

Senate Council  
September 15, 2014

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, September 15, 2014 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Andrew Hippisley called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:06 pm. The Chair introduced the two new student members of SC, Ana Osorio and Christian Oberst, and reintroduced Jake Ingram, Student Government Association president. SC members introduced themselves.

1. Minutes from August 25, 2014 and Announcements

The Chair said that Ingram will send him the names of student senators in the near future. The Chair intends to hold a small reception for the student senators to make them feel welcome and encourage their participation in the University Senate (Senate).

The Chair met with Provost Christine Riordan, who will give an update on the proposed new financial budget model to the Senate in November. The Provost would like to use one of the Senate's committees to review the new model, which will probably be Senate's Institutional Finance and Resource Allocation Committee (SIFRAC). The Chair asked her about deans sharing financial information with faculty and she said that was something she would insist upon. There will be no excuse for not being transparent.

One ongoing initiative from the Provost's area is development of female faculty; the Chair asked SC members to think about which Senate committee could be involved in that activity. Another initiative from the Provost's office was a summer task force that looked at summer education for incoming freshmen. The summer education could be remedial, but some such courses could carry credit. That issue could go to the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC). The Provost is also looking at capacity and the effect of more students on retention, advising, Living Learning Programs, etc. The Chair said it was his impression that the Provost was generally keen on involving faculty through the Senate.

The Chair said that although he had not met with President Capilouto, he will ask him about extending the charge of the ad hoc committee on faculty and the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA). The Chair has, however, mentioned that to the President's chief of staff. In the meantime, the Chair has asked the former chair of the Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure, Steven Testa, to draft possible extensions of the charge. Moving to another matter, the Chair said the President, through the Chief of Staff, had an urgent request that the Senate, perhaps a subcommittee of the Senate, look at the issue of faculty discipline. If a faculty member is found to have committed a violation, the current regulations limit punishment essentially to either a slap on the wrist or revocation of tenure. The Chair added that the President asked the Senate to move on this matter well over a year ago, but that nothing had yet been done – he wanted to ensure the Senate was responsive to his request.

There is a new form that a faculty member must fill out if the faculty member will be doing anything extra in terms of time or earning money. The *Administrative Regulation* regarding this new requirement will be developed in the coming weeks. One particular part of the new regulation will be increased involvement from department chairs regarding what faculty members do in their spare time if an activity involves their specific disciplinary area or infringes upon their regular work time.

The final announcement pertained to a student and a degree list – this particular case involved a student who was incorrectly advised such that the student graduated with a double major instead of a dual degree. The student complained and the college has admitted to an administrative error. The Chair commented that the double major would need to be rescinded. Although justice is on the student's side and the burden is on the Senate's side to fix, it will be uncharted territory.

The minutes from August 25 were sent out in advance and no corrections were received. There being no objections, the minutes from August 25 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

## 2. Old Business

### a. UAB Report and Trends

The Chair introduced Joe Fink (PH/Pharmacy Practice and Science), chair of the University Appeals Board (UAB). Guest Fink gave SC members an overview of the UAB process and structure. He also introduced Michael Healy (LA), the new student Ombud. Fink said that at this time of year, the UAB was relatively inactive because there were many new student and faculty members of the UAB who must receive appropriate orientation and Title IX training prior to hearing any cases. When he was finished he solicited questions from SC members.

In response to Brown, Fink said that a big lesson faculty could learn from UAB proceedings was that if a faculty member does not attend the hearing and explain their perspective, it will probably work to their detriment and to the student's benefit. Fink said the attendance rate by faculty had improved over the past five to seven years. Fink acknowledged that hearings are scheduled when the panel members can attend, without taking into account a student complainant or instructor schedule. Fink said another good lesson was that a faculty member should pay attention to their syllabus. Fink said when he started on the UAB his class syllabus was a page long, at best; now his class syllabus is 11 pages, single spaced. If a policy is not in the syllabus, it is hard for a faculty member to defend it.

Grossman requested that future reports include additional information. While personal details obviously cannot be shared, Grossman asked Fink to include three additional things: whether a student's appeal was an appeal of guilt or an appeal of the penalty for being guilty; the UAB's decision in each case; and the basis for the decision. Fink said he was willing to do that, but doing so would create a compilation that people could use to argue for precedent. Fink said that for his 2014-15 report, he would include that information and do a case-by-case paragraph of issues.

Debski asked about a year with a sudden increase in numbers; Fink replied that there were 11 students in one class who appealed a mid-semester grading change in the syllabus which caused them to receive a B instead of an A. Fink said he could include some graphs based on his numerical reports to give an idea of year-to-year trends.

Ingram said he, too, would appreciate data on whether an appeal was an appeal of guilt or an appeal of the penalty. Fink said that past year's files had already been taken to Legal Counsel but he could do such descriptions for his 2014-15 report.

The Chair thanked Fink for his report and noted he would be on the December Senate agenda. Fink agreed he would attend.

