

Senate Council
February 4, 2014

The Senate Council met irregularly on Tuesday, February 4, 2014 at 1 pm in 359 Student Center. (The Senate Council was scheduled to meet at 3 pm on Monday, February 3, but the University of Kentucky was officially closed that day due to winter weather. The SC meeting regularly scheduled for February 3 was therefore rescheduled to Tuesday, February 4.) Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Lee X. Blonder called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 1:14 pm. She thanked all those present for coming on such short notice.

1. Minutes from January 13, 2014 and Announcements

The Chair said that no corrections had been received. Therefore, the minutes from January 13 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**. The Chair reminded SC members about the webinar at 2 pm on Thursday, February 6, on faculty governance. She added that she also invited Senate committee chairs to attend.

The Chair sent out draft charges for the ad hoc Committee on Teacher-Course Evaluations; she said that she had not received any responses so she assumed SC members thought the charges were fine. There were no objections. She suggested giving the committee a deadline for its report. There was discussion about an appropriate deadline. Because a new form could not be used prior to fall 2015, there were no objections to a September 15 deadline.

2. Calendar Change - 2014-2015 College of Dentistry Calendar

The Chair asked Guest Marlana Prater Lowe (Curriculum Coordinator, College of Dentistry) to explain the proposed changes, and Prater Lowe did so. Watt **moved** approval of the proposed changes to the 2014-2015 College of Dentistry Calendar and Harling **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Senate Rules 5.1.8.5.A.3 - "Two-Year Window" Waiver Process

The Chair explained that the two-year waiver process for retroactive withdrawal appeals (RWAs) came to her attention when an associate dean emailed her a few weeks ago, asking for a waiver of *Senate Rules 5.1.8.5.A.3*. She invited Tom Nieman (AG/Landscape Architecture), chair of the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee (SRWAC), to attend the day's meeting, also because he was involved in the email communications. After some research, Davy Jones, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, determined that the SC provisionally approved in 2009 a waiver process that involved the SC chair and SRWAC as a whole waiving the two-year rule; a form was created and had been in use ever since. The Chair asked the SC to discuss the matter and the possibility of changing the *Senate Rules* so that SRWAC can on a permanent basis waive the *SR* requirement that RWAs be submitted within two-years of the last day of the semester for which the RWA is requested. She asked Nieman to offer his and the committee's perspective on the current process.

Nieman said that SRWAC had been operating under the guidelines of the provisional approval since fall 2009. The committee had been under the impression that they were operating legally. The waiver process has worked quite well; SRWAC uses the criteria for RWAs to determine whether or not to approve waivers. He suggested that SRWAC was the best forum for determining waivers, in large part due to the committee's experience with them and with the RWA process. The membership includes ex

officio non-voting individuals from the Disability Resource Center, the Counseling Center, etc., who serve as resources and sources of information about their respective areas and their years of experience in student affairs. Students often put together their RWA paperwork and documentation at the same time that they submit their waiver request. If SRWAC approves a waiver, the committee can then move directly to the RWA. If the waiver is denied, then the process stops there. Nieman said that he and SRWAC regularly work with staff in the Office of the Senate Council and the process works well. If the authority returns to the SC, he asked SC members to keep in mind that it would involve another hoop for students to go through. He added that members of SRWAC were better suited in terms of experience and knowledge to make decisions on waivers.

McCormick **moved** to ask the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee to draft language giving the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee the authority to be responsible for waivers of the two-year rule and decide where to place the language in the *Senate Rules* and then return the language to the SC for further discussion. Watt **seconded**. Hippisley wondered if such authority could be granted, given language in *SR I.I.O.C*, which clearly outlines the entities that are authorized to waive *SR*. Wood said that the language could allow the SC to delegate its authority to SRWAC and then report back on it to the SC. She said the important issue was the reporting situation and that waivers should be reported to the SC and Senate. Nieman clarified that the number of waivers was reported to the Senate during the annual report on SRWAC's activities. There was extensive discussion regarding the two-year rule and a waiver process.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with one opposed. The Chair suggested SC members also consider moving a motion to allow SRWAC to continue to approve/deny waivers until final language is approved. Harling **moved** to continue provisional approval of the September 2009 process so the SRWAC will continue to approve or deny waivers of the two-year rule until a final decision is reached. Pienkowski **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Student Requests to Waive *Senate Rules* 5.1.8.5.A.3

The Chair stated the Senate Council Office had not received any petitions from students requesting a waiver of the two-year rule for the day's SC meeting. Furthermore, because the authority for waivers was now provisionally with SRWAC, agenda item four ("Student Requests to Waive *Senate Rules* 5.1.8.5.A.3") was no longer relevant; there were no objections to moving to agenda item five.

5. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) - Andrew Hippisley, Chair

i. Proposed New University Scholars Program: BA/BS Philosophy and MA Philosophy

Hippisley, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee, explained the proposal for a new University Scholars Program for a BA/BS in Philosophy and MA in Philosophy. There were a handful of questions from SC members. After brief discussion, Guest Brandon Look (AS/Philosophy) agreed to have the sentence regarding prerequisites removed from the proposal. Due to timing concerns, Ms. Brothers volunteered to make the change for Look instead of requesting receipt of a revised proposal.

Harling **moved** that the SC send with a positive recommendation to the University Senate the establishment of a new University Scholars Program for a BA/BS in Philosophy and Master of Arts in Philosophy, in the Department of Philosophy within the College of Arts and Sciences. McCormick **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed New Undergraduate Certificate in Health Communication

Hippisley explained the proposal for a new Undergraduate Certificate in Health Communication. Some SC members expressed concern about the co-curricular components, which were required but could not be posted on the transcript because the co-curricular component was not credit bearing. After discussion, Guest Don Helme agreed that the co-curricular requirements could be embedded into one of the required courses. Ms. Brothers offered to make the wording changes to the paragraph in the proposal about co-curricular aspects and Helme agreed.

Harling **moved** approve the establishment of a new Undergraduate Certificate in Health Communication, in the Department of Communication, within the College of Communication and Information. Brown **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Tentative Senate Agenda for February 10, 2014

SC members discussed the tentative Senate agenda for February 10. The parliamentary and vice chair reports were removed from the agenda because there were no such reports to give.

Pienkowski **moved** to approve the tentative Senate agenda for February 10, 2014 as an ordered list, with the understanding that items may be rearranged to accommodate guests' schedules. Harling **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

There being no further business to attend to, Hippisley **moved** to adjourn and McCormick **seconded**. The motion passed by unanimous consent and the meeting was adjourned at 2:14 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Lee X. Blonder,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Brown, Blonder, Hippisley, Harling, McCormick, Pienkowski, Watt and Wood.

Invited guests present: Don Helme, Brandon Look, Marlana Prater Lowe and Tom Nieman.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, February 13, 2014.