

Senate Council
October 17, 2016

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm in 103 Main Building on Monday, October 17, 2016. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hand unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Katherine M. McCormick called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:01 pm. The Chair stated that SC did have quorum; Schroeder needed to leave partway through the meeting, but there would still be six elected members present after she departed.

The Chair said that given the number of absences, the Title IX presentation was postponed until a future date. The Chair then asked if anyone was willing to move a motion to add to the agenda the petition to modify the due date for midterm courses. Brown **moved** to modify the agenda and Grossman **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

1. Minutes from October 3, 2016 and Announcements

There were no changes to the minutes from October 3, 2016. There being **no objection**, the minutes were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

SC members agreed to address the midterm grade entry waiver prior to the other agenda items.

10. *Petition to Modify Due Date for Midterm Grades

The Chair offered a couple introductory comments. She noted that the Registrar's Office had no objection to the proposal, but did request that any changes accommodate an entire day, not to a specific hour.

Guest David Royster (AS/Mathematics) explained the request. Essentially, it is a hardship on some Mathematics faculty who have large classes, many of which are taking common exams during a one-week period. Royster said that during the following week, faculty will give some 3,000 exams in the evenings from Monday – Thursday; make-up exams are scheduled for Friday. The Senate Rules require midterm grades to be entered by midnight on Friday night, which is a challenge for some faculty. Royster said that the request was to move the due date for some Mathematics classes from Friday at midnight to Monday night at midnight. He noted that the former associate provost for undergraduate education had been able to help with an adjustment to the date last year but because that position was eliminated, it was necessary to make the request to SC.

Grossman **moved** to grant the request of the Department of Mathematics to have midterm grades due Monday at midnight instead of Friday at midnight for fall 2016 only and send to committee the proposal to change the deadline in the future for the entire University. Brown **seconded**. There was extensive discussion around the request. SC members confirmed that a similar change had been made spring 2016. Reid registered concerns that a delay in the grade deadline would decrease a student's flexibility regarding options for a class in which they were not excelling. Brown clarified that the proposal's delay of the grade deadline actually meant that the second set of Mathematics exams would be graded in time so that midterm grades would include the second grade; without the waiver, midterm grades would only reflect the first exam. Lauersdorf added that it would amount to a delay of one business day for students who might want to discuss grades with an advisor, although students would still have until the Friday of the following week to withdraw, almost two full weeks.

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

2. Naming of Reinstatement Committee Members

SC members discussed a possible composition. After discussion, Schroeder **moved** to name McCormick, Bailey, and Reid as the members of the SC's Reinstatement Committee. Brown **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair noted that she had neglected to offer a couple announcements. She reported that Mills, Blonder, Wood, and Mazur were absent. She reminded SC members that the next meeting would be in 330 Gatton College of Business and Economics Building. The Chair commented that until a permanent associate provost for student and academic life was identified, more issues like the midterm grade due date were likely to occur. She said that more frequently than not, academic decisions will have to come to SC for deliberation. The Chair added that SC was also going to see more clean ups pertaining to department names and where programs and courses are housed. She used the Graduate Center for Gerontology as an example – it had acted as a department in the past and created an undergraduate course even though graduate centers cannot home undergraduate courses. She said the SC office was working with Gerontology to move the course and that similar things would be happening during the course of business and as part of various transitions on campus.

Regarding 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 reported that she had identified nine individuals to populate the committee: Jennifer Bird Pollan (LA); Alice Christ (FA); Davy Jones (ME); Sue Nokes (AG); TK Logan (ME); Beth Kraemer (LI); Tommy Collins (research administrative coordinator); and Garrett Ball (student). The Chair noted that Marcy Deaton, associate legal counsel, would serve as an ex officio nonvoting member.

3. Proposed Change to 2016-17 College of Dentistry Calendar

The Chair explained that the College of Dentistry needed to add the presidential Election Day as an academic holiday. Brown **moved** to approve the change and Porter **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Recommendation to Change End Date for Single Summer Term

SC members discussed the suggestion from the Registrar's office to extend the end of the single summer term from August 2, 2018 to August 17, 2018. There were no objections to the planned change, but SC members raised a number of concerns about how the change would affect other aspects of campus life, such as:

- Faculty obligations in August at the beginning of the semester, such as departmental and college meetings.
- Cycles of maintenance and cleaning of residence halls.
- K Week, graduate student orientations, and early move-ins for students, e.g. student athletes, band members, and residence hall assistants (RAs).
- Terms of student apartment leases that end July 31 with new tenants moving in on August 10.

Grossman **moved** to table the proposal until October 31. Lauersdorf **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. Grossman suggested that someone from the Registrar's office and someone from Resident Life be invited to attend.

Those present introduced themselves. The Chair invited Guest Beth Kraemer (LI) to come to the table.

5. Proposed New Ad Hoc Committee on Technology

The Chair suggested that Brown and Lauersdorf explain the proposal, which they did. Grossman **moved** to create an ad hoc SC technology committee, as described by the documentation associated with the agenda. During discussion Reid requested that she, through her position as Student Government Association president, be the one to appoint the student. There were no objections to that. Bailey **seconded**. Lauersdorf commented that he chatted with UK's new chief information officer, Brian Nichols, who had expressed support for the new committee. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Grossman suggested the SC next discuss the item for which a guest was present. There were no objections.

