

Senate Council Minutes
November 20, 2006

The Senate Council met at 3 pm on Monday, November 20, 2006 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were conducted via a show of hands, unless otherwise indicated.

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 pm. Those around the table and the perimeter of the room introduced themselves.

Grabau, Lesnaw and Yanarella had alerted the Office of the Senate Council that they would be unable to attend and Michael explained that he would be arriving late

1. Minutes from November 3 and Announcements

The Chair noted that agenda items number five, seven and nine would be voted on with the proviso that any approval was contingent upon a positive letter of administrative feasibility from the Office of the Provost; the Chair said he would bring the proposals back to the Senate Council (SC) if otherwise.

2. [Temporary Waiver of Non-Transfer of Grades \(to UK GPA\) for Engineering's Paducah Campus Students](#)

The Chair noted that the temporary waiver item partly affected his academic department. He explained that after the community colleges separated from UK, there was a deadline created after which grades earned through the Kentucky Community and Technical College System (KCTCS) would not factor into a student's UK GPA; KCTCS transfer students would be treated as any other transfer student, such that no grades received from outside UK would be factored into the UK GPA. Because of the nature of the College of Engineering's BS program in Paducah (which worked cooperatively with Western Kentucky Community and Technical College and Murray State University), prohibiting those students' non-UK grades to transfer to their UK GPA would create a host of problems. The program in question had previously been approved by the University Senate (Senate). The Chair invited the College of Engineering's Associate Dean for Commonwealth and International Programs G. T. Lineberry to offer information about the proposal.

Guest Lineberry thanked the Chair and Mrs. Brothers for their help in getting the temporary waiver on a SC agenda so quickly. He added that the intent had been to have a proposal ready for the SC to take final action on, but that a decision had been made to send the proposal through all the College of Engineering's (CoE) various approval processes before sending it on. Lineberry said that there were reasons to support the proposal to allow for the continued transfer of grades earned at West Kentucky Community and Technical College (WKCTC) and Murray State University (MSU) to the UK GPA. The Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) had defined the BS programs in Mechanical

Engineering and Chemical Engineering at the “Paducah campus” as a cooperative degree program.

If the grades of the extended campus engineering students could not transfer to their UK GPA, Lineberry said the resulting problems could be defined as either academic or financial. Even though the courses were taught by other institutions’ faculty, UK offered the degree and maintained the quality. If the 57 hours of lower division credit (taken through MSU or WKCTC) were not factored into the UK GPA, the student would have no chance of receiving any commencement honors. In terms of the financial aspect, scholarships for students at the Paducah campus would be in jeopardy if the grades received for courses taken through MSU and WKCTC were not accepted by UK. Lineberry said that the requested temporary waiver would be for only one year and would only apply to the engineering students enrolled through the extended campus programs. At this point, Odoi entered the meeting.

The Chair affirmed Lineberry’s statement that a formal proposal to permanently allow WKCTC and MSU grades to be included in the UK GPA was in the CoE’s approval process. He noted that approval of the temporary waiver would more or less indicate a future approval of a proposal to make the waiver permanent. Lineberry added that CoE worked with the Office of the Registrar to ensure that if an extended campus student left the engineering program, those students’ grades would not transfer to the UK GPA, even though they would have if they remained in the extended engineering campus BS program.

In response to a question from Randall, the Chair explained that because of the separation of the community colleges from UK and resultant rejection of non-UK grades from the UK GPA, effective January 1, 2007 CoE’s Paducah campus BS program would be in jeopardy. A waiver of the rule would simply allow students to be treated in the future as they currently are. Both Lineberry and the Chair emphasized that the waiver would only apply to those students in the CoE’s cooperative degree program, not any other engineering program or other WKCTC students.

In response to a question from Randall, the Chair said that in discussions with the Office of the Registrar, there were no concerns about this waiver violating any CPE or other requirements. Lineberry said he would contact the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness to make sure there were also no Southern Association of Colleges and Schools issues. Lineberry, responding to Waldhart and Baxter, stated that the courses offered at WKCTC and MSU received UK faculty input, but were “owned” by the respective institutions. He said about 93 students from the extended campus have already graduated – there were roughly 100 students enrolled in the program at any given time. About half of the graduates remained in the state.

In response to a question from the Chair, Lineberry said that the waiver was being requested for the Spring 2007 and Fall 2007 semesters.

