

Senate Council  
January 12, 2015

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, January 12, 2015 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 3:02 pm

1. Minutes from December 15, 2014 and Announcements

The Chair welcomed SC members back to work, promising an extremely busy semester. He asked SC members to please review SC agendas as soon as they come out, which is typically on Thursdays. In the event that someone sees an agenda item that they think needs additional work or review, he asked they email him (and the appropriate Senate committee chair, if applicable) so as to have difficult questions answered prior to Monday at 3 pm.

The Chair announced an open forum for members of the University Senate (Senate) on January 27; he will inform senators of this later in the week via email.

Regarding the search for a new provost, the Chair said that every person nominated will be contacted and asked if they are interested in serving in that capacity; he noted the deadlines. The Chair opined that a permanent provost could be identified in February.

There were no corrections offered to the minutes from December 15. There being **no objections**, the minutes from December 15, 2014 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

2. Welcome to New Senate Council Members

The Chair welcomed the two new SC members present, Phil Kraemer (AS/Psychology) and Joan Mazur (ED/Curriculum and Instruction). He explained that Ernie Bailey (AG/Veterinary Science) was travelling. All the SC members (including the new ones) introduced themselves.

3. Old Business

a. Update from Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Disciplinary Action

The Chair asked Watt, chair of the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Disciplinary Action (CFDA) to offer an update. Watt explained that the CFDA met multiple times and as a result of deliberations, Watt wrote a 15-page draft report. The report was largely based on the faculty code from the University of California at Berkeley; he had asked for and received approval from them to use their format and language. The CFDA met to review the report and while there was some disagreement among some members regarding a few parts, on the whole the CFDA was satisfied with the report as a first draft. Both Watt and the Chair met with President Eli Capilouto, shared the report with him, and then met again.

Watt said the CFDA planned to meet again the following day to establish next steps. Watt said that when the SC reviews the report, it will require serious thought and intellectual deliberations. Watt said he thought a more final draft of the report would be ready for SC review in two or three weeks. The Chair thanked Watt for the update as well as for his hard work thus far.

b. Update from Senate's Rules and Elections Committee on Student Government Association (SGA) Suggestions for Senate Rules Section 6.3.0 ("Academic Offenses and Procedures") through Section 6.6.0 ("Honor Code") (PDF, pg 2)

The Chair invited Guest Connie Woods, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC). Wood explained that the SREC was given a written document from the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Student Government Association (SGA), which outlined specific sections of the *Senate Rules (SR)* about which the students were concerned. Wood said there were seven specific suggestions. The SREC met on December 4 and discussed all the suggestions. The SREC concurred with two of the suggestions from SGA completely. There were four suggestions that the SREC understood, but disagreed with them because the SREC deemed them to not be in

the best interests of students. The intent of the remaining suggestion was not clear to the SREC. Wood outlined the SREC's responses for each suggestion. There was discussion among SC members, including SGA President Ingram and Wood, regarding the suggestions.

Wood stated that all of the proposed edits, whether substantive or editorial, will be put into track changes and presented to the SC and Senate for approval. There was additional discussion.

When discussion wound down, the Chair thanked Wood for her and the SREC's work and said the SC would look forward to receiving the formal changes in the near future. Ingram thanked the Chair and the SREC for their work and assistance. Ingram explained that the Student Senate operates separately from him and was very concerned about certain sections of the *SR*. He did not agree with all the responses from the SREC, but thought it had been a successful experience in shared governance.

c. Update from SGA on SGA's Endorsement of *Governing Regulations XI* ("University Appeals Board")

The Chair offered a brief history of the proposed changes to *Governing Regulations XI*. He said that he recently received an email from Ingram which included language from a formal resolution. Ingram said that it was a formal resolution from the SGA's Student and Academic Affairs Committee, which was the same committee that offered the suggestions for *Senate Rules*, Section 6. The Chair said he thought the revised *GR XI* would go to the Board of Trustees in February.

4. Proposed Expansion of Committee Charge (*Senate Rules 1.4.2.1*, "Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC)")

The Chair explained that college and department rules greatly vary in currency: some have rules that have not been updated since the 1990s, and some units have no rules available for view. The Provost's office is responsible for ensuring all rules are up to date and conform to existing campus rules and regulations (*Governing Regulations (GRs)*, *Administrative Regulations (ARs)*, and *Senate Rules (SRs)*). The Provost's office asked the Chair about increased University Senate (Senate) participation in the responsibility of checking unit rules for consistency with existing campus rules and regulations, specifically with the *SRs*. The Chair said that in order to do so, it would need to be formalized; it made the most sense to expand the charge of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) to encompass that request. The Chair added that he came across a template that was supposed to make it easier for units to prepare rules; after reviewing the departmental and college rules templates, the Chair identified a number of factual errors, as well as obscure language. The Chair said he would bring the revised templates to SC to review if the SC changes the SREC's charge to include reviewing unit rules for consistency with *SRs*. He solicited a motion from SC members to put the issue on the floor for discussion. Grossman **moved** that the SC changes the charge of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee to add review of unit rules for consistency with *Senate Rules*. Christ **seconded**. The Chair said the motion was on the floor and invited discussion.

