The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, February 18, 2019 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Jennifer Bird-Pollan called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:01 pm. She thanked Vice Chair Osterhage for chairing the February 11 University Senate (Senate) meeting while the Chair was away. She added that the voting device problems that occurred at the Senate meeting had been resolved.

1. Minutes from February 4, 2019 and Announcements

The Chair said that no comments had been received for the minutes from January 28, 2019. There being **no objections**, the minutes from February 4, 2019 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair announced that Coalition of Senate and Faculty Leadership (COSFL) had sent out an email regarding some legislative bills that are scheduled to move through Frankfort during the legislative session, specifically the concealed carry bill and an anti-sanctuary bill. The Chair said that while there was no time in the day’s agenda for discussing the bills, she said she would forward the email to SC members.

Those present introduced themselves.

2. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) – Aaron Cramer, Chair

i. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Sport, Fitness, and Recreation Management

Cramer, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal. The Chair asked if there were any factual questions but there were none. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation to approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Sport, Fitness, and Recreation Management, in the Department of Kinesiology and Health Promotion within the College of

Education. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair called for debate but there was none. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. [significant change] Proposed Change to MS in Social and Philosophical Studies

Cramer explained the proposal. There was one factual question, after which the Chair stated that the **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation to approve the significant change to the MS in Social and Philosophical Studies, in the Department of Educational Policy Studies and Evaluation within the College of Education. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There was no debate. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iii. [significant change] Proposed Change to BA/BS Information Communication Technology

Cramer explained the proposed changes. There were no questions of fact. The Chair said that the **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation to approve the significant change to the BA/BS in Information Communication Technology, in the School of Information Science within the College of Communication and Information. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. Brion spoke in favor of the proposal but there was no additional debate. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Because the next committee chair was not yet present, the Chair suggested that SC members move to agenda item three and there were no objections.

3. Campuswide Committee Nominees

a. Provost-Level Performance Evaluation Appeals Committee

SC members discussed possible nominees for the Appeals Committee. SC members eventually settled on nine nominees, recognizing that the request had been for six; there was a sense that more nominees might make it easier to identify someone who was willing to serve. Brion **moved** that the Chair send forward the nine names discussed and Grossman **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. Our Path Forward Concept Team Assignments

i. Concept Team 1 – New Revenues

ii. Concept Team 2 – Other Revenues

iii. Concept Team 3 – Efficiencies and Effectiveness

iv. Concept Team 4 – Outreach and Service

v. Concept Team 5 – Structures and Staffing

The Chair explained that she had received a request to ask SC members to review the names of the nominees they sent submitted in the past, to determine if those nominees could remain or if some nominees would be replaced.

Grossman **moved** that the existing nominees be permitted to continue, unless the individual no longer wished to serve. Brion **seconded**. SC members discussed the motion. During discussion, Provost’s Liaison Turner explained that the concept teams were responsible for coming up with big ideas; similarly named implementation teams were then tasked with putting the ideas into action. While the implementation teams met regularly, the concept teams had not met since spring 2018. As discussion wound down, Grossman clarified that if someone was not able to continue, a request for a specific replacement could come to SC. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) – Herman Farrell, Chair

i. Proposed Suspension of Admissions (up to five years) of the Graduate Certificate in Public Health Management

Guest Herman Farrell (FA/Theatre and Dance, chair of Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC)) explained the proposal. The Chair called for factual questions. The only question came from the Chair, who asked about the teach-out plan. Guest Annie Davis Weber (assistant provost for strategic planning and institutional effectiveness) said she would check to be sure that a teach-out plan had been submitted.

The Chair said that the **motion** from the SAASC was to approve the proposal. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were some questions from SC members. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed Suspension and Closure of BSHE in Nutrition and Food Science

Farrell explained the proposal. Farrell clarified that the proposal was to suspend admissions, not closing it, because closing the program would require holding an open forum. There were no factual questions. The Chair said that the **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation to suspend admissions into the program. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iii. Proposed Suspension of Admissions and Closure of Graduate Certificate in German Studies

Farrell explained the proposal. He said that in addition to supporting the proposal, the SAASC also recommended a waiver of *Senate Rule 3.4.2.B.2* (“Procedures Governing Creation, Consolidation, Transfer, Closure, or Significant Reduction of an Academic Program or Educational Unit”). There were a few questions of fact. The Chair said that the motion on the floor was a recommendation from the SAASC to approve the proposal for suspension and closure.

