

Senate Council
January 11, 2016

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, January 11, 2016 in the Lexmark Public Room, 209 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 3:01 pm.

1. Minutes from December 7, 2015 and Announcements

The Chair reported a handful of editorial revisions. There being **no objections**, the minutes from December 7, 2015 were **approved** as amended by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair welcomed the new SC members, Lee Blonder, Margaret Schroeder, and Connie Wood.

There was a meeting just prior to the winter break in which Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Ben Withers, Honors Program Director Diane Snow, the Chair, and chairs of various University Senate (Senate) committees (Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee, Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC), Senate's Academic Programs Committee; and Senate's Rules and Elections Committee) met to discuss implications of the proposed new honors college, specifically if changes to the *Senate Rules, Administrative Regulations, and Governing Regulations* would be necessary, as well as some basic faculty governance discussions. The Chair said that his main takeaway was the suggestion from Bailey (SAOSC chair) that because potentially all colleges and faculty will be impacted by a new college, each college's faculty council should be asked to offer an opinion on a proposal for an honors college. There was brief discussion about the timeline for approval as laid out in the donor's contract, as well as the memberships of the Advisory Committee and the internal faculty review committee for the proposal.

2. Old Business

a. Review of Senate Committee Structure

The Chair explained the activities of the Senate's subcommittees since the discussion about Senate's committee structure during the June 2015 retreat. The Chair opined that many committees were working on various charges or reviewing proposals, although there were a few that appeared to be largely inactive. He noted that Senate's Advisory Committee on Disability Accommodation and Compliance (SACDAC) was a relatively new committee. SC members discussed the viability and necessity of some of the Senate committees; Porter asserted that the committees with administrative-type charges were already subsumed by UK's administrative offices. There was support for combining a couple of the committees.

There were no objections to the suggestion that SC address the issue again during its 2016 summer retreat.

3. Committee Nominees

a. UK Core (Community, Culture and Citizenship in the USA)

The Chair presented SC members with a list of nine nominees from six different colleges. After brief discussion, SC settled on a first choice and second choice. Mazur **moved** to approve both individuals and Brown **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Proposed Spring Commencement Date Changes to University Calendar (2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19)

The Chair explained that the Commencement date for May 2017, May 2018, and May 2019 needed to change from Saturday to Sunday, as the originally scheduled Saturdays all fell on Derby Day.

Grossman **moved** to approve the changes to the three University calendars (2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19) and Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) - Scott Yost, Chair

i. Proposed Changes to College of Dentistry "Academic Discipline Policies" and "Miscellaneous Academic Policies"

Guest Scott Yost, chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), explained the proposed changes to the College of Dentistry's Academic Discipline Policies and Miscellaneous Academic Policies. There were a few acronym changes that he said were not in the current version but he would send the proposal with those revisions shortly. Yost added that the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) previously reviewed the changes and identified which policies needed to be approved by Senate; many of the policies are embedded in the *Senate Rules*. There was brief discussion which included Guest Richard Mitchell (DE/Oral Health Practice).

The Chair said that the **motion** was that the SC approve the proposed Dentistry policy changes codified in *Senate Rules 5.3.3.4* and *5.3.4.1*. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed Changes to Admissions Requirements for BS Dietetics

iii. Proposed Changes to Admission Requirements for BS Human Nutrition

Yost and SC members discussed the BS Dietetics and BS Human Nutrition in tandem.

Yost explained that the proposal was reactionary, due to changes in the Department of Biology. The course BIO 152 was required for the BS dietetics as well as for the BS Human Nutrition, but the Department of Biology changed its course offerings to require BIO 148 as a prerequisite for BIO 152. That was not an issue for the BS Human Nutrition, but it was for the BS Dietetics. The solution was to require BIO 148 for both programs. Part of the confusion regarding these two changes stemmed from each program having both pre-major requirements as well as admissions requirements. Guest Sandra Bastin (AG/Dietetics and Human Nutrition) offered a few comments about the proposals.

