

Senate Council
October 20, 2008

The Senate Council met in regular session on Monday, October 20, 2008 at 3 pm in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Immediate Past Chair Kaveh Tagavi called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:07 pm. Tagavi noted that he had been asked by SC Chair David Randall to lead the meeting – Randall was out of town and Vice Chair Aken was also unavailable to attend.

1. Minutes from October 6 and Announcements

Tagavi asked SC members to review the minutes from October 6. There being no comments or objections, the minutes from October 6 were approved as distributed.

To accommodate invited guests, Tagavi suggested postponing other announcements until later in the meeting – there were no objections.

2. [Proposed College Standards Changes: Gatton College of Business and Economics](#)

Tagavi introduced Gatton College of Business and Economics Associate Dean of the Undergraduate Resource Center Nancy Johnson. Guest Johnson explained the rationale behind the various requests that made up the proposal. There were a few questions.

Provost's Liaison Greissman noted that the language in the first bullet (pertaining to general education component of undergraduate curriculum) could be confusing to the campus community, because of the campuswide use of the term "general education reform" to refer to the revisions to the University Studies Program, not to general courses taken outside the college. After some editing, the proposed language was revised¹ and agreed to by Johnson:

Each student's undergraduate curriculum must ~~have a general education component which comprises~~ include at least 60 earned credit hours of courses outside the Gatton College of Business and Economics.

There being no further comments or discussion, Anderson **moved** to approve the Proposed College Standards Changes for the Gatton College of Business and Economics (with the modification regarding the undergraduate curriculum) and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation, effective fall 2008. Chappell **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** without dissent.

4. Proposed Reading Period Ad Hoc Report

¹ Strikethrough indicates deleted text and underlining denotes new text.

Tagavi invited Chappell to share the report. Chappell noted that the members of the ad hoc committee were himself, Connie Wood and Joe Quinn (student).

The group had contacted a number of campus areas (Athletics, Parking and Transportation, Police, Registrar, Student Services, etc.) and asked for input on the development of a one- to two-day reading period at the end of the semester. Chappell shared the results of the queries; Guest Quinn and Wood also made comments.

There was extensive discussion surrounding the ad hoc committee's report. The ad hoc committee on a proposed reading period recommended against the convening of a full committee to pursue development of an altered calendar year to accommodate the proposed reading period. Guest Grossman was present and offered comments. He expressed concern that those queried by the ad hoc committee might not have understood that the proposal would not merely shift the calendar by one or two days (as did a previous proposal), but rather would move the calendar back by an entire week, which would prevent some of the problems previously identified by those to whom Chappell et al. spoke. Chappell acknowledged that the individuals contacted were not explicitly told that the current proposal's mechanism to design a reading period (changing the calendar by an entire week) was different from the method in which a reading period had been discussed and rejected in the past (moving the first day of classes from Wednesday to Monday).

As discussion progressed, Tagavi noted that while there were more comments that SC members wished to make, SC members were not necessarily discussing new or different aspects of the issue. He said he would entertain a motion to officially receive the ad hoc committee's report which also meant the dissolution of the ad hoc committee.

Anderson **moved** to accept the verbal report of the ad hoc committee on a proposed reading period, and to thank the committee for its work and thereby dissolve the committee. Michael **seconded**. There being no discussion on the motion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** without dissent.

After the vote, there was additional discussion on what other steps could or should be taken; Michael opined that the ad hoc committee had done a fine job, but maybe there were different avenues that could be investigated, as opposed to dropping the entire proposal. The SC agreed that the issue of a proposed one- to two-day reading period could return to a SC agenda at the discretion of Chair Randall.

Tagavi suggested SC members return to announcements.

1. Announcements

Tagavi shared that in addition to Aken and Randall, Piascik, Swanson and Yanarella also notified the Office of the Senate Council that they would be absent for the day's meeting.

There was still a need for a faculty senator to serve on the Web Advisory Committee; various names were given to Mrs. Brothers to contact about volunteering for that position.

There was also brief discussion regarding the Academic Approvals Workgroup – Mrs. Brothers explained that none of the faculty members contacted since the last SC discussion [on September 22, 2008] had responded positively. She added that the matter was brought again to the SC because of her concern that the SC be satisfied with the faculty representation of the work group. A few additional names were given to Mrs. Brothers for follow-up; SC members indicated that the ultimate composition would not need to be brought back to the SC for additional review, regardless of the outcome of the follow-up communications.

Tagavi directed SC members to comments from Senator Wermeling regarding the Senate vote to reject allowing pictures during the first round of Board of Trustee faculty trustee elections. Substantial discussion amongst SC members followed. It was determined that the result of the Senate action was that there would be no change to the language to *Senate Rules 1.5.2*; there was no sense among SC members that the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee was required to put together a proposal to remove mention of a picture from the second round of faculty trustee voting.

Ultimately, Chappell suggested that Chair Randall ask the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee to bring a revision of the defeated proposal to the SC to revisit. SC members agreed.

3. Committee Preferences (Round 2)

There was no objection to the proposed membership changes to various Senate committees, so Tagavi determined them to be acceptable.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:32 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh Tagavi,
Immediate Past Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Chappell, Ford, Michael, Tagavi, Wood.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guests present: Bob Grossman, Nancy Johnson, Joe Quinn.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, October 21, 2008.