The Chair suggested first voting on the waiver and Hamilton **moved** that the SC waive *Senate Rule 3.4.2.B.2* (open hearing and disclosure requirement) for the proposed suspension of admissions and closure of the Graduate Certificate in German Studies and Brion **seconded**. There were no factual questions or debate. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair then called for discussion on the **motion** from the SAASC to approve the proposal for suspension of admissions and closure. There was no debate. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iv. Proposed Suspension of Admissions and Closure of MS Clinical Sciences

Farrell explained the proposal. As with the previous item, the SAASC supported the proposal as well as suggested a rule waiver.

Brion **moved** that the SC waive *Senate Rule 3.4.2.B.2* (open hearing and disclosure requirement) for the proposed suspension of admissions and closure of the MS in Clinical Sciences and Osterhage **seconded**. There were no factual questions or debate. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair said that the **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation to approve the proposed closure of the MS in Clinical Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were a variety of comments during debate, but the majority of them pertained to Senate’s processes. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

v. Proposed Change to *Senate Rules 4.2.8* ("Undergraduate Certificates")

Farrell explained the proposed changes. Most SC members were supportive of the premise to allow non-degree seeking students to enroll in undergraduate certificates. In response to a question from the Chair, Farrell said that the SAASC did not propose to delete the sections of *SR 4.2.8* that were not included in the proposal, just that no changes were made to that language.

When the Chair called for questions of fact, SC members commented on the matters below.

* It is not clear why the proposed wording refers to “unit faculty” – it is the faculty of record that is responsible for any and all changes to a certificate curriculum.
* As written, the proposed language would seem to allow a unit faculty and certificate director to permit some non-degree seeking students into their undergraduate certificate but not others.
* Requiring the unit faculty to participate in curriculum-related decisions for an undergraduate certificate would be a change to current Senate processes; currently just the faculty of record is responsible for a certificate’s curriculum and admissions processes.

The Chair commented that the questions appeared to be moving more towards debate so SC members then debated the proposal.

Grossman **moved** to add “establish policies for” after the comma in “…at their discretion” so that the revised phrase would read, “…may, at their discretion, establish policies to extend….” Tagavi **seconded**. Tagavi commented that if that language were to be approved, it would mean that changing an undergraduate certificate’s admissions requirement to allow non-degree seeking students to earn the certificate the change would not need to be approved by Senate. Ms. Brothers commented that other sections of the *SR* require changes to admissions requirements to be submitted to Senate, so if such changes were not going to be approved by Senate, those other rules would also need to be changed. Grossman said that the intent of his motion was to ensure the admissions policies were standardized, not performed on an ad hoc basis.

The Chair suggested going around the table so each SC member could offer their comments on three issues: if, as a policy, SC members support allowing non-degree seeking students to earn an undergraduate certificate; if the default should be that undergraduate certificates were, or were not available campuswide to non-degree seeking students; and, if admissions to non-degree seeking students should *not* be made on a campuswide basis, whether the default admissions standard for undergraduate certificates should be that non-degree seeking students can, or cannot, earn an undergraduate certificate.

Walker’s opinion was that non-degree seeking students should be allowed to enroll in an undergraduate certificate, each program should decide if they will admit non-degree seeking students, and the default should admissions standard should be accepting non-degree seeking students, unless a specific program opts out of offering the certificate to non-degree students. Hamilton agreed with Walker.

Collett opined that undergraduate certificates should be available to non-degree seeking students; many certificates already have prerequisites that limit admissions so even now not all undergraduate certificates are open to all undergraduate students.

Cramer’s opinion was that it was fine for non-degree seeking students to enroll in an undergraduate certificate. He objected to requiring all undergraduate certificates to admit non-degree seeking students, saying that that was a decision for the faculty of record to make. For newly proposed undergraduate certificates, the Senate form could be modified to have require units to state if an undergraduate certificate was open to non-degree seeking students or not. Cross said that he agreed with Cramer.

Tagavi said that he did not want non-degree seeking students to be allowed to earn undergraduate certificates; students should first be admitted. Tagavi said he would vote in favor of Grossman’s motion to clarify that a standard policy should be established. When queried further by the Chair about his opinions if it was ultimately decided to let non-degree seeking students be admitted to an undergraduate certificate, Tagavi said that he supported leaving it up to the individual certificate’s faculty of record and that such a decision should not require Senate approval.