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

i. Proposed Admissions Requirement Change for BHS in Clinical Leadership and Management

Guest Scott Yost (EN/Civil Engineering), chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), explained the proposal. Guest Geza Bruckner (HS/Clinical Science) was present and helped to answer questions from SC members.

The aspect of the change that was discussed at length was the proposed new GPA requirement for admissions. A few SC members expressed concern that the proposed new 2.8 GPA for admissions was unfair to students and to other programs that do not have such admissions standards and enrollment caps. Grossman opined that it was akin to cherry-picking the best students. He said that unless the program could demonstrate that students were less likely to succeed in the program with a certain GPA, it was not an idea he could support. Bruckner commented that it was internal UK transfers who were most likely to be affected. Other SC members noted that similar, increased GPA requirements had not been well received by the University Senate. Brown suggested that he would be more comfortable with tying an increased GPA or a new grade requirement to specific courses, which would limit much of the concerns. Porter opined that there was plenty of precedence to limit admissions to a program through the GPA.

There was additional discussion about how to move forward. Grossman **moved** to return the proposal to the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) for further deliberations regarding the new GPA requirement. Brown **seconded**. Yost added that the degree program did not have a long history so it was difficult for them to show a range of data. The members of the SAASC were also somewhat concerned with the admissions-related GPA requirement but they were less worried because it was more likely to affect students already at UK, rather than incoming freshmen. There was additional discussion.

Grossman **withdrew** his motion and Brown concurred. Grossman **moved** to table the proposal for three weeks so that it returned to SC on October 31. Reid **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with six in favor and one opposed.

6. Committee Reports

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

i. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 5.1.8.3* (“Permissive Withdrawals”)

Brown, chair of the Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLeL), explained the proposed changes. During discussion, Lauersdorf asked how courses taught in the traditional fashion (i.e. not distance learning) would calculate contact hours. Brown explained that it could be done via a single sentence; Lauersdorf suggested that that information be readily available for senators when the item is reviewed by the University Senate. Brown agreed to do so.

The Chair said that the **motion** from the SCDLeL was that the SC approve the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 5.1.8.3* (“Permissive Withdrawals”). 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 *Senate Rules 5.2.4.2* (“Excused Absences”)

The Chair said that the **motion** from the SCDLeL was that the SC approve the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 5.2.4.2* (“Excused Absences”). Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. Brown explained the changes. During discussion, the Chair realized that there was slight change that should be made to the changes to *SR 4.1.8.3*. Brown said he would work with her to address it prior to it going to the Senate. After brief discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iii. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 5.1.8.1* (“Unilateral Removal for Failure to Attend First Two Class Periods”)

The Chair said that the **motion** from the SCDLeL was that the SC approve the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 5.1.8.1* (“Unilateral Removal for Failure to Attend First Two Class Periods”). Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

Brown explained the proposal. During discussion, those present agreed that the new first sentence (“If between the first day of class and the drop/add date students neither show evidence of participation....”) would be less confusing if it were changed slightly to remove the reference to “drop/add” and instead use “the last day to add a class.” After discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iv. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 9.1* (“Glossary of Terms”)

The Chair said that the **motion** from the SCDLeL was that the SC approve the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 9.1* (“Glossary of Terms”). Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. SC members discussed the proposed change. There was some confusion among SC members – some SC members thought the proposed definition of attendance (“completion of a scheduled course activity”) meant an activity engaged in during a class period, although Brown said it was intended to encompass class attendance, not participation in specific activity. SC members and Brown agreed that “being present for a scheduled class or completion of a scheduled course activity” was less confusing and Brown said that would be the language he presented to Senate. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

v. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 1.4.2.13* (“Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLeL)”)

The Chair said that the motion from the SCDLeL was that the SC approve the proposed changes *Senate Rules 1.4.2.13* (“Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLeL)”). Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. Brown explained the change. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

vi. Proposed Changes to *Administrative Regulations* 7:6 (“Intellectual Property Disposition and Administrative Regulation”)

Brown explained the proposed changes, saying he had been trying for a few years to have the language changed so that there is no prohibition against a faculty member using the distance learning format that they developed at another institution. There were no objections to the revisions. The Chair said she would bring up the matter with Provost Tim Tracy when they next met.

9. Senate Meeting Roundtable

SC members discussed the October 10 Senate meeting. Below are the comments.

- The voting glitches were the only real problem.
- The issue of the Senate not voting on honorary degrees was a little confusing, but it appeared to have been cleared up – there appeared to only be one senator who remained unclear about what occurred.
- The discussion on Schnatter Institute was good and from the perspective of the *Governing Regulations* and shared governance, the discussion did what it was intended to do.
- The comment that SC could not approve anything on behalf of Senate was troublesome – SC does have that right in certain circumstances.

8. Possibility of Senate Council Subcommittee on Diversity and Inclusion

SC members were amenable to increased dialogue about diversity and inclusion but asked for more specific information about what the committee might do before discussing the matter further.

Porter **moved** to adjourn and Stekardis **seconded**. A vote was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine M. McCormick,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bailey, Brown, Grossman, Lauersdorf, McCormick, Porter, Reid, Schroeder, and Stekardis.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.