### b. New Undergraduate Certificate Form

The Chair introduced Chris Thuringer (Undergraduate Education, director of special initiatives), who gave some background information on the form. Prior to discussion the Chair solicited a motion. Grossman **moved** that the SC require use of the proposed new Undergraduate Certificate form and Pienkowski **seconded**. Debski asked that the question regarding distance learning be reworded, which was acceptable to everyone. When discussion ceased, the Chair said that the motion would have the effect of requiring use of the form in mid-September by anyone who had not yet proposed an undergraduate certificate. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with one opposed.

### c. Revised New Undergraduate Program Form

The Chair offered background information on the development of the revised New Undergraduate Program form. SC members reviewed the proposed new Undergraduate Certificate form and offered a few changes to be incorporated. Brown **moved** to require use of the revised New Undergraduate Program Form immediately and Christ **seconded**. SC members discussed the use requirement – there was general consensus that the Chair should let councils and committees know that the form is operational now and can be used, but gentleness should be applied when requesting revisions to proposals that are already in the midst of the review process. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstaining.

### 3. Expedited Program Changes for Graduation Communication and Composition Requirement (GCCR)

The Chair invited two guests, Deanna Sellnow (CI/Communication) and Matthew Giancarlo (AS/English), to describe their request. Sellnow and Giancarlo explained their request for a second and final round of expedited program changes to incorporate the Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement. They said there were about 10 undergraduate degree programs that did not submit a change during the spring 2014 semester for a variety of reasons, such as illness on the part of the person responsible for submitting the change, confusion about some programs that were still in effect, and some units that just did not know how to accomplish the change.

Brown **moved** to approve the use of an expedited GCCR program change form for the remaining few programs, with a deadline of November 1. Debski **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

### 4. Senate Committee Compositions

SC members discussed the presented compositions for Senate committees as well as who may serve as a committee chair. There were comments about various committees and some individuals were added to certain committees. Watt **moved** to approve the Senate committee compositions and McCormick **seconded**. During brief discussion, SC members were amenable to the suggestion that the Chair identify a committee assignment for each of the four individuals who did not return a committee preference sheet. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

### 5. HCCC Chair - Responsible College Associate Dean

The Chair explained that the College of Dentistry associate dean who is next in line to chair the Health Care Colleges Council [as per the SC discussion October 1, 2013] would like to wait a year to get a better idea of how the Health Care Colleges Council (HCC) works. There were no objections from SC members to the Chair requesting an associate dean from the College of Health Sciences (HS) to serve as chair of the HCCC for a year, after which the associate dean from Dentistry will step into the role.

### 6. September Senate Meeting Roundtable

SC members offered their opinions about the recent Senate meeting. Below are some representative statements about the meeting.

- It was a good trial run of the electronic voting. The way amendments are dealt with, as well as ensuring that no voting occurs until discussion has ended, could be improved upon.
- When President Capilouto addresses the Senate, he continues to overemphasize capital construction and restaurants, leaving out substantive comments about things like education and student issues.
- Honorary degrees come from a joint Senate-administration committee, so a second is technically necessary to place honorary degree nominees on the floor. However, by virtue of the regulatory language irrevocably linking the joint Senate-administration committee's nominees with Senate review, no second is needed.

### 7. College Senate Election Issue

The Chair explained information about how colleges are directed to conduct elections for senators, in particular the need for secret ballot elections. There were a few colleges that were delinquent in sending in the names of their newly elected senators and the Chair solicited Provost Christine Riordan's assistance in moving along the tardy colleges. The College of Social Work (SW), however, was inexplicably late with their results; furthermore, there is evidence that the college's dean asked a past senator if they would serve again, without holding an election.

The Chair asked for guidance from SC. The Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) has to certify elected senators; the Chair wondered if the issue should be sent to the SREC to determine if the proposed new SW senator was eligible to be certified or if the issue should be overlooked this time, with

action coming if it occurred again. During discussion, the Chair clarified that the new SW senator was not yet officially certified, hence the Chair's request for how to handle the matter. After discussion, SC members agreed that the proposed new senator and the situation be sent to the SREC for that body to determine if the senator should be certified. It was confirmed that the matter had arisen in large part due to a faculty member's complaint that they had not even known there was to have been an election – the dean never forwarded the spring 2014 SREC email about college elections to SW faculty. SC members agreed that the SREC should review the matter.

#### 8. Requests to Present at University Senate Meetings

The Chair asked SC members for advice on how to respond to requests to make announcements during Senate meetings. The general consensus was that requests to attend the Senate to make announcements should be gently redirected so the Chair makes the announcement during the meeting. Alternate arrangements can be made if there are compelling reasons to do so, including why someone wants to make an announcement to the Senate.

There being no further business to attend to, the meeting was adjourned at 5:04 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Hippisley,  
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Brown, Christ, Debski, Grossman, Ingram, McCormick, Oberst, Osorio, Porter, Pienkowski, and Watt.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, September 25, 2014.