

Senate Council
October 3, 2016

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm in 103 Main Building on Monday, October 3, 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 3:02 pm.

1. Minutes from September 26, 2016 and Announcements

The Chair said there were a couple of changes to the minutes. There being **no objections**, the minutes from September 26 were **approved** as amended by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair announced that she was communicating with the SC's nominees about serving on an ad hoc committee to review *Administrative Regulations 6:2* ["Policy and Procedures for Addressing and Resolving Allegations of Sexual Assault, Stalking, Dating Violence, and Domestic Violence"]. When she is able to identify four faculty who are willing and able to serve, she will let SC know.

The Chair explained that a few senators were added to the roster after the majority of senators were assigned to committees. The Chair asked if there were any objections to her adding these senators to logical University Senate (Senate) committees or if SC would like such appointments to be placed on a SC agenda. SC members preferred that the Chair make such appointments.

Senator D. Jones sent in some technical edits to the proposed new Schnatter Institute. The Chair explained (and Bailey agreed) that Bailey was prepared to accept them as friendly amendments.

The last announcement the Chair brought to SC was related to the problem of errors in SAP. She described a handful of corrections that the College of Arts and Sciences has brought to the attention of the Senate Council office, including the issue of the Undergraduate Certificate in Appalachian Studies, which is currently homed in The Appalachian Center, a multidisciplinary research center (MDRC); Arts and Sciences would like that certificate homed at the college level because curriculum cannot be housed in an MDRC. The process for fixing such issues is to go through the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) and complete the appropriate forms. The Chair asked SC members to have a brief discussion about the possibility of a new process to correct technical errors in SAP, perhaps an expedited process overseen by the SAOSC. The SC members discussed the issue at length with Guest Anna Bosch (AS/English), associate dean for undergraduate programs. After discussion, there were no objections to bringing such issues directly to the SC for review. If the number of requests for corrections grows over time, or a proposal appears to do more than fix a clerical error, those present agreed to revisit the process.

2. Course Reviews and Syllabi – Proposal from College of Arts and Sciences' Educational Policy Committee

The Chair reminded SC members that they had asked for input from the Senate's academic councils and noted that the proposal included notice of approval and feedback from the Graduate Council, Health Care Colleges Council, and the Undergraduate Council. There was an extensive discussion among SC members and Guests Anna Bosch (AS/English, and associate dean for undergraduate programs) and Amy Spriggs (ED/Early Childhood, Special Education, and Rehabilitation Counseling, and chair of the Undergraduate Council). Brian Jackson (Interim Dean of the Graduate School and chair of the Graduate Council) was also in attendance.

As discussion wound down, Schroeder **moved** that the Course Reviews and Syllabi proposal be sent to the Undergraduate Council to request a formal proposal from the Undergraduate Council to describe what that body thinks should be included on the Curriculog course form based on the SC's discussion and the Undergraduate Council's past deliberations, consult with the Graduate Council, and return to the SC with specific recommendations for the Curriculog course form along with a possible draft of the form and suggested dates for moving towards implementing the revised Curriculog course form. Brown **seconded**. As an aside, Brown reiterated his past requests for a campuswide repository for current course syllabi. Reid commented that the lack of such a repository was a common complaint from students.

After additional discussion, Schroeder clarified that the intent of her motion was to ensure the SC and SC office had sufficient detail to implement changes; the proposal from the College of Arts and Sciences coupled with the input from the academic councils was not actionable in narrative form. She suggested that the Undergraduate Council (UC) suggest dates for piloting a revised Curriculog course form. After the SC reviews the specific changes recommended by the UC, the Chair can work with SC office staff to have the changes implemented. Lauersdorf lamented the various syllabus-related documents and communications that exist around campus and wondered if there was a way to standardize that type of information. Ms. Brothers commented that the motion from SC charging the UC with certain actions could be used by UC to recommend removal or consolidation of the various syllabus-related documents and communications.

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

3. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) – Ernie Bailey, Chair

i. Proposed Name Change of Department of Anatomy and Neurobiology to the Department of Neuroscience

Bailey explained the proposal. There were a few comments by SC members. Guest Anna Bosch (AS/English, and associate dean for undergraduate programs) and Guest Bret Smith (ME/Physiology) answered questions from SC members. In response to a question about activities in the area of neuroscience, Smith replied that there were approximately 100 faculty in many departments across campus who identified as being neuroscientists but that only 20 faculty were in the department. He opined that neuroscientists, such as himself, would not find the new department name objectionable.

