

PLEASE SEE PERTINENT HIGHLIGHTED SECTION ON PAGE 5

Senate Council
September 21, 2009

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, September 21, 2009 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a voice vote unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Dave Randall called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:07 pm.

1. Minutes from August 17, August 24 and August 31 and Announcements

The Chair noted that no changes had been received for any of the minutes.

Jensen **moved** to approve the SC minutes from August 17 and Steiner **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Ford **moved** to approve the SC minutes from August 24 and Steiner **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Anderson **moved** to approve the SC minutes from August 31 and Kelly **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair reported that *Administrative Regulations 1:5* ("Substantive Change") was approved by the SC on behalf of the Senate this past Monday. The Chair notified the appropriate individuals.

There were three [impending vacancies](#) on the Provost's University Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities. Provost's Liaison Greissman suggested that the replacements come from the departing members' home colleges. SC members offered five or six possible names.

The Chair apologized for neglecting to introduce Jurgen Rohr, the newest SC member, who would serve out the remainder of Peggy Piascik's term. Those present introduced themselves.

Moving to the next item the Chair reminded senators that multiple committees were in need of faculty membership. SC members discussed the table of names, and agreed that it could be sent to the appropriate individuals, with the addition of some names for the Public Health dean review.

Regarding the proposal from the Advising Network to change the University calendar, the SC decided to send the proposal to the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee for review.

2. [Report from Senate's Rules and Elections Committee on Recent Change to AR 11:4, "University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees" \(formerly AR III-1.0-6\)](#)

The Chair asked the chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, Davy Jones, to explain the issue. Guest Jones did so, but noted that there was currently an effort to make further revisions, and he requested that the item be postponed for a week. Neither the Chair nor SC members objected.

3. [Discussion on Dead Week Rules](#)

Jones explained that there were two general issues at hand, that of whether homework for a grade was disallowed during Dead Week and whether or not the recently changed language on Dead Week in the *Senate Rules (SR)* applied only to undergraduates or to all students.

Jones said that the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) could find no reference to “homework” in the revised language, so it concluded that homework was indeed allowed during Dead Week (DW).

Moving to the issue of what category of students were affected by the DW rules, Jones said that he distinctly remembered a comment during an SC discussion on the then-proposed changes to DW that the language would only apply to undergraduate students, although on the Senate floor a similar question was asked and the answer was that the DW language also applied to graduate students. He said that if the intent was for DW to only apply to undergraduate students, the language should be changed.

The Chair asked Joe Quinn, point person for the proposal last year, to comment. Guest Quinn agreed with Jones about the issue of homework – he said that the intent all along was to allow it. Quinn was unsure about the issue of applying the language to students other than undergraduates.

Referring to the issue of homework, the Chair opined that since “homework” does not appear in the *SR* language, and is clearly different from a “project,” the SREC interpretation that homework is allowed during DW was adequate.

There was a thorough discussion of the issue regarding which student classifications were involved. It was generally acknowledged that a comment was made on the Senate floor that indicated the Dead Week rules applied also to graduate students, but that was in contradiction to the SC’s understanding after the last SC discussion on DW prior to the Senate meeting.

Jensen **moved** to leave the language of *SR 5.2.4.6* as is, relative to the issue of applicability to undergraduate and graduate students, with the understanding that the SC intended for it to only apply to undergraduates, regardless of the confusion on the Senate floor. Swanson **seconded**. After additional discussion, Jensen **changed the motion** so that the Senate would be informed of the SC’s intent to leave the language of *SR 5.2.4.6* as is, relative to the issue of applicability to undergraduate and graduate students, with the understanding that the SC intended for it to only apply to undergraduates, regardless of the confusion on the Senate floor, and Swanson **agreed**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair noted that he had forgotten to share a couple of announcements. The Senate's former parliamentarian, Gifford Blyton, turned 101 years old on the previous Friday and Professor Kaveh Tagavi (and former SC chair) called Blyton for a birthday chat; Tagavi said Blyton was happy to hear from him.

Kirk was asked by the Chair to explain the issue of involving community service in UK's courses, which dovetailed nicely with a suggestion from a non-traditional student about the same. Kirk said that he and some other students were formally looking into the possibility of more courses with a community service component. Jensen noted that there was an individual responsible for experiential ed, and suggested Kirk contact that administrator, too. Greissman suggested the names of a couple faculty who could also be helpful. The Chair requested that Kirk keep informed the non-traditional student whose query spurred this initiative.

4. Senate Committee Compositions

The Chair requested a motion for approval of the compositions as presented in the meeting's agenda handout. Rohr **moved** to approve the committees as composed and that the Office of the Senate Council identify appropriate chairs for committees, as appropriate.

