Senate Council

Monday, March 6, 2023

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3:00 PM on Monday, March 6, 2023, in 103 Main Building, although a video conference link was also available for members. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken electronically unless otherwise specified. Specific voting information can be requested from the Office of the Senate Council (SC).

Senate Council Chair DeShana Collett (HS) called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:00 PM. The Chair welcomed those present. She informed everyone that the session was being recorded for notetaking purposes and noted that it was an open meeting. She asked that all attendees, online and in person, state their name and affiliation prior to speaking, to ensure everyone knew who was speaking. The Chair asked SC members to be ready to vote via Poll Everywhere. The Chair reminded SC members that regarding the ability to speak, members must raise their hand to be called upon. The Chair also reminded everyone that SC members would have priority speaking, noting that others may be called upon as needed and given a chance to speak only if there were no additional comments from SC members.

1. Minutes from February 27, 2023 and Announcements

The Chair informed SC members that no edits were received to the February 27, 2023 minutes. There being **no objections,** the minutes from February 27, 2023 were **approved as distributed by unanimous consent.**

The Chair expressed her appreciation for Chief Information Officer Brian Nichols, noting that she reached out to him a few months ago about helping the SC office staff make improvements to the process of managing activity reports and committee minutes. The Chair noted that the SC office worked with Marc Bradley, who helped office personnel to make the process significantly more efficient. The Chair expressed appreciation for Bradley and his willingness to collaborate.

2. Committee Reports

a. Senate Calendar Committee - Richard Charnigo, Chair

The Chair invited Senate Calendar Committee (SCC) Chair Richard Charnigo (PbH) to provide a report to SC members.

i. *Proposed Change to Senate Rules 2*

The Chair noted that she had invited a representative from the Senate Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) to attend to participate in the discussion to prevent any unintended consequences arising from changes discussed. The Chair informed SC members that University Registrar Kim Taylor was the proposer.

Charnigo explained the proposed changes to *Senate Rules (SR) 2.* The Chair stated the **motion** was a recommendation from the committee for the Senate to approve the proposed changes to *SR 2.* Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate.

SC members discussed the proposed changes to *SR 2* and offered comments regarding the nomenclature for how weeks were numbered and expressed concerns about some of the dates for grade submission deadlines falling too closely to University holidays at the end of the Fall semester. Kaveh Tagavi (EN) **moved** to amend the proposed change to *SR 2* by numbering the semester weeks. Faculty Trustee Aaron Cramer (EN) **seconded.** The Chair opened the floor to members for questions

of fact and debate. Taylor noted that while weeks could be added, the Registrar's office had been preparing calendars for years and explained that identifying the weeks and number of days in a semester had not been an issue. Doug Michael (LA) encouraged SC members to oppose the amendment, noting that such wordsmithing was not in the purview of the SC. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **failed** with nine opposed and none abstained.

The Chair stated that the original motion was being discussed. Tagavi **moved** for the SC to table the proposed changes and send to the SREC to provide more clarity to certain areas of the rule. The motion **failed** as there was no second.

The Chair stated that the original motion was again being discussed. Cramer commented that there was no reason for a motion to send the proposed changes to SREC, as all proposed *SR* changes were routinely sent to SREC. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

ii. *Five-Year Structural Calendar (2022-23 - 2026-27)*
Charnigo explained the five-year structural calendar (2022-23 – 2026-27). The Chair stated the **motion** was a recommendation from committee for the Senate to approve the five-year structural calendar (2022-23 – 2026-27). Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate. She noted that development and/or approval of a structural calendar does not change the Registrar's responsibility to seek Senate Council and Senate approval of academic calendars. Even if a structural calendar is approved, the Registrar will continue to provide calendars to the Senate Council and Senate, as dictated in SR 2.

SC members discussed the implications of the five-year structural calendar. University Registrar Kim Taylor clarified that the concept of a structural calendar was previously reviewed by Senate and noted that the structural calendar would be helpful for students and other constituents of the University. SC members discussed some of the specific dates included in the structural calendar. The Chair commented that the structural calendar was subject to change.

