

Senate Council Minutes  
September 26, 2005

The Senate Council met on Monday, September 26, 2005 at 3:00 pm in 103 Main Building and took the following actions.

1. [Approval of the Minutes from September 19, 2005](#)

The Chair asked if there were any corrections to the minutes besides those suggested via e-mail before the meeting. There being none, the minutes were approved as amended.

Announcements

The Chair announced that the feedback solicited from the draft letter regarding Privilege and Tenure issues had been collated and a revised version would be circulated after the meeting via the listserv.

Tagavi noted that a sensitive discussion had recently occurred on the listserv. He asked if Dembo would please provide a list of the current membership of the listserv and send an e-mail notifying the listserv whenever additions or deletions occur. The Chair will ask Dembo to do so.

Greissman provided a draft document containing revisions to the membership of the Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees. He outlined the major points and invited the Senate Council members to provide him with feedback or to pose questions prior to the discussion of this item at the next Senate Council meeting. He noted that while the proposed changes wouldn't go into effect until Fall 2006 the new regulations stating that only the elected faculty of the University Senate would vote on the degrees would take effect and be implemented immediately.

Lesnaw asked who had formulated the draft proposal. Greissman replied that representatives from Legal Counsel, the Provost's office and the Senate Council Chair had worked collaboratively.

2. [Graduate Certificate in Nursing Studies](#)

The Chair exercised his prerogative to rearrange the agenda, due to the scheduling conflicts of some of the visitors, and invited Julia Sebastian from Nursing to present the item.

Sebastian noted that the purpose of the graduate certificate would be to allow students in the Health Administration program to gain some exposure to the

clinical science of nursing. Grossman, as chair of the Academic Programs Committee, said that the proposal came forward from his committee with a positive recommendation.

Tagavi expressed concern that some of the courses affiliated with the certificate required prerequisites that MHA students would probably not have had. Sebastian replied that the clause “or consent of instructor” would be invoked for those students. Tagavi noted that some of the prerequisite descriptions did not make it clear that consent of instructor was possible, so Sebastian offered to file the necessary paperwork to make the corrections.

Tagavi expressed concern that MHA students may not perform well in Nursing courses without a Nursing background. Sebastian noted that the faculty of the college had carefully selected the courses in question because they would be most accessible to students with health administration training.

Lesnaw asked Sebastian to posit examples of other programs that may be invited to participate in such a certificate in the future. Sebastian replied that Psychology and Social Work seemed like good candidates, but that the success of the certificate would have to be evaluated in a smaller context before offering to include other programs.

Lesnaw asked for an explanation as to why the prerequisites for the courses in question were so extensive for Nursing students. Sebastian replied that when the program was designed it was with a more lockstep curriculum in mind, but that over time it became apparent that adult learners were capable of managing the material without so restrained an approach.

Greissman asked if the previous conversations at the Senate Council about Nursing enrollment pressures was pertinent in the current discussion. Sebastian replied that those conversations were about undergraduate enrollment while the current discussion was relevant to graduate education.

Sebastian reiterated that she will put forth the necessary forms to change the prerequisites for the courses in question.

There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. The **motion** on the floor from the Academic Programs Committee to approve the proposal **passed** without dissent.

### 3. AR regarding Non-Resident Fee Committee

The Chair invited Dave Watt to provide some background on the item. Watt noted that the changes were occurring both because the references to LCC needed to be removed from the AR and because there was a lack of clarity as to how the University's internal operating procedures related to the CPE's regulations, which were also unclear. While the CPE was initially interested in addressing the necessary changes to clarify the policy, the issue of alien non-residents receiving in-state tuition caused CPE to delay their revisions. The University, Watt noted, needed to move forward with needed changes and felt the Non-Resident Fee Committee was a good place to start.

Watt noted that the current committee structure was composed of six faculty or staff members and two student representatives. Watt proposed changing the structure to include himself, the Associate Provost for Enrollment Management and a faculty member. He outlined some of the problem areas in the University regarding students who used the system to obtain in-state status. He noted that students who were not satisfied with the committee's negative decision could always appeal to the Provost. He added that a representative from the Attorney General's office would be hired to review the particulars of such cases and make recommendations to the Provost.

Thelin asked how the new policy would interface with the recently-proposed changes in undergraduate enrollment. Watt suspected that gaining additional out-of-state tuition dollars was most likely part of the consultant's plan already, and that the proposed changes would aid the plan.

Lesnaw asked for the rationale as to why a student member was not included on the proposed committee. Watt relayed that it was unclear to him what added value a student member would bring.

Lesnaw asked how much money the University would regain annually if the proposal was adopted. Watt replied that while he didn't have actual dollar figures at the ready the amount was certainly significant. He mentioned the difference between resident and non-resident tuition for Dentistry students alone was most likely a sizeable amount.

