to include the following language at the end of the first paragraph: “the Graduate School and professional degree programs may restrict repeat options.” Yanarella **seconded**.

There was a discussion among many of those present about various revisions of the language in Finkel’s motion. Once discussion ended, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** that the Senate Council recommend to the Senate that *Senate Rules 5.3.1.1* be modified to include the following language at the end of the first paragraph: “the Graduate School and professional degree programs may restrict repeat options.” The motion **passed** unanimously. In response to Wood, the Chair clarified that a college’s rules would state the restrictions.

#### 4. [Rule Change: Addition of “Duplicate Credit” Rule to \*Senate Rules\*](#)

The Chair invited College of Arts and Sciences advisor and Advising Network representative Mike Shanks to offer background information on the proposal.

Guest Shanks explained that there was currently no written rule regarding how colleges treat duplicate credit. Shanks said there was no rule prohibiting a student taking a non-repeatable course multiple times for credit towards a degree. Currently, individual colleges were responsible for notifying the Office of the Registrar to request that credit be removed. There was a concern that a student could graduate with the minimum number of credits that included one course taken twice. Shanks said that the purpose of the proposal was to have a policy in place so that regardless of which college a student was in, a course taken for the second time would not be repeatable. Current technology would allow for the automatic removal of the duplicate credit.

Shanks explained that the first paragraph of the proposal was written to explain which credit would be removed. The second paragraph addressed how it would impact the repeat option and also how some colleges with selective admissions would have the option to count the best grade if a student took a course twice.

In response to Wood, Shanks said the repeat option was different in that it removed the first grade entirely. The Chair said that there was a section of the

SR that prohibited the retaking of courses in which a B or better had been earned. Finkel left the meeting at this time.

In response to a question by the Chair about selective admissions, Shanks referred SC members to the email comments included in the proposal as to why that language was added – some colleges with selective admissions wanted to be able to continue to manipulate the degree audit system. The Chair suggested keeping the last sentence of the second paragraph (“The Dean of a...and/or graduation purposes.”). The Chair added that the language about “passing grades” in the second line of the second paragraph implied that if a student took a course three times and received one E and two As, the E (not a “passing grade”) would not be counted.

There was a brief discussion about what the proposal entailed. The Chair noted that the proposal did not come from an academic unit, but rather from the advising network. Greissman opined that for purposes of selective admissions, a college could calculate a student’s GPA in ways the Registrar could not but it would be inappropriate to codify it.

Wood said that she agreed that the issue of duplicate credit should have been cleaned up long ago; when she served as dean of the Graduate School, she cleaned up duplicate credit issues by hand. Wood said she could understand a student wanting to retake a particular course in order to raise the grade and get into a specific program – she asked how the second paragraph addressed that issue. Shanks said it explained that if the student took a course more than once and received a D grade or better, only three hours of credit would be counted. Unless the grade was less than a B, the course would not count toward the GPA. He said that a student who took one four-credit hour course 10 times would only receive four hours of credit. In response to Wood, Shanks said that, as written, the new rule would dictate that all the grades received for the 10 attempts would be counted in the GPA.

The Chair clarified for Lesnaw that the language regarding duplicate credit was entirely new – there was no change, per se, other than the addition of the entire duplicate credit rule. Greissman added that the first paragraph of the proposed new language said that with respect to earned credits and quality hours, a student could not earn credit twice for the same course. The second paragraph allowed quality points for GPA purposes to be counted as many times as the course was taken.

Wood wondered if the proposed language was an artifact from SIS, which was not smart enough to catch duplicate grades. She thought it was never intended to have duplicate credit count toward degree hours, which was why there were some courses that are identified as repeatable up to nine hours. She said it was a technological problem for a system that never should have given duplicate

hours. She said the system should take the grade and multiply it by the number of hours and automatically use that for the transcript.

Wood **moved** to:

- remove the second paragraph of the proposed new language (that begins with, “Course work that is deemed duplicate credit....” and ends with, “...admission and/or graduation purposes.”); and
- change the first sentence of the first paragraph to read (with the suggested added text), “A student may earn credit and associated quality points<sup>1</sup> for a course....”

