

SENATE COUNCIL

March 31, 2003

The Senate Council met at 3:00 p.m. in the Gallery in the W. T. Young Library and took the following actions.

First order of business: Good News!

The Chair announced that the position for Senate Council Secretary has been filled. Rebecca Scott from the Graduate School will be joining the Senate Council office at the beginning of May. She will be welcomed by all.

1. Selective Admissions

Chair Dembo invited Past Senate Council Chair William Fortune to answer questions about the Selective Admissions Committee Report. Concerns were raised about the goal of Admission Requirements and the criteria by which the selections would be made; for example GPA. Many suggestions were offered on the re-wording / clarification of #2 in the SAC Report. A motion was made to add an amendment [Tagavi] to change the wording of the contract to:

*The Senate rules should be amended to state that all proposals to create or change admissions requirements in colleges and programs must provide a detailed rationale for each criterion in the proposal. Limiting enrollment solely by overall GPA is not acceptable.*

*For example, if the rationale of the proposal is predominately to limit enrollment, then the college or program cannot accommodate the anticipated student load without compromising academic integrity. \*The published appeals process must include the date by which the student must appeal and the date by which the appeal decision will be reported to the student. [\*Previously contributed by Falk]*

Saunier [Debski seconded] moved for the SAC Report to be presented to the University Senate with the modifications suggested by the Senate. The report will be reviewed with changes at the next University Senate meeting on April 14. All were in favor.

2. Graduation Contract

Chair Dembo invited Tony Stoeppel to respond to questions on a proposal for a Graduation Contract. A lengthy discussion followed about, among other things, resources being available for the University on the Administrative level as well as each individual College being able to uphold the contract. Debski suggested a fee or deposit be attached to the contract to help encourage the student to live up to the contract. A motion was made to accept the contract [Cibull/Kennedy].

The following amendments were also added to the contract:  
[Tagavi/Kennedy]

*When it comes to override or priority registration, students who are not on the contract, will not be discriminated against based on their status.*

The amendment went to a vote. Five were in favor, four were opposed. The motion for the amendment passed.

[ Yanarella

*The University Administration generally commits itself to providing adequate resources to realize the goals the Graduation Contract. As course scheduling problems contending from lack of resources in individual units integral to the grad contract become evident, the university administration commits itself to working with these units in overcoming those resource deficits.*

[Waldhart]

*...the university administration commits itself to providing needed resources to these units in overcoming those resource deficits.*

The amendment went to a vote. And passed unanimously

[Debski/Saunier]

Motioned and seconded that students should put up a nominal deposit at the signing of the contract and the money would be returned at the successful completion of the contract. If breached by the student, the deposit would not be refunded.

The amendment went to a vote. Three were in favor, five were opposed. The motion failed.

A motion was made and seconded [Cibull/Kennedy] to send the amended contract to the University Senate April 14<sup>th</sup> as an action item with positive recommendations, proposal and 2 amendments.

The motion went to a vote. All were in favor. The motion passed.

3. Academic Planning & Priorities

Chair Dembo invited Dr. Hahn to respond to questions on Academic Planning & Priorities. Cibull moved to table the proposal until more time had been given to review the information. Jones made a point to expedite the review process and at least move it on to the University Senate floor. Chair Dembo shared the Senates options and a motion was made not to vote or act on the proposal but discuss it at the next Senate Council meeting.

All were in favor of the motion.

so [Enid;Cibull]. All were in favor with none opposed. Huh???????

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey Dembo  
Chair, Senate Council

Present: Jones, Bailey, Edgerton, Kennedy, Tagavi, Yanarella, Saunier, Waldhart,  
Debski, Dembo, Falk.

SC Min 3/31/03