

University Senate Minutes  
April 10, 2006

The University Senate met on Monday, April 10, 2006 at 3:00 pm in the Auditorium of the William T. Young Library. Below is a record of what transpired.

Absences: Anyaegbunam, Barker, Bartilow, Berger\*, Bhavsar\*, Biagi, Bordo, Brown, Burchett, Cammers, Caudill, Cheng\*, Clarke, Cooper, Daniel, Deem\*, DeLuca\*, DeSimone, Diedrichs\*, Duffy, El-Ghannam, Ellingsworth, Fording\*, Frost, Garen, Gargola, Garrity\*, Grabau, Haist\*, Hobson, Holmes, Hull, Jackson, Jarvis, Jefferies\*, Johnson E., Kalim, Look\*, Matthews, McCormick, McKnight\*, Michael\*, Peffer\*, Pulito, Shaw, Smart, Smith, Sottile, Steltenkamp, Straus, Stringer, Thelin, Thompson, VanDyke\*, Vasconez\*, Wise, Zentall

\*Denotes excused absence

Invited Guests present: Joanne Davis, Nelson Fields, Gary Hansen.

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 pm.

1. Minutes from March 20, 2006 and Announcements

There being no changes to the minutes, they were approved as distributed.

The Chair recalled the traditional and ceremonial passing of the gavel to the incoming Senate Council Chair. He said that the Senate Council at its December meeting had elected Kaveh Tagavi as Chair and Larry Grabau as vice chair for 2006 – 2007. He said he was pleased to have individuals of such quality and caliber assuming their respective posts. Noting past chair Dembo's ceremonial act in April 2004 of handing the gavel to him, the Chair handed the gavel to chair-elect Tagavi. He also offered Tagavi the opportunity to update the Senate on the Board of Trustee (BoT) faculty trustee election.

Tagavi noted that he had had a good teacher in the Chair and in past-chair Dembo; he appreciated the additional year the Chair (Yanarella) would serve on the Senate Council as past chair.

Tagavi asked Jones, as chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), to offer an update on the BoT faculty trustee election. Jones shared that the nomination period had solicited candidates for the trustee election. The nomination window closed April 7; two petitions were submitted, both properly. The two candidates are Mary Molinaro (College of Libraries) and Ernie Yanarella (Department of Political Science). Jones said that on April 12 an email would go out to all University Faculty members with a link to the voting website and the dates during which University Faculty members could cast their votes. He said that due to just the two candidates, there was no need for a run-off; the election

would go to the election's winner. Jones asked senators to urge their constituencies to participate in the election for one of the highest posts of elected faculty leadership. He stated that members of the Administration point to levels of faculty turnout in election processes and a strong turnout would give a strong mandate.

In response to Tagavi, Jones explained that there would be no need to identify a second choice on the ballot, since there would be no run off. The election beginning this week would be to elect one faculty trustee.

The Chair said that this was likely the last official University Senate meeting of the academic year, but said it was possible that a special meeting could be called. He said the idea had not yet been vetted through the Senate Council (SC). It would depend upon their decision, as well as other factors. He said it was all contingent upon the completion and vetting of the USP External Review Committee report to the SC. He added that if the report were to be finalized and it was so provided for by the SC, the report could be brought to the Senate's attention in May or could wait until Fall. The Chair stated that any called meeting would be for informational purposes only.

#### KCTCS Candidates for Degree

The Chair asked SREC chair Jones to offer information on the item. Jones said that the current agenda item was a continuation of the process by which students enrolled at Bluegrass Community and Technical College (BCTC, formerly Lexington Community College) prior to July 1, 2004 still obtain degrees approved by the BoT and contain UK's name on the diploma. He referred to it as an illustrative exercise for having the collective faculty's thumb on the process; there was a concern that the names had come to the Senate before being approved by BCTC faculty. Jones reported that BCTC had subsequently approved the six names and the names were ready to be voted upon.

The Chair asked for any questions or concerns. There being none, a **vote** was taken and the six KCTCS candidates for credentials were unanimously **approved** by a voice vote.

#### 2. UK's May Degree List

The Chair spoke of the faculty's responsibility in approving the list. He said the list came from the SC with a positive recommendation. Due to changes ferreted out by various faculty members, three names had been added to the list. Jones stated that this was also an important illustration of the importance of exercising the elected faculty senator's responsibility to review the list. He explained that he forwarded the list to his constituency for review and three names were found to have been left off. Jones asked to **include** those three names in the list.