Lesnaw **seconded**.

Greissman confirmed for Piascik that leaving just the first paragraph would instruct the Registrar to compute grades as intended, but would also allow colleges to make internal judgments about how to compute a GPA for selective admissions purposes.

Wood confirmed for Shanks that with the second paragraph removed and the addition to the first paragraph, the result for students would be that if a student took and passed one course (non-repeatable) three times, the second and third attempts would not be factored into the GPA.

Greissman noted that as written, if a student took a course twice and received two D grades, the language was contradictory. Shanks said that if a course was retaken at UK, it would not count toward the GPA. Wood said that the GPA was for the coursework taken toward a degree. A course that would not count toward a degree should not count toward the GPA.

Randall noted that there did seem to be a contradiction between the existing *SR* and the proposed language. Randall suggested the proposal be sent back to committee for resolution. Lesnaw reminded SC members that there was currently a motion on the floor. Shanks said that he could accept the motion as amended, although it would change current practice of counting all the attempts to complete a course.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to amend the proposal by:

- removing the second paragraph of the proposed new language (that begins with, “Course work that is deemed duplicate credit....” and ends with, “...admission and/or graduation purposes.”); and
- changing the first sentence of the first paragraph to read (with the suggested added text), “A student may earn credit and associated quality points for a course....”

---

<sup>1</sup> Underline formatting denotes added text.

The motion **passed** with six in favor, one opposed and one abstaining.

Piasek asked why a student would not just use the repeat option to replace a poor grade. Greissman replied that if a student took a course, received a D and wanted to show a greater mastery, the student, under the proposed new language, could retake the course. If the student received a better grade the second time around, for purposes of selective admissions the second grade could be counted, but would not be counted officially. Wood noted that the student could use the repeat option. Randall said that the language in *SR 5.3.1.1* contradicted the proposed language, if the student received credit only one time.

Randall **moved** that the proposal be tabled and returned to the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee with the day's Senate Council meeting minutes available to help with further discussion. Lesnaw **seconded**. Lesnaw said the tabling was necessary to reconcile the contradiction between the proposed language and existing language. Greissman opined that the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee could reconcile the contradictions.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to table the proposal and return it to the committee with Senate Council meeting minutes available to help with further discussion. The motion **failed** with zero voting in favor and seven against.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to approve the proposed new language about duplicate credit and the associated amendment [see the bottom of page five of these minutes for the amendment]. The motion **passed** unanimously. It will be sent to the SREC to rectify the contradiction between the proposal and *SR 5.3.1.1*, after which it will return to the SC for final vetting.

##### [5. Proposed Changes/Combining of Administrative Regulations II-1.0-1 \("Faculty Appt., Reappt., Promotion & Tenure"\)](#)

The Chair explained that the proposed new language was a result of combining various, related *Administrative Regulations (AR)* that dealt with appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure. Because of that, it was impossible to utilize "track changes" to follow all the changes. The Chair added that the chair of the Senate's Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion (SACPT), Lee Blonder, was present to take part in the discussion. He invited Greissman to provide an overview.

Greissman said he had met with the SACPT, resulting in many helpful comments, in part because SACPT members had a lot of experience working with the resulting situations when the rules were not clear. The revision to the *AR* involved organizing the regulations in a manner similar to how the processes of appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure were conducted. The four different *AR (AR II-1.0-1, Sections I-IV)* were combined and organized sequentially, in terms of process.

The changes also included revisions to the *AR* on recruitment and appointment. While the Workgroup on Provost-Area Administrative Regulations moved the language verbatim from *AR II-1.0-10* into the combined *AR*, at the request of the SACPT the workgroup also clarified the language. Greissman said that there were substantive changes made, which were either tracked via strike-through or underlined and colored text. He emphasized that the all parts of the combined *AR* were open to suggestion, not just the specific sections modified/moved by the work group.

Once the Senate reviewed the combined *AR*, the revised proposal would be sent to deans for review, after which it would go back to the Senate for a final opportunity for Senate input. It would then proceed to the President's Cabinet for final approval. Greissman noted that while there was a desire to keep the process moving along, it was understood that there should be careful deliberations on the changes.

