
SREC Minutes

February 9, 2023, Thursday, 12:30pm to 2:00pm

Attending: Brown (Chair), Jones, Grossman, Hoch, Soult

Unable to attend: Michael, Tagavi, Anchel, Okoli

Minutes

- Approval of the minutes of the January 19, 2023 SREC meeting was deferred to the March meeting.

Announcements – Brown reviewed the following:

- Putting SRs Online. The SREC agreed at its December meeting that Roger would contact UK CIO Brian Nichols to ask about putting the SRs in Javascript online (e.g., [here](#)). Also: [email info, discussion, and Q&A](#). Roger hasn't (yet) contacted Brian Nichols.

Grossman noted that the draft Javascript version he made of the SRs several years ago becomes a bit more obsolete with each newly posted update of the SRS. There was discussion on how would be operationalized placing parts of newly amended SR text from its Word or PDF format (i.e. the format acted on by the Senate) and putting that amended text into the Javascript version. Especially if it was for large sections of the SRs. E.g., if there had been a global revision to most pages of the SRs (in Word/PDF), is there a way to import those large sections of the SRs directly into the Javascript version of SRs (retaining formatting, etc. shown in the Word/PDF version acted on by the Senate).

- SR Section 4 Updates: SC is looking at updates to SR Section 4. SC has done one review ([here](#)). Previously, the proposal was to go to Senate for a first and second review (January and February), then from SC to SREC for suggestions, and then to the March Senate meeting. However, the proposer (Christine Harper) has withdrawn the proposal (for now).
- Catalog versus Bulletin Update. As per SREC decision at December meeting, Davy contacted the various 'specialty catalog' owners (e.g., College of Medicine) and has finished gathering information on what do they want the Senate Rules to call their corresponding document(s). Roger will circulate a draft position statement for SREC to review and action at the March meeting. SREC action at that time will inform the Registrar's redesign the Registrar's website (e.g., see draft mock-up [here](#)) and editorial clarifications about nomenclature for the SRs.
- Omnibus Mid-Year Rules Update: Many thanks to Sheila who is preparing / finalizing the new Rules document as per the Senate-approved updates and our edits.
- Trustee Election Update: The election [website](#) is about ready. The first announcement will go to the 5,000+ participants on Wednesday (2/8). There are no changes to the draft timeline for election ([PDF](#)) ([.docx](#)).

Brown indicated it is not known yet when the actual newly formatted Senate web page will be made live. The current ('old') version of the Senate web page about the faculty trustee election will remain 'live' through the present election. Brown reviewed the 'processes that he's doing in the background' relating to certifying eligibilities (which may involve faculty ensuring their DOE for administrative service is up to date). Brown again solicited that any SREC member interested in participating by 'watch over Brown's shoulder' in these certification activities please contact Brown.

- College Faculty Senate Elections. On Friday (2/3), Katie Silver sent each dean information about the number of senate seats that need to be filled through the college's annual election. New this year is an

earlier deadline (March 3) for colleges to complete their elections.

- Grad Council Election Proposal: Last month SREC provided input to Grad Council about its proposal to change its election and membership rules. The SREC feedback went to Grad Council, and an updated proposal is going back to SC office for routing.

New Business

- Repeat Option for Non-Equivalent Courses: There are two questions about the applicability of the repeat option (SR 5.3.2) in instances—two case types—where the initial and repeated course are not exactly the same. *One case type* is when the initial course was offered under a unit's "experimental" course prefix / number and the repeated course was taken after the course got a Senate-approved prefix / number. The *other case type* is when a course requires a "subtitle" and the subtitles for the initial and repeated courses are different.
 - Redacted description of the issue by Registrar Taylor ([PDF](#))
 - Email discussion by SREC Rules Subcommittee ([PDF](#))

SREC Discussion of First Situation:

- when the initial course was offered under a unit's "experimental" course prefix/number and the repeated course was taken after the course got a Senate-approved 'stand alone' prefix/number.

The discussion clarified that the issue here is not repeat in a 'take multiple times for a grade each time' but rather 'repeat' a second time to receive the grade of the second attempt as a replacement (for GPA, graduation requirements, etc.) of the grade of the first attempt. Suggestion was made to use in the SRs the word 'retake' for the 'take multiple times up to the limit provided for the course' vs. 'repeat' in the meaning of the case here of 'repeat option.'