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

iii. *2025 - 2026 Calendar, Tentative*
Charnigo explained the 2025 – 2026 tentative Academic Calendar. The Chair stated the **motion** was a recommendation from committee for the Senate to approve the 2025 – 2026 tentative Academic Calendar. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate.

SC members briefly discussed some of the deadlines included in the calendar.

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

iv. *2022 - 2023 Pharmacy Calendar*
v. *2023 - 2024 Pharmacy Calendar*
vi. *2025 - 2026 Pharmacy, Tentative*
The Chair asked if there were any objections to consider the three proposed Pharmacy Calendars and there were none. Charnigo presented the three calendars to SC members. The Chair stated the **motion** was a recommendation from committee for the Senate to approve all three Pharmacy Calendars (2022 - 2023, 2023-24, and 2025-26, tentative). The Chair asked if there were any questions or debate and there was none.

A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained. The Chair thanked College of Pharmacy Associate Dean Frank Romanelli (PH) for attending.

b. Undergraduate Council - Kristine Urschel, Chair

The Chair invited Undergraduate Council (UC) Chair Kristine Urschel (AG) to provide a report to SC members.

i. *Proposed Changes to Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement (GCCR) in Senate Rules*

Urschel explained the proposed changes to the Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement (GCCR) language the in the *Senate Rules.* The Chair stated the **motion** was a recommendation from the UC that the Senate approved the proposed changes to the Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement (GCCR) the in the *Senate Rules.* Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate.

SC members discussed the proposed changes to the GCCR in the *Senate Rules* at length. Discussion included whether programs should be allowed a certain level of flexibility and whether another body should review the standards set by each department to ensure they were well aligned with the spirit of the GCCR. Some SC members expressed concerns about ensuring students were representing the standard expectation of the University. Other SC members noted that allowing program faculty to determine what the correct standards were could open the possibility of increasing specific skills that students in a particular program would need to demonstrate in the workplace. SC members discussed the fundamental importance of writing instruction in university education. Urschel clarified that the authority of UC would not change with the proposed changes, noting that the GCCR subcommittee had not existed for some time.

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

ii. *Updated GCCR Form*

Urschel explained the updated GCCR form. The Chair noted this was primarily an update to an existing form. The Chair welcomed a motion to approve the use of the updated form, effective immediately.

SC Vice Chair Leslie Vincent (BE) **moved** to approve the use of the updated GCCR form, effective immediately. Faculty Trustee Aaron Cramer (EN) **seconded.** The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate. There were no questions of fact or debate.

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

The Chair thanked Urschel for her work.

c. Senate Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) - Gregg Rentfrow, Chair

The Chair invited SAOSC Chair Gregg Rentfrow (AG) to provide an update to SC members.

i. *Proposed Name Change of the Department of Anesthesiology to the Department of Anesthesiology, Perioperative, Critical Care and Pain Medicine*

The Chair noted that Zaki Hassan (ME) was the proposer. Rentfrow explained the proposed name change of the Department of Anesthesiology to the Department of Anesthesiology Perioperative, Critical Care and Pain Medicine. The Chair stated the **motion** was a recommendation from the SAOSC that the Senate endorse the proposed name change of the Department of Anesthesiology to

the Department of Anesthesiology, Perioperative, Critical Care and Pain Medicine. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate.

SC members briefly discussed the proposed name change, including the addition of a comma after Anesthesiology. Faculty Trustee Hollie Swanson (ME) asked if the name change would help improve the department's residency program. Hassan noted that it would.