Waldhart **moved** that the Senate Council approve the temporary waiver (through December 2007) of KCTCS transfer changes for Paducah (College of Engineering) extended campus students so that all grades earned by those students in pursuit of the extended Engineering campus degree would be factored into the UK GPA. Odoi **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

3. [Institute for Workplace Innovation \(iWIN\) – College of Social Work](#)

The Chair invited College of Social Work Professor Jennifer Swanberg to speak on behalf of the proposal for the new Institute for Workplace Innovation. Guest Swanberg explained that she needed to leave for a meeting with President Todd, but would return to the meeting afterwards, if necessary. She said her colleague, Diane Loeffler, could answer questions about the Institute for Workplace Innovation (iWIN). Swanberg left the meeting at this point.

Guest Loeffler offered a quick overview of the proposed iWIN. She said that it would be an interdisciplinary institute involving individuals from the Colleges of Business, Public Health and Social Work, with an emphasis on creating more effective workplaces to benefit employees, business and the Kentucky economy in general. She said iWIN would launch a statewide study about trends and emerging trends, due to a need to understand better what the Kentucky workforce looked like.

In response to Duke, Loeffler said the institute would be essentially research-oriented, with some clinical or service roles, but not academic. Research could be used in training programs. For instance, if there were issues with older employees wanting a phased retirement, iWIN would be able to utilize future research in that area to help businesses. Randall asked if iWIN would offer any classes, majors, minors, certificates, etc. Loeffler replied that iWIN would not, adding that students could be used as interns, but there were no plans to offer classes. In response to another question from Randall, Loeffler affirmed that the start-up funds were supplied by the Office of the President; in three years it was hoped iWIN would be self-sustaining via endowments, business contributions, etc. The start-up money, however, was already included in the budget.

The Chair requested that a motion to approve be made, but contingent upon receipt of a positive letter of administrative feasibility from the Office of the Provost. The Chair explained that such a letter might not be required, but he saw no harm in having one.

Randall **moved** to approve the Institute for Workplace Innovation and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation, contingent upon receipt of a letter of

administrative feasibility from the Office of the Provost. Waldhart **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

4. [Disability Resource Center Resolution – Jake Karnes, Director](#)

The Chair explained that when he served as Academic Ombud, there were a few occasions when an instructor questioned why a student with a disability should be accommodated with extra time, etc. as required by federal law and recommended by the UK's Office of Institutional Equity (OIE). The Chair said that language could be added to the *Senate Rules* but at this time, a resolution supported by the Senate was sought. He invited Disability Resource Center Director Jake Karnes to explain the resolution.

Guest Karnes explained that in the past, one could more easily identify a student's disability, such as being blind or needing a wheelchair. Now, with many more chronic health problems and learning disabilities being present in the student population, many more "reasonable accommodations" were being requested from faculty; it was becoming common for most undergraduate classes to include at least one student requiring an accommodation. Although not many, there were instances in which a faculty member balked at having to offer such an accommodation and questioned Karnes regarding why an accommodation was necessary. Karnes stated he would like to be able to refer individuals to a resolution supported by the representative body for the faculty. The Chair added that instructors questioning the need for accommodation could also be referred to SC and Senate minutes when the resolution was discussed. Karnes replied that he would rather the minutes reflect that instructors could contact Patty Bender in the OIE if they question why an accommodation is necessary. He thought the resolution could be something to which instructors could be referred to.

In response to a question from Duke, Karnes said that students with disabilities were required to be assessed by the Disability Resource Center (DRC). Although some disabilities did not require much in the way of additional assessment, such as a physical disability, other types, such as learning disabilities, required more testing. The level of assessment also depended upon the professional documentation provided by the student. Karnes added that the DRC also worked with students experiencing a temporary disability. He said that University Health Services and other testing mechanisms were used to ensure that a disability was not fraudulent. Thelin added that the process of accommodation was enhanced by DRC involvement; the DRC was mutually beneficial to students and instructors.

Randall opined that the language in the last sentence of the resolution was somewhat vague. He suggested a revision: "...to accommodate students with disabilities, as determined by the Disability Resource Center, and endorses the...." The Chair asked if there were any further questions – he said the

resolution would go to the Senate for the widest possible publicity and support. He then requested a motion.