The Chair stated there was a positive recommendation from the SC. A **vote** was taken and the UK May degree list, the addendum individuals and the three added by Jones were unanimously **approved** by a voice vote.

### 3. College of Nursing Admissions Proposal

The Chair stated that the proposal was to amend the requirements for admission to the College of Nursing (CON) program. The centerpiece of the proposal was the addition of interview criterion to the admissions process. The proposal came with a positive recommendation from the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee and the SC. He added that Joanne Davis from the College of Nursing was present to answer any questions.

Burkhart stated that as a CON senator, she was aware that the proposal was discussed at length with the undergraduate faculty. Due to a shortage of nurses, more than grades and testing scores were desired to help identify the best candidates. Burkhart added that the interview helped the admissions to be more selective, and that it worked effectively in the pilot program. Gesund asked for information regarding provisions for interviewing students located out of the state or the country. Guest Davis replied that that particular issue had not arisen to date. She said any such situation would be dealt with reasonably. Davis added that greater than 90% of candidates were from Kentucky, with most being UK students. She said that those involved would try to resolve the issue fairly. She added that there were not significant numbers of out-of-state applicants.

Gesund stated that for any proposal to be complete it should include a provision for an interview with a student for whom physical attendance could be a problem. Davis wondered if the other medical colleges had similar provisions. Gesund said provisions should be offered for out-of-state and foreign students. Lock shared that, in the CON's masters program, it was current practice, although perhaps not written, that a telephone interview be conducted if necessary to accommodate a student. She said an appointment for the telephone interview would be made and the office would call the student, so that the student would not incur telephone charges. Lock assumed the CON admissions process would be handled similarly. Grossman added that there was no restriction that the interview had to be conducted in person.

The Chair thought it was unlikely the CON was attempting to impose an onerous task on a student. He said there were other avenues for conducting an interview without mandating a physical presence if it imposed hardship upon the student.

There being no further discussion on the proposal, the Chair called for a **vote** on the **motion** to approve the College of Nursing admissions proposal. The motion **passed** unanimously in a voice vote.

### 4. Program Suspension: BFA Fine Arts, Design Technology and Acting Concentrations

The Chair introduced this item. The proposal would suspend two programs under the BFA in Theater—the concentration in Acting and the concentration in Design Technology—with a plan to determine whether to permanently delete the two programs within five years. The program did not fully meet the needs of students or the industry it serves. The proposal came with positive recommendations from the Senate’s Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) and the SC. The Chair said that Nelson Fields was present to answer questions the two proposals.

Tagavi asked about a sentence in Field’s memo dated October 6, 2005 that includes the phrase, “does not fulfill the requirements of a true BFA program.” Tagavi expressed concern that the language indicated that students currently in the program were being done a disservice. He recommended “does not quite fulfill the requirements of a true BFA program.” and mentioned that the same recommendation had been accepted during the Senate Council consideration of the proposal. Guest Fields said that changes had been faxed previously, and would follow up to ensure the changed phrasing was included.

The Chair said there was a thorough discussion and many questions addressed by Fields at the SC review. He added that if the Senate so endorsed, the amended language would be included. The Chair asked for additional questions. Edgerton asked what would happen in the five-year interim. Fields said that the Department of Theatre was currently revising their bachelor of arts program. The department would be monitoring national trends during the five-year period; it would be prudent not to just delete the programs but rather to proceed cautiously. Fields added that student needs and those of colleagues at other institutions would be monitored and that BA students were accepted as regularly as BFA students were at prestigious institutions.

A **vote** was taken on the **motion** to approve the program suspensions of the BFA Fine Arts in Design Technology Concentration and Acting Concentration. The motion **passed** unanimously in a voice vote.

##### 5. Change in Composition of Graduate Council

The Chair explained that the proposal would change the composition of the Graduate Council to reflect the creation of the College of Public Health and the shift of the College of Human Environmental Sciences into the College of Agriculture. He also said that a second proposed change had been referred back to the SAOSC for further review. Both the SAOSC and the SC submitted the proposal with positive recommendations. The Chair added that Graduate School Dean Jeannine Blackwell was present to answer questions.

