Senate Council
February 15, 2010

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, February 15, 2010 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a voice vote unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Dave Randall called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:07 pm. Noting the snowy weather, he mentioned it might be nice to finish a little early.

1. Minutes from January 25 and February 1 and Announcements
The Chair shared that Swanson was absent. He called SC members' attention to the Cultural Diversity Festival to be held March 3 and encouraged SC members to attend.

Chappell **moved** to approve the SC minutes from January 25 as distributed and Kirk **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair explained that there was a small change reported that was not tracked in the February 1 minutes – the name of the person accepting a friendly amendment at the bottom of the first page needed to be changed from "Chappell" to "Kelly." Anderson **moved** to approve the minutes from February 1 as amended and Chappell **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair informed SC members that a senator had raised some concerns about how he (the Chair) and the SC are conducting University Senate (Senate) meetings, specifically regarding a perceived lack of adherence to Robert's Rules of Order. The senator has asked that SC members have already read the pertinent sections prior to the meeting. Those present engaged in a brief discussion regarding the request.

Nominees were needed for the College of Medicine Summative Evaluation Review Committee. SC members mentioned a variety of names to put forward to the Office of the Provost.

2. Curricular Proposals SharePoint – Follow Up
The Chair explained that the SC needed to approve a campuswide pilot of the SharePoint curricular proposals site.

Grossman **moved** that the SC approve campuswide pilot use of the SharePoint curricular proposals site for processing of curricular proposals during the spring 2010 semester and Chappell **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Grossman then **moved** that the PDFs for curricular proposals processed up through February 15, 2010 be removed from the SharePoint site. Anderson **seconded**. SC members then discussed the archival site on SharePoint and how to ensure that the PDFs of the posted proposals were not confused with the final, approved version posted on the site for the University Senate (Senate). Mrs. Brothers volunteered a few comments.

Once discussion wound down, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. QEP Topic Selection Team Nominees

Explaining that the membership of the QEP Topic Selection Team was to be decided jointly between the SC and the Provost, the Chair acknowledged that the Office of the Provost had done all the work in identifying individuals. As such, the SC could confirm the nominees as being jointly composed, or the SC could identify different or additional individuals.

Chappell **moved** to approve the nominees suggested by the Office of the Provost for the QEP Topic Selection Team, and Kirk **seconded**. Grossman offered a **friendly amendment** that Jensen be identified as the member liaison to the SC, subject to her consent. Both Chappell and Kirk **accepted**. After additional brief discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to approve the nominees suggested by the Office of the Provost for the QEP Topic Selection Team and identify Jensen as the liaison to the SC subject to her consent **passed,** with none opposed.

5. Two Requests from Senate Council to Academic Councils
The Chair explained that there were two requests from the Academic Approval Process Workgroup (AAW). Grossman, also a member of the AAW, explained the first request, for descriptions of what each academic council looks for when reviewing course and program proposals. When faculty members are first preparing a course or program proposal, it would be extremely helpful to know what kinds of questions will be asked by the academic councils. Such a set of guidelines will also be helpful to incoming council members.

Grossman **moved** that the SC request from each of the three academic councils a brief, bulleted description of what the respective council looks for when reviewing course and program proposals. Chappell **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The second request pertained to the need for a definition of an academic minor. Chappell **moved** that the SC request from the Undergraduate Council a formal definition of a minor. Grossman **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. Nominees for Area Committees and Others
SC members engaged in a lengthy discussion to confirm recommended faculty members and suggest additional names for membership on a variety of academic and administrative committees.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Dave Randall,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Chappell, Grossman, Kelly, Kirk, Nokes, Randall, Steiner, Thelin, and Yanarella.

Provost's liaison present: Greissman.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, February 17, 2010.