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

d. Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) - Leslie Vincent, Chair
The Chair invited SAASC Chair Leslie Vincent (BE) to provide a report to SC members.

i. *Proposed Changes to Senate Rules 4 ("Rules Relating to Admission to the University")*
The Chair noted that Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management and Chief Enrollment Officer Christine Harper, was attending, although she was not the proposer of this particular version. The Chair asked SC members to recall their discussion about the proposed changes to *SR 4 ("Rules Relating to Admission to the University")* from the prior SC meeting. The Chair informed SC members that the SC office staff had incorporated the proposed changes, noting the language had not substantively changed. The Chair commented that while reviewing the changes, one particular sentence could have ramifications for professional programs: "In compliance with the *Senate Rules,* the implementation of admissions policies established by individual colleges is managed by the University offices responsible for admissions." The Chair noted it was possible that this sentence could be misinterpreted to prevent professional programs from being responsible for their own admissions processes. The Chair suggested SC members think carefully about this sentence.

Vincent explained the proposed changes to *SR 4 ("Rules Relating to Admission to the University").* The Chair stated the **motion** was a recommendation from the committee for the Senate to approve the proposed changes to *SR 4 ("Rules Relating to Admission to the University").* Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate.

SC members offered a variety of comments and edits, including an edit to adjust for the sentence that the Chair mentioned previously. Vincent and Harper both noted that a proposal with more substantive changes would be presented to SC at a later date.

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

e. Graduate Council - Martha Peterson, Chair
The Chair invited Acting Dean of the Graduate School and Graduate Council (GC) Chair Martha Peterson (GS) to provide a report to SC members.

i. *Proposed Changes to SR 1.3.3.3 ("Graduate Council," "Composition")*
Peterson explained the proposed changes to *SR 1.3.3.3 ("Graduate Council," "Composition").* The Chair stated the **motion** was a recommendation from the GC to approve the proposed changes to *SR 1.3.3.3 ("Graduate Council," "Composition").* Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate.

SC members discussed the rationale for the proposed changes and the relationship between the Graduate Student Congress (GSC) and the Student Government Association (SGA). SGA President Andrew Laws noted that SGA represented all students and expressed concerns about changing the

language for the student members of the GC. The Chair commented that the *Senate Rules* stated the general policy for Academic Councils was that student members would be nominated by SGA. Peterson stated she was fine with striking the proposed language "…appointed by Dean of the Graduate School after consultation with Directors of Graduate Studies, Graduate Council, Student Government Association, Graduate Student Congress and Graduate School leadership" from *SR 1.3.3.3.4 ("Graduate Council," "Voting Student Membership")* to better align with the current *SRs.*

There being **no objections,** the proposed changes to *SR 1.3.3.3 ("Graduate Council," "Composition")* were **approved as amended by unanimous consent.**

In the interest of time, the Chair asked if there were any objections to moving agenda items 3 (2022-2023 Faculty Evaluation of the President) and 4 (Outstanding Senator Award Committee) to the next SC meeting. There were **no objections.**

f. Senate Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) - Sandra Bastin, Chair
The Chair invited SAPC Chair Sandra Bastin (AG) to provide a report to SC members.

i. *Proposed New BA Sport Leadership*
The Chair noted that proposer Justin Nichols (ED) was attending. Bastin explained the proposed new BA in Sport Leadership. The Chair stated the **motion** was a recommendation from SAPC for the Senate to approve the proposed new BA Sport Leadership, in the Department of Kinesiology and Health Promotion, within the College of Education. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate. There were no questions or debate.

A **vote** was taken, and then motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

5. Tentative Senate Agenda for March 20, 2023
Doug Michael (LA) **moved** to approve tentative Senate agenda for March 20, 2023. Marilyn Duncan (ME) **seconded.** There was no debate. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

6. Items from the Floor
Time did not permit for items from the floor.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 PM with **no objections.**

Respectfully submitted by,
DeShana Collett

Prepared by Katie Silver on Tuesday, March 7, 2023

SC Members Present: Bastin, Blasing, Collett, Cramer, Davis, Duncan, Grossman, Laws, Michael, Raglin, Salt, Swanson, Tagavi, Takenaka, Vincent

Invited Guests Present: Sheila Brothers, Katie Cardarelli, Richard Charnigo, Robert DiPaola, Christine Harper, Zaki Hassan, Davy Jones, Katherine McCormick, Justin Nichols, Martha Peterson, Frank Romanelli, Gregg Rentfrow, Kim Taylor, Kristine Urschel