

Senate Council Minutes
March 29, 2004

The Senate Council met on Monday, March 29, 2004 at 3:00 pm in the Gallery of the W.T. Young Library and took the following actions:

1. Approval of the Minutes from March 22, 2004

The Chair said he would excerpt the section regarding the Oral Communication discussion and provide it to the Senate prior to the Senate meeting. Ms. Scott thanked Tagavi for his changes. Debski requested more time to review the Minutes and suggested that if no changes were submitted in two days then the Minutes would stand as approved. The Chair agreed to accept changes until Thursday.

2. Graduation Agreement Update

The visitors and the Senate Council members introduced themselves. The Chair thanked Greisman for attending and asked him to introduce the topic. Greisman discussed some changes to the Agreement, noting the use of the word "agreement" in the title rather than "contract". He noted the changes to the document since its last review by the Senate Council.

Jones asked how long the student had to provide a copy of the letter indicating that an impediment to timely graduation existed to his or her academic advisor. Greisman noted that a time frame was not explicit and will adjust the language.

The Chair noted the change to the document on the second page indicating the University would be responsible for tuition payment and asked why the language had been changed. Greisman replied the college deans expressed concern that their college would be charged when they were not at fault, so the language had been changed to "University" to be inclusive of the department, college and administration involved.

Tagavi requested the inclusion of language that explicitly stated that students who were not enrolled in the Agreement would not be discriminated against. Greisman said that since no preference currently existed, none would exist under the Agreement. Grabau noted that many groups of students are allowed to register early because of their Honor student status or involvement in Athletics. Greisman said that nothing along those lines would change with the implementation of the Agreement.

Tagavi suggested adding the word "faculty" in front of the word department so that waivers and substitutions of requirements would be approved by the faculty and not just the administrative head of the unit. Cibull expressed concern that the Graduation Agreement would be used as an excuse to eliminate requirements. Tagavi requested the addition of the word "faculty" to number 1 and 2 of the Agreement. Greisman suggested the wording "by the department and its faculty". Tagavi asked if those were two different entities. Jones noted that the faculty are the policy-making body of the curricula. Greisman said the word "college" was meant to imply the administrators of

the college, like the dean. Jones asked how the wording would be interpreted in colleges that didn't have departments. Chard suggested using "department and/or college faculty". Greisman agreed.

Tagavi asked if professional programs that require additional time to obtain degrees are included in the tuition portion of the Agreement. Grabau suggested including a list of qualifying majors and degrees. Kennedy asked if courses that come later in a required series would be paid for if the student's graduation was delayed by not being able to enroll in the first course in the series. Tagavi said it was implied in the wording of the Agreement.

Greisman expressed concern over the philosophical question raised by Cibull. Greisman said the Agreement did not create the problems experienced by Communications in relation to the recent proposal to remove the Oral Communications requirement from the University Studies Program. Cibull said he thought the Agreement could be used as an argument to drop other requirements and was concerned that the original intent of providing resources for a four-year education was being sullied by the University's lack of ability to fund the requirements as they currently stand. He said "the mind set now is 'how do we cut costs', not 'how do we provide traditional education'". Cibull suggested Greisman attend another Senate Council meeting to discuss these concerns.

Greisman argued that all public institutions are presented with these problems and that the Graduation Agreement will force the institution to evaluate how it educates its students. He suggested that the current University Studies Program is wasteful and that it can be done better. Greisman expressed gratitude for the opportunity to evaluate the pilot Agreement after three years to determine the effect that it has on programs and requirements.

Greisman said he was convinced that curricular maps are the critical component of the Agreement. He reported that the Registrar's Office is programming maps from the 13 pilot programs into their degree audit system. Greisman closed by thanking the Council members for their time, agreeing to come back for a subsequent discussion and suggesting the Provost could become involved in the discussion.

The Chair asked when the pilot program would begin. Greisman replied that on-line registration would be made available Fall 2004 and that a massive advertising campaign would occur.

3. College of Public Health Proposal

Samuel discussed the various merits of the proposal and noted the various stages of approval it had undergone. Rogers said the proposal had the support of the staff. The Chair asked if the possible loss of staff positions had been addressed. Rogers said the staff had concerns at first but soon came to realize their jobs would become more important if the school became a college. Wiggs said the students were in favor of

becoming a college and stressed the importance to the students of receiving a degree from an accredited college.

Jones reported that Watt addressed the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees about this issue. He said that Watt said students in the program were given a commitment when recruited that by the time they reached the point of graduation the degree would be accredited. Jones asked who had made that promise to the students. Wiggs said the students were given no written materials to that affect. He said they were told the school would seek accreditation.

