

Senate Council  
November 20, 2017

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, November 20, 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 3:03 pm.

1. Minutes from November 6, 2017 and Announcements

The Chair said there were no edits for the minutes. There being **no objections**, the minutes from November 6, 2017 were **approved** as distributed **by unanimous consent**. The Chair said she had a few announcements.

The Chair reported that she and Bird-Pollan, chair of the ad hoc Committee on *Administrative Regulations 6:2* ("Policy and Procedures for Addressing and Resolving Allegations of Sexual Assault, Stalking, Dating Violence, and Domestic Violence"), met with President Eli Capilouto and Bill Thro, University General Counsel, to discuss the ad hoc Committee's recommendations. The Chair shared that the meeting was cordial and she looked forward to seeing some of the changes proposed by the Committee included in a revision to current regulations. Bird-Pollan added her opinion that both President Capilouto and General Counsel Thro were open minded about the recommendations and seemed willing to accept many of them; the suggestions that were met with resistance were issues, in Bird-Pollan's opinion, that SC presumed would not be open to changes.

The Chair noted that the issue of mandatory reporters was unlikely to change; she reported that Thro asserted that there was only one institution in the country that did not use similar parameters to identify mandatory reporters. She added that the meeting was two and a half hours long and they did not get to the employment questionnaire; that will be reviewed at a future date.

There were a handful of questions and comments from SC members. Those present opined that next steps would involve President Capilouto and Thro accepting some of the proposed changes and asking the Regulation Review Committee to draft a revised regulation(s). If that occurred, the revised regulation(s) would be sent to SC and Senate for comment and endorsement.

The Chair reported that the ad hoc Committee to Review UK Core had been composed and its first meeting was scheduled for December 6.

The Chair said that the Provost Search Committee was continuing its work. The position was closed. The Committee will meet on Wednesday. The Chair responded to a question about next steps by saying it was her understanding that the Committee will provide President Capilouto with the names of its top recommendations. The top candidates will likely be asked to participate in a variety of campus interviews; the Chair asked that SC be one of the interviewing groups. Campuswide town halls will be held on December 7 and December 8 and the President will make a final decision in time for the new provost to begin on January 1.

Regarding the town halls on title series, the Chair reported that there were a number of comments and questions from attendees, although she said it would be difficult to identify a single "take-home message" from the attendees. She opined that SC would need to empower another committee, perhaps still composed of members of the Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure (SACPT) and chairs for academic area committees but with the 2017-18 memberships and chairs. She reminded SC

members that Sharon Lock (NU), who chaired the ad hoc Committee on Title Series now held an administrative position and could not be chair of the SACPT so a new ad hoc Committee chair would need to be identified. She thought Lock would be willing to stay on as an ex officio member. There were a number of comments from SC members. Mazur suggested the report be taken up as new business at a future meeting.

The Chair noted that the issue of advising had emerged as a consequence of the undergraduate education reorganization. When students who were formerly advised through the undergraduate program as “undecided” were moved into the colleges, new resources were provided to advise those new students. In some colleges, what had traditionally been a joint staff/faculty advising function has evolved to a function with more staff than faculty. The Chair will meet with appropriate stakeholders and ask that these staff meet with the Senate’s Academic Advising Committee.

Referring to a motion made in the November Senate meeting regarding a fall break, the Chair explained that such a proposal would likely be forthcoming from the SGA in the next couple of weeks.

The Chair explained that all of the deans and others, including the Chair and associate provosts, were invited to participate in some conceptual discussions surrounding UK’s financial stability in difficult times, vis-à-vis state funding.

## 2. Old Business

### a. Special Senate Meeting Roundtable and Next Steps

SC members discussed their opinions of the special Senate meeting on October 30.

### b. Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLeL) – Roger Brown, Chair

#### i. Proposed Implementation of a Syllabus Bank

Guest Roger Brown (AG/Agricultural Economics), chair of the Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLeL), explained the proposal for implementation of a syllabus bank. The **motion** from the SCDLeL was that the SC approve the pilot of an online system to be developed to make unofficial (draft) versions of course syllabi voluntarily available to students securely (e.g. behind Link Blue login) as part of advising and priority registration. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

There were some concerns raised in regards to possible student misunderstandings about what “draft” meant. Childress indicated that as a student, it was not his expectation that a professor has everything ready for a syllabus six months in advance [during priority registration] but that he would appreciate knowing what the class was like the last time it was taught. He was not necessarily interested in which assignments would be due on which dates, but rather if a course was, for example, more exam-oriented or more paper-based. He stated that the course description did not contain enough information. He suggested that “liable to change,” “syllabus from a previous semester,” or similar wording could be added to ensure students know that the syllabus is not official until distributed in class. Brown explained that if approved, when a student attempted to click on a syllabus link, the student (or other user) would see a yes/no window that would require a student to acknowledge that the syllabus available through the syllabus bank was unofficial and a final version would be distributed in class.

Brown clarified that the proposal indicated that it would be a pilot program to test technical feasibility, not to limit which colleges or students would be able to access the syllabus bank. He was also willing to

accept a friendly amendment to remove “(draft)” from the proposal’s description of the syllabi that would be in the syllabus bank. In response to a question from the Chair, Brown indicated that the SC and Senate would need to endorse the proposal, not approve it, because implementation would be an administrative decision. There was a brief side discussion about Childress’ desire for students to have greater access to teacher-course evaluations.

