

Senate Council
September 26, 2011

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, September 26, 2011 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Vice Chair Bob Grossman called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:05 pm. He noted that the Chair would be a little late.

1. Minutes from September 19, 2011 and Announcements

Wood **moved** to approve the minutes from September 19, 2011 and Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Vice Chair Grossman asked SC members to direct their attention to the section of the meeting handout dealing with nominees for a variety of committees. SC members discussed the names that were presented. Blonder **moved** to approve the nominees for the Periodic Program Review for the College of Arts and Sciences Committee; the Periodic Program Review for the College of Engineering Committee; the Summative Evaluation of the Dean of the College of Nursing Committee; the Summative Evaluation of the Dean of the College of Agriculture Committee; and the College of Engineering Dean Search Committee, as presented. Coyne **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. Swanson arrived.

SC members discussed the proposed names for the Health Care Clinical Sciences Academic Area Advisory Committee. Vice Chair Grossman asked for a motion to approve the proposed membership of the Health Care Clinical Sciences Academic Area Advisory Committee as discussed, and Swanson **moved** thusly. McCormick **seconded**. There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Chair Swanson and took over responsible for the meeting. She moved to announcements.

Coyne, Grossman and McCormick agreed to serve as volunteers to test the document handling system.

The Chair suggested that Mia Alexander-Snow (Director of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness) be asked to serve as an ex officio member on the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC). The Chair said she thought Alexander-Snow could be very helpful in working with program assessment on the front end, could help demonstrate a good system of assessment, and help the SAPC know what to focus on regarding approving programs. There were no objections **[AI]**.

4. UK Core Course Vetting Process for 2011-2012 - Assistant Provost for Undergraduate Education Bill Rayens

The Chair invited Assistant Provost for Undergraduate Education Bill Rayens to offer information regarding the activities of the Interim General Education Oversight Committee (IGEOC). He offered comments to SC members about a variety of issues, including areas for improvement, regarding the operating of IGEOC, which he chairs.

After discussion, Wood **moved** that the SC extend the operating period of IGEOC to the time period that fits IGEOC's needs, with the understanding that IGEOC return to the SC and University Senate as planned

with recommendations about the UK Core vetting process and associated aspects. Grossman **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Rules and Elections Committee

i. University Appeals Board

Grossman explained that there was a question as to whether or not UK's *Governing Regulations XI (GR XI)* superseded the *Senate Rules* pertaining to the jurisdiction of the University Appeals Board (UAB) and the UAB imposing a tougher penalty on a student in the case of an academic offense. There was extensive discussion among SC members and Davy Jones, guest and chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, and guests T. Lynn Williamson (Senior Associate General Counsel) and Marcy Deaton (Associate General Counsel) all discussed the matter. At the end of the discussion, Williamson and Deaton agreed that against the background of establishing jurisdictional reach, the University Senate (Senate) has the right to speak to sanctions without undermining the judicial code, specifically that sanctions against a student cannot be increased by the UAB. Deaton, Jones and Williamson agreed to help the Chair draft language to send to the UAB.

Jones then explained the other issue was that during another situation brought to the attention of the SREC, the SREC realized that there was no formal reporting method to the Senate on the activities of the UAB. There was extensive discussion among those present about the matter.

Grossman **moved** to ask the chair of the University Appeals Board (UAB) to prepare a summary of actions of the UAB in academic matters, specifically grade appeals and academic offenses, and provide a de-identified summary of the nature of the appeals and the actions taken by the UAB to the SC at the beginning of each academic year.

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

b. Multiple Campus Registrars

Jones explained that during a recent interpretation, the SREC learned that there are four registrars at UK – there are registrars in the Colleges of Dentistry (DE), Law (LA) and Medicine (ME), and the University Registrar. The registrar in ME advised the dean that he could change a grade, which caused a further discussion. It appears that no one has oversight over the all four registrars. There was discussion about the matter. Jones explained to SC members that the three college registrars probably came about when the Senate granted permission to DE, LA and ME to have different calendars, which resulted in different schedules for entering grades, etc.

Grossman **moved** that the SC ask the Provost examine the possibility of consolidating all registrar positions into the University Registrar's office, and report his decision and rationale to the SC.

