

Senate Council
March 22, 2010

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, March 22, 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 3:08 pm.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair said that Grossman, Jensen, Kelly, Steiner and Yanarella were absent. He added that Provost Subbaswamy was scheduled to arrive around 4 pm to discuss the changes to the Lecturer title series. The Chair added that he invited Kaveh Tagavi (former chair), who regularly attends the *Administrative Regulation* review committee, to participate in the discussion. There were no objections.

The Chair noted that unless someone objected, he was inclined to reorder the agenda to accommodate guests and schedules. There were no objections.

Chappell **moved** to approve the minutes from February 22 and from March 1 as distributed. Anderson **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

2. More than Two Bachelor's Degrees

The Chair invited Associate Registrar Jacquie Hager to explain the proposed *Senate Rules* language that would offer guidelines for students wishing to earn more than two bachelor's degrees. Guest Hager did so, and then answered questions from SC members. Hager noted that the language clearly stated that a student must earn/complete all the University and departmental requirements for additional degrees. The specific 24 hours of additional coursework per degree reflects the typical requirement of 24 hours of coursework (aside from University/college requirements) normally required for a major.

SC members engaged in some brief discussion about how to proceed. Ultimately, Chappell **moved** to send the proposed wording to the Undergraduate Council and have that review returned to the SC within two weeks. Anderson **seconded**. Chappell clarified that his intent was for the Undergraduate Council (UC) to review the language either in person or via email, simply for consistency with University guidelines.

Nokes **offered a friendly amendment** that the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee look at the language concurrently with the UC and Kirk **seconded**. There being no discussion on the proposed amendment, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

A **vote** was then taken on the **motion** to send the proposed wording to the Undergraduate Council and the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee and have those reviews returned to the SC within two weeks. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. Proposed New Dual Degree Program: PharmD and MS Physician Assistant Studies

The Chair noted that after the last meeting, some SC members had additional questions about the rationale for the proposed dual degree program. Anderson commented that after speaking with colleagues, she no longer had the same concerns about the need for the dual degree. SC members engaged in continued discussion with Guests Kelly Smith and Gil Boissonneault.

Once questions were satisfactorily answered, Swanson **moved** to approve the proposed new Dual Degree Program of a PharmD and MS in Physician Assistant Studies, and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation, effective fall 2010. Anderson **seconded**. SC members engaged in general discussion of the proposal, as well as dual degrees and University Scholars Programs.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. SGA Calendar Proposal

Kirk suggested that the proposal be sent to an ad hoc committee for vetting across campus. Chappell stated that he had some comments to make.

Chappell asked Kirk if the Student Government Association (SGA) had discussed the proposal and Kirk replied that the proposal went to the appropriate SGA committee for discussion, and was then approved by the full SGA, with two dissenting votes. Chappell asked if deans had been consulted yet, and Kirk opined that a vetting of that sort would be done by the ad hoc committee.

Chappell stated that there needed to be formal documentation of the SGA-related meetings where the proposal was discussed. He also exhibited to SC members some information that did not support the need for additional student preparation time (with a split finals week). There was additional discussion.

Swanson **moved** to send the SGA's calendar proposal to an ad hoc calendar committee chaired by Bob Grossman for further vetting. Kirk **seconded**. Chappell objected to Grossman being named as part of the motion.

Kirk confirmed for Nokes that students in the College of Agriculture had not registered any opposition to the proposal.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to send the SGA's calendar proposal to an ad hoc calendar committee chaired by Bob Grossman for further vetting. The motion **failed**, with four opposed and two in favor.

8. Discussion on Revised *Administrative Regulations 2:9* ("Lecturer Title Series")

The Chair welcomed Provost Kumble Subbaswamy, and suggested he start the discussion. Guest Subbaswamy explained the impetus for the proposed changes, as well as various concerns.

SC members engaged in a lengthy discussion regarding the proposed changes. Towards the end of discussion, Chappell suggested that the SC deliberate once more on the proposed changes, and that there be a wider solicitation of comments. Chappell **moved** to table the discussion on the proposed revisions to *Administrative Regulations 2:9* until the following Monday, with the prospects of identifying other units/bodies that should be consulted, prior to the Senate Council making a recommendation to the Senate. Nokes **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Provost Subbaswamy expressed some concern about timing, in order to have the revisions presented to the Senate in April. Chappell stated that the intent of his motion was to solicit opinions via email immediately, in order to help guide the discussion on the following Monday.

The Chair asked the Provost for an update on the Transfer Action Plan legislation, and the Provost did so.

4. Confirmation of Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee Chair

Chappell **moved** to appoint Tom Nieman as chair of the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee and Swanson **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Proposed New Name for Cardiovascular Research Center – Discussion

The Chair led SC members in a discussion regarding a proposed name change to the Cardiovascular Research Center (CRC), based upon a substantial donation from faculty member employed by the CRC. The SC expressed a variety of concerns, chief among them being: 1. The sense that the SC/Senate was expected to approve the name change, with respect to the short timeline; 2. A possible conflict of interest if an employee has employment access to the substantial funds the employee donated; and 3. A possible conflict regarding naming a center for a current employee.

Mrs. Brothers was asked to look more closely into a few aspects, and return to the SC the following week with additional information.

Moving to a different topic, the Chair noted that Chappell had asked for time to discuss a mass email to faculty regarding the Advising Network's calendar proposal. Chappell explained that he wanted to solicit faculty input into the proposed changes.

Nokes **moved** to approve sending the solicitation for input to senators and faculty councils and Anderson **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Respectfully submitted by Dave Randall,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Chappell, Kirk, Nokes, Randall, Swanson and Thelin.

Invited guests present: Gil Boissonneault, Jacquie Hager and Kelly Smith.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, April 22, 2010.