

University Senate
April 23, 2018

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, April 23, 2018 in the Lexmark Public Room (room 209) of the Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via electronic voting devices unless indicated otherwise. Specific voting information can be requested from the Office of the Senate Council.

Senate Council Chair Katherine McCormick (ED) called University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:00 pm. She welcomed senators and noted that first the Senate would hear from President Eli Capilouto and his staff, after which the Senate would move on to its academic business. She requested that senators, if possible, stay if five o'clock approached and business was still being conducted, noting that faculty colleagues had worked hard on the proposals and she did not want to leave anyone without having their proposal reviewed.

The Chair reminded senators to be civil during conversations and to be sure to share with colleges and the people represented by senators the business of the Senate. The Chair called for an attendance vote and 40 senators registered their presence, although more were present in the room.

The Chair welcomed President Eli Capilouto, chair of the Senate.

1. President Eli Capilouto, University Senate Chair

President Capilouto thanked senators for the time to speak with them. He recognized the length of the agenda and said that he, Provost David Blackwell, and Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration Eric Monday (guest) would be succinct as they provided information about three areas, beginning with the state budget and UK's short-term and long-term financial needs. President Capilouto described the biennial budget process and its effects on UK and other universities in the state. Executive Vice President Monday then gave senators an overview of the five-year financial plan and the collaborative efforts of staff, faculty, and students on the eight concept teams. Provost Blackwell updated senators on the current activities of the concept teams and thanked those present who are serving on those teams.

President Capilouto thanked both Monday and Blackwell and continued speaking about how UK planned to weather the budgetary challenges. Farrell (FA) asked if the President was aware of any stated rationale regarding the elimination of funding for the University Press of Kentucky. President Capilouto replied that he was not aware of any specific rationale, but expressed confidence in finding a way to fund the Press.

The President then spoke at length regarding the second topic, the language in the biennial budget regarding tenure and he reiterated to senators the value and importance that UK places on the tenure system. He explained to senators that the tenure language was likely placed in the budget bill to provide other universities a way to address their fiscal challenges, noting that UK had not requested any such language. President Capilouto noted that as in the past, UK remained committed to the tenure system. In response to a question from Zook (AS), President Capilouto said that he was not considering changes to tenure. D. Jones asked how the President made a compelling case about tenure to the public. President Capilouto replied by noting that he tried to follow public opinion to find a deeper understanding of those who support UK with tax dollars and what resonates with them. He noted that public support for higher education had dropped considerably since 2014 and that there were doubts about the value of a college education. He said that he tried to talk about UK's curriculum and how it prepares students for future work and that STEM [science, technology, engineering, and math] fields should be combined with the arts, to prepare UK students to be the best servants for Kentucky.

President Capilouto noted that competitive universities provide tenure and that it would put UK at a great disadvantage if faculty were to have reason to think that tenure at UK was not valued.

Tagavi (EN) asked if the budget language required changes to UK's *Administrative Regulations* and *Governing Regulations* and the President said he was open to working with Senate if the Senate wished to revise or strengthen UK's language about tenure, but that he had no draft documents he was working on. Brion (EN) suggested the President share with the public a comment from a student in her class – if the best faculty are not at UK, then students will not be as likely to want to attend. The President noted that students who have a meaningful relationship with their faculty instructors are more likely to value their education.

Turning to the third and final topic, President Capilouto then asked Bird-Pollan (LA, vice chair, incoming chair) to explain the process used to review UK's *Administrative Regulation (AR) 6:2* ("Policy and Procedures for Addressing and Resolving Allegations of Sexual Assault, Stalking, Dating Violence, and Domestic Violence"). Bird-Pollan (LA) explained that about a year and a half prior, the Chair asked Bird-Pollan to chair an ad hoc Committee that was to review *AR 6:2*. Bird-Pollan asked Committee members to stand and be recognized with a round of applause. She then described the work of the Committee, its membership, its process, and its deliberations. She explained that after the Chair sent the Committee's report to the President, she and the Chair met with the President and Legal Counsel Bill Thro and discussed the entire 20-page report and all the elements of the Committee's recommended changes to the *AR*. She thanked the President for taking their recommendations seriously and she noted that it was important to appreciate the work conducted by the Committee members; Bird-Pollan noted that the subject matter was complicated and important, that balance was difficult, and the Committee wrestled with controversial ideas in a respectful manner. She again thanked President Capilouto and leadership for listening and taking their recommendations to heart in the promulgation of a revised rule.

The President thanked Bird-Pollan and the Committee for all the thought and effort that went into their difficult discussions. He noted that he planned to propose four major changes to the current *AR*.

