

Senate Council
February 25, 2019

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, February 25, 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. At the Chair's request, all those present introduced themselves.

1. Minutes from February 18, 2019 and Announcements

The Chair said that no comments had been received for the minutes from February 18, 2019. There being **no objections**, the minutes from February 18, 2019 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair offered a few announcements.

The date for the SC's summer retreat is scheduled for May 8. The Chair explained that SC often held an additional business meeting after the Senate meeting, but her goal was to take care of any routine business at the retreat, instead of holding a meeting the following week.

Given SC members' responses about availability to meet on March 11 (the Monday of spring break, March 11), it looks as if there would not be quorum if SC were to meet then. The Chair said that that if no SC meeting were to be held, the coming Monday's SC meeting would be the last meeting prior to the March 18 Senate meeting. That meant that any proposals from Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) or Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) would have to be ready for the meeting on March 4 in order to go to the March 18 Senate meeting.

The student member of Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee (SRWAC) was unable to attend meetings at the time scheduled. The Chair contacted Student Government Association President Hamilton, who recommended a different student, who is now attending those meetings.

The current chair of the Undergraduate Council (UC) does not plan to serve again in that role next year, as she has served multiple years. The Chair referred to a past announcement to SC but explained that the individual who was tentatively willing to serve as UC chair had decided he was not interested. Given how long it can take to identify a chair for a busy Senate committee, the Chair asked SC members to think about possible future chairs. An ideal faculty candidate has some experience working in one of Senate's busy curricular proposal-related committees. Brion recommended a particular individual. In response to a question from Tagavi, the Chair said that a UC chair had to be tenured, but did not need to be a full professor.

The Chair suggested addressing the item in Old Business later, after the items for which proposers were present were addressed. There were no objections from SC members.

3. Committee Reports

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

i. Proposed New BA in Interdisciplinary Disability Studies

Cramer, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal. The Chair called for questions of fact and a variety of SC members had questions. Both Cramer and Guest Kristin Maxwell (ED/Special Education, Early Childhood, Special Education and Rehabilitation Counseling) answered questions.

When there appeared to be no further questions of fact, the Chair suggested debate. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation to approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new BA degree in Interdisciplinary Disability Studies, in the Department of Early Childhood, Special Education, and Rehabilitation Counseling within the College of Education. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. Grossman said he supported the proposal overall, but was troubled by the overall 2.5 GPA admissions requirement. He noted that in the past, the SC tended to prefer proposals where specific GPA or letter grade requirements applied only to particular courses that were good predictors of future student success. SC members discussed the admissions language and also offered suggestions for modifying it. Grossman said he did not think the proposal needed to return to the SC, but that it could be revised as discussed and submitted to the SC office. When there were no further comments, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed New BSBA in General Business

Cramer described the proposal. The Chair called for questions of fact and both Cramer and Guest Paul Childs (BE/Finance and Quantitative Methods) responded. The Chair said that the **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation to approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new BSBA degree in General Business, in the Gatton College of Business and Economics. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

Grossman referred to the anticipated large size of the proposed faculty of record (entire college faculty) and suggested delegating it to a smaller group of faculty for curriculum-related decisions. Childs reiterated that any change to any degree was voted on by the entire faculty. Other SC members opined that different colleges might have different models for faculty approval for curricular changes. The size and structure of the proposed new degree program were the only issues debated.

When there were no further comments, the Chair called for a **vote** and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

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

i. Proposed Changes to BSN Suspension Policies (*Senate Rules 5.3.2.6.C & D*, "College of Nursing")

Guest Herman Farrell (FA/Theatre and Dance), chair of Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), explained the proposal. The Chair called for questions of fact. SC members asked many questions; there was extensive discussion about the repeat option as provided for in *Senate Rules (SRs) 5.3.2.1* ("Repeat Option") and how the proposal would affect it.

The Chair said that the **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation to approve the proposal requesting a change to *SR 5.3.2.6.C.,D* with the proposed revision (including a reference to Section C.3 in Section D). Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. The Chair called for debate. Debate was relatively brief, with Tagavi, Grossman and Cross raising the concerns listed below.

- The phrase “fails to earn a grade of C (2.0) on the first attempt of any two courses required....” in *SR 5.3.3.5.C.3* could be understood to really mean ‘a grade of C (2.) *or better on the first attempt....*’ It would be better, however, to correct that language now instead of letting the unclear language continue.
- The proposed new language (“on the first attempt”) to *SR 5.3.3.5.C.3* is unclear; if a student received a ‘W,’ would that attempt be included? Specific letter grades should be spelled out so it will be clear to students.
- The proposed language for *SR 5.3.3.5.C* (“A student shall be ~~suspended~~ dismissed from....”) was overly harsh, particularly if a student experienced a non-academic emergency that affected their grade. Better language would include some discretion for those making these decisions.
- There was no clear rationale for the proposed change to *SR 5.3.3.5*. If the change is due to accreditation requirements, it would be helpful to have that information.
- The proposed change would essentially be an elimination of *SR 5.3.2.1* (“Repeat Option”) for students in the BSN program. BSN students who reviewed *SR 5.3.2.1* would have a hard time knowing that the language did not apply to them. Allowing an elimination of this rule for one college would be precedent setting for other programs to request a similar arrangement.

