Senate Council
May 8, 2017

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, May 8, 2017 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Katherine M. McCormick called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:05 pm.

1. Minutes from April 24, 2017 and Announcements
The minutes were sent out earlier in the day; the Chair asked if SC members wanted to approve them or wait until the next meeting. SC members suggested approving at the next meeting. There were a handful of announcements by the Chair.

The Chair noted that faculty trustees Grossman and Blonder represented faculty well at the weekend's Commencement ceremonies, which were well attended by students and parents. She noted that the faculty and students from one particular college continued to leave prior to the end of the ceremony, even though the ceremony was no more than two hours long. There were a few comments from SC members about various aspects of the ceremonies.

There was a brief discussion about the recent name change to "Commonwealth Stadium," as well as the recent student attempt at breaking and entering to steal a statistics exam prior to final exams.

2. Old Business
a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) – Margaret Schroeder, Chair
i. Recommendations for Program Changes Involving New Emphases (Tracks, Concentrations, and Specializations)
Schroeder, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the background and rationale for the SAPC's recommendations regarding new emphases. The gist of the proposal was that in addition to reviewing new programs, the SAPC would also review program changes that are determined by SACS (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges) as being a substantive change. Schroeder noted that the explicit *Senate Rule* reference was not included in the supporting documentation – the new language on substantive change was intended to be placed in *SR 3.2.3.C.2.a*.

The **motion** from the SAPC was to accept the SAPC's recommendations, specifically: that "substantive change" be used as the criteria for determining if a program change should receive additional review/scrutiny by the SAPC; that the *Senate Rules* be revised according to the language in the proposal; and that a new, general substantive program change checklist be developed and added to each program change form. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

Mazur, co-chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), and Schroeder discussed what language should be placed in which section of the *Senate Rules*. As discussion wound down, the Chair asked for and received clarification that Mazur would prefer, and Schroeder would **accept** on behalf of the SAPC, the friendly amendment to replace references to "substantive change" with "significant change," to mirror existing language in *Senate Rules 3.4*. When there was no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. SC members concurred that the proposal would need to move to the University Senate in September for final approval.

ii. Year-end Report
Schroeder presented the SAPC's year-end report for 2016-17. She asked SC members if there was any need for an expedited review process – the SAPC wondered if it was necessary to create a process that

could be used for proposals with a short turnaround time. It was the general consensus of SC members who offered opinions that an expedited review process was unnecessary – deadlines were announced with reasonable advance warning and were as flexible as the calendar would allow.

SC members discussed the timing exertions required to ensure that new degree program proposals were sent to the Board of Trustees in time for the same proposals to also be reviewed by the Council on Postsecondary in time to be effective for the following fall semester. SC members asked the Chair to inquire if the President's Office would allow submission of academic programs on a schedule different from the usual eight-week-in-advance deadline for materials to be reviewed by the Board.

Schroeder commented that there was a widespread misconception that Senate committees have the benefit of full-time clerical support - if a faculty member refuses to convert a file to a PDF or alter a form, it required Schroeder's time to make the change, time that she could have spent doing any number of other things. Blonder referred to Schroeder's earlier comment that all proposals were reviewed by SAPC within two weeks of receipt – she asked Schroeder to please add that information to the year-end report and Schroeder agreed.

b. Update on Faculty Evaluation of the President
Bailey said that the evaluation survey was sent out previously and the deadline for submissions was May 16 or so. He said that reminders would go out, but only to those that had not yet participated. There was some discussion about one faculty member in another part of the world who could not access the survey because IP addresses from that area of the globe were blocked by UK's IT department. Everyone agreed about the need to create an official workaround for faculty with technical problems, but Bailey thought that it might be best to spend a little time working on a solution to use for the next survey, not for the current survey that was almost finished.

The Chair asked for permission to reorder the agenda to discuss the roundtables later, at the same time and there were no objections.

c. SC Retreat Planning
The Chair offered that the details for the Retreat had been finalized.

3. Nominees for Performance Review Appeals Committee
The Chair asked for suggestions about nominees for a performance review appeals committee that was appointed by Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement GT Lineberry. She explained that he needed additional nominees, preferably not from the following colleges; Agriculture, Food and Environment; Law; or Education. SC members discussed possible nominees and identified six faculty to submit as possible nominees.

4. Commencement Speakers
The Chair turned to Mazur, who had requested the discussion. Mazur wondered if there would be value in having outside speakers at commencement ceremonies. SC members discussed the idea at length and had a few ideas; the Chair stated that it seemed acceptable to pass those comments to the Commencement Committee, as well as share them with the faculty serving on the Commencement Committee. There was support for inviting the chair of the Commencement Committee to a future SC meeting to learn more. There were some comments and suggestions offered by SC members.

- Combine all graduate ceremonies together and all undergraduate ceremonies together, so that an undergraduate student speaker addresses undergraduates and a graduate student speaker addresses graduate students.

- Identify individuals who are inspirational and can contribute to improving the intellectual context or engagement of students and invite them to speak.

- Ask students if they like the current commencement arrangements.

- Have an honorary degree recipient offer remarks at a commencement ceremony.

- The address that President Capilouto gave at the four commencement ceremonies was not as uplifting as prior ones.

- The two hour-long ceremonies were a good length.

- The faculty who have both undergraduate students and graduate students appreciated being able to attend one ceremony for all students in the college, instead of having to attend the separate undergraduate and graduate ceremonies.

- If additional speakers of any sort are included, it will be critically important to ensure the speaker is someone who send graduates off on a positive spring board.

- The Alumni Association could be involved in the identification of speakers.

2. Old Business (continued)
d. [March] Senate Meeting Roundtable

5. April Senate Meeting Roundtable
The Chair invited SC members to offer feedback on the two most recent University Senate meetings. Below are comments from SC members.

- Senate meetings are only two hours long and occur once a month. It was inexcusable to lose quorum five minutes before the meeting was scheduled to end.

- Maybe senators could be reminded about the importance of maintaining quorum.

- The discussion about the amendment to the *Administrative Regulation* needed to be given more time and reflection.

- The discussion about the *Administrative Regulations* offered plenty of time to reflect.

- The Senate did make a good catch regarding a disconnect between the codified language about staggered three-year terms and the described practice of bringing in individuals to the Community of Concern Committee periodically, as necessary and appropriate.

- The SC should have caught the conflict between formal, staggered terms and one-off participation based on a specific situation.

- While faculty may want to know what happens after they submit a report about a student who was disruptive in class, faculty may not have the right to know.

At Mazur's request, the Chair and Ms. Brothers described and shared information about the agenda items for the upcoming retreat on Thursday.

There were no further comments or questions from SC members. Bird-Pollan **moved** to adjourn and McGillis **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 4:56 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine M. McCormick,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bailey, Bird-Pollan, Blonder, Cross, Lauersdorf, Mazur, McCormick, McGillis, and Schroeder.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, May 18, 2017.