Guest Blonder informed SC members that the SACPT had only gone through about the first half of the proposed changes – the remainder would be reviewed later in the month during another meeting with Greissman.

Thelin stated that at many other universities, there was a parallel and independent evaluation performed by the faculty in the unit, which was sent forward to the provost independently of the dean's evaluation. Both recommendations were weighed equally and separately. This prevented a situation in which a dean could block a dossier from moving forward.

Wood agreed and thanked Greissman for his committee's work. She said there should be a greater equity given to the wishes of the department and the collective wisdom of external reviewers, to avoid prejudicing the area committee. Wood expressed concern, though, that the changed wording regarding the selection of outside reviewers would allow faculty to pass a rule that, for example, would allow each faculty member to choose one outside examiner. She preferred keeping the role of faculty as advisory to the chair. She suggested language such as "seek input."

Thelin suggested that language be added to explicitly address the use of reviewers with personal relationships with the candidate, such as an external letter from a candidate's thesis advisor. Wood noted that in the College of Arts and Sciences, there was a written policy that such reviewers were not counted as strongly as other references.

Wood explained that when she was a department chair, she sometimes ignored the recommendations of faculty who were being unreasonable – she supported language that would protect the individual faculty member going up for review.

Yanarella shared that when he was Senate Council chair, some of the knottiest and most controversial cases involved a sitting dean who had made a decision that, in some cases, ran contrary to the full support of all or a vast majority of department faculty and in the face of strong outside letters. He opined that a two-track system (separate transmissions of faculty and dean comments) would create a situation in which the next level advisory committee could sift out and make a reasoned assessment of the merits offered by the dean and the arguments made by department faculty and other faculty involved in the process. Greissman commented that such a suggestion would need to be reviewed by the Provost; he wished to avoid speaking for the Provost on such a significant change.

Randall pointed out that subsequent language stated that recommendations from both the dean and department faculty would go forward. Thelin opined that such language was not the same as a parallel movement. He added that in his experience, the faculty serving on the behavioral science area committee were very thoughtful and fair. He said it could be hard for a provost to deny a dean what the dean has proposed.

Wood related that she had experience with successful and unsuccessful dossiers. One weakness of the system was that under the current practice, a department chair and faculty would have to intervene to counteract a recommendation from a dean that might not be rational, which was tremendously frustrating to both the chair and faculty. She said that the hierarchy at UK was such that whatever the dean said trumped the input from external reviewers, department chair and faculty.

Greissman noted that the reference to which Randall pointed was for terminal reappointment – Greissman commented that there was a curious distinction between a negative terminal reappointment letter that went forward from the dean, as opposed to when the dossier moves forward against the recommendation of the dean, only in cases of a procedural error.

Guest Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Anderson said that such comments were very important to revising current processes. She said that Provost Subbaswamy wished to avoid alarming faculty about making unilateral decisions – he wanted discussions on these matters. Piascik left the meeting at this time.

There was also concern that there was no mechanism by which additional information that came to light during the review process, such as a patent being approved, could be forwarded, if the dean prevented it. Such pertinent information needed to be available during the review process.

Dembo wondered about institutions in which the entire process occurred in the college only and did not rise to the level of the provost. Thelin replied that it was hard to imagine a complex organization like UK removing the final decision from



the provost. Thelin stated that he did not favor power “at the top,” but it was necessary for the provost to retain the authority to make the ultimate decision. By using a parallel track, a diverse objective would be allowed. In addition, area committees could negotiate with a provost in an informal way, since they were a step removed from the prospect of entanglement with a department faculty and chair or dean. He suggested that area committees have more discretion in their role.

Yanarella wanted to restore the norm of the Provost using the area committees as sounding boards for tough decisions, as was done by Chancellor Hemenway before announcing his decision. Anderson informed SC members that Provost Subbaswamy would be meeting with area committees this year. He will inform the committee if his decision differs from their recommendation and will point out that if something is needed during deliberations, the committee should contact Anderson directly. She commented that on a couple of occasions, she was able to provide an area committee with the status of a publication, etc. so the committee could utilize it in their deliberations.

