The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, November 19, 2018 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. Given the number of guests, the Chair suggested that those present introduce themselves.

The Chair asked for unanimous consent to modify the day's agenda. She received an email from Registrar Kim Taylor on the previous Friday, requesting approval for a minor calendar change to the registration window. The Chair said that if there were no objections, she would like that request to be added to the day's agenda. There were no objections and the Chair said she would add the item so that it feel immediately after "Old Business." She noted that Registrar Kim Taylor would be arriving shortly after the meeting started.

1. Minutes from November 5, 2018 and Announcements
The Chair said that no comments had been received for the minutes from November 5. There being **no objections**, the minutes from November 5, 2018 were **approved** as distributed **by unanimous consent**.

The Chair offered a series of announcements.

Because of the recent bomb scare on campus near Whitehall Classroom Building, the Chair said she had been approached about having an informative presentation given to SC or to the University Senate (Senate). After brief discussion, there were no objections to scheduling such a presentation for the Senate, perhaps in February.

The Chair now has all the nominees for the Work Group on Policies Regarding Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment. When the Chair next meets with President Eli Capilouto, they can compose the Work Group. The Chair said she hoped the Work Group might get started in early December.

The Chair asked Provost's Liaison Kirsten Turner for an update on the funding for proposals for the online initiative. Turner explained that 48 proposals were submitted and over 20 will be funded; acceptance letters are currently going out and will be completed soon, if they are not already. The first round included more proposals than could be funded, so a second round of proposals is expected. Anyone who submitted during this first round but was not selected will be considered for the second round, as will newly submitted proposals.

Regarding the SC's recent actions regarding the PhD Gerontology and PhD Chemistry, the Chair said that she reviewed the forms and the relevant *Senate Rules* (*SRs*) regarding the processing of program changes. The Chair said that the forms tracked the *SRs* exactly and that *SR 3.2.1* specifically included changes to "…the specific courses, the number of credit hours, or other requirements, for a certificate or degree." She said that these rules should be kept in mind for future discussions, but if SC desired, it could develop a proposal to change the rules.

The Chair noted that neither she, nor Vice Chair Osterhage, would be able to chair the SC meeting on December 17. Therefore, the Chair said she was cancelling the December 17 meeting. The last SC meeting of the semester will be on December 3, after which the Chair invited those present to head to Pazzo's after the meeting ended, to celebrate a productive year; she concurred with Grossman's assertion that it also recognized the SC members whose terms were ending.

2. Old Business
a. [significant change] Reopening of Master of Science in Nursing (and changes to requirements)
Because the SC passed a motion to table the Master of Science in Nursing for two weeks, the Chair noted that there was no need to move a motion to begin discussion. She asked Cramer to remind SC members about the discussion at the prior meeting and Cramer did so. The Chair called for questions of fact and there were a number of questions. Guests Karen Butler (NU) and Debra Hampton (NU) also participated in the discussion.

When there were no further questions of fact, the Chair noted that the **motion** on the floor for discussion was a recommendation from the SAPC to approve the significant change to the MS in Nursing, in the College of Nursing. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. She then called for debate. Grossman suggested that the proposal be revised to remove all references to cross-listings. Wood asked that the related courses be transmitted to the Registrar's office with a note that the 600- and 700-level courses were different from the 900-level courses and technically were not cross-listed. The discussion continued.

Cross suggested amending the motion from the SAPC to approve the proposal except for the language regarding cross-listings, because the courses are not actually cross-listed. Grossman suggested just asking for a revised proposal that omits references to cross-listings of courses, and send the revised proposal to Ms. Brothers well in advance of the next Senate meeting. The discussion continued, largely focused on the best way to move the proposal forward as long as the references to cross-listings were removed. Grossman **moved** that the SC recommend approval of the SAPC's motion to the Senate as long as the references to cross-listings have been removed from the proposal. Brion **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair suggested moving on the HR nominees, as the Registrar had not yet arrived.

3. Nominees for HR's Retirement Plan Vendor Focus Groups
The Chair distributed the list of self-nominations for HR's focus groups on the retirement plan vendor. Grossman **moved** to send forward all the names to HR and Blonder **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstained.

Item added during meeting, per Chair's request and with SC consent: Proposed Change to 2018-19 University Calendar (November Registration Dates)
The Chair explained that a similar request was made the prior year, to keep the registration window open through Sunday, November 25, instead of closing it on Tuesday, November 20. The Chair said it was possible that while students were sitting at home, perhaps with family members who might write tuition checks, it would be good for them to be able to use the time over the Thanksgiving break to register for classes.

Grossman **moved** to change the window for priority registration from October 29 – November 20 to October 29 to November 25 and to approve the change for future calendars (ending registration on Sunday instead of Tuesday). Wood **seconded**. After brief discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