The **Thelin moved** to support and send to the Senate with a positive recommendation the following resolution:

Students with disabilities are required to provide instructors letters of accommodation from the University of Kentucky Disability Resource Center prior to requesting any accommodation in their classes for a disability. Students must provide the Center extensive disability documentation before qualifying for accommodations. (The accommodation criteria can be found on the Center web page under "Documentation Guidelines.") The confidential letters are the official notice to instructors confirming that the student is eligible for the stated accommodations according to University guidelines and that it is the instructor's legal responsibility to fulfill the requests. Additionally, the letters serve as a guideline for effective teaching and testing of students who, because of limitations imposed by disability, have different modes of learning and demonstrating mastery of material. Instructors are encouraged to contact the Center for additional information, clarification and assistance about providing accommodation.

The University has a long tradition of accommodating students with disabilities, preceding the existence of any Federal mandates. In keeping with that tradition and in recognition of the necessity to comply with the law (Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and Americans with Disabilities Act), the University Senate acknowledges the need to accommodate students with disabilities, as determined by the Disability Resource Center, and endorses the University accommodation procedure.

Harley **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

[5. New Program: Joint Univ. Scholars Pgm with KY State Univ. for MS in Rehabilitation Counseling](#)

The Chair invited Ralph Crystal to explain the proposal. Guest Crystal thanked SC members for the invitation and the opportunity to share information about the proposal to create a University Scholars Program with Kentucky State University (KSU) for an MS in Rehabilitation Counseling.

Crystal explained that approximately nine years ago, an endorsement curriculum was developed with KSU in response to federal initiatives regarding diversity. The endorsement curriculum trained students in their senior year at KSU in practices and techniques through a sequence of four classes offered at UK, two in the Fall and two in the Spring; successful completion earned a certificate from UK. Many students were subsequently returning to UK immediately after

graduation to get a master's degree, or going into the workforce and then coming to UK for a master's degree. Meetings began about six years ago to investigate alternate ways to encourage students to work toward their master's degree, leading to a proposal to utilize the University Scholars Program; students would be joint undergraduates at KSU and graduate students at UK. Working through the University Scholars Program would also allow the offering of scholarships.

In response to a question by Baxter, Crystal explained that the endorsement program, offered through distance learning, would continue to be offered along with the University Scholars Program for an MS in Rehabilitation Counseling. The University Scholars' Program would utilize the same courses as the endorsement program, but would include a commitment on the part of the student to finish their MS at UK. Waldhart pointed out that University Scholars Programs required a student to be enrolled in the same graduate-level program as they received their undergraduate degree in. The benefit was the student being allowed to "cross-count" the 12 credit hours at KSU toward the MS degree.

In response to a question from the Chair, Crystal replied that the students at KSU were primarily in criminal justice programs, although any human service area, such as social work, was applicable. The Chair opined that since the Graduate Council had reviewed the proposal, the presumption was that it was satisfied with the major and graduate degree programs not matching completely. Thelin noted that there was a cooperative program in place between the Patterson School of Diplomacy and Georgetown College in which the areas of study were coherent and related, but not exactly the same. In response to Waldhart, the Chair confirmed that a motion for approval would be needed that contained a proviso regarding a letter of administrative feasibility from the Office of the Provost. If the letter was not positive, he said Crystal would be alerted and the proposal returned to the SC for further discussion.

Waldhart **moved** that the proposal for a new University Scholars Program with Kentucky State University for an MS in Rehabilitation Counseling be approved and sent to the Senate with a positive recommendation, contingent upon receipt of a letter of administrative feasibility from the Office of the Provost.

Randall asked about the success of the endorsement program. Crystal replied that for the most part, the experience had been a good one. The majority of problems were a result of the courses being offered via distance learning and associated technical difficulties. About half of the students matriculated to the UK graduate program. In response to a question from Liaison Greissman, Crystal said he hoped not to encounter a situation in which a University Scholars Program student attempted to not adhere to a commitment to attend UK's Graduate School and merely request the certificate for completing the endorsement courses. He said faculty would interview applicants ahead of time and that students would have to go through normal Graduate School processes. In response to the Chair, Crystal said that the courses would be UK classes and

would apply to the undergraduate and graduate degrees. Students would also have to pay graduate tuition. Syllabi for the courses would have differing expectations for undergraduate and graduate students.

The Chair thanked Waldhart for her motion. Thelin **seconded**. A **vote** was taken that the proposal for a new University Scholars Program with Kentucky State University for an MS in Rehabilitation Counseling be approved and sent to the Senate with a positive recommendation, contingent upon receipt of a letter of administrative feasibility from the Office of the Provost. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Due to the presence of visitors, the Chair requested and received agreement from SC members to first review all proposals with guests present to speak on their behalf.