Greissman spoke in favor of the proposal, noting that state taxpayers should not pay the same rate as non-state tax payers. Grossman agreed, noting that is was bad policy to allow students who know how to manipulate the system to pay a different rate than those students who were not as savvy. Additionally, out-of-state students shouldn't pay a differential rate from each other.

Jones asked why this AR required Board of Trustees approval. Watt replied that there was a clause in the CPE regulations stating that such changes required Board approval.

Grossman made a **motion** to approval the proposal, which was **seconded** by Tagavi. The motion **passed** without dissent.

#### 4. Joint Provost-Senate Council Committee

The Chair provided some background on the item, discussed his philosophies regarding the need for general education reform at the University, and asked the Senate Council for their endorsement of the joint committee and the charge, as well as some nominations for potential committee membership. He added that the purpose of the committee was to spark campus-wide discussion regarding general education reform, that the committee would use the work of those committees and councils that have already looked at reforming USP, and that any recommendations would be vetted through the usual University Senate processes.

Grossman requested more information regarding the committee's membership. The Chair replied that the Senate Council and the Provost would each nominate individuals. He suggested that the existing working group should be the basic shell of the new committee, and that it should consist of no more than 9 or 10 members. He listed the working group's current composition of Connie Ray, Deb Moore, Richard Greissman, Jane Jensen, himself, Tad Pedigo and Phil Kraemer. He added that Ms. Scott supplies administrative support as needed. He noted that the current working group consists of two faculty members and requested three additional nominees to round out the group.

Grabau asked how the proposed committee related to the DeSantis Committee and to the funding the President provided to look at this issue. The chair replied that the DeSantis Committee, also known as the USP External Review committee, would issue a preliminary report very shortly, and would issue a complete report in December. The content of the preliminary report would be used to spark campus-wide dialogue about the recommendations, while the final report would hopefully incorporate some of the suggestions and ideas generated during that dialogue. He added that there was a clear understanding by all involved that this issue was an academic policy matter and would require Senate Council and Senate approval before implementation of any suggestions could take place.

Greissman noted that the name had been changed to clarify that the committee would not issue a report, as a task force might, but would instead facilitate a conversation that might lead to some recommendations. He added that the work of the committee would not negate or trump the DeSantis report, but would perhaps add more meaning to it since topical conversation would ensue.

Tagavi asked who will chair the committee. The Chair replied that sort of detail would be discussed between the Provost and the Senate council. Tagavi requested that specific details regarding the membership of the committee be included in the proposal. Grossman suggested keeping the language flexible so that administrators who are currently on the committee might change their minds and be more readily replaced. Greissman agreed, suggesting that perhaps numbers should be used to delineate how many nominees of which type should be appointed.

Tagavi suggested that of the ten members five be appointed by the Provost and five by the Senate Council, inclusive of the two faculty members already on the committee.

The Chair suggested that instead of deciding who should chair, perhaps a more politic approach might be to suggest the appointment of co-chairs. Tagavi agreed, suggesting that the co-chairs should be the Senate Council Chair and the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education. Grossman added that if Kraemer declines that post then the Provost could appoint a different co-chair.

Tagavi made a **motion** to approve the proposal with the caveat that appropriate wording to specify the committee's composition be included. Grossman **seconded** the motion, which passed without dissent.

##### [5. MSFAM in Home Economics name change](#)

The Chair invited Ray Forgue and invited him to outline the proposed changes. Forgue replied that the degree is actually an MSFAM in Family Studies, but that due to some past oversight the major name of Home Economics was still appearing on student transcripts. He added that the students requested that the name be corrected to accurately reflect the nature of their studies.

Bailey provided some additional background, as the chair of the Academic Organization and Structure committee, and said that the proposal came from his committee with a positive recommendation.

Grossman asked if there were other MSFAM degrees that had a different major name. Forgue replied that the MSFAM in Early Childhood Education was a good example of the need for differentiation. Grossman asked if the name was supposed to be MSFAM in Family Studies. Forgue replied that the proposed name, as stated by Grossman, would correct the current Home Economics misnomer. Tagavi said that a MSFAM in Family Studies was redundant and advised against such a change.

Bailey provided some additional background and drew the Senate Council member's attention to the pertinent areas of the Change in Masters Degree program form. Grossman noted that between the pertinent area of the form and the attached rationale it was easier to see the program's reasoning behind the request. Bailey suggested that the consultation sheet be edited to more accurately reflect the department's request.

Tagavi made a motion to approve the degree name change from Home Economics to Family Studies. Bailey noted that the recommendation of the committee was already on the floor in the form of a motion.