Gesund asked how the creation of the College of Design would affect the composition. Blackwell said that those revisions were addressed during last year’s structural changes. She said that when the College of Human Environmental Sciences was moved, one program went to the College of

Education. The proposal being discussed addressed that move and also a shift in the format of the College of Public Health with the other health care colleges. She said the specifics were outlined in the proposal.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to approve the change in composition of the Graduate Council. The motion **passed** unanimously in a voice vote.

#### 6. Winter Intersession Calendar

The Chair noted that the proposed Winter Intersession calendar (WI) was submitted with a positive recommendation from the SC, with the proviso that the structure met past academic criteria. He added that the SC also moved that the WI's three-year trial basis would be an impetus for a review and report to the SC in the next academic year on the future status of WI, beyond the pilot phase. Senate Council Liaison Greissman was available to answer questions.

Jones referred to the SC's motion regarding a review of the WI, and specified that the language passed by the Senate Council articulated to future proponents of the WI that the SC would not be inclined to approve (beyond the current 2006-2007 WI) the program without some type of review occurring. The Chair concurred with Jones' recollection.

Cibull asked if the objective of quality education could be addressed in the final review, in addition to previous measures of student and faculty satisfaction. Greissman said the review should at least look at building block courses and evaluate how the students performed academically afterward. Martin asked if projecting the time to graduation would be important to track. Greissman replied that the graduation agreement did not take either summer or winter sessions into account. He said that part of the impetus for the WI was to take some of the time-to-graduate pressure off a student. Greissman said the real issue was if the WI had academic integrity, and that it could be partly measured in student and faculty satisfaction. He asked for input on additional types of criteria on which to judge the WI.

Debski asked about the ratio of building block classes to enrichment classes. Greissman was unsure, and reiterated he welcomed input as to what would constitute an appropriate review.

There being no further discussion on the item, a **vote** was taken to approve the 2006-2007 Winter Intersession calendar. The **motion carried** unanimously in a voice vote.

#### 7. Name change: BS in Agricultural Education, Communications and Leadership (page 3 of proposal)

The Chair stated that the proposal aimed to change the name of the BS in Agricultural Education, Communications and Leadership (AECL) to Community

Communications and Leadership Development (CCLD). The name change reflected a series of changes within the new BS program, including changing the course prefixes in the program from ACE to CLD. The proposal stemmed in part from the creation of the Department of Communications and Leadership Development in 2002. The Chair added that the Undergraduate Council and SC offered positive recommendations, and that Gary Hansen was present to answer questions.

There being no questions, the Chair called for a **vote** on the **motion** to approve the name change of the BS program in Agricultural Education, Communications and Leadership to Community Communications and Leadership Development. The motion **passed** unanimously in a voice vote.

#### 8. New Program: BS in Career and Technical Education

The Chair requested background on the proposal from Hansen. Guest Hansen said the proposal came about for a number of reasons. In the process of changing the AECL program, the agricultural education option was removed. The teacher prep program in Family and Consumer Science (FCS) was combined with the AECL program into the proposed BS in Career and Technical Education (CTE). He said the FCS education faculty and the faculty of Agricultural Education had been coordinating, scheduling and cross-listing courses for years. He added that the language of CTE was the terminology used in the field and that there were students already pursuing the degree.

Forgue spoke for the proposal, as a member of the department from which the FCS education program had since been transferred.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to approve the creation of the BS in Career and Technical Education. The motion **passed** unanimously in a voice vote.

#### 9. New Minor: Community Communications and Leadership Development

The Chair explained the proposal would create a new minor in Community Communications and Leadership Development within the Department of Community and Leadership Development. It would allow students to minor in that particular area, and thus recognize this specialization beyond the major. The new minor came with a positive recommendation from the Undergraduate Council and the Senate Council. The Chair asked Hansen if he had anything to add. Hansen said a number of students had inquired into a minor in this area.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to approve the new minor in Community Communications and Leadership Development. The motion **passed** unanimously.

#### 10. BSN to PhD Nursing Program

This proposal would allow BSN nursing graduates to earn a masters degree while working toward a PhD. The option required three years of full-time course work plus the dissertation and is designed for exceptional BSN graduates who are interested in having research as a major part of their career. The proposal came with a positive recommendation from the SC.

