

Senate Council Minutes - January 24, 2005

The Senate Council met on Monday, January 24, 2005 from 3:00 to 5:00 in room 103 Main Building and took the following actions.

1. Approval of Minutes from January 10, 2005

The Chair asked for corrections or changes to the minutes. There being none, the minutes were approved as written.

2. Proposed changes to ARs regarding post-doctoral appointments

Proposed changes to ARs regarding post-doctoral appointments ([PDF](#))

After introductions, the Chair asked Watt to provide a brief summary of the proposal. Watt said the proposal was a straightforward request from the College of Medicine faculty to extend the term of post-doctoral appointments from a maximum of three to a maximum of five years. Grossman asked if the proposal was in the best interest of the faculty or the students. Watt said he thought it was in the best interest of all parties in that faculty could spend more time training the students, and less time filing paperwork to extend the appointments, and the students could spend more time learning before experiencing the various pressures of their first faculty positions. Grossman asked if the regulation could be changed to allow no more than three years under a particular faculty advisor. Watt said it could be done, but suggested that many students want to spend longer than three years in a particular lab.

Dembo entered the meeting at this point.

Grossman said he was worried about students who were held in post-doctoral appointments longer than they wanted to be because the faculty advisors kept them from advancing. Watt said he didn't think that happened, adding that the proposed change would provide a mechanism for furthering the training of students.

Jones noted that training post doctoral students takes longer than it used to and thought that the additional time would be well-spent in learning procedures and techniques. Watt added that students also get the opportunity to learn how to write grant proposals, vitas, how to prepare for interviews and other professional skills in addition to developing themselves intellectually.

Theelin noted that a post-doctoral appointment used to carry a great deal of prestige. He suggested that they are now held in abeyance instead of going into full-time positions as they used to and asked if such a practice was good for younger scholars. Cibull suggested that training has gotten more complex and issues like tenure come up in a young faculty's member's career very quickly. He suggested that having a longer period of training would provide a young scholar with more time to train and learn without being on the seven-year tenure clock.

Lesnaw spoke in favor of the proposal, noting that an additional two years of time spent with a faculty mentor would benefit the post-doctoral student in terms of being able to develop independence and find a research niche in a relatively protected environment.

Tagavi asked if the Graduate School had been asked for their opinion. Watt said he was not sure. Greissman said his impression was that the proposal had been fully vetted, and the Chair added that it had gone through Graduate Council.

Cibull made a motion to approve the proposal. Tagavi seconded the motion.

In further discussion, Grossman suggested a mechanism for reviewing the proposal after three years to determine if problems have arisen as a result of the change. Jones asked if the post-doctoral student office in the College of Medicine would be able to monitor such concerns and report at the end of a specified period. Watt said the office could certainly monitor the cases specific to the College of Medicine and then report back to the Senate Council. He noted that the office was overseen by a faculty committee that could keep track of problems over a three-year period.

Greissman said that the language pertaining to the Chancellor would be cleaned up before being sent forward to the President. Seven Senate Council members voted in favor of the proposal. Grossman abstained. The motion passed.

3. Admissions and Academic Standards Committee recommendations

Admissions and Academic Standards Committee recommendations ([DOC](#))

The Chair thanked Braun for being present to provide the committee's recommendations to the Senate Council. Braun reported that at the committee met on November 29 and forwarded all of the proposals with only minor changes.

Proposed change to Senate Rules regarding Reinstatement ([PDF](#))

Braun presented the proposal and provided some background information. He said the committee recommended approval of the proposal with the modification that it be made clear that the proposed deadlines were dates by which students must take action to initiate their reinstatement.

Tagavi asked if the colleges that were polled had earlier deadline dates for reinstatement. Davis replied that none of the colleges had earlier deadlines. Grabau asked what would happen if students did not meet the deadline. He noted that some colleges have more lenient policies than others. Braun said that while it had not been discussed in the committee he assumed that colleges would have the option to make exceptions. The Chair noted that colleges could always request that the Senate Council waive the Senate Rule in exceptional cases.

Grossman made a motion to approve the proposal. Kaalund seconded the motion, which passed without dissent.

College of Nursing Enrollment Cap request

College of Nursing Enrollment Cap request ([PDF](#))

Braun reported that the College of Nursing requested a cap on the pre-nursing enrollment of 200 students. He said the request stemmed from a limit on the number of available seats in key pre-nursing classes and the fact that there are only 80 open slots on an annual basis in the Nursing school. Davis said the aim of the College of Nursing was to confirm 200 students during the Spring recruitment period rather than addressing a shortfall or surplus during Summer advising and registration.