[7. New Program: Dual BS in Engineering \(Electrical or Mechanical\) and MS in Manufacturing Systems Engineering](#)

Those present introduced themselves. The Chair invited Center for Manufacturing Director and Director of Graduate Studies Larry Holloway to explain the proposal.

Guest Holloway shared that the degree in Manufacturing Systems Engineering is masters only, housed in the College of Engineering and administered through the Center for Manufacturing. Funding had been received from Ford Motor Company to push graduate programs down to undergraduates because of the interest in hiring students who have such knowledge at lower levels. The dual BS/MS proposal would not “double count” credits as happens in University Scholars Programs, but allowed students to take undergraduate and graduate courses concurrently.

In response to a question from Greissman about tuition, Holloway stated that the differential tuition issue was very problematic. One problem stemmed from the intensive “boot camp” periods in the summer, during which students take graduate courses; the problem occurs when a student has to pay graduate tuition for the boot camp courses, but is still an undergraduate. Holloway said that he was working with a variety of individuals to develop a mechanism by which a student’s account could be flagged to indicate the type of billing required. He summed up by saying that although the tuition issues were a headache, they should not hold up the proposal; a dual BS/MS would be a great opportunity for students to move toward a graduate degree.

Waldhart wondered if the tuition problems were similar to the situation with an MBA. Crystal replied that the problem was a student taking graduate courses and paying graduate tuition for the Summer, but then continuing to take undergraduate courses in the fall but still being required to pay graduate tuition. He said students would be informed of the issue, since once someone was

identified as a graduate student, the student could lose undergraduate financial aid. Holloway said that although the undergraduate/graduate tuition was a problem, it was something that needed monitoring and further investigation and research, not something that should stop the proposal.

In response to a question from Baxter, Holloway stated that a student probably could bail out of the Graduate School portion of the program and just keep the undergraduate degree, although the student would be forever after listed as being enrolled in the Graduate School. Odoi asked how the graduate and undergraduate courses factored into the GPA. Holloway replied that he was unsure of the specific practice, but said it was an issue regularly addressed in University Scholar Programs. The Chair suggested Holloway be able to answer such a question if it were to be asked at the Senate meeting when the proposal was discussed in December.

Duke asked about the situation a student would be in if the student did not finish the graduate degree – would any degree be awarded if the student did not continue with the graduate degree? Holloway replied that it was his understanding that there was a mechanism by which a student could receive the undergraduate degree even if the student did not finish the MS portion of the program. Baxter also expressed an interest in knowing how the GPA would be computed if the student took both undergraduate and graduate courses. In response to Randall, Holloway stated that a student would need to adhere to Graduate School requirements, such as carrying a 3.0 GPA while performing graduate work.

There was a brief discussion regarding the proposal being posted with the CPE for review. The Chair requested a motion to approve the proposal, contingent upon receipt of a letter of administrative feasibility from the Office of the Provost.

Odoi **moved** that the proposal for a dual BS in Engineering (Electrical or Mechanical) and MS in Manufacturing Systems Engineering be approved and forwarded to the Senate with a positive recommendation, contingent upon receipt of a positive letter of administrative feasibility from the Office of the Provost. Duke **seconded**. Waldhart left the meeting at this point.

A **vote** was taken on the motion, which **passed** unanimously.

8. [New Program: Interdisciplinary PhD in Education Science](#)

The Chair invited College of Education Associate Dean for Research Eric Anderman to share background information on the proposal. Guest Anderman explained that he had been working with Graduate School Dean Blackwell with regard to the Interdisciplinary PhD in Education Science. He said that the college was streamlining its doctoral programs for full-time students and the interdisciplinary program in research. Anderman said that there was a great need for people trained in interdisciplinary education to be involved in scientific

educational research. Students would have a first year of a core curriculum in areas such as research methodologies, etc. and then move into different strands, similar to different majors. The different strands would have slightly different requirements and credit hours. In the future, the college planned to redesign the doctor of education (EdD) programs.

The Chair noted that as with the other new programs on the agenda, he would need a motion from a SC member to allow for approval contingent upon receipt of a positive letter of administrative feasibility for the new Interdisciplinary PhD in Education Science. Waldhart **moved** thusly. Baxter **seconded**.

