University of Idaho  
2013-2014 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA  

Meeting #7  

3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, October 15, 2013  

Crest, Commons  
IWC Room 390 – Boise  
213 – Coeur d'Alene  
TAB 321B IF4 – Idaho Falls  

Order of Business  

I. Call to Order.  

II. Minutes.  
   • Minutes of the 2013-14 Faculty Senate Meeting #6, October 1, 2013 (vote)  

III. Chair’s Report.  

IV. Provost’s Report.  

V. Other Announcements and Communications.  
   • Online Graduation Applications (Krogh)  

VI. Committee Reports.  

   University Curriculum Committee:  
   • FS-14-007 (UCC-14-014) Regulation L (vote)(McMurtry)  
   • FS-14-008 (UCC-14-021) Final Exam (vote)(Krogh)  
   Borah (Spence)  
   Safety – smoking (Stuen/Smith)  

VII. Special Orders.  

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.  

IX. New Business.  

X. Adjournment.  

Professor Trish Hartzell, Chair 2013-2014, Faculty Senate  

Attachments:  
   Minutes of 2013-2014 FS Meeting #6  
   FS-14-007 & FS-14-008  
   Borah Handout  
   Safety Handout
University of Idaho  
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
2013-2014 Meeting #6, Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Present: Aiken (w/o vote), Awwad-Rafferty, Baillargeon, Bird, Brandt, Cobb, Couture (Boise), Davis, Eckwright (w/o vote), Flores, Hartzell (chair), Karsky, Kennelly, Manic, Miller, Murphy, Pendegraft, Perret, Pregitzer, Qualls, Safaii, Stoll, Stuntzner (Coeur d’Alene), Wolf, Ytreberg  
Absent: Becker, Frey, Morra, Ostrom, Smith  
Guests: 9

Chair Hartzell began the meeting by announcing a consent agenda to confirm the appointment of Senator Safaii to the University Budget & Finance Committee and Senators Perret and Murphy to the Campus Planning Advisory Committee. There were no objections.

A quorum being present, Senate Chair Hartzell then called the meeting to order at 3:33pm.

Minutes: It was moved and seconded (Awwad-Rafferty, Brandt) to approve the minutes of meeting #5. Motion carried with abstentions by four senators including Senator Kennelly.

A senator inquired about the rationale for abstaining and several reasons were postulated: senators who were absent during the previous meeting will generally abstain from voting on the minutes; senators who have not had time to sufficiently digest the previous meeting minutes may choose to abstain; and senators who may disagree with some aspect of the minutes (e.g., tone) may choose to abstain.

Chair’s Report. The Chair reported on the following items:

- Thanks to Vice-Chair Marty Ytreberg for chairing last week’s senate meeting. Thanks to everyone for the productive and meaningful discussion.
- Chair Hartzell is a member of the University of Idaho presidential search committee and she attended meetings this past week to interview ten semi-finalists. Committee members are excited about the pool and the five finalists who will be visiting UI campuses for interviews in October: Donald Birx (October 8), Jack Payne (October 15), James Applegate (October 22), Chuck Staben (October 24) and Laurie Stenberg Nichols (October 29). For more information on the finalists: http://www.uidaho.edu/president/presidential-search/search-finalists
- Chair Hartzell met with University Judicial Council committee members who have expressed concerns about the recently proposed changes to the Student Code of Conduct. Ann Thompson, assistant to the faculty secretary, heroically has put together a document that provides all of the original components of the student code alongside the new version of the code that was presented at senate last week. We will make this 38-page table available to you. Many thanks to Ann for sorting this out on paper.
- Auditorium Chamber Music Series this evening presents Grammy award-winning bassist John Clayton and his pianist son Gerald playing classical and new jazz.
- “Chicken with Plums” is the third film in this year’s French film festival series. It will be shown this evening at the Kenworthy Theater.
- This year’s UI Common Read features the book Tomatoland by author Barry Estabrook. He will deliver the program’s keynote address on Thursday, October 3, in the SUB Ballroom.
• Kenworthy Theater will be showing the Manhattan short film festival on Thursday, October 3. Moscow is one of 300 cities around the world involved in this film festival.
• Sabbatical leave applications are due in late October. For more information: http://www.uidaho.edu/newsevents/item?name=sabbatical-leave-applications-for-2014-15-due-oct-31-2013
• Senator Bird, a member of the Brink lounge remodeling advisory committee, provided the following update: furniture for the remodeled lounge is scheduled to be delivered October 28, if all of the construction is complete. The contractor is currently waiting for the store-front doors that will open from the lounge to the stairwell at the entrance to Brink Hall. These doors are the most complicated and time consuming piece of construction.
• Future October senate meetings will feature guests Nancy Krogh, registrar, to talk about the on-line application process; Greg Walters, executive director of human resources and Ron Smith, vice-president for finance and administration to talk about reclassification; and Steven Neihiesel, assistant vice-president for enrollment management to talk about enrollment.
• Senate will not meet next Tuesday, October 8, because our meeting conflicts with the Bellwood Lecture featuring Morris Dees of the Southern Poverty Law Center.

Provost’s Report. Provost Aiken reported on the following items:
• The 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals held a special sitting at the UI College of Law Courtroom. Provost Aiken commended law students for their engagement and reported that several judges from the 9th circuit court made a point of commenting on students’ attentiveness during the deliberation and process. The judges also said UI is fortunate to have such a great law school.
• Regarding the presidential search process, Provost Aiken added the following to the Chair’s comments: We are recruiting a president but they are also looking at us. It is in the best interest of everyone associated with UI for us to show these presidential candidates what a terrific place this is and what a dynamic and robust intellectual community we have here. We want to put our best foot forward and we want the best of them to become our next president. We want to be honest but we will have plenty of time to tell them about challenges later.
• Provost Aiken continues to work at being transparent and communicative on Focus for the Future and staff classification system issues, but she does not yet know the answers to some questions on these matters. She would be pleased to send out written communications but at this time she could say only that “I wish I knew the answers to these questions, but at this time – I do not.” These continue to be huge investments in our time, effort and spirit – that we do not have right quite yet.