Grossman noted that there are currently 160 students enrolled in pre-nursing and that the proposed cap is higher. He asked for an explanation as to how much growth the program expected. Brockopp noted that nursing programs around the country were burgeoning in response to the nursing shortage. She said the primary issue in asking for the cap was an ethical issue relating to making sure that promises made to students were kept. She said it was wrong to tell students that they were enrolled in the pre-nursing curriculum and then not make available the necessary courses.

Grossman said that he had spoken against setting caps and requiring selective admission criteria for acceptance into upper division status as mechanisms for enrollment control in the past and would continue to do so in the future. He said the issue of resource shortages was University wide and felt that alleviating the problems in one college would no doubt exacerbate the problems in others.

Grabau indicated that the Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment Management had visited this issue of University-wide resources briefly but decided it was too large an issue for the committee to take on in addition to its actual charge. He noted the national shortage of nurses and asked if opening more seats in the courses in question could help graduate more nurses. Brockopp replied that doubling the number of students admitted to the Nursing program would require approximately \$500,000 to \$800,000 of additional funds and she doubted that sort of money would be available in the near future. Grabau suggested trying to find other ways to solve the resource problem.

Cibull said that examining solutions for the future did not create additional resources for today. He suggested it would be unfair to tell students they were part of the pre-nursing curriculum and then not make available the necessary classes. He said that if only 200 seats were available in the necessary courses then only 200 students should be admitted.

Kennedy suggested approving the cap for two years and then asking the University and the legislature for more funds for the Nursing program.

Lesnaw asked if there was any available data to accompany the request from the College of Nursing. Davis replied that the course being taken by pre-nursing students had been specially created for those students through a special arrangement with Anatomy and Physiology so that students could be guaranteed seats in those sections. Davis added that the proposal was the result of having tried multiple options only to arrive at the conclusion that the proposed enrollment cap was the only alternative remaining.

Duke asked if there was another route to the Nursing program other than through the pre-nursing curriculum. Davis said that students apply to Nursing from a variety of majors across campus. Duke wondered why the cap was needed since students outside pre-nursing can still apply to Nursing, therefore making the odds of acceptance even longer for the pre-nursing students. Brockopp replied that there were not enough faculty members to teach the required courses. She said that hiring another professor would solve the problem of course availability but it still wouldn't solve the problem faced by students when applying for one of the 80 available spots in Nursing. She said her intent was to implement a policy that would help the College provide ethical information to students about their opportunities.

Grossman asked why another section of Anatomy and Physiology couldn't be added. Davis noted that Medicine was in charge of those classes, not Nursing.

Jones asked if the faculty of the College had voted in favor of the proposal. Brockopp replied that while no official vote had been taken, the proposal had been discussed

with the rest of the faculty many times and she could produce a vote if need be. Tagavi suggested that the dates on the proposal be updated to reflect the new year. Davis agreed. Tagavi asked if the cap, if passed, would need to be codified in the Senate Rules. After general discussion around the table it was suggested that this sort of general policy does not require codification.

Lesnaw said that given the critical lack of nurses at this time she had a philosophical problem with trying to cap enrollment. She said that shortages in teaching power, classroom space and the like are quite common in her program and yet they find a way to meet the shortages by looking to other resources. Brockopp said she believed everything that could be considered had already been attempted.

Theilin wondered why such a level of scrutiny was required for a proposal that had already been vetted and approved by the Senate Council members' colleagues in Nursing. He said he agreed that it would be nice to see the vote of the faculty in the College, but suggested that if a problem existed in over-subscription then the problem should be addressed at face value.

Cibull made a motion to approve the proposal contingent upon the production of the faculty vote that approves the request from the College of Nursing. Jones seconded the motion. Kennedy proposed an amendment that the Senate Council request from the College of Nursing a documented estimate of University-wide resources that would be necessary to increase the number of graduating nurses by one-third per year. The Chair ruled Kennedy's amendment out of order since it did not pertain to the motion at hand.

In further discussion, Grossman noted that while he appreciated the concern Nursing has for their students, he thought that approving the proposed cap would set a dangerous precedent for a problem faced by many departments and programs.

Lesnaw asked why the 200 spots would be filled on a first come, first serve basis. Davis replied that in the past Nursing had attempted a selective admission process to fill those spots but encountered problems of attrition in pre-nursing students. She noted that many freshmen are undecided about their career aspirations and that filling the spots without additional admission screening was more likely to ensure a full class.

Grossman offered the amendment of including a sunset clause of three years. After three years time the enrollment cap will end and must be resubmitted to the Senate Council for consideration if the College wishes the cap to continue. Nine Senate Council members voted in favor of the amendment, which passed without dissent.