SC members discussed the various compositions. Kirk said that he would work on finding student members for the committees. There was a lengthy discussion about the fact that many of the Senate's committees do not meet on a regular basis, if ever. SC members were concerned that certain areas within the authority of the faculty were being lost due to a lack of faculty activity. Steiner was particularly concerned, and after some time the Chair asked if he would be willing to return to the SC with some suggestions on how to reinvigorate the regular meeting of Senate committees. Steiner agreed.

Jensen asked if some of the individuals currently on the non-functioning University Studies Committee could be tapped to serve on the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee; Mrs. Brothers said she would check.

Yanarella **seconded** Rohr's motion. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion to approve the committees as composed and that the Office of the Senate Council identify appropriate chairs for committees, as appropriate. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Discussion on Mandatory Attendance Taking

The Chair informed SC members that Provost Subbaswamy had inquired as to whether the SC was interested in looking at the issue of mandatory attendance taking as a possible aid for student success initiatives. After some brief comments by SC members, the Chair said that he would interact with Greissman and report back to the SC.

6. Process for Soliciting Nominations for Vetting Teams

The Chair asked SC members to turn their attention to a list of questions in the handout, answers to which would help guide the Office of the Senate Council when preparing the solicitation for nominees, as well as the ballots for the October Senate meeting. The details are listed below.

- The nominees' name, blurb (one- to two-sentence explanation of which vetting team and why) and college and department will be posted online, and that will be made clear in the mass solicitation email.
- The SC will largely work from the nominations received, although there is no reason the SC cannot recommend someone who was not nominated.
- After the Senate votes in October, the SC will name the remaining three members and the chair of each vetting team.
- Only those members nominated and included on the ballot can be voted on – no suggestions from the floor of the Senate.
- It does not matter how many times a person is nominated, or by whom.
- Senators should have the nominee information in hard copy form during the Senate meeting
- The names of all nominees will be placed on one ballot, although that ballot may be made up of multiple pages. The ballot will be divided up by teams, with names listed along with the team for which they were nominated. A separate handout will include the nominees' names, blurbs and affiliations.
- Voting members of the Senate will need to sign for a ballot at the October meeting.
- The Office of the Senate Council will send out the letters of appointment to those faculty who are chosen to serve on the vetting teams, and it is reasonable to assume the Office of the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education will follow up with additional information.
- The charge letter will be drafted by the Chair, and given to SC members to review prior to sending it to team members.
- A draft of the mass email soliciting nominations for the vetting teams will go to SC members for a review, but will require quick attention.
- The results of the Senate's October vote will be determined after the meeting adjourns, but as soon as possible, with the Chair and Mrs. Brothers being responsible for collating the votes.

- The ballots will indicate that up to three choices can be made. A ballot for a particular team with more than four or more names selected will be discarded.

7. [Rule Waiver for WM-95](#)

The Chair explained the situation to SC members. After some discussion, the consensus was that while sympathetic to the student's request, the rule should not be waived. SC members asked that the Chair speak with the student, and suggest she look into receiving college- or department-level honors.

8. RWA Waiver Process

The Chair asked Mrs. Brothers to explain the retroactive withdrawal appeals (RWA) issue, which she did. Mrs. Brothers reminded SC members that they expressed concern at the end of the spring 2009 semester about being asked to decide on requests for waivers of *SR 5.1.8.5.A.2*, the "two-year rule" (which requires students to submit the application for an RWA to the dean's office within two years of the last day of classes of the semester for which the appeal is made), without any type of guidelines by which to make the decision.

Mrs. Brothers explained that the form would be used to help the OSC standardize how waivers are treated, as well as create a process by which all students are more easily treated equitably. If the rationale for the delay is the same as one of the four acceptable reasons for an RWA, or if the delay is the result of an administrative delay, the SC chair will decide whether or not to grant the waiver. If the rationale for a delay past the two-year window cannot be categorized by one of those five areas, the SC chair will grant the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee the authority to waive the rule for that particular student. Mrs. Brothers added that the form will not be documented in the *SR*, nor would it be posted online. When colleges call the OSC to ask about how to request a waiver, the form will be sent to them at that time.

Wood expressed concern about the waiver form, saying that it codified a process for exceptions. There were no objections, however, to the Chair's suggestion that the waiver form be used on a trial basis for the 2009-2010 academic year.

Yanarella asked the Chair for permission to discuss an item not on the agenda, and the Chair agreed. Yanarella spoke about the issue of cliff vesting and said that the Board of Trustees would be addressing the issue at its October meeting. After making some comments about the proposed policy, he suggested that the SC take up the issue at the next SC meeting. The Chair indicated that it could be placed on the agenda.

There being no further business to transact, the meeting was adjourned shortly after 5 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Dave Randall,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Ford, Jensen, Kelly, Kirk, Randall, Rohr, Steiner, Swanson and Yanarella.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guests present: Marcy Deaton, Davy Jones and Joe Quinn.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, September 24, 2009.