Randall asked if the new program would replace existing doctorates. Anderman replied that it would be a new degree program. There were some students in an EdD program who wanted a PhD who would be advised to enter the new program. In response to Randall, Anderman stated that the college was working with the University of Louisville to redesign the programs so that ultimately the PhD programs would be research-oriented while the EdD programs would be practitioner-oriented. He said that no new faculty resources would be needed; current coursework would be re-tooled so student would go through the program in cohorts; no new courses would be required. In response again to Randall, Anderman explained that there was faculty talent available to offer the new interdisciplinary degree; only six to seven students were expected in the program every year. (Mrs. Brothers added that information about faculty resources was included in the original proposal, but that documentation was not included in the handout due to copier troubles.) The Chair pointed out that the letter of administrative feasibility from the Office of the Provost would address such issues.

Theilin added that since there was no offering for a PhD currently, it was difficult to attract and retain students in certain areas. Anderman confirmed that the new program would be a happy resolution to that situation. In response to Randall, Anderman said that a student would still have the choice of entering into the PhD program or into an EdD program. Michael entered the meeting at this point.

Anderman confirmed for Odoi that the new PhD would be comprised of a combination of current courses, but with the addition of mentoring and research aspects. Anderman explained for Duke that there would be no differences for faculty regarding the EdD, since students in the EdD currently undergo a qualifying exam, research and methodology training, etc. Greissman asked if the program had already been posted to the CPE for review; Anderman replied that the end of the 45-day posting was almost at an end. Anderman added that not being able to offer the new program would result in losing students in the eastern part of the state to the University of Louisville, which currently had such an interdisciplinary program. He confirmed that both the PhD and EdD programs would be offered in the College of Education.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion to approve a new Interdisciplinary PhD in Education Science, contingent upon receipt of a positive letter of administrative feasibility from the Office of the Provost. The motion **passed** unanimously.

9. [Journalism, Integrated Strategic Comm., Telecommunications Test-Out \(objection to posting on transmittal\)](#)

It was mentioned that both Michael and Baxter lodged the objection to the proposal.

Michael stated that he had no objection to the proposal based on its merits, but rather based on the little known [Senate Rule 5.2.1.2.B](#) regarding testing out of courses. The Chair noted the presence of three College of Communications and Information Studies (CCIS) faculty members: School of Integrated Strategic Communications Director Beth Barnes; Associate Professor of Journalism Scoobie Ryan; and Associate Professor of Journalism Yvonne Cappe.

Guest Barnes explained that many of the courses involved in the programs of Journalism, Integrated Strategic Communications and Telecommunications were skills-based and not appropriate for testing out of; an objective test would not adequately reflect what a student would learn if enrolled in the course. Barnes explained that the programs in question wanted to be able to tell students up front that they could not test out of certain courses, regardless of self-expressed proficiencies. In response to Michael's question about this applying to every course in the schools' programs, Barnes replied that it was primarily skills courses that should not be tested out of, which rely on project skills and applying knowledge.

Guest Ryan explained that many affected courses involved a learning process. She said that plagiarism was a real problem in the field. In addition, it was not comparable for a student wanting to test-out to check out a camera and present an instructor with a project that the student may or may not have shot, edited, etc.; it would not be equal to a semester-long project completed by a student immersed in the class. In response to Michael, Ryan stated that she believed that there were not really any courses involved in the CCIS that would be appropriate for testing out of. The proposal to disallow testing-out was first proposed for broadcast classes; at the meeting at which such a test-out was discussed faculty from many of the CCIS schools also wanted their courses to be exempt from testing-out. There was general agreement by all (including discussions at a faculty meeting; an academic affairs committee meeting; and an informal meeting held earlier in the day by CCIS faculty to discuss testing-out) that testing-out was inappropriate.

Baxter noted that he saw instances of Computer Science students believing they could test-out of certain courses; he would require the student to undertake a programming project over the course of a week, after which Baxter would

evaluate the project and, if successful, offer the student a formal exam. He said he would hate to see a student waste an entire semester performing work that was already mastered. Ryan replied that the courses required for obtaining a degree were severely limited by their accrediting body. If a student stated that s/he was able to test out of the courses, Ryan would suggest the student pursue a degree in a field complementary to journalism, such as economics or political science. She said that faculty had the students for only 30 to 40 hours and wanted to maximize the amount of time spent with students. Baxter said that in his experience, students would only want to test out of one or two courses; Ryan replied that a student had recently attempted to test-out of three core courses.

Michael added that students benefited from classroom interactions, not just the work expected of them. Baxter wondered about offering a student an opportunity to bypass certain courses – if a student exhibited mastery of a certain course, the student could then be required to take another course.