Culture and Climate Assessment Committee. Chair Hartzell then introduced guests Carmen Suarez, chief diversity officer and associate vice-president for student affairs, and Jane Baillargeon, senator and assistant director for institutional research and assessment. Dr. Suarez asked Faculty Senate to consider co-sponsoring a half-day or full-day symposium or series of workshops in spring with tracks for both faculty and staff on “how does UI become a more multicultural organization?”
• The diversity consciousness-raising process was part of a leadership retreat in May and the ongoing efforts currently are co-sponsored by staff council, the President’s Diversity Council and the Office of Human Rights, Access and Inclusion.
• The President’s Diversity Council is as inclusive as possible and is made up of more than 55 faculty, staff and students from around the university. The council is divided into six groups:
student retention and recruitment, faculty retention and recruitment, staff recruitment and retention, multiculturalism in the curriculum, culture and climate (Senators Baillargeon and Awwad-Rafferty co-chair this group) and statewide engagement.

- Issues and definitions of diversity must be attended to by organizations and these are legitimate decision-making, management, framing and theoretical tools especially for the academy.
- Students of color constitute UI’s fastest-growing student populations.
- There are a wide variety of techniques to be used in the classroom in order to introduce multiculturalism into any discipline (not just the social sciences, for example).
- There is a deliberate goal in the strategic plan about bringing in diversity and developing cultural competencies.

Senator Baillargeon “seconded” Dr. Suarez’s comments and added that the current efforts are an outgrowth of the culture and climate committee’s work from last year. Based on data collected from students, faculty and staff we felt we needed to have a broader conversation and we need to offer strategies and tools – not just “training.” The culture and climate committee recommended to Dr. Suarez that she provide these strategies and tools to various groups around campus.

Dr. Suarez and Senator Baillargeon responded to senators’ questions and comments as follows:
- Would TAs (teaching assistants) be involved in this? That is a very good suggestion and I could have conversations about that. We have worked with new TAs and research assistants through the College of Graduate Studies and it has become pretty robust. There is room for continuing these kinds of things and we welcome the input.
- What do you have in mind with the phrase “co-sponsoring”? Does it embrace the notion of reaching out to colleges to find presenters as well as facilitate participation? That would certainly be wonderful! I could settle for endorsement but a more in-depth partnership could give good guidance and help us develop things that are meaningful with real “take-aways” and not waste time making people feel that all they are doing is rehashing conversations.
- What kind of programs are we doing for students at this time? I have many students in my class who come from a first-generation family and they do not have the background. What is available for them? I may not be the best person to provide a comprehensive answer but I am aware of some things that are being done through student affairs and academic affairs. Some units reporting to me are working to move from strictly programming to direct retention. We work with first-year students who self-identify as coming from one of those backgrounds and we have just implemented a class on how to orient to the university and transition successfully; we are working much more with Hispanic students and their parents and we have introduced Spanish-language kinds of things; dean of students also does quite a bit of work with other first-generation students; we participate fully in the dean of students early warning system and our office heavily outreach to students who self-identify as students of color. We offer them study tables, one-on-one counseling sessions and fully-developed mentoring programs and we emphasize academics. This is also available at the Women’s Center. Senator Baillargeon added that there is an American Diversity check-off requirement in the General Core Studies which is another piece from the academic side.

Chair Hartzell agreed that Faculty Senate could consider endorsing or co-sponsoring a symposium. She added that she would like to see some emphasis given to training faculty on new techniques that she has read about in science journals and that work well in the classroom. Dr. Suarez replied that she is aware of faculty with expertise in these areas and that perhaps they would want to be involved in leading some workshops although we may be able to go outside the university to find a keynote
speaker. Chair Hartzell invited Dr. Suarez to present senate with a prospective date for the workshop or symposium. Dr. Suarez responded that if senate prefers for her to choose a date, she is willing to do so, but she is first asking for a partnership so that all who are involved in the planning could determine the date and structure. Chair Hartzell said that senate will bring this up for discussion and then get back to Dr. Suarez.

Parking and Transportation Services. Chair Hartzell next introduced Carl Root, parking and transportation services (PTS) manager. Chair Hartzell said Mr. Root is her hero on-campus and that whenever she sends an email to him, he responds immediately with calming messages. Mr. Root began by describing two pedestrian crossing/traffic calming projects that are progressing. These are located at Deakin Street between the SUB and VandalStore and at 6th Street – Academic Mall. These projects are in the construction drawing phase and it is hoped that we will break ground on them the day after commencement and have the construction work done during the summer. For more information: http://www.uidaho.edu/parking/transportation-plan/phase-one

- Up to 80 new bicycle racks are being added on the north side of Renfrew Hall. This project is also in construction drawing phase but they plan to work on it over winter and have them ready for March 2014.
- PTS is continuing with permit pricing strategy that began in 2008 to increase the Residential permit price to $172 by FY16. No other permit price changes are expected at this time.
- PTS is financially stable at this time and generates net income each year at approximately $200,000-300,000 which is reinvested in pedestrians’ safety, bicycle racks and so on.
- The lot improvements to 14 and 35 are on the drawing board. The next step will be designs for the lots. Lot 14 is the gravel lot next to the steam plant and it will be important for the new research building (IRIC – Integrated Research Innovations Center). PTS anticipates a net increase in faculty and/or staff parking for IRIC. Lot 14 is in a high-profile place, underdeveloped and very unsightly. By improving Lot 14 with pavement, curb and gutters, we improve that entire area of campus. It might even have the effect of sprucing up the steam plant.
- Pedestrian improvements include completing gaps in the sidewalks and improving pedestrian orientation/limiting non-essential vehicle travel.

Ongoing projects:
- Mr. Root is participating in designs relating to building and maintaining IRIC. Challenges include service, delivery, ADA access to three buildings: College of Natural Resources (CNR), IRIC and Brink-Phinney. IRIC is a big project in a small area, construction will take two years and there will be a logistics challenge while it is under construction.
- The Education Building is another high-impact project and it will also take a couple of years and will be going on at the same time as the IRIC construction. It is similarly very challenging in regards to access and logistics.
- Student Health Center will undergo a remodel beginning in January 2014. The last two projects [Education Building and Student Health Center] will have some relocation challenges and will require moving people.
- The law school is adding an elevator at this time.
- There is a new campus signage standard and this will affect general signage and building signage, as well as some parking-related signage which PTS is contributing to.
• Parking and Transportation Services is continuing to add outdoor lighting on Perimeter Drive from Facilities on up to the golf course, similar to what was done between the highway and 6th Street.
• Work is being done on the entryway monuments and signage at Stadium and Perimeter.