The Chair said that the **motion** was that the SC approve the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 4.2.2.4.A.2*. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There was no discussion so a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iv. Standard of Evidence in Academic Offenses

Yost explained that Ombud Michael Healy had asked SC to review the standard of proof for academic offenses. He said the SAASC settled on using "preponderance of evidence" as the standard, although the SAASC can revisit the standard of proof to match that of an implemented faculty disciplinary action policy. SC members and Yost discussed the proposed change; many SC members were concerned that the preponderance of evidence (51%) suggested by SAASC was more detrimental to students than another option, "clear and convincing" (80%) evidence. Yost confirmed that currently there is no standard in the *SR*. After discussion, Wood **moved** to return the proposal to the SAASC so the SAASC can review what standard of proof UK's benchmarks have, as well as to get input from Legal Counsel and

students. The Chair clarified that student input could be accomplished through asking the SC's student representatives to take a revised proposal to the Student Government Association for input.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. Title IX Language - Addition to Syllabus Template/Guidelines

The Chair explained that there was a request to add Title IX information as an optional section to UK's boilerplate syllabus, which would give specific resource information to students. Guest Pearl James (AS/English) was present to explain the proposal and was accompanied by Diane Follingstad (ME/Psychiatry, director of the Center for Research on Violence Against Women), Claire Renzetti (AS/Sociology, chair, endowed faculty member in the Center for Research on Violence Against Women), and Leon Sachs (AS/Modern and Classical Languages, Literatures and Cultures, senator), who requested the issue be presented to SC.

James and Follingstad explained that the submitted language included an overall statement on antidiscrimination, as well as specific information about sexual assault. The purpose for requesting its addition to the syllabus template was twofold: one-quarter to one-third of students do not have accurate information about confidential reporting and accommodations; and many faculty (including teaching assistants (TAs), research assistants (RAs), and graduate assistants (GAs)) are not aware that they are *de facto* mandated reporters. James added that assaulted students drop out at exceptionally high rates so having information about available resources would be beneficial to a student's overall well-being, as well as to their academic progress.

SC members engaged in a lively discussion with James, with comments from Follingstad, Renzetti, and Sachs. The majority of SC members were supportive of the intent behind the paragraph, but had a number of suggestions.

- Instead of directing students to the *Administrative Regulation* on sexual assault, the paragraph should contain hotlinks to the Violence Intervention and Prevention Center, Counseling Center; and University Health Services.
- As currently written, it could be confusing to have language about what to report to UK's Institutional Equity and Equal Opportunity Office and what should be reported elsewhere. The mandated reporting information should be separated from the basic discrimination statement.
- Check if other universities have similar phrasing, to see what has worked elsewhere.
- Briefly explain what type of academic accommodation a student could request.

Schroeder said that she had done some wordsmithing with the language and would send her final version to James and others. James said she would take this feedback and return with a version that incorporates the suggestions.

7. Senate Meeting Roundtable (Time Permitting)

The Chair asked SC members for their perceptions of the December 14 Senate meeting. Below are individual and representative comments from the discussion.

Senate Council
January 11, 2016

- When Provost Tim Tracy and President Eli Capilouto have addressed the University Senate (Senate) recently, they appeared to dance around the issues and not really address questions. Given the new governor and fiscal constraints, there is plenty for faculty and leadership to discuss. It was odd that there was no mention of implementation issues regarding the 2016-2020 Strategic Plan.
- There are substantive issues that repeatedly come up when the President and Provost are in attendance, but it appears that UK is not really making any progress. Many valuable faculty are leaving but it takes an act of God to refill those positions. Teaching assistant stipends are abysmal and have not changed in 20 years. When that issue was raised in Senate with the Provost, the Provost said to talk to deans – it just goes back and forth. Academic excellence is substantively related to resources, but there is no forum to really discuss that. The President just talks through speeches without conversing at all.
- When the Provost and President come to Senate, SC should be better prepared with questions and talking points. The current culture is that President Capilouto and Provost Tracy talk at faculty, not with faculty.
- It is hard to create a dialogue when a presentation is not submitted in advance to senators, but rather is first seen at the moment of presentation.
- The Provost's speech was identical to what was in UKNow.
- Discussions about the creation of a proposed new honors college are constrained by the perceived script that the Provost and President talk from.
- Canned speeches and cheerleader-type speeches are not helpful. The phrase about how valuable faculty are is wearing thin. In the future, prepared remarks from the President and Provost should be strictly limited, with sufficient time available for questions from senators.
- The recent spike in the need for Senate to rescind degrees warrants better documentation, such as a copy of the degree application and transcript.

Given the time, the Chair said that agenda item number eight ("Chairs in Senate, from Retreat Discussions in 2014 and 2015") would be taken up at the next meeting.

Schroeder **moved** to adjourn and Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The SC meeting was adjourned at 5:08 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Hippisley,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Blonder, Brown, Grossman, Hippisley, Mazur, Porter, Schroeder, Wilson, and Wood.

Invited guests present: Sandra Bastin, Diane Follingstad, Pearl James, Claire Renzetti, Leon Sachs, and Scott Yost.

Senate Council
January 11, 2016

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Friday, January 15, 2016.