

Senate Council
March 27, 2017

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, March 27, 2017 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 Katherine M. McCormick called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:00 pm.

1. Minutes from March 6 and March 13 and Announcements

The Chair said there were no changes submitted for either set of minutes. There being **no objections**, the minutes from March 6, 2017 and March 13, 2017 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

There were a few announcements.

- The Washington Post recently did an article on collegiate athletics and coaches' salaries. In response, Provost Tim Tracy and a couple other individuals authored a response via an editorial that was sent to the Washington Post, Louisville Courier-Journal, and Lexington Herald-Leader.
- The Student Government Association (SGA) is holding an open forum for students. Mills opined that it was likely the SGA's annual solicitation of student feedback.

2. Old Business

a. Discussion on Voluntary and Involuntary Leaves of Absence – Interim Dean of Students Nick Kehrwald

The Chair introduced Guest Nick Kehrwald, interim dean of students, and Guest Marcy Deaton, associate legal counsel. Kehrwald handed out three files to SC members: a draft version of an *Administrative Regulation* to codify the Community of Concern and involuntary medical withdrawals; comparison of the rules regarding permissive withdrawals, voluntary medical withdrawals, and retroactive withdrawals; and a draft version of *Senate Rules* language regarding a new addition for voluntary medical leave. The Chair explained that the purpose of his visit with SC was to receive feedback.

There was extensive discussion. SC members expressed a variety of thoughts about various passages and phrases in the two documents that contained draft, new language.

- Make sure the two types of withdrawals (voluntary medical and permissive) are clearly defined so there is no confusion about which process a student should undertake. For example, one justification for a permissive withdrawal is a medical situation, so how does that differ from a voluntary medical withdrawal?
- Given UK's recent emphasis on students' financial concerns, why should a student with a serious financial difficulty not be eligible for tuition reimbursement?
- The language should be clarified for both voluntary and involuntary medical withdrawals that a student will not be forced to sign a HIPAA (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act) waiver or otherwise share their medical records.
- The language should be clarified to explain what, exactly, "self-care" refers to.

- As written, a student cannot appeal an involuntary medical leave unless new evidence is available. What if the problem was procedural?
- Can the Community of Concern force a student to go through a medical or pharmacological treatment that the student does not wish to participate in?
- The language is too broad and phrases that refer to endangering the public health could be applied to a student with the flu who came to class.
- The references in the involuntary medical leave document to intervention plans sound a lot like medical treatment, which was not appropriate for UK. Something like an “intervention plan” should be better described.
- The language regarding the deadline for a request to return to campus (after an involuntary medical leave) and the “applicable registration window” should be clarified. Is the intent that if a student misses this particular deadline, they student can submit their application for any subsequent applicable registration window?
- The involuntary medical leave document should make it clearer that it is an extraordinary activity, not routine, and that a decision to proceed on the part of the University will be made only after an evaluation by a forensic psychiatrist.
- SC members expressed support for the suggestion to separate the existing draft *Administrative Regulation (AR)* into two separate documents, one for the Community of Concern and one for involuntary medical leaves.
- In the involuntary medical leave document, VII.C gives the associate provost for student and academic life broad powers to determine if a student should be removed from campus immediately. Further down in VII.E, however, it appears that a committee will review all involuntary medical leaves – it is not clear who has what authority.
- If a forensic psychiatrist’s opinion is the basis for proceeding with an involuntary medical leave, it would make sense to have a forensic psychiatrist’s opinion serve as the basis for allowing a student to return.

SC members were amenable to the prospect of reviewing revised drafts of both the voluntary and involuntary medical leave policies when they were ready, but requested more advance notice to better review them.

3. Nominees for Ombud Search Committee

SC members deliberated on names and identified three nominees that the Chair should send forward. Reid offered the names of three students. SC members also discussed possible chairs for the committee and offered some suggestions to the Chair with the request that she share them with Provost Tim Tracy.

4. Proposed Change to 2017-18 College of Pharmacy Calendar

The Chair explained that a clerical error was at fault – the wrong 2017-18 Pharmacy calendar was submitted for approval. Grossman **moved** to approve the proposed change to the 2017-18 College of Pharmacy calendar and Schroeder **seconded**.

5. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) – Margaret Schroeder, Chair

i. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Teaching in Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Classrooms

Schroeder, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal. In response to a question from Wood, Schroeder stated that the wrong version of the proposal had been sent forward – in question 3a¹ should have been removed. Grossman asked that the passive voice in the last two sentences of question 3b (regarding faculty of record) should be changed to active voice to clarify who has the responsibility to add and remove faculty.