Nine Senate Council members voted in favor of the motion, which also passed without dissent. The representatives from Nursing departed.

Kennedy made a motion that the Senate Council request a documented estimate of the University-wide resources necessary to increase the number of graduating nurses by one-third in each year after 2009. Cibull seconded the motion, noting that it might serve as the impetus to increase Nursing's resources. Tagavi asked when Nursing should provide the information. Kennedy replied that the information should be made available by December 2005.

Thelin suggested that perhaps it was a mistake to assume that Nursing wished to grow. He added that a variety of factors contribute to the shortage of nurses in the country, including licensure issues and attrition. Kennedy reminded the group that Brockopp had just spoken about the shortage of nurses. Duke noted that she spoke of the shortage of practicing nurses, which was different. Cibull agreed and spoke of the demanding physical and psychological nature of nursing as a profession and noted that nurses lost through attrition were not likely to return. He said that if more nurses were going to enter the field it would be due to graduating more nurses and said he did not share Thelin's concern.

Duke said that she would prefer not to make a decision on the motion since there were no Nursing faculty member in the room. She suggested speaking with Nursing to determine how the faculty feel before voting on the motion.

Kennedy made a motion to table the motion for up to two sessions to allow a chance for the College of Nursing faculty members to be informed of the motion and invited to attend the Senate Council meeting at which it will be discussed. Grossman seconded the motion to table definitely, which passed without dissent.

Masters Time to Degree proposal

Masters Time to Degree proposal ([PDF](#))

Braun reported that similar schools allow a six year limit rather than eight. He noted that the argument in favor of approving the proposal was that departments had to continue to offer courses that were required when the students were admitted even though new students were no longer required to take those same courses. Braun said the proposal had the recommendation of his committee.

Cibull asked how many students complete the Masters between the sixth and eighth year. Jackson said that he did not have that data but explained that students would still

be able to appeal for additional time, as is currently the practice. Tagavi recommended that the year be updated from 2004 to 2005 on the proposal. Jackson agreed.

Grossman made a motion to approve the proposal. Kaalund seconded the motion.

In further discussion, Duke asked if transfer credits would be accepted if the work was older than six years. Jackson said that old work would not be accepted. Grossman spoke in favor of the proposal, noting the extent to which the Directors of Graduate Studies were involved in the vetting of the proposal.

Nine Senate Council members voted in favor of the proposal, which passed without dissent.

Conditional Admission Proposal

Conditional Admission Proposal ([PDF](#))

Braun explained that Graduate students could currently be admitted tentatively or provisionally and said the Graduate School would like to combine those two terms into "conditional" admission for those students who are missing some part of their application. He said his committee recommended the proposal with the caveat that it be made clear that the new status would apply to both domestic and international students.

Grossman made a motion to approve the proposal with the recommended change. Grabau seconded the motion.

Tagavi asked when the new status would become effective. Jackson replied that it would be effective for applications received in Fall 2005. Duke asked if the status would apply to applications already received. Jackson answered that it would go into effect for students who were applying for Spring 2006.

Nine Senate Council members voted in favor of the motion, which passed without dissent.

4. Announcements

Grossman announced that the work of the [Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Offenses](#) was nearing an end and drew the Senate Council members' attention to a draft proposal. He asked if they would rather see the proposal before it was released to the University community for input and feedback or they would rather that such

information, once obtained, be incorporated into the draft before forwarding to the Senate Council.

The Chair noted that in practical terms the draft could not go to a live University Senate meeting until March at the earliest. Grossman noted, however, that he would like to announce his committee's progress and the existence of the draft document at the February Senate meeting. Cibull suggested the document be circulated via the listserv for a period of three days, after which it could go to a broader audience if no objections were received. Cibull's solution generated consensus from the other Senate Council members. Grossman will circulate the draft via the listserv.

In other business, Kennedy drew the attention of the Senate Council members to an AAUP document he supplied at the start of the meeting that related to the subject of lecturers. He asked the Senate Council members to read it when they could.

5. Proposed changes to the AR regarding Lecturers

Proposed changes to the AR regarding Lecturers ([DOC](#))

The Chair indicated the presence of a guest who had interest in this topic and welcomed Rosenman from English.

Greissman explained that the draft he provided with red and blue changes was different from the one circulated on the agenda. He noted that due to an error the changes suggested during a previous Senate Council meeting had not been incorporated and said the new version corrected that error. He thanked Jones for helping him remember the exact nature of the suggested changes.