Guest Hall added that the proposal would decrease the time to completion of both the masters and PhD degrees by 13 credit hours. The masters would be awarded the semester before anticipated graduation.

A **vote** was taken on the **motion** to approve the BSN to PhD Nursing Program. The motion **passed** unanimously in a voice vote.

#### 11. Retroactive Withdrawal Rule

The Chair said the proposed rule originated with Tagavi, in his role as the Academic Ombud. The Senate Council sent it to the Senate with a positive recommendation.

Tagavi stated that a question had been raised to him as Ombud, which dealt with whether a grade of E received for an academic offense (cheating grade) could then be changed to a W by retroactive withdrawal. He said that upon further investigation he ascertained that none of the bodies who might be involved in an RWA process (University Appeals Board, the Registrar or the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Committee (SRWAC)) would check to see if an E was granted for an academic offense (AO) before acting upon it. Grossman added that the rule would apply to the current AO policy. He said that a student could be granted a retroactive withdrawal for a course in which a grade was received due to an AO, but only in extreme circumstances. He offered an **amendment** that the provision would also prevent XE and XF grades from being changed retroactively to an E. Cibull **seconded**.

Hertog observed that there were some issues with numbering, which would be taken care of during codification. Jones asked if the rule about to be passed would apply to both the current and new AO rule. Grossman replied that it would.

A clarification was offered by Tagavi that the proposed rule would go into effect in Fall 2006. Wood expressed concern that the ability to convert a cheating grade to a W would bypass the due process that imposed the cheating grade. In response to a question by Cibull, Tagavi said the SRWAC was presently the body that judged the condition for extreme emotional distress, etc. for a retroactive withdrawal, but in the particular case of a student requesting a retroactive withdrawal for a cheating grade, the University Appeals Board (UAB) would also be involved. Wood continued to question whether a retroactive withdrawal appeal for a cheating grade would effectively trump the academic process of awarding the cheating grade.

Grossman thought the cheating offense would still remain on the permanent record but he did not know what would appear on the transcript. Eldred asked why the UAB would not have taken those extreme circumstances into account when the cheating grade was earned. Edgerton said that a retroactive withdrawal could be petitioned for up to two years after the grade was awarded. Blackwell stated that a transcript sent externally would have no indication of a grade changed as a result of the retroactive withdrawal process, and did not affect the GPA; SIS allowed an internal user to see the original grade.

Tagavi said that if the SRWAC granted a W for one class during a semester, it was justified to offer a W for a cheating grade, using the example of a student with a brain tumor having it diagnosed after the problems appeared academically. Eldred asked about Blackwell's answer involving SIS and the new SAP student module. Blackwell did not know what information would be available in the new system.

Forgue said that the issue was not in what appeared in SIS, but that the transcript going out would not show a cheating grade. General discussion on the proposal followed.

The Chair called for a vote. He asked Grossman to restate the motion. Grossman said he **moved** to include an amendment that would allow the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Committee to change an XE/XF to a W if the criteria in Tagavi's amendment apply, such that the University Appeals Board would have the final authority to approve the granting of a retroactive withdrawal.

A **vote** was taken on the **amendment**, which **passed** with a majority in a show of hands and five opposed.

Discussion on the proposed rule itself followed. Edgerton referred to language in *Section 5.1.8.5.1* about a student "typically" only receiving a RW for all classes in a given semester. He asked if it was the intent of the rule to state that a student would have to have a RW for an entire semester in order to receive a RW for a cheating grade. Tagavi said he did not anticipate that question, but he could specify either part or all of the semester. Waldhart said that the use of "typically" indicated that it was a guideline, but the SRWAC could just look at the one AO grade. Calvert supported a higher bar being set for a RW of an AO that would require withdrawing from all courses in a semester. Edgerton offered a hypothetical situation in which a student might take medication at a certain time of day, which would only affect one class. He wondered about the logic behind forcing a student in that situation to repeat all the courses in a semester.

Cibull said that the current discussion was assuming an automatic granting of a change from a cheating grade to a W. He offered his support for the processes



of the UAB, expressing his concern with micromanaging the appeals process any more than necessary. He stated support for the motion.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion**. The motion **passed** with 46 votes in favor, one vote against and two abstentions.