Cibull said that Watt and Samuel had presented the same issue as a reason why the proposal should be approved. Samuel replied that they couldn't have made the commitment that the school was going to be accredited. Cibull indicated that Samuel had said otherwise in the past. The Chair asked if Cibull's point pertained to the merits of the proposal. Cibull said that it did because the point about commitments being made to students was one of the points given in the Provost's letter as to why the college should be approved. He requested that Jones' question be answered.

Samuel said that a letter seeking accreditation had been signed by Holsinger, Skutchfield and Todd. He said that he hoped nobody had said they could promise that the school would be accredited, because that was presumptive. Jones reiterated that Watt had used the commitment to the student as the reason for urgency at the level of the Board. Samuel said the doctoral students were intentionally delaying graduation so they could receive an accredited degree. Samuel said he understood there were problems with the way the material had been presented. Tagavi suggested that the promises made to students should not be used as an argument for why the proposal should be approved. Samuel said that three officials had signed the letter in question. Cibull said that Samuel was aware that the argument had been used in the past and suggested that it was incorrect back away from statements that were previously made. He said his other concern was that the amount of grant money the college could attract was not very large. Samuel estimated grant income of about one to one-and-a-half million dollars if accreditation was received, but guessed it might be more than that once the College became competitive.

Kennedy requested to see the letter with the three signatures and suggested drafting a strong statement about not making promises that obliges the University to do things.

Lee addressed the concerns set forth by the Academic Standards Committee of the Senate, noting that the programs that will remain in the College of Health Sciences are large programs consisting of many students. Samuel agreed that removing Health Service Management would not have a monumental effect on the College of Health Sciences.

Kelly discussed the proposal from the perspective of the College of Medicine (COM) Faculty Council. He said his report reflected the discussions held at a Faculty Council meeting as well as a meeting of the general faculty. Kelly reported that while the COM

faculty are in favor of the idea of creating a College of Public Health at the University, there was no consensus that this was the appropriate time to do so. He said that while the COM faculty supported the idea two to one, only 50% thought this was an appropriate time to do so. Kelly said his information had been obtained from the two meetings already mentioned and from a web site established to allow faculty the chance to vote. In response to Cibull's question about how many COM faculty had voted, Kelly replied that 90 of the 550 faculty had voted. In response to Edgerton's question about the concern over the timing of the proposal, Kelly replied that most of the concerns were about what resources would remain the COM and the underfunding of programs.

Kennedy asked why COM faculty turn-out was so low. Kelly said that Kennedy's assumption that those who didn't respond thought it wasn't worth their time to do so was not unreasonable.

Jones asked about "new recurring funding" for the college and asked where those funds had come from. Samuel replied that the Chancellor of the Medical Center had made decisions as to how those funds were allocated, that most of the funds for the proposed college were already available in the programs to be brought together, and added that any new funds did not come out of the current fiscal year budget. He added that faculty lines, funding and people had all been in place as of July 2003.

Rogers said most of the funding had been put in place during the creating of the School of Public Health. He noted that a recent visit from the accrediting agency clarified the number of lines needed. Cibull asked in what way clarification had been received. Rogers replied that questions about research and clinical faculty counting as a whole faculty line had been answered. Samuel added that no money had been added aside from last year's salary increases and that no new lines had been added this fiscal year. He said that the creation of the College of Public Health would clarify a complex situation in that all of the components of the field of public health would be unified in one college. He apologized that the proposal was presented the way it was, adding that there had always been the clear intent that Public Health would pursue accreditation. He said that nobody should have said commitments made to students were reasons the college should be created.

Chard asked if the budget would be the same either way, if the total dollar figure would match. Rogers replied that since FY 2002 the school received two new faculty lines by way of the Chancellor's Office, but that Public Health had received nothing new in 2003 or 2004.

Chard said her committee was most concerned with Kelly's letter and Grossman's statement when reviewing the proposal. She said her committee voted to approval the proposal unanimously but included a list of concerns requiring further explanation. Debski asked if any new start-up funds would be required. Chard said no start-up funds should be required. Samuel said money would be saved by consolidating the various departments into one college, though he believed staff jobs would not be in jeopardy. Rogers noted that the organizational structure already exists with staff lines already

filled in the existing programs. Samuel said Public Health recently installed a new phone system when Allied Health left the building, but no other start-up expenses were anticipated.