Wood requested stronger language – she wished for a mechanism by which relevant information could flow to the dossier so all involved would be making decisions based upon the most recent information, noting that journal publishers and the U.S. Patent Office did not routinely conform to UK’s timelines. Greissman replied that if the dossier was not complete, *IV.A.* required the dossier to return to the college and department. Wood said that it would not be unheard of for a dean to not take such required action.

Blonder noted that allowing people to submit material that was not reviewed by the unit faculty would be a huge procedural error – if internal reviewers wrote negative letters because only a certain number of articles had been published, and then if a published article appeared in front of the area committee only, the faculty member could rightly claim a procedural error. Wood added that if an article were accepted by a journal after the dossier went forward, it would not be fair for it not to be included.

Noting the time and the likelihood of future discussion on the combined *AR*, the Chair suggested that the remainder of the meeting be dedicated to the last two items.

6. [Proposed Changes to Governing Regulations I: "\(I\) Financial Advantage," " E. Kentucky Ethics Statutes," "M. Solicitation of Funds," & "N. Campus Sales"](#)

The Chair invited Special Projects Administrator (Office of Legal Counsel, or “Legal Office”) Marcy Deaton to explain the proposed changes.

Guest Deaton explained that she was a co-chair with Greissman on the *AR* Committee. The regular revisions and responsibilities for the *Governing Regulations* had been given to the Legal Office. She said that due to KRS

164.90, no university employee was allowed to have any interest in a business doing work for the university. She said that in the last general assembly, the legislature adopted HB 130, which gave individual universities (through approval by their governing boards) the authority to adopt institution-specific regulations.

Thelein expressed concern that although the regulation might be acceptable in a number of situations, an attempt should be made to proof it against extreme cases. Deaton said that there were just two past cases in which a faculty member was forced to choose between their business and employment with UK and in both cases the faculty members quit their UK employment. She added that she would note Thelein's concern.

Dembo wondered if there was more than a semantic difference between the phrasing of "unless specifically approved by the Board" versus allowing a waiver to a regulation. He said that "unless specifically approved" implied a more permissive stance that would perhaps convey the opening of more doors, whereas a "waiver" could imply that a door was closed, except in specific circumstances.

Moving on to sections *M.* and *N.*, Deaton explained that those two sections had been in the *GR* for years, but during a recent revision they were inadvertently left out. They have continued to be used as current policy if a question pertaining to them were asked. She noted that new language in *M.* now included a prohibition against the use of UK's email systems unless specifically approved.

The Chair thanked Deaton for attending. She replied that she would be a regular visitor as *ARs* were modified.

#### 7. [Revisiting Calendar Committee Proposal](#)

The Chair invited Yanarella, chair of the SC's ad hoc Calendar Committee, to offer information on how the Calendar Committee's (CC) proposal could be revised. Yanarella said that the Senate's discussion was very healthy and participants could be divided into two primary groups – those that liked the proposal in its entirety (that would create a weeklong fall break) and those who preferred a minimalist revision (that would swap the current Friday fall break day in October with the day before Thanksgiving. There was also a minority who seemed entirely opposed to any sense of eroding the academic calendar. Yanarella opined that it was now up to the SC to act, since he had solicited but not received additional input from CC members.

Randall **moved** that the Senate Council forward with a positive recommendation to the Senate the suggestion that the current one-day (Friday) fall break be changed to occur on the Wednesday immediately before the Thanksgiving holiday. Aken **seconded**. In response to Thelein, Yanarella thought that there would be no difficulties for the Office of Student Affairs as a result of such a change.

Yanarella said that as CC chair, he would prefer to see the proposal originally sent to the Senate and the proposal as modified by Randall's motion both sent to the Senate on May 7. He said that in the absence of a clear sense of the Senate's desire, it would be fairer to senators who approved of a weeklong fall break to send both proposals together. Wood thought that Robert's Rule of Order would prevent sending two contradictory proposals to a voting body.

Lesnaw spoke against Randall's motion. She said that in view of the psychological benefit to have a break in the middle of the semester, it would be a tremendous benefit to students. In addition, it would bring the fall semester into better symmetry with the spring semester in terms of a weeklong, mid-semester break.