## 12. Dead Week Rule

This proposal, also from the Office of the Ombud, would modify the dead week rule in the *Senate Rules (SR)* by defining dead week as the last week of classes during the semester and the final three days of any summer session/term and clarifying the activities that would and would not be permitted during dead week. The proposal came with a positive recommendation from the SC.

Tagavi spoke for this proposal, saying that as Ombud, the issue of dead week was unbelievably contentious for students and faculty alike. He explained that the section addressing dead week was housed in the *SR* under *Section 5.2.4.6 Final Examinations*. He added that the proposed new “E.” of *Section 5.2.4.6 “Dead Week”* was to allow those disciplines that rely on regular quizzes to continue to utilize that particular teaching tool, so long as certain standards were met. Voss asked if “exam” and “quiz” were defined elsewhere in the *SR*, and suggested using a percentage threshold instead of the regularity in scheduling. Tagavi stated that he believed a percentage standard would not be better and added that he did not have the authority to change the wording, as it had been reviewed and approved by the Senate’s Admissions and Academic Standards Committee.

Grossman stated that *E.* was slightly contradicted by *D.* and offered a **friendly amendment** to include a change to *D.* to add “, except as enumerated in *E.*” at the end of the sentence. Tagavi **accepted**.

Extensive discussion followed regarding removing one section or another and modifying the language. Hertog stated *B.* was unnecessary and could prevent an instructor from scheduling a final exam early to accommodate a student shipping out for military reasons. He said that *D.* would suffice. He offered a **friendly amendment** to strike *B.* Tagavi **accepted**.

In response to Eldred’s concerns that the rule could still be interpreted to allow final exams during dead week, the Chair offered a **friendly amendment** to insert “including final examinations” into *D.* Tagavi **accepted**.

There was concern by Petrone and other senators that the wording in *E.* could be too restrictive. Forgue offered a **friendly amendment** to categorize the quizzes as “only quizzes that count for less than 3% of the grade.” Petrone indicated a level of 5% would be preferable. After additional discussion, Dembo stated that due to the infinite number of courses and grading styles, the percentage threshold was not manageable. He believed the regularity was an appropriate

standard. Edgerton expressed concern with addressing dead week at all in the *SR*.

Grossman offered a **friendly amendment** to include the words “instruction” after “The last week of” in *A*. Tagavi **accepted**. Grossman offered another **friendly amendment** to strike the reference to the WI in *A*. Tagavi **accepted**.

Forgue mentioned his amendment to *E*. to change the standard to be that of only quizzes counting less than 5% each of the grade and mentioned in the syllabus. Voss **seconded**.

A **vote** was taken on the **amendment**. The motion **failed** with four votes in favor, and a majority against. There were two abstentions.

Petrone offered an **amendment** to remove “and all have equal weights” from *E*. Anderson **seconded**.

Tagavi stated that he understood the sentiment behind Petrone’s friendly amendment, but said that as Ombud, he would have to speak against it. An instructor could theoretically give a quiz that was 85% of the grade during dead week. Waldhart suggested using “have approximately equal weight” and Petrone indicated her approval of that language. Eldred wondered what the definition of “approximately” was. Wood said that she opposed the “approximately” language due to various interpretations of what that would encompass. She spoke for very clear guidelines as originally proposed by Tagavi to stop any abuse of the intent of dead week. After additional discussion, Petrone **withdrew** her amendment.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** with the various **friendly amendments**. The motion **passed** with 46 in favor and two against.

### SI Grade Proposal

The Chair stated that this proposal had been reviewed by the Senate Council, but was referred back to the Graduate School. Brian Jackson resubmitted the proposal, which was improved due to increased clarity. Due to this item not having been included on the agenda six days in advance, the Chair noted that a waiver of the six-day rule as outlined in *SR 1.3.1.1.F* would be required to place the item on the agenda.

A **vote** was taken on the **motion** to waive the six-day rule. The motion **passed** by a two-thirds vote in show of hands.

The Chair asked Blackwell to offer background on the proposal to create an SI grade as well as discuss the other slight changes proposed. Blackwell stated that IRIS had requested Blackwell bring to the Graduate School and eventually to the Senate a proposal for a new grade. The grade of “S” was used for two

different functions; due to the move to a new system, SAP programmers wanted clear and precise programmable rules. S was traditionally used for residency credit in doctoral programs and dissertation and thesis work, for zero credit and usually no assigned grade. IRIS employees requested this use be separated from the second use of the S grade, that of limited use for credit-bearing courses (seminars, independent work in research courses) to indicate a project continuing beyond a normal semester. The grade SI (“S” Interim) would indicate work continuing beyond a semester. While the grade of I could be used, it had negative overtones and a new grade was desired to indicate positive and continuing work on a project.