SC members discussed the request that the Senate, likely the SREC, review unit rules for consistency with existing campus rules and regulations. Wood also participated. The Chair reminded SC members about the importance of units having up-to-date rules and offered some comments about how the process could work. He added that a member of the SREC has traditionally offered such assistance in the past unofficially. If the SREC's charge was changed such assistance would be on behalf of the Senate, not on an individual basis. There were two primary objections to changing the charge of the SREC. First, the Provost's office has had a staff member on payroll to review unit rules for consistency with existing campus rules and regulations. Also, the phrase "shall review" did not specify how often unit rules would have to be reviewed and it could be a paperwork burden.

Christ **moved** to substitute the sentence below for the proposed language in the agenda.

The SREC shall be available to assist the Provost, colleges and departments on questions of consistency of college and department rules with the *Senate Rules*.

Mazur **seconded**. There were a number of additional comments from SC members. Because the SREC has a duty and an obligation to serve faculty on behalf of the Senate, discussion then moved to removing reference to the

Provost. There were still concerns that “available to assist” was too vague. A **vote** was taken on the **motion** to substitute and the motion **passed** with five in favor and two abstaining. The Chair said that discussion could continue, now on the newly proposed sentence. SC members continued to express concern about the workload and possible misinterpretations of the substitute sentence. There was some support for having something formal to offer support to the faculty who develop the rules, but the overriding sentiment was that this responsibility of the provost should remain the provost’s responsibility with no formal assistance from Senate.

When there was no further discussion, the Chair called for a **vote** on the **motion**. The motion **failed**, with none in favor and seven opposed.

#### 5. Proposed Revision to Senate Rules 5.4.5.C.b.i ("Diplomas," "In Memoriam Posthumous Degrees")

The Chair described the process based on the revised language. If a student dies in the midst of pursuing a degree, the department chair is made aware of this and in turns reports this up to the dean. The dean then makes a request for an *In Memoriam* Posthumous Degrees to the Senate Council office, typically via an email. The Senate Council office will then check with the Registrar and the Dean of Students to ensure the student is in degree-seeking status and in good academic standing. If so, the deceased student’s name will be placed on an *In Memoriam* Posthumous Degrees list, much like any other student’s name being placed on a degree list. The Chair said that like other degree lists, an *In Memoriam* Posthumous Degree list would need approval and recommendation from the Senate. The proposed changes will make the steps clearer.

The Chair said that one of three scenarios seemed likely: everyone agrees and votes to approve; someone does not like a certain part of the language because it does not reflect the intent of the original language (substantive objection); or someone agrees with the philosophical nature of the language but think it could be better articulated (clerical edits). He suggested a motion to approve the proposed language. Grossman **moved** thusly and Porter **seconded**.

The SC discussed the proposed changes to the language. The primary concern among SC members was changing the responsibility for checking on the student with the Registrar and Dean of Students from the college dean to the Senate Council office. Brown **moved** to substitute the language below (in *SR 5.4.5.C.b.i*) for the proposed language in the agenda.

i. Upon being made aware of the deceased student by either the family or chair of the student’s home department, the Dean’s Office of the student’s college shall consult with the student’s degree program, ~~and the Dean of Students Office,~~ the Senate Council office, and the Office of the Registrar to review the student’s academic and disciplinary record, to confirm that at the time of death:

1. The student was in a UK degree-seeking status, and
2. The student was in good academic standing.

McCormick **seconded**. There was support for that. Another concern among SC members was the lack of SC approval or disapproval rights over granting an *In Memoriam* Posthumous Degree – the SC’s only role, as with other degree lists, would be to place the list on a Senate agenda. Wood recommended that the proposed edits be vetted by Legal Counsel prior to Senate review.

The Chair commented that there seemed to be general support for the idea of the dean’s office being responsible for consulting with the Senate Council office, Registrar and Dean of Students. He asked SC members to take a vote on substituting that language for the proposed language in the agenda. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair said that the next item of business would be to identify any wording issues that would improve the passage. Grossman identified five non-substantive edits and **moved** to make those changes. Christ **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Christ **moved** to approve the proposed language, as outlined below.

