Senate Council
August 18, 2014

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, August 18, 2014 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 Andrew Hippisley called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:07 pm.

1. <u>Minutes from April 21, April 22, April 28, May 12, and June 11, 2014 and Announcements</u>
The Chair reported that no corrections were received for the minutes from April 22, May 12, and June 11. Editorial corrections were received for the April 21 and April 28 minutes, which were circulated to SC members via email earlier that morning.

Anderson **moved** to approve the April 21, April 22, April 28, May 12, and June 11, 2014 and Pienkowski **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair had a variety of announcements for SC members.

- Past Chair Blonder approved inclusion of graduate student on May 2014 degree list due to administrative error.

- Past Chair Blonder offered provisional approval for program changes made necessary by the implementation of the new Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement.

- Past Chair Blonder offered provisional approval for the May 22 transmittal, which included courses and program changes.

- The Chair approved a non-standard calendar for EDP 670-020. At his request, Ms. Brothers solicited a formal request for a permanent non-standard calendar, which should come before SC in the fall.

- The Office of the Senate Council will no longer provide handouts for SC meetings, but a hard copy, one-page handout of the agenda will be available during the meeting. The agenda and previous meeting's minutes will be mailed out on Thursday so SC members have time to prepare prior to the SC meeting. Revisions to minutes will be emailed Monday morning.

- A photographer from Public Relations could be asked to take a group picture of SC members. Those present were amenable to the suggestion and Ms. Brothers said she would arrange for the picture to be taken during a SC meeting in the relatively near future, as well as alert SC members to the time/date ahead of time.

- The Chair met with Provost Christine Riordan recently and brought up the issues with the draft 2014-2020 Strategic Plan that SC identified during the June retreat. Specifically, the Chair said that as per the *Governing Regulations*, faculty are charged with determining educational policy and it would have been appropriate for the University Senate ~~had been~~<u>to be</u> part of the strategic planning process. The Provost suggested giving the draft 2014-2020 Strategic Plan to relevant Senate committees in mid-September for input. The Chair also discussed the SC's intent to nominate members of Senate committees, when appropriate, for various ad hoc committee compositions, which the Provost liked. The Chair said the Provost has asked deans to keep her in the loop about possible new programs and she will share such information with the Chair. The Chair now receives the Provost's weekly communication to deans so he is aware of those things. Finally, the Provost emailed colleges who were delinquent in sending in results from their Senate elections; the Provost and the Chair received immediate responses from those deans and most elections are now underway.

There was a request that the Chair convey to the Provost that some units and colleges did not have up-to-date versions of faculty rules posted on the Senate's web site. The Chair agreed to mention that to the Provost during their next meeting and added that he meets monthly with the Provost.

- The Chair also meets monthly with President Eli Capilouto. The Chair said the President made it clear he is eager to know the concerns of faculty. The Chair mentioned that many faculty do not understand why more use is not made of faculty who are experts in their field. The Chair reported that the President seemed interested in such use and will think about the logistics involved. There were a few comments from SC members. Regarding the SC meeting with the President, the Chair said that the suggestion was again well received; the President prefers meeting when ~~there are~~ SC finds sufficient items to discuss, rather than setting a specific time now. Anderson mentioned that it would be meaningful if the President also comes to SC if ~~there is~~he finds something the SC can help with. The Chair will convey this to the President at their next meeting.

- The Chair meets every two weeks with the President's Chief of Staff, Bill Swinford. The Chair related that those discussions are also helpful.

- The Chair reported on his recent attendance at the Executive Committee meeting of the Board of Trustees (Board), when the evaluation of the President was on the agenda. He reported his presentation of the results of the SC's survey of faculty and noted that the SC's evaluation differed from the Board's evaluation, which included survey responses from about 28 individuals. He discussed the Executive Committee's use of a "smooth" average in which the two highest and two lowest scores were removed from the President's evaluation. Former SC vice chair Connie Wood (AS/Statistics) also attended and at the request of Executive Committee Chair E. Britt Brockman, MD, she explained that removing outliers was appropriate in cases of experimental design flaws, but that removing the two highest and lowest scores in this particular situation was not appropriate. The Chair added that some of the faculty evaluation comments correctly reflected reality (e.g. clear references in the survey to ongoing campus infrastructure projects), which could be seen as external validation of the faculty's survey results. The Chair reported that he suggested to the Board that the questions that touch on UK's missions of undergraduate teaching, graduate teaching and research bear careful scrutiny as these are components of UK's mission. Faculty were largely supportive of recent efforts to improve undergraduate education, but results were broadly negative regarding questions about graduate education and research.