In response to a question from Jones, Blackwell said there would be parallel changes for the UN grade. Bailey asked about the situation created by a graduate student leaving the program and returning, or transferring out. Blackwell said the SI would stay permanently on the transcript if there were no exam and no grade change by the instructor. In reference to what the definition of “allowable period” was in the proposed new *Section 5.1.3.3*, Bailey asked if it was defined as the masters degree period. Blackwell said there purposely had not been a specific definition included – she believed it would generally correspond to the amount of time required for a particular degree, assuming no petition for an extension. Bailey thought the grade should change to an E; Blackwell said the SI could theoretically stand, indicating the student was making progress.

Tagavi thought there should be a sentence for SI similar to the last sentence of the description of UN. He also wondered about the GPA-inflating effect of mandating a change to a letter grade, since some students enroll in certain courses just to meet the nine-hour minimum for a full-time student. Tagavi suggested converting an SI to S or U. Blackwell said that if the course were credit-bearing and eligible to receive a grade, a letter grade would be assigned upon completion, as was current practice.

Edgerton wondered how an instructor would indicate that a student’s effort was continuing to be below par. Blackwell said that the normal occurrence in cases where a student received a UN was the instructor having a serious talk with the student, resulting in either improvement or an examination of career options. Wood expressed concern that the undefined “allowable period” was unclear, and urged the term be better defined and that the grade be changed to an I after that period. Grossman stated that the term “allowable period” in the proposed new *Section 5.1.3.3* referred to a time frame outlined in the previous sentence.

Blackwell said that due to the three different categories of students that would be affected, it was difficult to specifically define each period quantitatively. She said she was willing to change the language if that were the will of the Senate, but cautioned that there were many graduate students who entered the program and dropped out, some subsequently beginning a new program elsewhere without

completing UK's graduate degree. Blackwell was concerned with giving a student an I grade, which had the connotation of failure. She said it was not unusual for a student to truncate a graduate career at UK but go on to another program elsewhere. She said leaving the interim SI grade would not disadvantage the student.

Bailey suggested leaving the grade as an SI, and not converting to an E. Greissman said that the technical reason for creating the SI grade was to have an interim grade used in certain circumstances – a distinction was desired between an interim and a final grade. Bailey stated that a grade of E indicated failure; leaving the grade at SI would indicate progress but no completion. Bailey offered an **amendment** to strike the last sentence of the proposed new *Section 5.1.3.3*. Grossman **seconded**. Blackwell **accepted**.

The Chair called for a **vote** on the **motion** with the accepted **amendment**. The motion **passed** unanimously in a voice vote.

Being the last Senate meeting at which Chair Yanarella would preside, he offered thanks to some of the individuals contributing to a successful University Senate: Sheila Brothers (Senate Council Administrative Coordinator); Robyn Barrett (Court Reporter); Michelle Sohner (Sergeant-at-Arms); James Sparkman (TASC - A/V); and Gifford Blyton (Parliamentarian). The Chair stated his appreciation of the conversations and the participation of senators. He acknowledged the limitations of deliberative democracy, but also the importance of keeping the democratic spirit alive. The Chair went on to say the democratic spirit was also alive and well in the Senate Council and that he had received an extraordinary education as Senate Council chair. He said faculty governance was in the good hands of those regularly elected to the Senate Council.

In closing, the Chair offered best wishes to chair elect Tagavi, vice chair elect Grabau and the reconstituted Senate Council. He offered a special farewell to Grossman, who would be resigning from the Senate Council to take on the Associate Chair and Director of Graduate Studies duties in the Department of Chemistry, and to Roy Moore, departing faculty trustee and Senate Council member. Tagavi stated that the University Senate owed Chair Yanarella a debt of gratitude for the smooth operation of the Senate and Senate Council over the past two years. Senators expressed their appreciation with a round of applause.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:11 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh Tagavi,  
University Senate Vice Chair

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on April 14, 2006.