Dembo asked if the proposal needed the full review of the Senate, if correcting a computer glitch in the Registrar's Office was the only issue at hand.

Grossman called the question. The **motion** on the floor from the committee to approve the proposal **passed** without dissent.

Tagavi requested that the record reflect that even though the term advisory committee was used in number 2 of the proposal he had not mentioned it during the discussion. Bailey noted that only item 1 of the proposal would go before a live Senate meeting while the other items were circulated on the web site for review and approval.

Grossman made a **motion** that item 1 be included on the web circular rather than going before a live Senate meeting. Lesnaw **seconded** the motion. Greissman suggested that the MSFAM in Early Childhood Education program be contacted to let them know of the name change and see if it would present that program with any difficulty.

The **motion** passed without dissent.

#### 6. Graduate Certificate in Clinical Research Skills

The item had previously been on the web circular but was brought to the Senate Council meeting for discussion due to an objection by Tagavi. Tagavi said he was concerned that the proposal did not specify how the description of the graduate certificate would change to allow for the drop in practicum credit hours. He requested that a revised description of the graduate certificate be provided.

Grossman made a **motion** to table the proposal until Dr. Shedlofsky could attend to address this concern. Tagavi offered the friendly amendment of also requesting an updated description in writing, but Grossman did not accept. Lesnaw **seconded** the motion. Tagavi requested that the minutes reflect that he would like to see the proposal and the revised description explicitly stated in writing. The motion **passed** without dissent.

#### 7. Nominating Committee

Tagavi suggested changes from various Senate Council members, including changes to wording that a minimum of two of the committee members would be voting rather than the definite number of two. Jones noted that the 72 hours needed before approval referred to the Senate Council Chair's consideration.

Lesnaw asked if the committee would ask potential nominees if they were willing to serve. She worried that there would be some embarrassment if faculty were asked if they were willing to serve but then their names were not among those selected by the Senate Council for forwarding. Jones noted that the names selected would be a pool of names from which the final decision would be made, so there would be no embarrassment since the cut could have come at either the Senate Council or the administrative level. Thelin suggested that the committee would have to specify to nominees that they may or may not be selected from the outset to avoid any misunderstanding later. Lesnaw agreed that such a solution would address her concern.

The revised language will be: "The committee shall ascertain the willingness of the nominees to serve before sending names to the Senate Council. Such recommendations to the Senate Council may be considered by the Senate Council Chair as approved 72 hours after distribution, etc..."

Grossman suggested that one Senate Council member would be sufficient to remove a name, rather than the two suggested in the proposal. Tagavi agreed to the change.

There being no further discussion, the proposal **passed** without dissent.

#### 8. Faculty Code Committee and Library Area Committee nominations

Jones asked if the two nominees whose names had been submitted had been rejected by the Administration for any particular reason. The Chair replied that the librarian had been rejected because she would have to recuse herself from almost every case, but that he had no information regarding the other candidate.

Jones noted that under revised regulations the Libraries is now recognized as a college and could conceivably divide itself into departments or divisions. If such changes occurred then librarians could serve on the Library Area Committee since they would only have to excuse themselves from cases arising from their own areas.

Jones recommended submitting the other name, Flashman, again. Grabau asked why such a move should be undertaken. Jones replied that since no communication had been received from the President as to why the candidate was unsatisfactory the candidate should again be submitted in an attempt to prompt communication.

Jones made a **motion** to forward the names of Flashman and Peters. Grossman **seconded** the motion, which **passed** without dissent.

#### 9. University Senate agendas for [October 3](#) and [October 10](#)

Grossman asked if President Todd was aware that October 3 was Rosh Hashanah and that a prolonged speech would cause the Jewish faculty members to be pressed for time. Ms. Scott replied that that was part of the logic behind not placing additional items on the October 3 agenda.

Jones made a **motion** to approve the agenda, with a **second** from Thelin. The motion **passed** without dissent.

Numbers five and six from the October 10 agenda required striking, since they had not been passed by the Senate Council. Thelin made a **motion** to approve with a **second** from Grabau. The motion **passed** without



dissent. Tagavi requested that Ms. Scott obtain the marked-up version of the proposed AR changes for circulation to the Senate. Ms. Scott agreed.

Other

Moore asked that Mark Wattier, the new faculty representative to the CPE, be allowed to meet and speak with the Senate Council at a future date. Ms. Scott recommended the October 17 Senate Council meeting. Moore will communicate with her regarding the agenda for that meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by  
[Ernie Yanarella](#), Chair

Members present: Dembo, Grabau, Grossman, Lesnaw, Moore, Thelin, Tagavi, Yanarella.

Liaison present: Greissman

Guests present: Bailey, Forgue, McGurk, Sebastian, Watt

Prepared by [Rebecca Scott](#) on September 26, 2005.