**C. In Memoriam Posthumous Degrees [US: 2/10/2014]**

**1. Purpose.** Pursuant to Senate Rule 5.4.5.A, the University of Kentucky Senate seeks to provide to the families of deceased students who had not completed requirements for a degree with a meaningful acknowledgment of the achievements and legacy of the student and, at the same time, uphold academic and institutional integrity. To meet these goals, the University Senate recommends that the UK Board of Trustees establish a new category and title of Honorary Degree, *In Memoriam* Posthumous Degree (hereafter *In Memoriam* degree), to be conferred upon final action by the Board of Trustees.

**2. Conditions for Conferral of *In Memoriam* ~~Posthumous~~ Degrees**

**a. Eligibility.** An *In Memoriam* ~~Posthumous~~ Degree allows for recognition of a student's connection to the University of Kentucky regardless of their progress toward completion of degree requirements. Undergraduate, graduate, and professional students who were registered in a degree program at the time of their death, but did not complete degree requirements, are eligible for an *In Memoriam* ~~Posthumous~~ Degree.

**b. Procedures.** A proposal for conferral of an *In Memoriam* ~~Posthumous~~ Degree shall be initiated and processed as follows:

i. Upon being made aware of the deceased student by either the family or chair of the student's home department, the Dean's Office of the student's college shall consult with the student's degree program, ~~and the Dean of Students Office, the Senate Council office, and the~~ Office of the Registrar to review the student's academic and disciplinary record; to confirm that at the time of death:

1. The student was in a UK degree-seeking status, and
2. The student was in good academic standing.

ii. The Dean's office shall forward the request for an *In Memoriam* ~~Posthumous~~ Degree to the Office of the University Registrar ~~and to the University Senate~~. The University Registrar shall process the request and place the deceased student's name on an *In Memoriam* degree list for Senate action.

iii. ~~If approved, in the likely event that~~ the elected Faculty Senators approve the recommendation of each *In Memoriam* degree along with other degrees, the Senate Council office shall forward the recommendation ~~the request by the degree list process.~~ to the University President for transmittal to the Board of Trustees for final action. The elected Faculty Senators may vote to disapprove forwarding the recommendation. In the such rare event cases that the

elected Faculty Senators do not approve the recommendation of an *In Memoriam* degree candidate, the elected Faculty Senators will provide, through the Senate Council, a written justification of the disapproval to the President (Chair of the Senate).

iv. Upon final approval by the Board of Trustees, the ~~Office of~~ University Registrar shall prepare an *In Memoriam Posthumous* degree diploma for the student's family. The diploma document for this honorary degree title will be structured the same as for other honorary degrees (SR 5.4.5.B).

Porter **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. Solicitation of Expansion of Honorary Degree Titles - *Senate Rules 5.4.2.3.D* ("Titles of Honorary Degrees")

The Chair explained that certain honorary degrees titles are explicitly mentioned in the *SR* as being available to the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees (UJCHD) to recommend for UK's honorary degree candidates. The chair of the UJCHD requested additional honorary degree titles be added to the list in the *SR* to give the UJCHD more flexibility in identifying a honorary degree title that is appropriate for an honorary degree candidate. There were no objections from the SC when the Chair suggested he ask the UJCHD to come up with a proposal for the SC to consider.

7. Proposed Revision to Governing Regulations - *Governing Regulations X* ("Employment") and *Governing Regulations XIV* ("Ethical Principles and Code of Conduct")

The Chair asked Guest Marcy Deaton, associate legal counsel, to explain the proposed changes to the regulations since they were last seen by the Senate. Deaton did so, explaining that the terms "University employment" and "University operations" were chosen because those terms were broadly inclusive. SC members discussed the revised language. Brown **moved** to endorse the proposed changes to *Governing Regulations X* and *Governing Regulations XIV* as presented and McCormick **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

8. Request for Senate Input into Advising Initiatives - Assistant Provost for Undergraduate Education Karen Badger

Guests Karen Badger (assistant provost for undergraduate education) and Ben Withers (associate provost for undergraduate education) talked to the SC about a recent initiative on advising, which came about as a result of deans' proposal to address UK's retention efforts and graduation rates. Badger spoke about the current effort to transform undergraduate advising and Withers offered background information about precedence for keeping the Senate involved in advising discussions.

The Chair then solicited a motion to charge the Senate's Academic Advising Committee with reporting on recommendations for advising standards, in light of the deans' document, and reviewing effectiveness and accountability of academic advising throughout the University. Brown **moved** thusly and Mazur **seconded**. After some additional brief discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to charge the Senate's Academic Advising Committee with reporting on recommendations for advising standards, in light of the deans' document, and reviewing effectiveness and accountability of academic advising throughout the University. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

There being no further business to attend to, Grossman **moved** to adjourn and Mazur **seconded**. The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Hippisley,  
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Brown, Christ, Grossman, Hippisley, Ingram, Kraemer, Mazur, McCormick, Porter, Watt, and Wilson.

Invited guests present: Karen Badger, Marcy Deaton, Ben Withers, and Connie Wood.