Mr. Root then addressed the question of parking structures for the UI campus.
• He pointed out that parking structures are very expensive to build at an approximate cost of $25,000-30,000 per parking space depending upon the site and materials – this figure is for a “bare-bones” concrete structure.
• A lot of college campuses build parking structures for mixed use, with offices or retail space on the ground floor, then parking above it.
• Parking garages – depending upon the site – are not very efficient with interior circulation space and other factors.
• A 150 space structure, which would be somewhat ridiculous to build because of too few parking spaces, would cost roughly $4.5 million and debt service would be roughly $500,000 per year (very rough guess and do not hold him to this figure).
• If this cost was spread across all permit holders, parking permits would increase permanently approximately 50% in price.
• Washington State University has a large deferred maintenance in their parking garages and this is one reason for the acceleration in their permit prices.
• Other parking garage issues: security, staffing, and access control via pay stations or card swipe systems.
• There are two options for paying for a parking structure: spread the cost over all parkers or require structure users to pay for it, at the rate of $8 per day or more. Few at UI would want to pay that amount for parking, although it is possible that people attending events would be willing to do so. Another issue is where to put a parking structure? There is no location identified in the Long Range Plan. Finally, UI currently has a surplus of parking within an 8-minute walk of the campus core. Metered parking is available and the new meters that accept credit cards and are solar-powered have been well-received. We could add more meters if there is a demand for it.

Mr. Root responded as follows to senators’ questions and comments:
• You mentioned there are two gravel lots scheduled for paving and one is next to the steam plant. Which other lot is scheduled for paving? Lot 35 next to the Student Health Center and it is probably the most notorious lot in our system. This lot generates the most complaints and gives us the most problems. It is very small with only 20-23 spaces and if it were bigger it would be paved by now. If we pave it we would need to spend around $300,000 to deal with the storm water runoff.
• These lots that need to be improved are horrible gravel lots and some are gold lots. Originally Lot 35 was not improved because there was a plan to put a building there. Yes, it was slated for the part of the chilled water system but now it is not being looked at as a future building site unless there is a decision to add-on to the Student Health Center.
• What about the gravel lot on Railroad Street behind the Industrial Technology building? This red lot is not highly utilized but it is not on the priority list for improvement.
• Perhaps you could give the Railroad Street lot to the fraternities and return some parking to us near the health sciences buildings. Okay, I will look into that.
• Years ago there were many lots that we could park in but then they gradually became purple lots. We wondered how that happened (some of this happened before Mr. Root came to UI)? In terms of supply and demand, there is probably more pressure on those gold lots from the Greek organizations than any others. A lot of it is street parking and we cannot control the short term vs. the long term. We like to think the houses would manage that on their own, for example, if they have someone in their house who works late at night they could give them preferred access. A lot of houses have off-street parking that belongs to them because it is on private land but they do not tend to want to manage their own parking. But in terms of supply and demand there is probably more pressure than on any other lot.

• Will service, emergency and fire access work for the College of Natural Resources after IRIC has been constructed? If so, how will it work? Yes, of course, it will. We designed the pedestrian crossing on 6th Street so that it will accommodate fire and emergency. The academic mall is a fire lane with emergency access. One option for providing service access would be to eliminate the alleyway (the driveway next to Line Street that complicates that intersection so terribly) and modify Line Street – make it large enough and wide enough to provide access between CNR and the new building. We could do this in a way that would accommodate fire trucks, as well. The challenge is having service, delivery, ADA and all of CNR’s needs addressed, as well. PTS and the architects are working on these tough issues. I envision more of a barrier for non-essential vehicles coming up Line Street; I would like to cut it off and bring in access from 7th Street, although 7th Street has serious grade issues.

• What is a calming project? How do you “calm” traffic? We make motorists feel a little less comfortable by putting a planter aisle down the middle of the street, narrowing the lanes and gradually raising the table. Motorists respond by slowing down.

• There are no problems finding gold parking near the physics building but colleagues up the hill say that if they do not show up early enough in the morning there are no gold-permit parking spaces available. Part of their frustration stems from gold parking permits being sold to non-faculty/staff. Some would like to see UI restrict sales of gold permits to faculty and staff only. Board-appointed faculty and staff are eligible to purchase gold permits. We sell lot-specific gold permits in Lot 56 and Lot 14 to students because these lots have been underutilized in the past. But otherwise the criterion is “board-appointed” staff and faculty for purchasing gold permits. I agree that the greatest demand for parking is around the campus core and the Student Health Center. A student who is a board-appointed employee is also eligible to purchase a gold permit.

• Will there be wheelchair access and snow removal in these areas during construction and afterwards? Yes. These will be built to ADA standards with curb cuts and we will improve ADA access on 6th Street by bringing the whole table up to sidewalk level. This should make it safer for people with mobility challenges.

Committee on Committees. Vice-chair Ytreberg presented for senate approval a list of committee appointments that had been made during the summer and early in fall semester. This comes as a seconded motion from the Committee on Committees. Motion approved unanimously.

University Curriculum Committee. Chair Hartzell introduced Annette Folwell, chair of the University Curriculum Committee (UCC). Professor Folwell presented five items which come as seconded motions from the UCC:

FS-14-002 (UCC-14-005). Rename Foreign Language major and Women’s Studies minor (two items). Professor Folwell explained that the Department of Modern Languages and Cultures is making a name change to their business degree which is currently titled “Foreign Language – Business.” The department is changing the degree name to “Modern Language – Business” to
correspond with the departmental name. A senator inquired about the use of the word “languages” (plural) in the departmental name but the use of “language” (singular) in the degree title. Professor Folwell speculated that it could be because the department concentrates on one particular language but she added she would need to look at the catalog in order to confirm that. The second item has to do with renaming the Women’s Studies minor to Women and Gender Studies for the following reasons: this is a more inclusive title; it properly reflects the courses that are part of this minor; this change reflects national trends. This is a minor program, not a B.S. or B.A.