There being no further discussion about an online syllabus bank, a **vote** was taken on the revised **motion** that the SC endorse the pilot of an online system to be developed to make unofficial versions of course syllabi voluntarily available to students securely (e.g. behind Link Blue login) as part of advising and priority registration. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Announcement Regarding Intellectual Property

Brown explained that the SCDLeL had, over the years, regularly requested clarification about the intellectual property-aspects of materials created for distance learning courses. Brown reported that he had been instructed to work with one of the attorneys in Legal Counsel about the issue.

c. Roundtable Discussion – SC Chair Katherine McCormick

- *Administrative Regulations 6:1* (“Policy on Discrimination and Harassment”)
- *Administrative Regulations 6:2* (“Policy and Procedures for Addressing and Resolving Allegations of Sexual Assault, Stalking, Dating Violence, and Domestic Violence”)
- Employment Questionnaire

There was no discussion about any of the recommendations from the ad hoc Committee on *Administrative Regulations 6:2* (“Policy and Procedures for Addressing and Resolving Allegations of Sexual Assault, Stalking, Dating Violence, and Domestic Violence”). The Chair indicated that she had included this discussion per a request from Tagavi. Tagavi asserted that he had no desire to discuss the Committee’s report or its recommendations at this time, but he did want to have a discussion in SC in regards to any formal, regulation-related changes sent forward by the administration as a result of the Committee’s recommendations.

3. Proposed New Senate Advisory Committee on Diversity and Inclusion – Discussion with Vice President for Institutional Diversity Sonja Feist-Price

SC members welcomed Guest Sonja Feist-Price, vice president for institutional diversity. The Chair reminded SC members that at the May 2017 SC retreat, SC passed the following motion: recommend to Senate that it establish a permanent committee (that is not required to be chaired by a senator) on diversity and inclusion and that the charge of the new committee includes the following responsibilities: 1. to increase the diversity among senators, in particular representation of underrepresented minorities; 2. to work with admin to disseminate best practices for recruiting and retaining faculty of color; and 3. address other issues around diversity and inclusion as they arise. She said that she invited Feist-Price to confirm her willingness to collaborate on the proposed new standing Senate committee, noting that Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement G. T. Lineberry should also be included. The Chair suggested that Feist-Price offer some comments to begin with. Those present engaged in a lively dialogue about ways in which a Senate committee dedicated to diversity and inclusion could be part of a larger campus dialogue. Some of the highlights of the discussion are below.

- Feist-Price and Lineberry will present data to college deans regarding underrepresented minority (URM) faculty members. Blonder asked if Feist-Price could give SC and Senate the same

presentation and Feist-Price agreed, but suggested that her presentations to SC and Senate occur in early spring, after the presentation to deans in January.

- In response to a request from Tagavi, Feist-Price said she would be happy to share with SC members, after presenting to deans, information about how many URM faculty leave UK after two years, five years, etc., as well as information about how many URM faculty are denied tenure.
- SC members were interested in learning more about how many URM faculty are pulled into administrative positions prior to becoming full, tenured professors.
- The May 2017 retreat discussion included comments about how to better diversify Senate and SC. When colleges receive emails about how many faculty to elect to serve as senators, the email could include a gentle comment regarding the importance of having a diverse group of faculty to serve on Senate.
- Every college has a diversity officer so when it is time to conduct Senate elections, perhaps diversity officers could be notified, too, so they could perhaps help ensure college elections include a diverse slate of candidates.

The Chair said that next steps for the new standing committee would be for the SC and Chair to work with Feist-Price to populate it.

#### 4. Committee Reports

##### a. Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLLeL) – Roger Brown, Chair

##### i. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rule 5.1.8.1* ("Unilateral Removal for Failure to Attend First Two Class Periods")

Guest Brown, chair of the Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLLeL), explained the proposed changes to the *SRs*. The **motion** from the SCDLeL was to approve the proposed changes to the *SRs*. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

SC members discussed the proposed changes with Brown. In regards to the specific language, SC members offered a handful of suggestions, which Brown accepted as friendly amendments, on behalf of the SCDLeL. After some time, the Chair noted that there had been significant discussion and asked if members were ready to vote on the revised language, below\*.

~~Students who miss the first two class periods of a course without notifying the department of their intention to attend may be reported by the department~~ If from the first day of class to the last day to add a class, inclusive, students neither show evidence of participation in the course nor notify the Instructor of Record of their intent to complete the course, the Instructor of Record may report these students to the dean who shall remove the students them from the class role roll and notify the Registrar that the student has students have been removed from the class roll. The Registrar will inform such students that they have been removed. The students will have no record of the class appear on their transcripts.

---

\* Underlined formatting indicates added text and strikethrough indicates deleted text.

Senate Council  
November 20, 2017

A **vote** was taken on the revised language and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed Changes to: *Senate Rule 5.1.8.3* ("Permissive Withdrawal"); *Senate Rule 5.2.4.2* ("Excused Absences"); and *Senate Rule 9.1* ("Glossary of Terms")

Brown explained the proposed changes to SC members, explaining that all three *SR*-related changes were related and should be presented together. There were no comments from SC members that specifically objected to the proposed changes, but there was some concern that the term "interaction," which was newly added text to all three *SR* passages, was not defined. Those expressing that concern suggested that Brown take the proposal back to the SCDLeL and add language that offers examples of what an "interaction" would entail. Brown agreed to take the proposal back to the SCDLeL.

Given the time, Wood **moved** to adjourn and Schroeder **seconded**. SC members voted with their feet and the meeting was adjourned at 5:14 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine M. McCormick,  
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bailey, Bird-Pollan, Blonder, Childress, Cross, Grossman, Lauersdorf, McCormick, Marr, Mazur, Schroeder, Tagavi, and Wood.

Invited guests present: Roger Brown, Sonja Feist-Price, and Nick Kehrwald.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, November 28, 2017.