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

5. Senate Oversight of University Calendar

Enforcement of Existing Calendars

Possibility of Ad Hoc Committee to Look at Calendar Issues

Jones explained to SC members that two colleges were modifying the University calendar without Senate approval. The College of Arts and Sciences (AS) was proposing to offer two six-week sessions

during the summer, as opposed to offering courses during the four-week and eight-week sessions. Further, the College of Nursing offers a course that begins on the first day of the four-week session and ends on the last day of the eight-week session. Jones said that the changes to the calendar could cause havoc for the Registrar's office and raise other legal issues. There was discussion among SC members. Jones added that the Registrar's office will provide him with a list of all courses that are not offered in accordance with the University calendar.

After additional discussion, Grossman **moved** that the SC ask Provost Subbaswamy to inform the deans that if a college wishes to have their calendar exceptions approved, the college must request it of the Senate. Wasilkowski **seconded**. There was additional discussion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

2. Old Business

e. Discussion on Interpretation of Senate Rules 5.2.4.7 ("Final Examinations")

Jones offered extensive information about the history of the final examination language in the *Senate Rules*, dating back to approximately 1920. There was discussion about the item. Grossman commented that the proposed language explicitly gives different exam lengths to colleges that have approval for different calendars.

Grossman **moved** to approve the following change¹ to *Senate Rules 5.2.4.7* ("Final Examinations"):

5.2.4.7 Final Examinations

If an instructor is administering a final examination is to be given, and he or she is requiring students to take the exam in a particular place at a particular time, then he or she must it will be administered the exam during the examination period-as scheduled by the Registrar for the semesters of the regular school year. [US: 10/10/11]

~~These examination periods will utilize the last 5 days of each semester and will be preceded by a study day or weekend on which no classes or examinations for weekday classes will be scheduled.~~

A. The Registrar shall schedule two-hour periods for final examinations for courses offered during the fall and spring semesters. The faculties of colleges that have Senate approval for their own special calendars may instruct the Registrar to schedule final examination periods of a different length. The Registrar shall schedule spring and fall semester final examination periods during the last 5 days of the semester; that 5-day period shall be preceded by a study day or weekend on which no classes or examinations for weekday classes will be scheduled. Final examinations for weekend classes will be administered the weekend before this 5 day period and need not be preceded by a study day. [US: 4/9/01; 10/10/11]

~~Final examinations, where appropriate, will be administered during the last class day of the summer session/term.~~

B. The Registrar shall schedule final examinations for courses offered during the 4-week summer term, 8-week summer session, and winter intersession for the time of the last scheduled class period. [US: 10/10/11]

¹ Strikethrough denotes deleted text, and underline denotes added text.

C. An instructor may allow students less than the full period scheduled by the Registrar to complete the final examination, but he or she must inform the students at least two weeks before the start of the examination how much time they will have to complete the examination (one week in advance for winter intersession, 4 week summer term and 8 week summer session).

In cases of take-home final examinations, students shall not be required to return the completed examination before the end of the regularly scheduled examination period. [US: 4/28/86]

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

There was additional discussion regarding the clarity of requirements for final exam times. Grossman **moved** that the SC ask the Provost to remind deans that unless they have permission from the Senate to use a separate calendar, the college must follow the final exam schedule given by the University Registrar. McCormick **seconded**. There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

2. Old Business

b. Senate Oversight of Study Abroad Courses

The Chair invited Associate Provost for International Affairs Susan Carvalho to present the proposal (jointly created with assistance from the Registrar's office) regarding Senate oversight of Study Abroad courses. There was extensive discussion among those present about the proposal.

Eventually, Wood **moved** to approve the proposal as presented in the handout [below], with the additional comment that the report is two-year interim solution, which will be reviewed by the SC upon receipt of yearly reports from the Associate Provost for International Affairs, delivered to the Senate in the fall each academic year. Wasilkowski **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair then returned to the issue of committees needing faculty membership. SC members discussed additional nominees. Blonder **moved** to approve the committee nominees as discussed. Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

SC members then decided to ask Debra Anderson (NU) to join the SC and fill Wermeling's SC term until its end, in December 2011.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15.