The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Teaching in Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Classrooms, in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction within the College of Education. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair asked if SC members were willing to vote on the motion, with the stipulation that the two changes be included and there were no objections to that. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed Deletion of the BAEd in Secondary Education - Science Education

Because the program came from Schroeder's home department, the Chair presented the proposal and explained it to SC members. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the deletion of an existing BAEd in Secondary Education - Science Education, in the Department of STEM Education within the College Education. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

In response to a question from Mazur, Schroeder explained that the reason the deletion had not come forward sooner was that there is one student who has been in senior status for the past four and a half years – the program has made repeated attempts to contact them, via phone, email, and letter. The student is aware that the program is being deleted. Wood noted that even after being deleted, Kentucky's Council on Postsecondary Education would allow the student to complete the degree if they returned.

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

iii. Proposed Deletion of the BAEd in Secondary Education - Mathematics Education

The Chair explained the proposal. In response to a question from Mazur, Schroeder explained that a pathway to science and math still exists, but it is through use of a content major, which students have been using for the past six years. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the deletion of an existing BAEd in Secondary Education - Mathematics Education, in the

¹ "Upon the completion of 6 hours, students will meet with an advisor (certificate faculty of record) and decide whether to enroll in a master's, endorsement, or doctoral program."

Education - Mathematics Education, in the Department of STEM Education within the College Education. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iv. Proposed New MS in Sport and Exercise Psychology

Schroeder explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new MS degree in Sport and Exercise Psychology, in the Department of Kinesiology and Health Promotion within the College of Education. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

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

i. Proposed Change to PhD Economics

Guest Scott Yost, chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), explained the proposal. There were no questions about the content of the proposal, but there was some confusion about whether or not the proposal had received the necessary and appropriate college-level approvals. After discussion about that matter, there was agreement that college-level approval needed to be received.

Schroeder **moved** to table the proposal until such documentation was provided and Cross **seconded**. After brief discussion, Schroeder withdrew her motion and Cross withdrew his second. Grossman **moved** that the SC recommend that the Senate approve the proposed changes to the PhD Economics, conditional upon the Senate Council office receiving documentation of a positive vote by the college faculty. Mills **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed Changes to Senate Rules 5.4.3 (“Requirements for Graduation”) and Senate Rules 5.4.3.4 (“Free Electives”)

Yost explained the proposal. There was extensive discussion among SC members and Guest Kim Anderson (EN/Chemical and Materials Engineering and associate dean for administration and academic affairs). The **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation to approve the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 5.4.3* (“Requirements for Graduation”) and *Senate Rules 5.4.3.4* (“Free Electives”). Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

During discussion, Grossman suggested deletion of the revised last sentence for *Senate Rules 5.4.3.4*² because it was confusing and did not make sense. There were no objections from anyone present and there was additional discussion. Grossman **moved** to amend the proposal by removing the last sentence (as revised) in *SR 5.4.3.4* and Schroeder **seconded**. After additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. SC members continued to discuss the change.

When discussion wound down, a **vote** was taken on the amended proposal and the motion from SAASC **passed** with none opposed and one abstained.

Lauersdorf suggested that the gist of the approvals conversation regarding the PhD Economics (what does notice of approval mean) be discussed in more depth. There were no objections to adding this topic to a list of possible agenda items for the SC’s summer retreat.

² “Electives have no minimum hour requirement --that is, it is left to the discretion of the Undergraduate Council as it approves programs and program changes. “

6. Outstanding Senator Award

Bailey explained that one duty of the vice chair was to lead the process of identifying a senator to receive the Senate's Outstanding Senator Award and he began the discussion on the Outstanding Senator Award. He indicated a preference for opening up the award's criteria so that more faculty could be honored. SC members expressed a wide variety of opinions about the proposed changes. Towards the end of the discussion, Bailey summarized that the award would continue to be offered to either a current or past senator but that more than one award could be granted.

The Chair noted the time and indicated that the remaining agenda items would need to be addressed as "old business" during the next meeting. McGillis **moved** to adjourn and Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 5:18 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine M. McCormick,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bailey, Bird-Pollan, Blonder, Cross, Grossman, Lauersdorf, McCormick, McGillis, Mazur, Reid, Schroeder, and Wood.

Invited guests present: Susan Cantrell, Marc Cormier, Marcy Deaton, Nick Kehrwald, and Jenny Minier.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, March 30, 2017.