**FS-14-003** (UCC-14-006). Discontinue Graduate Certificate, Semiconductor Theory and Devices.
**FS-13-005** (UCC-14-008). Discontinue Graduate Certificate, Advanced Materials Design.
These three certificates have been offered through the College of Engineering. No students have completed two of these certificates. The most recent student to complete the third certificate was in 2009. Barry Willis, associate dean for outreach in the College of Engineering, provided additional background: 12 certificates based on existing courses were developed in the early 2000s in an effort to meet industry needs for students who wanted to learn this material but did not plan to enroll in a graduate program. Out of the original 12 certificates these three were not successful and the college is cleaning up these listings in preparation for an accreditation visit. Motion to approve these UCC items were approved unanimously.

**FS-14-006.** FSH 4700. Secretary Eckwright briefly spoke to this handbook change which now more broadly allows “visitors” to attend classes rather than “visiting scholars.” This change is being made to bring the handbook into conformance with the catalog. The catalog change was made last year and approved at the University Faculty Meeting in April 2013. It was moved and seconded (Cobb, Awwad-Rafferty) to approve this change. Motion carried unanimously.

**University Judicial Council referral.** Chair Hartzell then invited Senator Pendegraft to speak to this referral and the proposed resolutions found in the senate packet. Senator Pendegraft began by speaking to the first item which is a request that the “communication from the Dean of Students of senate meeting 24 Sept 2013 be referred to the University Judicial Committee [i.e., University Judicial Council] (UJC) ... “Senator Pendegraft said that proposed changes to the *Faculty-Staff Handbook* typically go through one of the faculty committees, and UJC would be the appropriate committee in this case. Senator Pendegraft reported that the chair of UJC is perfectly willing to undertake that charge. Senator Pendegraft then moved adoption of the first of the three resolutions, seconded by Senator Kennelly. Senators then engaged in a lengthy discussion regarding the resolution, making the following points:

- Chair Hartzell stated that General Counsel has reviewed the proposed revisions to the student code of conduct as presented by the dean of students at senate last week.
- UJC chair has said that the UJC was not consulted, at all, regarding proposed changes to the student code.
- This makes sense to have the UJC, a standing committee, take up the discussion and have it percolate back up. This is good process.
- Dean of students said at last week’s senate meeting that they plan to take these proposed revisions to various committees and groups – that the proposed changes were not coming forward as a motion but was a collection of information. Will sending it to UJC stop this process? Will this cause a problem between the two of them?
- Dean Pitman spoke with Senator Pendegraft today and did not express any concerns about this draft code going to UJC for their input.
• UJC chair has expressed concerns to Senator Pendegraft about problems in the current student code that the dean of students office is not sensitive to. UJC input will broaden the conversation rather than narrow it.

• Will the collection of additional information lead to confusion over which document is most up-to-date and which committee or office is looking at which document/draft? Chair Hartzell said that we cannot wait for the dean of students’ office to get to the point where they feel it is a better document/draft. We would like to make some changes early-on in the process and then it will ultimately go back to some of those groups. The way this has happened is a bit convoluted, but several years ago senate requested the code of conduct be updated, because it had not been done for many years. The update did not happen in a timely fashion, however, and there was not good communication with senate regarding how things were progressing - because early in the discussion, Senate leadership did not receive drafts of the work in progress.

• The dean of students’ office has been communicating with student groups, at the request of senate leadership.

• This is an efficiency issue. Many people are looking at the code now. This suggestion is one way to pull together many different ideas and the UJC members are best-prepared to address this.

• What specific action do you hope UJC might make after reviewing this document? Senator Pendegraft replied that he would anticipate UJC providing a redline/strikeout proposal to revise the current code and ancillary documents. The proposal we saw last week is not only a proposal to replace the current student code of conduct; it is also a proposal to replace the current Statement of Student Rights. If you have not reviewed the current Statement of Student Rights I respectfully suggest you do so to compare the language in that with the language in the proposal as they are radically different. I would hope that what comes out of UJC is a proposal that would be markedly friendlier to student rights as the current proposal is terribly hostile to student rights. I am hoping UJC will provide a sufficiently different alternative that I could support. Chair Hartzell added that Ann Thompson’s side-by-side comparison of the proposed changes with current policy is important because we are able to see what has been changed. The normal process is for us to see changes that are made but that did not happen in this case. Also, early-on, senate (and UJC) involvement was written out of the process and we do not agree with that approach.

• Is there a way to establish a collaborative relationship with the dean of students’ office as we go forward with the revision, so that it does not become one document vs. the other? There are probably other issues, aside from student rights, that are important in helping students and managing students that the dean of students’ staff have thought about. Is there a way to work in parallel rather than interdigitate along the way? Chair Hartzell responded that it is our intention to work with the dean of students’ office as we have been doing all along. UJC members have looked at the proposed changes and they like some aspects. They would like to merge the documents and suggest that certain features be brought in to the old document and add back in a little bit of protection to students in terms of due rights.

• After that is done what is the procedure? Chair Hartzell replied that ultimately there is still an issue as to whether the student body will vote to approve this, because in current handbook language and policy (Student Statement of Rights) the students have the right to vote on these changes. We do not want to eliminate those rights but the voting guidelines are pretty “high bar.” We will need to work out those details in conjunction with students to ensure that their rights are protected.

• Senator Pendegraft added that based on his conversation earlier today he feels that Dean Pitman’s primary concerns are jurisdictional issues and that language could be written that
students would find acceptable particularly if students help write the language. This is part of the attraction of UJC working on it since there are student members of this committee. It may be difficult to write this language but it is possible to do and if students are involved they are more likely to support it. Another senator added that she has met with the dean and associate dean of students and that it is her impression that it is not their intention to overstep student rights; their intention is to ensure student safety. The student rights issue needs to be brought to their attention because it was not something that they had noted. They were thinking more of safety and jurisdiction.