  Vice Chair Christ, who also attended the meeting, commented on the striking ~~correspondency~~ correspondence between Board survey respondents and faculty survey respondents – there were a number of issues on which both groups expressed similar sentiments: agreement on improvements to campus infrastructure, but concerns about loss of historical buildings; some agreement on the positive results of outsourcing activities (residential housing partnership and campus dining services), but concerns about long-term effects on campus; and finally concerns about transparency and lack of inclusivity and diversity in decision making. Christ added that this year the Board's review was relatively minor in terms of number of survey respondents, although the review next year [for 2014-15] will involve many more individuals. Christ said that some trustees expressed interest in additional demographic information about the respondents to the faculty survey of the President; she suggested that additional questions be part of the faculty's survey the next time it is distributed.

- The Chair will have about three minutes during new faculty orientation to talk to new faculty. McCormick suggested increased interaction with college faculty councils as part of encouraging broader participation in the Senate. The Chair suggested that if he met with a college's faculty council, he could also bring along one of that college's senators.

- The Chair and Vice Chair will attend the Provost's Leadership Retreat on August 25 and will have 45 minutes to talk with attendees.

- Due to a scheduling complication, the Board will meet prior to the Senate in September. It is not feasible for the Senate to approve the (second) August degree list after the Board meets. Therefore, the degree list will be emailed to senators as usual, but the exercise will take place the week prior to the SC meeting on August 25. That will allow senators the opportunity to review the list and identify students who should be added. The SC will then approve the list on behalf of the Senate on August 25. There were no objections from SC members.

- The last announcement pertained to the SC listserv. The Chair suggested a change so that hitting "reply" will reply only to the sender instead of replying to the entire listserv. There were no objections.

2. <u>Provisional Approval of Courses and Program Changes</u>
The Chair explained that sometimes a course proposal or program change is submitted but does not arrive in the Senate Council office until after the deadline for the last web transmittal of the year. The Chair explained that the recommended motion was for the SC to delegate authority to the SC Chair to approve such proposals on a provisional basis:

> Recommendation: that the SC move that for the 2014-15 academic year, if a course proposal or program change approval situation is so urgent that it cannot await approval by an academic council and/or the 10-day web transmittal posting, but it has received all necessary department and/or college faculty approvals, then the SC Chair may provisionally approve the course proposals and program changes for a single initial semester so long as the Chair reports that action to the SC and University Senate at the next possible meeting. The course cannot be taught again, nor can the program change be considered final, until the proposals finish the remaining post-college approval steps, nor may the Chair render a second provisional approval for the same item(s).

Although most proposals have at least been reviewed by one of the Senate's academic councils, there were rare exceptions when a proposal has not been reviewed by an academic council. The Chair said the recommended motion includes a sunset clause so that the SC will revisit the issue again next year.

There was discussion among SC members about the recommendation. Brown **moved** that for the 2014-15 academic year, if a course proposal or program change approval situation is so urgent that it cannot await approval by an academic council and/or the 10-day web transmittal posting, but it has received all necessary department and/or college faculty approvals, then the SC Chair may provisionally approve the course proposals and program changes for a single initial semester so long as the Chair reports that action to the SC and University Senate at the next possible meeting. The course cannot be taught again, nor can the program change be considered final, until the proposals finish the remaining post-college approval steps, nor may the Chair render a second provisional approval for the same item(s). Anderson **seconded**. Grossman offered a **friendly amendment** to strike "by an academic council and/or" and replace with "via" and add "and the approval of at least one academic council" after "college faculty approvals." Both Brown and Anderson **accepted**.

