

Senate Council
October 5, 2015

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, October 5, 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 3:01 pm.

1. Minutes from September 28, 2015 and Announcements

The Chair said that no objections had been received and none were offered at the time. There being **no objections**, the minutes from September 28, 2015 were **approved** by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair offered a handful of announcements. He said he had met with a couple of new deans and plans to meet with the remainder in the coming days to explain the role and importance of faculty participation in the University Senate.

The Chair asked Kraemer, chair of the Senate's Academic Advising Committee, to give an overview of recent advising activities on campus. Kraemer did so, mentioning the recent advising forum and student focus groups. He said that UK's Advising Network plans to launch a survey on advising in the near future. He said his committee will sift through all the information gleaned from the past few months' work and will give SC a comprehensive report, likely towards the end of the fall semester. Kraemer also mentioned the ongoing appeal of technology in classrooms and how it can best help educators.

Grossman offered an update on trustee activities that he and Wilson participated in, specifically their attendance at the recent Council on Postsecondary Education's Trusteeship Conference and the issues that were discussed there.

2. Naming of Reinstatement Committee

The Chair said that the SC needed to formally designate a subset of the SC to hear cases of a second reinstatement, meaning that a student had been dismissed from the University twice. Grossman **moved** that the subset be comprised of McCormick, Hippisley, and Mullen. Webb **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee (SRWAC) - Tom Nieman, Chair

i. 2014-15 Annual Report

Guest Tom Nieman, chair of the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee (SRWAC), offered an annual report on the activities of SRWAC during the 2014-15 academic year. There were some questions from SC members about how SRWAC interacts with students who appeal to withdraw from a course due to a diagnosed learning disability. Nieman commented that SRWAC comprises a great group of faculty and ex officio members, whose role it is to help SRWAC voting members understand nuances of policies and procedures. He added that having a student member who attends regularly is different from past years, but that SRWAC was thrilled to have an engaged student participating in meeting deliberations.

ii. Proposed Changes to Retroactive Withdrawal Application Form

Nieman explained that SRWAC had suggested a few changes to the forms that a student fills out when applying for a retroactive withdrawal. The Chair noted that the recommendation for the modifications to the forms came from committee, so no **second** was needed. 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 Changes to *Senate Rules 5.1.2.3 & 5.3.3.3* (Numeric Grading in College of Medicine)

Guest Scott Yost explained the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 5.1.2.3* and *5.3.3.3*, which were made necessary due to the change in the College of Medicine to move to numeric grading. The Chair noted that the **motion** from SAASC was that the SC approve the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 5.1.2.3* and *5.3.3.3*. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

There was discussion about the inclusion of a "P" grade if a student passes a pass/fail course, but that the proposal did not include an "F" grade if a student failed a pass/fail course. Guest Todd Cheever, associate dean for medical education in the College of Medicine, opined that the section with an F grade should have been retained and said he would edit the proposal to include that grade. Brown offered an editorial correction to change "this accomplishment" to "these accomplishments" and Cheever accepted that change. When there was no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Identification of Faculty Nominees for Various Committees

a. Periodic Program Reviews (Colleges of Engineering, Medicine, Business and Economics, Law, Dentistry, Health Sciences and Libraries)

SC members deliberated on the list of faculty nominees to serve on periodic program review committees for a variety of colleges. When a sufficient number of names had been discussed, Webb **moved** to approve the names to send forward and Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. Sexual Assault Misconduct Hearing Panel and Appeals Panel

The Chair referred SC members to the list of possible faculty nominees for panels for Sexual Assault Misconduct Hearings and Appeals. Brown **moved** to approve the names and Webb **seconded**. There was no discussion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

c. University Honors Program Committee Composition

Guest Ben Withers, associate provost for undergraduate education, gave SC members a brief description of the history of the University Honors Program. Withers added that if Honors was to expand significantly in the coming months, it would make sense to use the existing set of language in the *Senate Rules* regarding faculty of record for Honors as the basis for future discussions. In response to a questions, Withers said the faculty of record meet monthly during the academic year.