SREC discerned that at this time, there is not a mechanism in Curriculog or in a Senate form that tracks when a proposal for a stand-alone course 'Y' is rooted in (and is the same content as) a former experimental shell course 'X.'" For the moment, the SREC is not addressing the question of who ascertains or how it is ascertained that the content of the stand-alone course is 'the same' as the claimed originating shell course. Rather, we are presuming for this SREC exercise that it has been properly ascertained to be the same content in both courses.

The consensus of the SREC members was that in this situation, the later 'stand alone' course --- that was the same content and arose from the original A&S 300 experimental shell --- could be used for the purposes of 'repeat option.' The SREC can draw to the attention of the SC consideration of whether to add this feature to the current new course form. The SREC decided to render the following "*" interpretation (Jones moved; Sault second).

"When it is appropriately determined that a course that started as a 'shell course' became later created as a stand-alone course, then those two courses are the same course content as far as exercise of the "repeat option."

The SREC also agreed to refer to the Senate Council the substantive question as to what entity is authorized to make the 'appropriate determination.'

The motion passed unanimously.

SREC Discussion of Second Situation:

- when a course requires a “subtitle” and the subtitles for the initial and repeated courses are different.

The SREC discussed that the SRs currently do not parse down to into the implications of subtitles for whether the content is sufficiently ‘the same’ or ‘different’ when the same course number is offered with two subtitles. The Rules Subcommittee felt that it is Senate intent that if the content of the two different subtitles is sufficiently different then the “repeat option” does not allow one subtitled content to be used as a repeat option on the second subtitled content. The SREC further discussed that the substantive question is, again, what is the authorized entity to make the determination as to whether the two contents are sufficient similar to be ‘the same course’ for repeat option purposes.

The SREC decided to render the following “*” interpretation (Jones moved; Grossman second).

“When it is appropriately determined that the content of two subtitle offerings under the same Senate course number are the same content, then those two courses are the same as far as exercise of the “repeat option.”

The SREC also agreed that a part of the motion is to refer to the Senate Council the substantive question as to what entity is authorized to make the ‘appropriate determination.’

The motion passed unanimously.

The SREC also adopted by unanimous consent to ask the Senate Council to arrange that when these two items are discussed by committee, a member of the SREC is availed to be present for that discussion.

Brown mused, with SREC concurrence, that when these two items are submitted to Senate Council, Brown will include in the rationale several options the Senate Council may entertain, such as should the determinations be made by a faculty body (or faculty body delegate) or the dean (or a dean delegate), etc.

POSSIBLE FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (information only)

Review of potential substantive edits to SRs

- See list of substantive edits ([PDF](#)) ([.docx](#))
- See A **track changes document** showing all edits ([PDF](#)) ([.docx](#))
- NOTE: The potential substantive changes in the track changes document are coded with yellow highlighting.

Clarify in SRs what (when?) is a student?

- Email with Davy 9-9-22 ([PDF](#))
- SREC needs to clarify what is a student and how does a student’s status as such change to clarify, in part, when student rights and responsibilities apply.
- Need to distinguish individual’s status (i.e., student or not) for the following circumstances:
 1. accepted to university
 2. admitted to university (e.g., person paid deposit)
 3. registered for a course (i.e., person has reserved a seat a course, but the course hasn’t started yet)
 4. enrolled in a course (Is this the same as “registered for a course”?)
 5. enrolled in a course that has started
 6. not enrolled in any course that is underway but not withdrawn from the university such as in the

summer

7. withdrawn from the university such that admission/readmission is required before being able to register for a course.
- For each of these purposes where in the SRs the Senate exercises authority to ascribe a privilege, right, responsibility, or requirement on a student, the SRs should clarify to which students and at what time the rule applies.

Clarify in the SRs what does “residence” mean?

- Nowadays, it appears that the Senate Rules glossary definition of “residence” is obsolete. What does the Senate nowadays intend for “residence” to mean? Kim has in previous discussions with DeShana and Brian (3/10/21) urged that the Senate’s definition include aspects of non-credit bearing residence, which appears increasingly timely given the current discussion of ‘badges’ and the current SC ad hoc committee to survey the University’s non-credit bearing academic landscape.

Fall 2023 Omnibus Revisions

- SR 4.2.2.2.6 – Editorial clarification, add needed section numbers. ([PDF](#)) ([.docx](#))
- SR 1.5.2.1 -- Editorial corrections. ([JPG](#))