A **vote** was taken on the **motion** that for the 2014-15 academic year, if a course proposal or program change approval situation is so urgent that it cannot await approval via the 10-day web transmittal posting, but it has received all necessary department and/or college faculty approvals and the approval of at least one academic council, then the SC Chair may provisionally approve the course proposals and program changes for a single initial semester so long as the Chair reports that action to the SC and University Senate at the next possible meeting. The course cannot be taught again, nor can the program change be considered final, until the proposals finish the remaining post-college approval steps, nor may the Chair render a second provisional approval for the same item(s). The motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. <u>Appointment of Senate Parliamentarian for 2014-2015</u>

Christ **moved** that the SC appoint J. S. Butler to serve as the University Senate's parliamentarian for the 2014-15 year. Anderson **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Naming of Subset of SC for Reinstatement Committee
The Chair said that he had some suggested names for the subset of the SC to serve as the Reinstatement Committee, but said he was willing to take self-nominations from the floor. There being none, the Chair recommended that he, Vice Chair Christ, and Student Government Association President Jake Ingram serve as the Reinstatement Committee for 2014-15. There being **no objection**, the subset of Hippisley, Christ, and Ingram was approved by **unanimous consent**.

5. Proposed Change to 2014-15 Calendar - Last Day for Thesis/Dissertation Acceptance by Graduate School
The Chair asked Guest Cleo Price (assistant dean in the Graduate School) to explain the change, which he did. There were a few questions from SC members, which Price answered to their satisfaction.

There being **no objections**, by **unanimous consent** the SC approved the addition of December 15 (as the last day for candidate for a December 2014 degree to submit their thesis/dissertation for format review) to the 2014-15 calendar as well as the change to text associated with December 19, so that December 19 is described as the "Last day for candidates for the December 2014 degree to have thesis/dissertation accepted by the Graduate School."

6. Proposed Changes to *Governing Regulations XI* ("University Appeals Board")
The Chair explained the background to the changes in *Governing Regulations XI* ("University Appeals Board"), including the Senate's endorsement in May 2014 of another related change, which ultimately did not receive universal support from all affected parties. He offered additional details and added that there was a misplaced comma, which had already been reported to Associate Legal Counsel Marcy Deaton. Guest Deaton was present to answer questions, of which there were a few.

Grossman **moved** that the SC recommend the Senate reconsider the May 2014 motion regarding the then-proposed changes to *Governing Regulations XI* ("University Appeals Board") and replace that previous motion with the day's motion to endorse the proposed changes in Section G of the *Governing Regulations XI* ("University Appeals Board") and forward them to the Board. Pienkowski **seconded**.

Proposed change (Section G "Disposition of Authority")[1]:

> G. Disposition of Cases – Authority
> ~~The authority of the UAB over the disposition of academic cases is provided in the University Senate Rules for academic cases and in the Code of Student Conduct for non-academic cases. Decisions of the UAB are final.~~
>
> <u>The University Appeals Board has authority to decide both academic and non-academic cases. With respect to the UAB's resolution of academic cases arising under either its original or appellate jurisdiction, the UAB operates within University Senate Rules that define academic offenses, create a range of sanctions to be imposed upon a finding of guilt, and establish the standard of proof subject, only to the limitations imposed by the Constitutions and statutes. With respect to non-academic cases, the range of sanctions and standard of proof are set out in the Code of Student Conduct. The decisions of the UAB are final.</u>

There being no additional discussion or objection, the motion was **approved** by **unanimous consent**.

7. SC Discussion Regarding Electronic Voting Records
The Chair led SC members in a discussion on how the voting records of the Senate should be documented and presented three possibilities: 1. retain the voting records on the Senate Council office's local server and share upon

---

[1] Underlining denotes added text and strike-through denotes deleted text.

request; 2. incorporate the voting records into each set of Senate minutes; or 3. post the voting records online with the meeting agenda. It was agreed that retaining the records on the local server and sharing them upon request would be the best practice.

8. <u>Electronic Voting Demonstration (Time Permitting)</u>
The Chair and Ms. Brothers demonstrated how electronic voting in the Senate would work. SC members had a variety of comments and questions. There were no problems with the demonstration.

9. <u>AAW Report - Definitions (Time Permitting)</u>
The Chair explained that a working group from a few years ago presented definitions for various academic terms; the Chair suggested sending the definitions to the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) for further review and possible Senate action. Ms. Brothers added additional information about the work group's charge and activities.

There were no objections to sending the academic definitions to the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) with a charge to review the definitions, edit them as appropriate (including deleting and adding terms), and present them to the Senate Council no later than December 1, 2014.

There being no further business to attend to, the meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Hippisley,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Blonder, Brown, Christ, Pienkowski, Grossman, Hippisley, McCormick, and Porter.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, August 21, 2014.