- Chair Hartzell suggested that one thing that might make this move more smoothly is taking out components that we all agree on and vote on those, while working on other segments as they come along. If we do this in increments we may be able to complete it in a timely fashion and it might be easier for everyone.

- Will senate be working with one document, sooner or later? I do not want to be put on the spot of choosing one document over another. Chair Hartzell said that we would direct UJC to work with the dean of students to get this document into shape for us. This will be spelled out, so that the UJC understands that this is included in their charge.

- Senators discussed the question of one document vs. two documents and the importance for the draft documents to be consolidated into one document before returning it to senate for review. One senator suggested that we do not want to stymie the process by requiring a single document from UJC as there is potential for a minority report. We should add the words “if possible” to the UJC charge of delivering a single document to senate for review.

- Senator Pendegraft said that the resolution is a proposal to start with the current code and modify it, as necessary, rather than starting with the proposed revision from the dean of students office. The section on amnesty in the current document, for example, is very good and should be retained. The proposed revision is deeply flawed and the fundamental vision of the proposed revision is disturbing. He would not like to see us start with the proposed revisions and work backwards. The current document has served us well. It needs some adjustments, but it is not broken and he would like to see us work with it to make changes.

- Another senator said that when she met with the dean of students it was her understanding that there was so much that needed to be revised that it was just easier to rewrite the code. This is a rewrite, not a revision.

- There is a huge policy decision to be made, i.e., whether we want the student code of conduct to be based in administrative law or in criminal law. The code is currently based in criminal law and the proposal is to base it in administrative law. These are not blendable systems and we cannot take rights from criminal law and paste them into administrative law – this would result in hopeless litigation for the university. Perhaps senate is the body to make the policy decision of whether to base the code in criminal or administrative law?

- Chair Hartzell suggested forming a small sub-committee to look into this further. Senators did not support this suggestion.

- A senator who has served on the UJC commented that the processes are onerous and UJC members need more legal input.

- Vice-chair Ytreberg suggested making it clearer in the proposed motion that the UJC could decide to revise the proposed document from the dean of students’ office – make it clear that the UJC could either work from the current student code of conduct or could work from the proposed document.

- Chair Hartzell read the motion: “Senate resolves that the communication from the Dean of Students of senate meeting 2 Sept 2013 be referred to the University Judicial Committee (UJC),
that the UJC be charged with making its own suggestion for revision of the SCC and related documents including such portions of the DOS draft as the committee shall find useful, and that the UJC be asked to report back to the Senate as soon as possible, but not later than Jan 2014.” She then suggested senate could send this to UJC and ask them to provide feedback including what is stated in the second bulleted item in the motion. They will need to work with the dean of students. Then they can bring it back to senate and let us know what should be retained from the original and what should be added from the proposed document. They might not agree on everything but we could move forward with certain components of it. We could hold more detailed discussions on determining whether it will be based on criminal or administrative law, for example.

- After additional discussion, senators agreed that the motion on the floor, as written, will allow UJC to make appropriate decisions regarding the documents in question.

Motion carried with 20 in favor, 2 against and one abstention (Senator Pregitzer).
Chair Hartzell will let Dean Pitman know the outcome of the vote.

**Adjournment:** It was moved and seconded (Miller, Stoll) to adjourn at 5:03pm. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Gail Z. Eckwright
Secretary to Faculty Senate and Faculty Secretary
Current application process is homegrown, and requires extensive maintenance—PDF generation broke with an ITS upgrade in 2012. We fixed it but...
The next upgrade would make the homegrown system obsolete.
Registrar's Office began examining options in February 2012 to move away from paper-based process.

Broken PDFs

OLD
Electronic data converted to paper for routing/approval, then manually updated back to electronic—creates data entry and duplication errors

NEW
Electronic data stays electronic—more efficient, less prone to errors

Current vs. Paperless Benefits

OLD
Paper application can be printed multiple times, faxed, copied, etc.—results in duplication, out-of-date documents, and confusion

NEW
Only one application exists—user confident in viewing the most up-to-date version and avoids time spent comparing documents for changes

OLD
Paper application routed to many people, easy to lose on a desk, student cannot be certain of current status or location of application

NEW
Student notified as application moves through approval steps, can’t be “misplaced,” can easily locate and remind if a step gets delayed
**Advisor Role**

**OLD**
- Receive paper application, various steps, sign and return to student or college/department office

**NEW**
- Receive email notification of student's application, take steps only if/as necessary

---

**Advisor Role**

How to help your students graduate, pre-application:
- Confirm/correct curriculum information; add/remove majors/minors, change catalog year as appropriate (change of curriculum form)
- Submit substitutions/waivers (substitution/waiver form) as soon as possible
- Review/correct the student's listed advisors (view on Degree Audit)

---

**Advisor Role**

How to help your students graduate, post-application:
- Follow up on communications from college/department
- Continue to submit substitutions/waivers (substitution/waiver form) as soon as possible
- Correct information and help student reapply if denied

---

**Related Projects**

- Substitutions/Waivers
- Curriculum changes
- Advisor assignment
- Ceremony attendance/walkthroughs
- University electronic identity/role management
What’s new in the new Graduation Application? A Summary of Changes

PAPERLESS

The new application to graduate is a paperless, electronic process using the Workflow product from Ellucian (same vendor as Banner and well-integrated with our main student information system).

WHY?

In addition to the cost/resource savings and sustainability benefits of using less paper, the application cannot be physically lost or duplicated. This allows the student, advisor, and college to know the exact status and “location” of the application at any point in time and the application can be routed immediately from anywhere with an internet connection, rather than by hand delivery or mail. In addition, all advisors listed for a student will receive an automated email when the student applies for any of their curricula.

UNDERGRADUATE APPLICANTS - COMPLETED SENIOR SURVEY REQUIRED

The application will not allow an undergraduate student to proceed without first completing the senior survey.

WHY?

Undergraduates have previously printed a receipt of senior survey and attached it to the application, so this step eliminates another piece of paper and one “check” required of the college approver.

GRADUATE APPLICANTS - APPROVED STUDY PLAN REQUIRED

The application will not allow a graduate student to proceed without an approved study plan, if one is required by their major.

WHY?

