

Minutes of the April 10 2023 Meeting of the Undergraduate Council of the University Senate

Minutes prepared by Hanna Nekvasil, Chair

In virtual attendance: Hanna Nekvasil, chair, Kevin McDonnell, Deborah Serling, Madeline Turan, Diane Bello, Katherine Johnston, Christine Pitocco, Jennifer Dellaposta, Debbie Zelizer, Donna Capanzano

- i) Hanna introduced the proposed changes to the charge of the UGC forwarded by F. Jason Torre from the University Senate Bylaws Working Group. In which the primary change was to remove “monitoring policy concerning undergraduate admissions and scholarships” from the current UGC charge and to place this with a “reformed” Undergraduate Admissions Committee which would be titled the **Enrollment Management & Retention Committee**.
- ii) Discussion of this raised the following points:
 - A. Regarding the UGC
 - The word “monitor” was added to the remaining UGC charge (i.e., This Council shall review, **monitor** and recommend policy to the Provost). As “monitor” is “to observe and check the progress or quality of (something) over a period of time; keep under systematic review”, the council felt that it added nothing to the charge that was not covered by “review” but could have the negative connotation of overreach by an advisory body.
 - The term **Divisional Council** was added to Major governance unit. With no knowledge of what a single **Divisional Council** Major governance unit is, the UGC indicated that this must be justified before it can be accepted.
 - The UGC could find no information on the “ Undergraduate Admissions Committee Charge” on the Senate website and therefore could not determine its history.
 - There was a universal request for background. What was the impetus for the change? What value will this bring? How do we justify another standing committee when it is so hard to fill vacancies on existing committees?
 - B. Regarding the new committee charge
 - What does the Graduate Council have to do with “all aspects of the University’s undergraduate admissions ...”
 - Again “Monitor” or “keep under systematic review” is just ongoing review and is therefore redundant with review. However, it has a connotation of oversight with micro-management overtones and thus, is to be avoided.
 - “monitor the implementation of their respective policy/co-policy recommendations” This is too strong, and an overreach. We can advise only, we cannot enforce and do not oversee implementation. Recommend the last sentence be struck in its entirety.
 - The definition does not elucidate sufficiently what this committee will do.
 - The rationale behind the combination of “Enrollment management” and “retention” is not immediately clear and to title this committee in this way sounds

as if the goal is to dictate specifically to Dawn Medley the Vice Provost for Enrollment Management and Retention – this may set an unwelcoming tone!

Recommendation: That there be a meeting between a representative of the Bylaws Working and the UGC regarding these questions and concerns.

(iii) The meeting concluded with Hanna indicating that she would write up these concerns and pass them on the F. Jason Torre of the Bylaws Working Group. (This was done 4/15)