There being no further comments, a **vote** was taken on the motion to send with a positive recommendation to the Senate the suggestion that the current one-day (Friday) fall break be changed to occur on the Wednesday immediately before the Thanksgiving holiday. The motion **passed** with four in favor and two against.

The Chair explained that Anderson was also present to request a special consideration by the SC. On behalf of the Health Care Colleges Council (HCCC), Anderson was requesting that the proposal to move the Graduate Center for Nutritional Sciences (GCNS) from the Graduate School to the College of Medicine go to the Senate without the customary review by the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAO&SC).

Anderson explained that for the HCCC meeting at which the GCNS move was discussed, she was asked by Provost Subbaswamy to chair a UCAPP subcommittee on his behalf, so she asked an HCCC member to chair the day's HCCC meeting. Anderson explained that as chair of the HCCC, she reviewed every proposal before the HCCC, but there were also primary and secondary reviewers, who respond to questions from HCCC members. Proposals are posted in their entirety prior to meetings, but may not be reviewed completely by all members. To make a long story short, there was a question during the meeting as to whether faculty in the College of Medicine (COM) had reviewed the proposal to move the GCNS; such information was explicitly included in the proposal but overlooked. Due to the oversight, the move of the GCNS was tabled. Once Anderson was able to step in, too much time had passed to allow review by the SAO&SC prior to the special May Senate meeting.

The Chair added that Graduate School Dean Jeannine Blackwell, the Graduate School faculty and the faculty of the COM were all in favor of the move.

In response to Yanarella, the Chair replied that approval by the SC to review the proposal without SAO&SC review did not in any way dictate the outcome of the SC's review – the SC could review the move of the GCNS and decide, among

other things, that it must go to the SAO&SC for review before going to the Senate. Lesnaw stated that the move was a very complicated issue and said she was still confused as to whether or not the majority of COM faculty approved the move. She requested that all pertinent information be shared with SC members.

The Chair said that, as always, all information received regarding the proposal would be available to SC members. In response to Wood, Anderson said that the HCCC tabled the item on March 29. Wood replied that the GCNS was perhaps one of the most multidisciplinary of all the multidisciplinary centers in the Graduate School, all of which had been the subject of a great deal of controversy over the years. She expressed concern with side-stepping any of the processes normally involved in the review of a proposal. Wood opined that even if the HCCC had approved the move at their March 29 meeting, it might not have been able to go to the SAO&SC in time for a complete review prior to the special May Senate meeting. She noted that she was not passing judgment on the proposal, but merely expressing concern with short-circuiting the review process.

Anderson accepted Wood's concerns and as chair of the HCCC, took responsibility for the delay in moving the proposal forward in the approval process and reiterated her request for expedition.

Randall noted that if the move were approved, the grants generated by the GCNS would help with the COM's rankings – he said he would be amazed if anyone in COM had objected to the move.

Aken noted that there could be a problem with library resources regarding where the funding was directed, similar to problems experienced when the Graduate Center for Toxicology moved from the Graduate School to COM.

Anderson said that she had heard from a faculty member in COM who was very upset at the erroneous belief that COM faculty had not discussed and perhaps did not approve of the move – that faculty member was very willing to discuss the deliberations of COM faculty with the SC if necessary.

In response to Lesnaw, the Chair said that if the SC reviewed the GCNS move without input from the SAO&SC and the SC recommended it go to the Senate for approval, it could be approved at the special Senate meeting on May 7. That would allow the move of the GCNS to take place effective July 1, 2007, instead of waiting another year.

Lesnaw **moved** that the Senate Council consider the move of the Graduate Center for Nutritional Sciences from the Graduate School to the College of Medicine without review by the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee. Harley **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with five in favor and one opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:17 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh A. Tagavi,  
Senate Council Chair

Senate Council members present: Aken, Dembo, Finkel, Harley, Lesnaw,  
Piascik, Randall, Thelin, Tagavi, Wood and Yanarella.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Non-SC members present: Lee Blonder, Lisa Cliggett, Bill Lubawy, and Mike  
Shanks.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on May 9, 2007