Grossman **moved** to table the proposal until a representative from the College of Nursing could attend to explain the rationale for the change, as well as describe what options were considered. Cross **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

2. Old Business

a. Proposed Change to Senate Rules 4.2.8 ("Undergraduate Certificates") ~~pending receipt of SAASC documentation~~

Farrell explained the proposed changes to the proposal, as requested by SC the previous week. The Chair reminded SC members that part of SC’s concerns the prior week also pertained to the approval process for undergraduate certificates and how proposers would indicate if they wanted newly proposed certificates to be open to non-degree seeking students. The Chair suggested that the SC could also discuss a process by which existing undergraduate certificates could be modified via the Senate approval process, if so desired.

SC members briefly discussed a proposed, modified process. The Chair apologized for mentioning the topic before the main motion was discussed; SC members were amenable to discussing the process issue after the larger proposal was voted on.

SC members indicated a desire to move to debate, so the Chair said that the **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation to approve the proposal as revised. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed.

Cramer asked about the mechanism by which faculty of record would be able to “control registration of” non-degree seeking students. In response to a question from Grossman, Guest Kim Taylor (registrar) said that the Registrar’s office was unable at the current time to enforce a restriction on the number of non-degree seeking students who would be allowed to be enrolled in an undergraduate certificate. There was some confusion regarding if the language referred to course registrations or registrations in the certificate. The Chair noted that the recently approved change to the *SRs* did not include any restriction on when non-degree seeking students would register for classes. Farrell confirmed for the Chair that the language had been added due to the concerns of the Undergraduate Council (UC) that degree-seeking students be prioritized over non-degree-seeking students with regard to course registration. There were other comments about how the control could and could not be managed.

Cross **moved** to remove “and control priority registration for,” and Brion **seconded**. There was extensive discussion about how such registration could be controlled, but because there was no obvious, easy way to do so, SC members supported removing the language. In response to a question from Tagavi, Farrell stated that as long as the language clearly indicated that the faculty of record had the ability to continue to privilege degree-seeking students with regard to registration, both he and the SAASC would likely consent to the change. There was no further debate. A **vote** was taken and the motion to remove the phrase **passed** with none opposed.

Osterhage asked about the existing text that implied post-baccalaureate students were a category of non-degree seeking students, implicating the new text of the rule. SC members discussed the issue and Brion **moved** to remove “(non-degree)” from the first paragraph of *SR 4.2.8*. Osterhage **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstained.

The Chair then called for a **vote** on the motion to approve the proposal, as revised both by SAASC and by SC. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair suggested SC members discuss the matter of process. Grossman **moved** that existing undergraduate certificates be: offered the opportunity to fill out and submit a special, abbreviated form to allow admission of non-degree seeking students; and that the proposal to change admission standards would be required to comply with college-level and Undergraduate Council review processes, but would skip review by the SAASC and instead be reviewed/approved by a 10-day web transmittal; and that in order to utilize the abbreviated form and accelerated process, such requests must be submitted to the UC by the end of the spring 2020 semester. Tagavi **seconded**. SC members discussed the proposed, revised process, as well as the abbreviated form and how revised undergraduate certificate-related forms would look like. Debate continued. The Chair indicated that units would be proactively contacted by the SC office. Cramer said he would raise the issue with the proposers of the undergraduate certificates currently under review by the SAPC. The Chair said that the abbreviated forms would be sent to SC for review. There was no further debate so a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Proposed Change to 2019-20 University Calendar

Guest Taylor described the proposed change, saying that the specific request was to add Friday, May 8 as a second date for spring Commencement. Grossman **moved** to approve the change and Tagavi **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Planning for Review of Gatton College of Business and Economics' *Institute for the Study of Free Enterprise*

The Chair provided background information, presented a few options for the SC to consider, and asked for the SC's input. The Chair said that she had already contacted the senator who chaired the SAOSC when the Institute for the Study of Free Enterprise was reviewed by the Senate. In response to questions from Brion and others, the Chair said that the SC could develop a specific charge for an ad hoc review committee, or it could ask that the ad hoc committee be asked to develop its own charge, based on some guidance from SC.

No one objected to the suggestion regarding chair of an ad hoc review committee. The Chair expressed a strong preference that SC members bring nominees forward for discussion. During discussion, Blonder said she would send to SC members the minutes from the Senate meeting when the Institute was reviewed. Brion **moved** to establish an ad hoc committee to review the Institute for the Study of Free Enterprise, name the individual mentioned as the chair, and identify other members in the near future. Cross **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The Chair said she would include a discussion on nominees on the agenda for the next SC meeting.

There being no additional business to attend to, the meeting was adjourned by unanimous consent at 4:58 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Jennifer Bird-Pollan,
Senate Council Chair

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

Provost's Liaison present: Turner.

Invited guests present: Paul Childs, Ralph Crystal, Jackie Rogers, Kim Taylor, and Annie Davis Weber.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, February 27, 2019.