Withers explained how the current membership on the Honors faculty of record came to be. The original members were suggested by Withers in 2012 and SC agreed to appoint them. There are seven members who were appointed in 2012 and will serve another three-year term, if SC does not object; Withers noted that all seven were willing to continue. A year or so ago, two of the original members rotated off, due other commitments or no longer working at UK. Withers worked with the past SC chair to have SC approve two members, who are currently willing to continue serving; those two members have a term end date of 2016. Withers said that one current member was ready to leave, so Withers said there was one vacancy that needed to be filled. Withers suggested a lecturer (AS/Chemistry) who teaches a

chemistry Honors course and has been extremely involved in the Honors Program, including coming to campus in the summer for the Honors students' orientation.

Bailey **moved** to approve the Chemistry lecturer as the newest member of the Honors Program faculty of record and Mazur **seconded**. There was some discussion. The Chair confirmed that those remaining on the faculty of record would be serving their second consecutive term and would not be able to be reappointed a second time. There was some discussion about staggering the term end dates – currently the seven original members will have to roll off three years from now, which might not be the best scenario. Withers noted that if discussions proceeded regarding a greatly expanded Honors Program with a new organizational structure, the membership and its end dates could be discussed as a part of that issue, perhaps within the next six months or so.

There were some additional questions about people on the faculty of record who were not appointed by SC. Withers explained that he originally asked those two to join in an informal way, as they have close working relationships with the Honors programs. One of the faculty works with Scholars in Engineering and Management (SEAM) and the other faculty member works with Honors through Social Entrepreneurship Scholars. Withers explained that the faculty of record for the Honors Program had granted voting rights to those two faculty, so they are now voting members, although they were not originally appointed.

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

5. Senate Forms

The Chair explained that all the forms on the day's agenda had been sent to the chairs of the Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council, as well as to the chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC). He said that some of the forms had been presented to SC before but had been tweaked slightly to address two SC concerns that had repeatedly been a concern in the past: it was not clear if faculty of a department know about their courses being "borrowed" by another program; and it has not always been clear if a contact person had sufficiently engaged his/her entire department in a proposed new offering, or a significant change to an existing program. All forms have an explicit requirement for documentation of faculty oversight and input. After brief discussion, it was clarified that proposals will need to include some documentation of a vote in a departmental meeting, either through a set of meeting minutes or through an email from the department chair outlining the votes that occurred regarding a proposal. Brown asked if in-person meetings were necessary and it was generally agreed that a chair could both pose a question and hold a vote via email, so long as any vote follows the rules of the department.

There were a variety of questions and comments from SC members about the forms. Withers also participated in the discussion. It was made clear that contact persons will not need to submit proposals on the new forms if a proposal was already working its way through the approval system. Contact persons using old forms must be prepared for reviewing bodies to ask about aspects that are newly mentioned on the new forms, but there will be no specific requirement that existing proposals will have to be resubmitted on the new forms.

- a. New Undergraduate Certificate
- b. New Graduate Certificate
- c. Change Certificate
- d. New University Scholars Program

e. New Master's Degree

When there was no further discussion, Grossman **moved** to approve the use of the new forms: New Undergraduate Certificate; New Graduate Certificate; Change Certificate; New University Scholars Program; and New Master's Degree. McCormick **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. Tentative Senate Agenda for October 12, 2015

SC members discussed the tentative Senate agenda for October 12 and the order of agenda items. SC members suggested putting the reports from Senate's Academic Planning and Priorities Committee and Ad Hoc Committee on the Confucius Institute as the first two committee reports. The SC also added "Conversation with the President" as a descriptor for the President's agenda item. Grossman **moved** to approve the reordered and modified Senate agenda for October 12 and Brown **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Hippisley,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bailey, Brown, Gower, Grossman, Hippisley, Kraemer, McCormick, Mazur, Mullen, Watt, Webb, and Wilson.

Invited guests present: Todd Cheever, Tom Nieman, Ben Withers, and Scot Yost.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, October 13, 2015.