Returned to the discussion of her committee's minutes, Chard said the answer to the concerns raised by Grossman regarding the remaining programs was offered by Rita Wilkie. Wilkie reported that Watt had no intention of rearranging the remaining programs in the College of Health Science. Chard said her committee felt comfortable that all key constituent groups who might be affected by the formation of the new college had been contacted and had opportunity for input. Chard said the small voting turn-out from the COM faculty might be due to the impression that "this was as done deal". Her committee suggested that every concern from Kelly's letter be acknowledged and taken into account. Chard said a committee member expressed concern that one of the reasons for fast approval listed by Nietzel in his feasibility letter was the need to fulfill commitments made to students. Chard said that students entering into a program that isn't accredited run the risk of getting a degree that isn't accredited. She said the committee members were sympathetic to the students, but that particular reason did not necessitate Senate action in the specified time-frame.

Cibull asked if the course overlap with the Martin School had been addressed. Samuel replied that an agreement with the Martin School had been reached and that Public Health was committed to not detracting from the Martin School or the Biostatistics program. Jones noted Toma's concerns regarding which courses will be offered by the Martin School and Public Health. Samuel said her concerns had been addressed in a satisfactory manner.

The Chair noted the letter signed by Todd, Skutchfield and Holsinger was now on the projection screen. Lee noted the letter was sent to the accrediting body to request applicant status. Cibull said the letter did not have much to do with what it was purported to say and suggested the commitment made to students should be broached as a reason to approve the proposal.

Debski asked how many Public Health programs are seeking accreditation. Samuel said that aside from the 30 that exist there are four or five more seeking accreditation. He said LSU's newly established college as an example.

Cibull asked how grant earning of the faculty who were formerly in the medical center would be handled. Samuel replied that he had no intention of redirecting grant funds and provided some examples of faculty who would be in the new college whose grant funds are credited to other colleges.

Chard made a **motion** to forward the proposal to the Senate with a positive recommendation contingent upon the items in the letter from the COM faculty and Faculty Council being taken into account. Kennedy **seconded** the motion. Jones asked who should take them into account. Chard indicated the visitors from Public

Health. Jones suggested a friendly **amendment** to include “administrative implementers will take into account”. Chard and Kennedy accepted the amendment.

The **motion** to “forward the proposal to the Senate with a positive recommendation contingent upon the administrative implementers taking into account the items in the letter from the COM faculty and Faculty Council” **passed** without dissent. The proposal will be presented at the April 12 University Senate meeting. The visitors from Public Health departed.

4. Section GR VII.A.4 and Section GR IV – Proposed Draft Language

Jones presented the proposal and provided some history. Jones said the Provost would not oppose the proposed language pertaining to faculty input in the review process of deans and chairs. The second item Jones presented set forth language that would delegate the responsibility for terminating academic degree programs to the Senate. Jones said that the inclusion of the new language was necessary to codify the Senate’s responsibility. Cibull expressed concern about programs that were being terminated for financial reasons. Chard said financial exigency was why this language should be codified now. Cibull said he wasn’t sure if the proposal was in the best interest of the University. Jones suggested faculty should be involved in program termination, not administration. The Chair noted the changes would affect programs only, not educational units.

Chard made a **motion** to allow Jones to present the proposals to the AR/GR work group with the support of the Senate Council. Jones **seconded** the motion. Edgerton asked Cibull to elaborate on his reservations. Cibull thought the faculty would not want to dissolve academically viable programs that were no longer in the best interest of the University to maintain. Jones said the new wording would prohibit Administration from terminating programs based on academic merit. Cibull said Administration could just remove funding from programs they wanted to terminate. Chard noted the Administration would have to provide financial explanations for doing so. The motion **passed** with dissent.

5. University Senate Agenda for April 12, 2004

Cibull noted the presence of many contentious items on the agenda. The Chair agreed and said that items unattended to at the April meeting may require a special meeting to be called. Cibull suggested imposing time limits on debate. The Chair suggested finishing all other business by 4:00 pm to allow time for the Oral Communications proposal. Cibull suggested posted the time schedule. Debski noted a time frame is only good if it is followed. The Chair will provide a schedule and will ask the Senate to follow it.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:59.

Respectfully submitted by
Jeffrey Dembo, Chair

Members Present: Chard, Cibull, Debski, Dembo, Edgerton, Grabau, Jones, Kaalund, Kennedy, Tagavi.

Visitors Present: Greisman, Kelly, Lee, Rogers, Samuel, Stoeppel, Wiggs.

Prepared by Rebecca Scott on April 1, 2004