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

i. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Child Welfare Practice
Guest Aaron Cramer (EN/Electrical and Computer Engineering, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC)) explained the proposal. The Chair solicited questions of fact and there was one. The Chair then stated that the **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation to approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Child Welfare Practice, in the College of Social Work. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair called for debate and SC members offered comments. When debate was over, the Chair called for a vote. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Query from SAPC
Cramer said he was soliciting SC's opinion about a general requirement for undergraduate certificates. He said there was one proposal for an undergraduate certificate currently with the SAPC and he wanted SC's guidance on a particular matter. He explained that the certificate proposal included requirements for both a 900-level course and a 600-level course. (The proposal included a communication from Graduate School Dean Brian Jackson in which he said it was permissible to invoke the *SR* describing the circumstances under which an undergraduate student could take a graduate course [*Senate Rules 3.1.1.A*]. The offering department for both courses individually asserted that undergraduate students had been welcomed in each class for about 10 years now and the intent of the proposal was to codify an unofficial track in the chemical engineering program that had been used for the last decade. He said that the SAPC was struggling to find ways to make the course arrangement work. One option would be to create a 500-level course to take the place of the 600-level course. Another option would be to consider a semi-permanent rule waiver for the certificate to allow their undergraduate students to take the 600-level course. Cramer said that the SAPC identified a third option, which would involve a change to the *SR* to allow undergraduate students take a professional-level course, with wording similar to that of *SR 3.1.1.A*.

The Chair called for debate, but noted that because Cramer was soliciting feedback on behalf of SAPC, it would be important to be consistent, as the SAPC will likely request revisions based on SC's feedback. There was extensive discussion among SC members. There was general support for a rule change if one was forthcoming, but there was little support for the idea of a "permanent" application of *SR 3.1.1.A* for students enrolled in the certificate; that rule was intended to be used on a case-by-case basis. Also, there were some concerns that a permanent dean of the Graduate School might not have the same opinion regarding block usage of *SR 3.1.1.A*. Cramer clarified that the 600-level course was offered by the same unit as the one proposing the certificate, so it might be easiest for that situation to be resolved by the creation of a 500-level course for the certificate. As discussion continued, it became clear that SC's proposed solution involved the creation of two new 500-level courses for the certificate students to take, to replace the 600-level course and the 900-level course. SC believed it was inappropriate for an undergraduate certificate to include graduate-level or professional-level courses.

b. Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLeL) - Roger Brown, Chair
i. Proposed Change to *Senate Rules 5.1.8.1* ("Unilateral Removal for Failure to Attend First Two Class Periods")
Guest Roger Brown (AG/Agricultural Economics), chair of the Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLeL) explained the proposal. There were a number of comments from SC members about the proposed changes. Ultimately, Grossman **moved** to send the proposal back to the SCDLeL for further discussion and Cross **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstained.

c. <u>Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) – Al Cross, Chair</u>
i. <u>Proposed Reorganization and Accompanying Transfer of Degree Programs within the College of Health Sciences</u>
Cross explained the proposal. The Chair called for questions of fact and suggested they be answered by Guests Karen Badger (HS/Clinical Sciences, associate dean for undergraduate education) and Carl Mattacola (HS/Rehabilitation Sciences, associate dean of academic and faculty affairs). There were a number of questions of fact. When it came time for debate, there were a series of questions and comments about the specific wording of the motions from the SAASC.

The first **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation to endorse the proposed reorganization of the College of Health Sciences, based on its non-academic merits. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. After additional discussion about the wording of the second motion, the Chair stated that the motion from the SAASC was a recommendation to approve the proposal, including the transfer of degree programs as part of the reorganization, based on academic merit. SC members engaged in debate. When debate wound down, the Chair solicited a **vote** and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstained.

5. <u>Establishment of a Task Force for Online Program Guidelines - Draft Charge and Composition</u>
The Chair asked Guest Roger Brown (AG/Agricultural Economics), chair of the Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLeL), to describe the task force. Brown noted that there were many areas on campus involved in administrative activities related to online learning and some of Senate's committee chairs were sitting on *Our Path Forward* committees, but there were not any faculty actually in control of these activities. Brown also noted that when issues arise that appear to cross over multiple committees (Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLeL), Senate's Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (SAPPC), and Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC)), it would be useful for the chairs of these groups to discuss the information they hear from their individual *Our Path Forward* committee members with other Senate committee chairs, to bring thoughts see if the issues being discussed might involve Senate proposals.

The Chair referred SC members to the draft proposal that had been on the agenda and thanked Osterhage, chair of the Senate's Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (SAPPC), for her lead role in drafting charge. The Chair said that the SGA had not yet been consulted, but that she would do so if approved by the SC. She opened the floor up for discussion. After a few initial comments, the Chair asked for a motion so that a discussion could be had. Osterhage **moved** to approve the draft charge and composition of the Task Force for Online Program Guidelines and Spear **seconded**. Discussion commenced. There was lengthy discussion about what, exactly, the Task Force would do, as well as whether the chair of the Senate's Research and Graduate Education Committee (SRGEC) should be included.

As discussion wound down, there was a sense that the proposal needed to be revised and returned to SC for further discussion, due to an overly broad charge and questions about what, exactly, the Task Force would do. There were some comments indicating that no SC approval was required; the pertinent Senate committee chairs could get together and discuss issues and gather feedback, as long as no decisions were made. The Chair asked SC members for their guidance on next steps. Wood **moved** to table the proposal until November 26. Brion **seconded**. After additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Grossman **moved** to adjourn and Walker **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 5:09 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Jennifer Bird-Pollan,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bird-Pollan, Blonder, Brion, Cross, Firey, Grossman, McCormick, Osterhage, Spear, Tagavi, Walker, and Wood.

Invited guests present: Karen Badger, Karen Butler, Aaron Cramer, Herman Farrell, Kalea Benner, Roger Brown, Debra Hampton, Carl Mattacola, Douglas Michael, and Annie Davis Weber.

Provost's Liaison present: Turner.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, November 27, 2018.