Waldhart related that in the Department of Communication, students were allowed credit by exam for basic public speaking. She said that students usually came with a self-expressed statement of proficiency based upon a comment by a non-professional and wanted to take the nationally known test to prepare a speech. After the speech, more than half reported that they did not realize that public speaking involved more than merely vocalizing thoughts. Normally 12 – 20 students signed up for the test, 10 took the test and five or six continued on and took the speech part. Of those completing, the average grade was a C or D, not truly a demonstration of mastery of the subject. She said that at Virginia Tech, engineering faculty had to create a course for students who scored well on a “test-out” but did not know all that was necessary to succeed in subsequent courses. Waldhart opined that the prohibition on testing-out was acceptable for the CCIS units in question. She thought it was a legitimate request.

Randall wondered if there was any way that something could be written in to the programs (Journalism, Integrated Strategic Communications, Telecommunications) to allow an exception. Ryan spoke against such an exception. She explained that the University of Missouri did not accept any transfer credit in journalism. Barnes added that a graduate was referred to as a “Missouri journalist,” a level of distinction in the field because of the strict standards at the University of Missouri. Barnes said that their accrediting body allowed up to 12 transfer credits; even in those cases, students were spoken with to ensure that the courses were appropriate to transfer. She said the program would usually accept the courses that were least likely to affect the major so that the student received an appropriate molding into a professional. She said that testing-out was not a feasible option.

Guest Cappe said that if a local newsperson came to Journalism and expressed interest in a degree, she would wonder why the individual was not interested in a degree in another field that would expand the ability to report on/in a certain field.

She added that many stations were going to a “one man band” – reporter, interviewer and other responsibilities held by one person. She said that when a student left the School of Journalism, the student would be able to perform many activities, not just one or two that are involved in journalism. Odoi expressed concern about a student not being able to perform any type of test-out under any circumstances. He wondered how many students had tested-out in the past. Ryan replied that in the past 10 years, one student tested out of JOU 204 with a C grade; the student subsequently took the course because of the low grade. Barnes added that the prohibition on testing-out was not because of accommodations made for a plethora of students, but rather to establish that the specific types of courses were not appropriate to test out of. The Chair asked if there were further questions.

Duke wondered how the problem of a *Senate Rule* in contradiction to the proposed change to the programs in Journalism, Integrated Strategic Communications and Telecommunications would be addressed. Michael thought that the explanation offered by Barnes, Ryan and Cappe was sufficient to prohibit testing-out; the issue was that credit by examination was always inappropriate in these programs.

The Chair stated that a motion was needed to approve the prohibition because it was removed from the posted, 10-day web transmittal for SC review. He said that if approved, it would go on a 10-day web transmittal for review by the Senate.

Waldhart **moved** to approve the proposal to prohibit testing-out of any courses required for degrees in Journalism, Integrated Strategic Communications and Telecommunications. Thelin **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion passed with six in favor, one against and one abstaining.

6. [Naming of Subset of Senate Council for Reinstatement Committee](#)

The Chair explained that a few years ago, the SC considered reinstatement requests one at a time, but found that the interviews, etc. took up a lot of time. The responsibility for reviewing reinstatement requests was then delegated to a subset of the SC. He said that for 2005 – 2006, the Reinstatement Committee was made up of himself, Dembo and student member Monica Hobson. Hobson had since graduated and Dembo expressed a desire to not serve again on the committee. The Chair said that he was willing to continue to serve, so what was needed was one faculty member and one student member. In response to Odoi, the Chair said that there were usually one to two reinstatement cases heard by the Reinstatement Committee during each semester. He said there was one case waiting to be heard.

Odoi and Randall volunteered to serve on the Reinstatement Committee. The membership of the Reinstatement Committee being comprised of Randall, Tagavi (SC Chair) and Odoi was **approved** by unanimous consent.

Due to the time, the Chair said that agenda items ten and eleven would be placed on the agenda for November 27.

Waldhart **moved** to adjourn. Duke **seconded**. Approval of the motion was indicated by a mass exodus.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh Tagavi,
Senate Council Chair

Senate Council members present: Baxter, Duke, Harley, Michael, Odoi, Randall, Waldhart, Tagavi, Thelin.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Non-SC members present: Eric Anderman, Beth Barnes, Yvonne Cappe, Ralph Crystal, Jake Karnes, G. T. Lineberry, Diane Loeffler, and Jennifer Swanberg.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on November 29, 2006.