The study plan provides the requirements for completion of the degree, so no approval can take place without an approved study plan against which to check.

CURRICULUM AND TERM ARE UNCHANGEABLE ONCE SUBMITTED

When a student submits an application using the new system, all aspects of the curriculum (including degree, major, minor, catalog year, etc.) and the term of completion are locked. No manual changes may be made to this information once the application is submitted; if any of this information is missing or incorrect, the student will need to request to have the prior application cancelled and reapply with the correct information. If the application has been fully approved prior to the cancellation request, the application fee will not be refunded.

WHY?

Several reasons: 1) the curriculum and term information is used by the underlying logic of the electronic approval process to ensure correct routing and fee application, 2) the curriculum and term of graduation need to be approved by the appropriate authorities and the current practice of handwritten/manual changes does not adequately document those approvals for audits, and 3) the degree audit to be reviewed by the approvers will not be accurate if curriculum information is incorrect.
BASELINE APPLICATION

The application will use the pages and tables provided by “baseline” Banner to collect and store the required information from the applicant. These pages are mostly straightforward and similar to the past application, and the student will still use the same link in VandalWeb to begin the application.

WHY?

Using unmodified Banner forms allows us to remain up-to-date without expensive in-house programming efforts and the potential for errors. We also share expertise with other Banner institutions to support future process improvement.

COLLEGE APPROVAL

For undergraduate degrees, the application will be routed directly to a single representative (or their designated proxy) in the college office for electronic approval. Any additional approvals may be developed and coordinated between the college representative and individual departments or advisors outside of the workflow.

WHY?

Several reasons: 1) this change was originally driven by the overall inaccuracy of advisor records; the workflow must be able to identify one person to receive the application and we could not reliably identify which advisor might be tied to which degree (or for double-majors under one degree, which advisor was “more important”); 2) the feedback we received was that the college representatives were generally responsible for identifying concerns with the applications and their solutions; and 3) the application must be a university-wide solution, leaving flexibility for colleges and departments to build their own processes as desired.

CEREMONY ATTENDANCE/WALKTHROUGH FORM

Students will indicate their intent to participate in any commencement ceremony through the graduation application. However, a new Ceremony Attendance/Walkthrough page in VandalWeb will be used to allow the student to indicate the specific ceremony(ies) they plan to attend. This assists with all ceremony preparations, including counts. Students are able to visit the form numerous times to update their choices if their plans change. The form also asks the student to confirm their hometown for publication in the commencement bulletin and graduation notifications.

Students who wish to participate in a ceremony prior to their graduation term may also elect to do so using this form. The request to “walkthrough” will initiate an electronic approval process with the college through Workflow, replacing the current “Request to Walkthrough” paper form.

WHY?

In order to provide clear ceremony date information and options to students a new web form was developed to allow students who apply to graduate to indicate their ceremony attendance. To simplify the walkthrough approval process an additional workflow was developed.
TO: University Curriculum Committee
FROM: College of Graduate Studies
RE: Regulation L
DATE: September 18, 2013

L-1. Academic Standing for Undergraduate Students. Students are considered to be in good academic standing when they have a semester and a UI cumulative grade-point average of 2.00 or higher.

   L-2-a. At the end of a semester, undergraduate students who do not attain a UI cumulative grade-point average of 2.00 are placed on academic probation for the next semester of enrollment and are referred to the appropriate academic dean for advising. The effect of this probationary status is to serve notice that if a student's cumulative record at the end of the next semester in residence is unsatisfactory he or she will be disqualified and ineligible to continue at UI. Students in their first semester of college who achieve less than a 1.0 grade point average at the end of the semester will be placed on first academic disqualification rather than probation (see L-4-a).
   L-2-b. Students on academic probation who attain a UI cumulative grade-point average of 2.00 or higher are automatically removed from probation.
   L-2-c. Students on academic probation who attain a semester grade-point average of 2.00 or higher during the next or subsequent semester after being placed on probation, but whose cumulative grade-point average is still below 2.00 remain on academic probation.
   L-2-d. Because final grades for a probationary term may not be available until after a student has registered for an ensuing term, such registration must be considered tentative until the student's academic standing may be determined. If the student is disqualified at the end of the probationary term, the registration for the ensuing term is invalid and will be cancelled unless the student is reinstated (see L-4).

L-3. Academic Disqualification for Undergraduates.
   L-3-a. Students in their first semester of college who achieve less than a 1.0 grade point average at the end of the semester will be placed on first academic disqualification.
   L-3-b. Students on academic probation with less than 33 cumulative net credits will be disqualified if their semester grade-point average falls below a 2.00 and their UI cumulative grade-point average falls below a 1.80. Students in this group with a semester grade-point average below a 2.00 and a UI cumulative GPA between 1.80 and 1.99 will remain on probation.
   L-3-c. Students on academic probation with 33 or more cumulative net credits will be disqualified at the end of a probationary semester if both their UI cumulative grade-point average and their semester grade-point average are below 2.00.
   L-3-d. To reregister after being academically disqualified, students must be reinstated. (Students must contact their respective college, prior to the beginning of the semester, for the deadline to petition for reinstatement.)
   L-3-e. Because final grades for a probationary term may not be available until after a student has registered for an ensuing term, such registration must be considered tentative until the student's academic standing may be determined. If the student is disqualified at the end of the probationary term, the registration for the ensuing term is invalid and will be cancelled unless the student is reinstated (see L-4).

   L-4-a. After a first academic disqualification, students may be reinstated (i.e., have their eligibility to continue restored) by petition to and favorable action by the college in which they are enrolled OR by remaining out of UI for at least one semester. Summer does not qualify as a one semester absence.
   L-4-b. After a second academic disqualification, students may be reinstated at any time only by petition to and favorable action by the college in which they are enrolled.
   L-4-c. Students academically disqualified for a third time may be reinstated only after successful petition to the college in which they are enrolled and the Academic Petitions Committee.
   L-4-d. Students who have been reinstated may continue to register on probation so long as they attain a 2.00 or better grade-point average for each semester following a disqualification.
   L-4-e. Students who are academically disqualified and reinstated are reinstated on academic probation.