Hall’s opinion was that allowing non-degree seeking students to seek an undergraduate certificate should be left up to the certificate’s faculty of record. He said he was concerned about allowing non-degree seeking students into undergraduate certificates, but that that particular trend was probably going to prevail. He said that any change to the admissions requirements should be approved by the faculty of record.

Brion said she preferred that each undergraduate certificate’s faculty of record should decide whether or not to admit non-degree seeking students. She supported the idea of this being a specific question on the form to propose a new undergraduate certificate. Brion also stated that a change to admissions standards for undergraduate certificates allowing non-degree seeking students to enroll in an undergraduate certificate should be approved by the Senate.

Spear suggested that the default admissions mode for undergraduate certificates should be to accept non-degree seeking students. If a certificate intended to prohibit non-degree students from enrolling, they should opt out of the admissions decision.

Osterhage’s opinion was that the original intent of the undergraduate certificate should be considered. If the default became allowing non-degree seeking students to enroll in an undergraduate certificate, there could be a huge increase in the numbers of students in these programs. The default should be that non-degree seeking students are not able to be admitted, but that a faculty of record could submit a program change to allow non-degree seeking students to be admitted. Grossman said he agreed with Osterhage, in that non-degree seeking students could be admitted to an undergraduate certificate only if the faculty of record decide to allow it. Admissions policies related to non-degree seeking students should go through the Senate approval process just like any other admissions change.

Tagavi suggested that he and Grossman withdraw the motion currently on the table, so that Farrell could take the SC’s comments back to the SAASC. Grossman **withdrew** his motion and Tagavi **withdrew** his second.

The Chair summarized the comments as follows: there was near unanimity (not full) that non-degree seeking students should be allowed to seek admitted to an undergraduate certificate; a plurality of SC members believed that the default admissions standard for currently existing undergraduate certificates was that non-degree seeking students would not be admitted to undergraduate certificates unless the faculty of record explicitly requested that change; and that a majority of SC members believed changing the admissions criteria to allow non-degree seeking students to be admitted to an undergraduate certificate would be submitted to Senate like any other admissions change. There were multiple comments about revising the Senate forms for undergraduate students to add fields for proposers to describe if admissions would be open to non-degree seeking students or not. Tagavi commented that any policy regarding admitting non-degree seeking students would need apply to all non-degree seeking students for a particular undergraduate certificate, as opposed to allowing some non-degree seeking students to enroll in the undergraduate certificate but not others. Grossman added that the phrase “at their discretion” as proposed new text was problematic and not explicitly clear about what, exactly, was at their discretion.

4. Proposed Change to 2018-19 University Calendar (Prohibition from Changing Majors)

The Chair asked Provost’s Liaison Turner to explain the request. Turner said that there is a long period in the University calendar (February 25 – end of April) during which students are prohibited from changing majors. She said that that particular prohibition was removed by SC for the prior academic year and she was coming forward to let SC know that a similar request might be coming soon. She added that the suggestion to open up that window was shared with associate deans and advisors and that there was some concern about that change. She said if it turned out there was wide support for the change, she would return to SC to request a vote. The discussion among SC members and Turner pertained primarily to the timing of any such SC vote; there were no concerns voiced about the proposed change itself. SC members decided that they could vote on opening up the window when changing majors was prohibited via email if Turner decided to move forward with the request.

5. Date for Summer Retreat

The Chair said that a request for members’ availability would be forthcoming to find a date for the summer SC retreat. There were no comments or questions.

6. Outstanding Senator Award

The Chair explained that per the *SRs*, Vice Chair Osterhage will chair the work group that seeks and identifies a recipient for the Senate’s Outstanding Senator Award. Cross and Grossman volunteered to serve with Osterhage.

7. Composing New Senate Technology Committee

The Chair invited Guest Mark Lauersdorf (AS/Linguistics, chair, Senate’s Technology Committee) to explain the proposed membership. After brief discussion, Grossman **moved** to approve the six names mentioned and Cramer **seconded**. Cramer spoke in favor of a particular faculty nominee. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. Grossman **moved** that the proposed chair be appointed as such and Hamilton **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm.

 Respectfully submitted by Jennifer Bird-Pollan,

 Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bird-Pollan, Brion, Collett, Cramer, Cross, Grossman, Hall, Hamilton, McCormick, Osterhage, Spear, Tagavi, and Walker.

Invited guests present: Will Buntin, Tricia Coakley, Joe Ferrare, Harold Hoebusch, Carl Mattacola, Justin Nichols, Annie Davis Weber,

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, February 20, 2019.