Rosenman spoke in favor of the proposed AR changes but said she had concerns about its implications. She outlined the difficulty recently experienced by the English department and said that 34% of the faculty in English are full-time Lecturers. Rosenman expressed concern for the composition of the faculty and noted how difficult it was to replace faculty at the same rate of their departure. She also noted that when faculty leave and are replaced with FTLs the committee work and advising load gets redistributed to the remaining regular full-time faculty. Her third concern was about faculty governance and whether or not FTLs would have voting rights in the department in areas of study in which they were not participants.

Grossman said he assumed Rosenman had not been privy to the changes made to the document prior to the meeting and asked if the language in paragraph two regarding maximum numbers of lecturers satisfied her concerns. Rosenman agreed that some of her concerns were satisfied. Greissman noted that the intention is to allow for a cap.

Jones noted that under the GRs only core department faculty have voting rights and only they can confer membership with or without voting rights on non-core faculty. Jones said that while FTLs would be eligible for membership it was not automatically afforded them. Thelin said the language was vague and suggested it be made clear that membership could be conferred upon them, not that they could opt in if they wanted. Tagavi suggested including "tenure track faculty". Greissman suggested "tenured and tenure-track".

Grossman expressed concern that the proposed changes would not solve Rosenman's problem. He said that if she presented a 20% cap on FTLs in her department to the Dean he could fire some FTLs and redistribute their workload among the remaining faculty. Rosenman agreed that all of her concerns could not be addressed by the proposed changes but said that passing them would help others and addressed the problem it was designed to address.

Tagavi said he would like to see caps set at no more than 10% per college with requests for exceptions going to the Provost upon recommendation from the Senate. He asked if the terminology "final action" in the proposal contradicted the GRs regarding the Board's right to approve appointments over a certain salary. Jones replied that this was an Administrative Regulation and thus would be subservient to the higher Board Governing Regulation that require reporting to the Board of Lecturer personnel actions. limit was going to be raised so high that Lecturers would probably never be appointed by Board approval. Tagavi asked why clinical title series faculty were not on the last line. Greissman replied that clinical title series faculty were not tenurable. Tagavi asked if a senior lecturer could be appointed initially or if new appointees would always be brought in at the level of lecturer. Greissman replied that new appointees could be senior lecturers. Tagavi asked why vacation was not specified in the AR. Greissman replied that Lecturers, as faculty, would be subject to the GRs regarding vacation.

Thelin suggested including wording in the rationale to include the "vast majority of full time faculty positions in each unit or each department". He felt that unless it was specified the aggregate number across campus could be misleading.

After various other editorial suggestions that will be incorporated into a new draft before forwarding to the University Senate, Cibull called the question. Since there was no motion of the floor Grossman made a motion to approve the AR, with revisions, and forward to the University Senate. Jones seconded the motion. Eight members voted in favor of the proposal, which passed without dissent.

6. Orthopedics request for name change to Orthopaedic Surgery

Orthopedics request for name change to Orthopaedic Surgery ([PDF](#))

The Chair provided some brief background on the proposal. Tagavi asked if there was a record showing the vote of the faculty. The Chair drew his attention to the appropriate document. Dembo asked if the proposed name change had been through the Faculty Council of the Medical Center. Ms. Scott reminded the Senate Council members that when the proposal was first discussed during Fall 2004 the Senate Council decided that since it was just a spelling change they would not require the approval of the Faculty Council of the Medical Center, the Academic Council of the Medical Center or the Academic Organization and Structure Committee. She added that what had been agreed to was that if a proposal to change the spelling came forward it go from the Senate Council and then, if approved, to the University Senate before going to the Board of Trustees for approval.

Tagavi made a motion to approve the proposed name change. Kaalund seconded the motion. Seven Senate Council members voted in favor of the motion. Cibull voted against the motion and there were not abstentions. The motion carried.

Announcements

The Chair noted that due to Staben's appointment as Associate Vice President for Research he was no longer eligible to serve on the Senate or chair the Institutional Research and Finance Allocation committee. He asked the Senate Council members to recommend replacements for committee chair. He said that Thelin would certainly be qualified, but Thelin declined the nomination. The Chair added that Perrier, a current committee member, had taken an active role on the committee. Jones suggested that nominations continue on the listserv. Ms. Scott will provide an update list of Senators from which nominations can be made.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:13pm.

Respectfully submitted by
[Ernie Yanarella](#), Chair

Members present: Cibull, Dembo, Duke, Grabau, Grossman, Jones, Kaalund, Kennedy, Lesnaw, Tagavi, Thelin, Yanarella.

Liaisons present: Greissman, Saunier.

Guests present: Braun, Brockopp, Davis, Jackson, Rosenman, Watt.

Prepared by [Rebecca Scott](#) on January 25, 2005.