L-5. Academic Warning for Undergraduates. Students not on probation who attain a grade-point average below 2.00 during a given semester without dropping below a UI cumulative grade-point average of 2.00 receive an academic warning. Although this does not affect their academic standing or their eligibility to register, the students are referred to the appropriate academic dean for advising.
L-6. **Summer Session.** Academic disqualification at the end of a spring semester does not affect a student's eligibility to continue in the immediately ensuing summer, but to register in any subsequent term the student must be reinstated. Academic standing is not computed at the end of summer session.

L-7. **Fresh Start.** Qualified undergraduate students who wish to reenter the university in a specific degree program after a period of absence will be allowed a "Fresh Start" as described below.

L-7-a. To qualify for a Fresh Start, students (1) must not have been enrolled in any college or university as a full-time matriculated student for at least the five years immediately before applying for the program, (2) must have a UI cumulative GPA of less than 2.00, and (3) must be approved for the program by the college dean that administers the academic program they wish to pursue.

L-7-b. Once the student has completed an additional 24 credits of course work with a Fresh Start cumulative GPA of at least 2.00 and has been in the program at least two semesters, the cumulative GPA will be reset to 0.00 as of the time of admission to the Fresh Start Program.

L-7-c. Students in the Fresh Start Program will be allowed a maximum of six credits of "W" during the first two semesters after admission to the program. If the Fresh Start is successfully completed, the count for the 20-credit limit on withdrawals (see C-2 on page Error! Bookmark not defined.) will be reset to 0 as of the time of admission to the Fresh Start Program.

L-7-d. University probation and disqualification regulations apply throughout the Fresh Start process.

L-7-e. To graduate with honors, a student in the Fresh Start Program must have at least 56 credits in UI courses after the Fresh Start (see K-1). Fresh Start Program participants are eligible for the dean's list (see K-2) on a semester-by-semester basis.

L-7-f. Application forms and explanatory materials are available at the Registrar's Office.

L-8. **Academic Standing for Graduate Students.** Graduate students are considered to be in good standing when they have a semester and cumulative grade-point average of 3.00 or higher. Regulation L does not apply to graduate or law students. See the College of Graduate Studies section for information on probation, disqualification, and reinstatement of graduate students. See the College of Law Announcement for information for law students.

L-9. **Academic Probation for Graduate Students.**

L-9-a. A graduate student is placed on academic probation after any semester or summer session in which a GPA of less than 3.00 is earned in courses placed on the graduate transcript, regardless of the student's cumulative GPA.

L-9-b. Graduate students on academic probation who attain a semester and cumulative grade-point average of 3.0 or higher are automatically removed from academic probation.

L-9-c. Graduate students on academic probation who attain a semester GPA of 3.00 or higher during the next or subsequent semester or summer session after being placed on probation, but whose cumulative GPA is still below a 3.00, will remain on academic probation.

L-10. **Academic Disqualification for Graduate Students.** A graduate student will be disqualified if a semester GPA of less than 3.00 (regardless of cumulative GPA) is earned on courses placed on the graduate transcript during the second, consecutive semester or summer session

L-11. **Academic Reinstatement for Graduate Students.**

L-11-a. A graduate student may be reinstated after disqualification under the following conditions: the student may not enroll as a graduate student for at least one semester (fall or spring), must get the positive recommendation of his or her program's administrator, and must gain approval from the College of Graduate Studies.

L-11-b. Reinstatement is granted for a specific semester only and the student must enroll in that semester.

L-11-c. The student must receive a term GPA of at least 3.0 the first semester back in the College of Graduate Studies.

L-11-d. A reinstated student will be placed on probation if their cumulative GPA is below a 3.00.

L-11-e. A reinstated student will be disqualified after the second consecutive term where a 3.0 GPA was not achieved (see L-10).

L-12. **Regulation L does not apply to law students.** See the College of Law Announcement for information for law students.
TO: University Curriculum Committee  
FROM: Office of the Registrar  
RE: 2014-2015 Final Examination Schedules  
DATE: October 1, 2013

Note: These are being presented to the University Curriculum Committee as an informational item.

Fall Final Examination Schedule  
December 15-19, 2014

Regular classrooms will be used for the exam unless the instructors make special arrangements through the Registrar’s Office. In order to avoid conflicts, rooms must be reserved in the Registrar’s Office for “common final” exams. Instructors will announce to their classes rooms to be used for all sectioned classes having common final exams. **Instructors may deviate from the approved schedule only upon recommendation of the college dean and prior approval of the Provost.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Class Meeting Day of the Week</th>
<th>Class Start Time</th>
<th>Final Exam Day</th>
<th>Final Exam Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>7:30 AM</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>7:30 AM – 9:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>7:30 AM – 9:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:30 AM</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:30 AM</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>12:30 PM – 2:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:30 PM</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>12:30 PM – 2:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:30 PM</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>3:00 PM – 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:30 PM</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>3:00 PM – 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:30 PM</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>12:30 PM – 2:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>7:30 AM – 9:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:30 AM</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>7:30 AM – 9:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:30 PM</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>12:30 PM – 2:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>12:30 PM – 2:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>7:30 AM</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>7:30 AM – 9:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>7:30 AM – 9:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:30 AM</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>7:30 AM – 9:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:30 AM</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:30 PM</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:30 PM</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>12:30 PM – 2:30 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- **Common final exam** periods are from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday.
- Students with three or more finals in one day are permitted, at their option, to have the excess final(s) rescheduled to the conflict period. The **conflict exam** periods are from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday and Thursday. A student must make arrangements with the instructor of the course to move a final exam to one of the conflict exam periods.
- Evening classes, those starting at 5:00 p.m. or later, will have the final examinations during the final exam week at the regular class time.
- Online classes, which have in person finals, will have the final examination the Saturday following the final examination week in the Fall semester. In the Spring semester these in person finals will be held on the Saturday prior to the final examination week.
- Non-Standard time patterns will use the final exam start time in the day/time pattern of the earlier hour. For example, a Tuesday section with an 8:30 a.m. start time would use the 8:00 a.m. final exam time for Tuesday.
- If a class meeting day and time is not found in the final examination schedule above, the instructor of the class is responsible for contacting the Office of the Registrar to identify the appropriate day and time for the final examination.
Spring Final Examination Schedule  
May 11-15, 2015

