

Senate Council
November 19, 2012

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, November 19, 2012 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Lee X. Blonder called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:01 pm.

1. Minutes from October 29, 2012 and November 5, 2012 and Announcements

The Chair noted that no corrections were received for the minutes from October 29, 2012. There being **no objection**, the minutes from October 29, 2012 were **approved** as distributed **by unanimous consent**.

The Chair then moved to the minutes from November 5, 2012; no corrections were received. There being **no objection**, the minutes from November 5, 2012 were **approved** as distributed **by unanimous consent**.

There were a few announcements. The Chair informed the SC that she investigated the possible use of clicker technology for University Senate (Senate) meetings. The clickers would offer an immediate readout of who voted and documentation that only voting members are voting. The Student Government Association (SGA) and the Staff Senate both use clickers during meetings. There is an office on campus that can lend out Turning Point clickers for University Senate (Senate) meetings and software will need to be installed on a PC used during the meeting. The Chair added that someone will need to run the laptop during meetings. She invited Edwards to offer additional information about the use of clickers during SGA meetings, which he did. After brief discussion, the Chair added that the President's Chief of Staff, Bill Swinford, was amenable to offering financial support to purchase a set for the Senate to use.

SC members agreed to have a pilot of clickers during the January meetings, as well as pilot the use of clickers in the February 2013 Senate meeting. Senators will be encouraged to email comments on the pilot.

The Chair asked SC members to offer comments on the recent Senate meeting. SC members primarily expressed comments about the proposed new budget model.

2. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) - Davy Jones, Chair

i. Clarification Senate Rule on Duplicate Credit

Guest Davy Jones, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), explained that over the past year the SREC has been working on interpretations of the *Senate Rules (SR)* and occasionally identifies something as being a substantive policy issue, which is not in the purview of the SREC. He said the issue was then brought to the SC to determine who will decide on the substantive issues. He described the matter for SC members. The second page of the handout contains *SR 5.1.9* which used to be the rule, but the third page of the handout has *SR 5.3.1.2*, which was passed later. *SR 5.3.1.2* superseded *SR 5.1.9.B* and an administrative clause has been entered into the *SR 5.1.9.B* to refer readers to *SR 5.3.1.2*. When *SR 5.3.1.2* was codified, it was inserted into the *SR* in a way that it looks like it only deals with undergraduate programs. (See Appendix I.)

Grossman **moved** that the SC recommend that the Senate: replace the text of *SR 5.1.9.B* with a reference to *SR 5.3.1.2*: and move the position of *SR 5.3.1.2* to the location that would be numbered as *SR 5.3.0.1*, with a heading denoting both undergraduate and graduate programs, so that the effect will be that the text of *SR 5.3.0.1* will then come to expressly apply to both undergraduate and graduate programs. Pienkowski **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Contradiction within *Senate Rules* on Retroactive Withdrawal

Jones said that the SREC was asked to interpret a situation and saw a substantive contradiction in the rule. *SR 5.1.8.5.A.2* explains how a grade of E or XE can be changed to a W through the retroactive withdrawal process. In *SR 5.1.8.5.A.5*, however, it says that an XE cannot be changed to a W through the retroactive withdrawal process. Jones said the SREC reviewed legislative history and was unable to determine if there was a typo somewhere or a substantive issue at play that needs clarification. He said the SREC recommends that the matter be referred to the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) for them to render a recommendation to the Senate. SC members and guest Interim Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education discussed the issue.

Grossman **moved** that the issues raised regarding *Senate Rules 5.1.1*, *5.1.8.5*, and *6.4.C* be sent to the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) for the SAASC to come up with a coherent policy and new language for the *SR*. Brion **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. Grossman suggested that Withers write up his description of the issue and email it to the Chair. Jones added that Withers' explanation was very well said.

b. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) - Raphael Finkel, Chair

i. Proposed Changes to Admissions Requirements for Human Nutrition and Dietetics Undergraduate Programs in the Department of Nutrition and Food Science

Guest Sandra Bastin (Interim Chair, Department of Dietetics and Human Nutrition) commented that she brought Director of Undergraduate Studies Tammy Stephenson to help answer questions. Those present introduced themselves. Guest Finkel, chair of the SAASC, explained the proposal. SC members had questions about: the possible floating value of the acceptable cumulative grade-point average and how the grade from a course repeated after the three allowed repeat options would be used, if at all. Bastin and Stephenson said they could prepare a revised document. Finkel suggested they send it to him and the SAASC would review it before sending it to the SC, in time for the December Senate meeting.

5. Draft Policy on Academic Rigor

Jones explained that in spring 2009 the Southern Association for the Accreditation of Colleges and Schools placed an increased emphasis on showing in the *SR* how the Senate has its arms around courses and programs to show increased rigor from the undergraduate level, to graduate and then professional levels. He said that a group comprised of the vice president for institutional research, planning and effectiveness, the dean of the Graduate School, the then-associate provost for undergraduate education, and a faculty member from the College of Law created a statement (page 19 of the handout), to which Jones and Wood made a few additional edits. (The edits from Jones and Wood are in track changes.) In response to comments from SC members, Jones said he would change the language to present tense. After that, the language could go to each council.

SC members discussed the language. There was some concern that the language was vague in regards to the Senate's role in the approval process for the statements on academic rigor. Edwards suggested that the individual academic councils could create statements of academic rigor that the Senate would then

be responsible for approving. There was additional discussion. The Chair suggested that Jones take the language and return it to the SREC to make it present tense before the SC decides what to do next with it.

4. Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement G. T. Lineberry

The Chair introduced Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement G. T. Lineberry to SC members. Guest Lineberry then spoke to SC members about his background and vision for various aspects of the office associated with his position. He said he planned to enact a suggestion to him that he develop a faculty committee to advise him. Lineberry suggested having a seven-person advisory body for the Office of Faculty Advancement (OFA) that will meet every two or three weeks, to serve as a reality check and sounding board, and help prioritize and operationalize suggestions. The SC Chair will be an ex officio member, and members will include three faculty identified by the SC. The remaining three faculty members will be recommended by the deans to the Provost.

SC members discussed a variety of things. There was considerable support for the creation of an equity review committee to help ensure equitable salaries and equitable access to lab space and developmental monies. There was also support for better utilization of emeritus faculty for improved contact with graduates and better engaging older faculty who are most likely to know graduate students who have established themselves; faculty emeritus can also be involved in alumni relations. Some SC members expressed concern about the suggestion that a faculty member would approach the OFA with a problem, since the OFA may not hear about an issue until after it reached the level of the dean, as well as that the OFA reports to the Provost. SC members also expressed concerns about clinical title series faculty and lecturers and their respective professional development needs.

The Chair thanked Lineberry for attending.

5. Interim Provost Tim Tracy

Those present introduced themselves. Interim Provost Tim Tracy said that there was a name change to a center that was approved by the Board of Trustees as an administrative center. The request is to change the name from the Center for Health Management Services and Research to the Center for Health Services Research. It was not active for some time, but is currently being reconstituted. SC members asked a number of questions about the center, in part to understand its current and proposed place in the university structure and whether the center was administrative or research. Provost Tracy explained that he was requesting approval to change the name and change the formal reporting structure from the chancellor of the medical center to a dual reporting to the Provost and the Executive Vice President for Health Affairs (EVPHA). There was extensive discussion about the nature of the center when it was fully operational. Greissman asked Provost Tracy to clarify the reporting structure. The Provost replied that the center used to report to the chancellor for health affairs.

SC members agreed that the matter could be dealt with relatively simply if the proposal from the Provost changed to having the reporting structure change solely be an update of the language to current terminology (and dropping the suggestion that it have a dual reporting line to the Provost and EVPHA) and a change to the name from the Center for Health Management, Services, and Research to the Center for Health Services Research.

Grossman **moved** that the SC recommend the Senate endorse the proposed name change of the Center for Health Services, Management, and Research to the Center for Health Services Research and clarify that the center now reports to the provost. Wasilkowski **seconded**. The Provost clarified that there were

currently no faculty in the center to consult. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

SC members then asked the Provost a variety of questions. Among other answers, he suggested that faculty email him directly if there is a disagreement between a faculty member and a dean over the implementation of educational policy, particularly with respect to changing grades. The Provost cannot do something about things he does not know about. There was also a discussion about the new values-/incentive-based budget model and a few other issues. Due to the time, the Chair thanked Provost Tracy for attending.

Brion **moved** to adjourn and Wasilkowski **seconded**. The motion **passed** by **unanimous consent**. The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Lee X. Blonder,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Blonder, Brion, Coyne, Edwards, Grossman, McCormick, Pienkowski, Swanson, Wasilkowski, Wilson, Wood and Wright.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guests present: Sandra Bastin, Raphael Finkel, Davy Jones, G. T. Lineberry, Tammy Stephenson and Ben Withers.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Friday, November 30, 2012.

Appendix I

The SREC recommends to the Senate Council the following.

A. That the University Senate replace the text of SR 5.1.9.B with a reference to SR 5.3.1.2

B. That the position of SR 5.3.1.2 be moved to the location that would be numbered as SR 5.3.0.1, with a heading denoting both undergraduate and graduate programs, so that the effect will be that the text of SR 5.3.0.1 will then come to expressly apply to both undergraduate and graduate programs.

5.1.9 GRADE POINT AVERAGE (GPA)

A. GPA is the ratio of the number of quality points gained to the number of credit hours (whether earned or not) in courses for which the grades of A, B, C, D, or E were conferred, excluding grades in developmental or remedial courses. [US: 3/9/98; US 4/10/00; US: 9/10/01]

B. If a student repeats a course in which a grade of “B” or better has been received, any subsequent grades of “B” or better and credit hours earned for those courses (if any) shall be ignored in computing the student’s grade point average, unless the repeat option has been exercised according to Rule 5.3.1.1. A student does not repeat a course within the meaning of this rule if he or she only repeats the same course number where there are multiple topics, subtitles, independent study, or other courses allowed by the student’s program using a common course number. [US: 4/13/98]

* SR 5.3.1.2 overrides SR 5.1.9.B to the extent that any contradiction may exist between them. [SREC: 10/25/12]

C. Credit hours are considered as earned only if a grade of A, B, C, D, P or S was conferred.

5.3.0 REPEAT OPTION, SCHOLASTIC PROBATION, SUSPENSION AND REINSTATEMENT

5.3.1 STUDENTS IN UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

5.3.1.1 Repeat Option [US: 11/14/83; US: 4/13/87; US: 11/14/88; US: 4/23/90;

5.3.1.2 Prohibition of Duplicate Credit [US: 10/8/07]

A student may earn credit hours and associated quality points for a course only once unless the course is designated as repeatable. A student who nonetheless has enrolled more than once for the same nonrepeatable course will be awarded credit hours and associated quality points only for the first time the course is completed during the student’s academic career, regardless of the source (e.g. transfer, A.P., etc.) unless the student properly exercises the Repeat Option under SR 5.3.1.1.