Respectfully submitted by Hollie I. Swanson,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Blonder, Coyne, Grossman, Kelly, McCormick, Peek, Steiner, Swanson, Wimberly, Wasilkowski and Wood.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guests present: Susan Carvalho, Marcy Deaton, Sonja Feist-Price, Gary Gaffield, Davy Jones, Bill Rayens, T. Lynn Williamson and Leslie Woltenberg.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Friday, September 30, 2011.

#	√	Item	Responsibility	Completed
20.		Charge Senate's Academic Programs Committee with creating processes for substantive change issues (teach-out, contractual/consortium process, off-campus sites, how to reopen a suspended program). (8/23/10)	SC	
31.		Ask the Provost to submit a statement of financial and administrative feasibility for proposals prior to the proposals being sent to cmte. (10/4/10)	Document Handling System	
40.		Draft changes to <i>Senate Rule</i> language on Senate meeting attendance policies for review by SC. (8/30/10 & 11/15/10)	Chair, Steiner	
42.		Discuss with the Provost the method of allocating resources from distance learning courses. (11/15/10)	Chair	
44.		Create ad hoc committee (perhaps with VPR and Provost) to look at what constitutes an administrative or an educational unit, and if there is a continuum or a sharp difference. (11/22/10; 12/6/10)	Chair, SC	
46.		Discuss election of officers, specifically who is eligible to cast votes. (12/6/10); Solicit opinions from the Senate. (2/28/11)	SC	
53.		Investigate "Quality Matters" WRT distance learning courses. (1/10/11)	SC	
57.		Look into creating a Senate committee on assessment. (1/31/11)	SC	
62.		Determine how to address the issue of the proportionate representation of appointed Board of Trustees members. (2/7/11)	SC	
63.		Invite UofL employment ombud to SC meeting after joint ombud cmte visits the University of Cincinnati. (2/21/11)	Mrs. Brothers	
66.		Invite Associate Provost for Undergrad Ed to offer "State of Undergraduate Education" address to Senate. (2/21/11)	Chair	
67.		Invite Associate Provost for Academic Affairs about distance learning courses. (2/21/2011)	Mrs. Brothers	
71.		Invite Dean Kornbluh et al to present "A&S Wired" to the Senate in fall 2011. (5/2/11)	Mrs. Brothers	
72.		Discuss status of department chairs and directors of interdisciplinary centers during the August Advance. (6/15/11)	SC	
73.		Ask each college dean's office to submit information about their faculty council, as part of the SACS reaccreditation effort. (6/15/11)	Chair	
74.	√	Form an ad hoc committee charged with formulating a document describing best practices regarding distance learning practices, with membership of said cmte in the purview of the Chair. (6/15/11)	Chair	06/2011

76.	Develop metrics for faculty input into president's performance during August Advance. (6/15/11)	SC	
77.	Draft a report on the perceptions of the faculty reps on the Presidential Search Committee on the process, and include relevant info from similar universities' recent presidential searches. (6/15/11)	Chair & Steiner	
78.	Create checklist describing most common problems encountered during reviews of curricular proposals and disseminate to colleges. (6/15/11)	Mrs. Brothers	
81.	Meet with each college's faculty council in the fall, and also reinforce the importance of identifying a senator to communicate with college faculty. (6/15/11)	Chair	
82.	Request that the chair of the Senate's Academic Facilities Cmte be invited to attend meetings of the Capital Planning Advisory Group. (6/15/11)	Chair	
84.	Deliberate on the idea of recording meetings and posting the video (with time markers of important discussions).	SC	
85.	Find out if the Senate has an approving or endorsing vote on proposed changes to post-tenure review policies.	Chair	
86.	Determine by late August the message(s) the Chair should relay when she visits college faculty councils.	SC	
87.	Invite Mia Alexander-Snow to give her presentation on assessment to the Senate.	Mrs. Brothers	
90.	Post Senate cmte final reports on their websites. (8-22-11)	Mrs. Brothers	
91.	Ask the President to nominate a faculty representative to the SEC/NCAA from a list of names forwarded to the President from the Chair of the Senate Council.	Chair	
92.	Invite Mia Alexander-Snow to serve as an ex officio member of the Senate's Programs Committee. (9/26/11)	Chair	