Regular classrooms will be used for the exam unless the instructors make special arrangements through the Registrar's Office. In order to avoid conflicts, rooms must be reserved in the Registrar's Office for "common final" exams. Instructors will announce to their classes rooms to be used for all sectioned classes having common final exams. **Instructors may deviate from the approved schedule only upon recommendation of the college dean and prior approval of the Provost.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Class Meeting Day of the Week</th>
<th>Class Start Time</th>
<th>Final Exam Day</th>
<th>Final Exam Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 AM</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>7:30 AM – 9:30 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>7:30 AM – 9:30 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 AM</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 AM</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>12:30 PM – 2:30 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 PM</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>12:30 PM – 2:30 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 PM</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>3:00 PM – 5:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 PM</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>3:00 PM – 5:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 PM</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>12:30 PM – 2:30 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>7:30 AM – 9:30 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 AM</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>7:30 AM – 9:30 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 PM</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>12:30 PM – 2:30 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>12:30 PM – 2:30 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 AM</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>7:30 AM – 9:30 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>7:30 AM – 9:30 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 AM</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>7:30 AM – 9:30 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 AM</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 PM</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 PM</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>12:30 PM – 2:30 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 PM</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>12:30 PM – 2:30 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>12:30 PM – 2:30 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 PM</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>3:00 PM – 5:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>7:30 AM – 9:30 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 AM</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>7:30 AM – 9:30 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 PM</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **Common final exam** periods are from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday.

• Students with three or more finals in one day are permitted, at their option, to have the excess final(s) rescheduled to the conflict period. The **conflict exam** periods are from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. on Thursday and Friday. A student must make arrangements with the instructor of the course to move a final exam to one of the conflict exam periods.

• Evening classes, those starting at 5:00 p.m. or later, will have the final examinations during the final exam week at the regular class time.

• Online classes, which have in person finals, will have the final examination the Saturday following the final examination week in the Fall semester. In the Spring semester these in person finals will be held on the Saturday prior to the final examination week.

• Non-Standard time patterns will use the final exam start time in the day/time pattern of the earlier hour. For example, a Tuesday section with an 8:30 a.m. start time would use the 8:00 a.m. final exam time for Tuesday.

• If a class meeting day and time is not found in the final examination schedule above, the instructor of the class is responsible for contacting the Office of the Registrar to identify the appropriate day and time for the final examination.
2014 BORAH SYMPOSIUM PROGRAM

The Borah Committee has selected a topic for the 2014 Symposium and three guest speakers. Given that next year is the centennial of the outbreak of the First World War, the topic will be:

The Legacies of World War I and the Making of the Modern World, 1914-2014

The goal of the Symposium will be to examine how technological innovations, diplomatic decisions, economic policies and social changes brought about by the war have shaped the world in which we live today.

The schedule and specifics of the guest speakers are as follows:

Each of the guest speakers will deliver evening talks open to the campus and community.

1. Professor Jay Winter will arrive in Moscow a week before the start of the regular Symposium. During 1-4 April he will hold special colloquia and meet with selected classes. On Monday, 7 April, he will deliver the Symposium’s plenary address on the Legacies of the Great War in the Current Era.

Jay M. Winter is the Charles J. Stille Professor of History at Yale University. He is a specialist on World War I and its impact on the 20th century. His other interests include remembrance of war in the 20th century, such as memorial and mourning sites, European population decline, the causes and institutions of war, British popular culture in the era of the Great War and the Armenian genocide of 1915.

2. On Tuesday, 8 April, Professor Priya Satia will speak on the impact of WWI on the Middle East and how that still influences the region today.

Priya Satia is an associate professor of History at Stanford University. Her research interests span modern British cultural and political history, colonialism and imperialism, the experience and practice of war, technology and culture, human rights and humanitarianism, the state and institutions of government, arms trade, political economy of empire, and environmental history.
3. On **Wednesday, 9 April** the Symposium’s keynote address will be given by **Gen. Richard Myers**. He will focus on the development and application of “weapons of mass destruction” during the 1914-18 conflict and the influence and application on today’s issues.

Retired Air Force General Richard Myers served as the 15th chairman of the Joint Chiefs Staff from 2001-2005. As the nation’s highest-ranking military officer and the principal military advisor to the President, Myers led America’s global war on terrorism and the fight against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. In addition, He is Foundation Professor of Military History and Leadership at Kansas State University and holds the Colin Powell Chair for National Security Leadership, Ethics, and Character at National Defense University.

**The following details remain to be worked out:**

1. A possible film series relating to the Symposium’s theme.

2. Daytime talks by local experts on topics relating to WWI and its legacies.

For the Committee,

Rick Spence, Professor of History, Co-Chair
Proposed Smoking / Tobacco ban
Notes from University Safety and Loss Control Committee (USLCC)
Eric Stuen, Chair AY13-14 and Alistair Smith, previous chair.

Discussions in AY 12-13 showed USLCC members to be divided over whether a smoking or tobacco ban policy should be implemented.

Presentation by students Daniel Trautvetter and Shannon Haselhuhn to USLCC on April 18th revealed results of a survey they conducted that showed a majority of U of I students to be in favor of a smoking ban.

- Coverage of faculty and staff in that survey was limited.
- Coverage of off-campus and non-traditional students was limited.

On April 18th, USLCC moved to recommend that a public forum be held on the issue.

On Sept. 19th, USLCC moved again to recommend a public forum and a second, more comprehensive and representative, survey be undertaken.

- We are in favor of a public forum organized by unbiased members of ASUI that allows for presentation from both sides of the issue.

- Purpose of the public forum would be to educate the public on the proposal and discuss the following questions:
  - Should all tobacco be banned, or just smoking be banned, or are the current policies regarding tobacco sufficient?
  - Could smoking be limited to designated smoking areas that are further away from buildings than is currently permitted?

- We think a second survey of a large sample of people from the UI community should be undertaken that is representative of opinions of all types of students, faculty and staff.
  - Perhaps an unbiased task force from ASUI could lead this effort with support from faculty senate to make use of UI survey resources.