The **motion** from the SAOSC was that the SC recommend to the Senate that it endorse the name change for the Department of Anatomy and Neurobiology in the College of Medicine to the Department of Neuroscience in the College of Medicine. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. 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 3.1.0* ("Course Numbering System") and *Senate Rules 3.1.1* ("Exceptions")

Guest Scott Yost, chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), explained the proposed changes. There were a few questions.

The motion from the SAASC was that the SC recommend to the Senate that it approve the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 3.1.0* ("Course Numbering System") and *Senate Rules 3.1.1* ("Exceptions").

Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

c. Advisory Committee for Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement (ACGCCR) – Scott Yost and Kathi Kern, Co-Chairs

i. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 5.4.3.1* (“Composition and Communication,” “Assessment of the Program’s GCCR”)

The Chair welcomed Guest Scott Yost (EN/Civil Engineering), co-chair of the Advisory Committee for Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement (ACGCCR) and Guest Kathi Kern (AS/History, director of the Center for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching), the other co-chair of ACGCCR. Yost and Kern explained the proposed revisions regarding assessment of the graduation composition and communication requirement (GCCR).

SC members, Yost, and Kern engaged in a lengthy discussion. SC members expressed a variety of concerns, listed below.

- The proposed language would require more information to be submitted for assessment than the previous language.
- There are about 100 undergraduate degree programs; ACGCCR may not be big enough to be actively involved in the GCCR assessment for each undergraduate degree program.
- The proposed language is much stronger than the existing language and requests documentation from undergraduate programs that were not previously required.
- It will take a lot of effort on the part of a director of undergraduate studies (DUS) to submit the paperwork that the proposed language requires.
- The proposed language shifts responsibility for assessment from individual programs to the ACGCCR.
- The ACGCCR does not have the authority to evaluate a degree program’s assessment plan.
- Enforcement of the GCCR assessment is an administrative function, not something the Senate can require.

There was no resolution to the proposed assessment policy.

ii. Proposed Workaround for GCCR Substitution Policy

Yost explained a potential “workaround” substitution policy as a waiver of the *Senate Rules (SR)*. SC members expressing opinions objected, noting that course substitutions have always been in the purview of colleges so substituting one course for an approved GCCR course was a course substitution issue, not a waiver of the *SR*. Members understood the need for the ACGCCR to be aware of GCCR-related course substitutions but did not think that the lack of a formal policy on substitutions would be detrimental.

4. Proposed University Senate Resolution on University Staff

Senate Council
October 3, 2016

Guest Mark Whitaker (AS/Anthropology) explained that many faculty had come to him expressing concern about staff employees at UK; in addition, he felt that some staff employees felt less than appreciated recently. Whitaker said that he and other faculty thought it would be a good idea for faculty to express appreciation for staff; faculty depend on staff from the level of employees in the grounds crew to the special staffers who make faculty members' jobs easier. There were a number of comments from SC members. Wood expressed concern that the language implied that the University was not currently making every effort to consider the well-being of staff employees. Blonder objected to the resolution on the grounds that faculty also feel unappreciated and underpaid. Bailey thought that a preamble explaining the need for the resolution would be helpful.

After lengthy discussion. SC members were of the opinion that such a resolution would be perceived as stronger if 10 senators endorsed the resolution and it be walked on to a Senate agenda rather than to have the SC put it on the Senate agenda. Brown, Schroeder, Mazur, Mills, Stekardis, and Bailey expressed to Whitaker their desire to sign a resolution in support of staff employees.

5. Tentative Senate Agenda for October 10, 2016

SC members discussed the tentative Senate agenda for October 10. All those present agreed with the removal of the GCCR-related items and the proposed resolution in support of staff. They reordered the agenda slightly to ensure items that had been to Senate previously were part of "old business." Wood **moved** to approve the tentative Senate agenda as revised and Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:21 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine M. McCormick,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bailey, Blonder, Brown, Lauersdorf, McCormick, Mazur, Mills, Reid, Schroeder, Stekardis, and Wood.

Invited guests present: Anna Bosch, Brian Jackson, Kathi Kern, Bret Smith, Amy Spriggs, Scott Yost.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, October 5, 2016.