- Determinations of responsibility (guilt or innocence) will be by preponderance of evidence (50.1%).
- Determination of responsibility will be unanimous.
- Respondent will be able to appeal, but Complaining Witness is not.
- Lawyers can actively participate in all aspects.

Wood (AS) asked if UK's standard of evidence would change if federal guidance changed. President Capilouto replied that if the federal government issued guidelines on how to follow Title IX rules, UK would follow them. There were no further questions from senators. President Capilouto thanked senators for their time and suggested they might all meet again at graduation. Senators thanked the President with a round of applause as he departed.

The Chair described the timeline of the ad hoc Committee on *AR 6:2*.

- June 17, 2016: Committee Charged by SC

University Senate
April 23, 2018

- October 28, 2016: First Committee meeting
- December 19, 2016: SC added “employment questionnaire” to Committee’s charge
- August 28, 2017: SC discussed Committee’s memo and proposed AR changes; offered suggestions and memo returned to Committee
- September 25, 2017: SC discussed Committee’s memo and proposed AR changes and questionnaire comments
- SC endorsed Committee’s questionnaire comments
- SC adopted Committee’s memo and proposed AR changes
- October 13, 2017: Chair submitted Committee’s report and recommendations to President Capilouto

The Chair described to senators how to find the Committee’s report memo and recommended AR changes. The Chair reminded senators to be ready to review a proposed change to AR 6:2 (“Policy and Procedures for Addressing and Resolving Allegations of Sexual Assault, Stalking, Dating Violence, and Domestic Violence”) at the May Senate meeting.

2. Minutes from March 19, 2018 and Announcements

The Chair said that editorial changes had been received and the revised version was emailed to senators earlier in the day. There being no objections, the minutes from March 19, 2018 were approved as amended by unanimous consent.

The Chair offered a series of announcements.

- There will be one more Senate meeting, on May 7; the meeting will be back in the Athletics Auditorium of W. T. Young Library.
- The Senate Council office was unable to schedule a 2016-17 University Appeals Board (UAB) report for this semester will be try to schedule the update for a fall Senate meeting.
- There is a possibility of changing the start time for the May 7 meeting from 3 pm to 2 pm. During the SC meeting on April 30, the SC will discuss whether or not there is a need to start the Senate meeting early. If the meeting start time is changed, it will be announced in the email with the agenda and minutes.
- The Chair helped prepare a file that describes UK’s regulations pertaining to tenure and how programs are reviewed; it was shared with SC recently. She described it as a quick reference sheet and noted that tenured faculty cannot be released unless the processes outlined in the document were followed. The file describing reduction or termination of a program or unit can be found at (top bullet): <http://www.uky.edu/universitysenate/faculty-related-links>.
- Many staff and others are concerned about the language in the biennial budget that terminated tuition agreements with other Kentucky universities. (UK’s Employee Education Program and Family Education Program remain unchanged.) The Chair explained that administrators are reviewing data and possible next steps and referred senators to the email from President Capilouto on April 20 for more details.

- UK is changing its wireless system from ukyedu to eduroam. The Chair said that senators could visit www.uky.edu/wifihelp for help logging in. The current wireless network (ukyedu) will be eliminated shortly after May 7.
- The Chair offered congratulations to the faculty recipients of UK's 2018 Outstanding Teaching Faculty Awards: Roger Brown (AG/Agricultural Economics); Lynn Phillips (AS/Geography); Bradley Plaster (AS/Psychology); C. Ray Archer (AS/Psychology); Christine Goble (EN/Mechanical Engineering); Wendy Liu (BE/Finance and Quantitative Methods); and Trenika Mitchell (PH/Pharmacy Practice and Science).
- The Chair reminded senators of the need to be conscientious in moving curricular proposals in a timely manner. She said that the SC office and Senate committees work hard to move proposals through the system, but it was important for individual faculty proposers to also do their part. If a proposal is returned to a proposer with a request for revisions, the proposer would be well served to make the edits and return the proposal quickly. The Chair said that if a proposer is unresponsive, it will slow down the approval process and the program and potential students could be negatively affected. The academic councils review work quickly, but their timelines also depend on faculty responsiveness.
 - If seeking a fall 2019 effective date, curricular proposals must be reviewed by the appropriate academic council(s) (GC, HCCC, UC) and received by the SC office by: February 5, 2019 for new degree program proposals; March 15, 2019 for other proposals requiring committee review (new certificates, transfers of a degree, new department, change to credit hours required for graduation, significant program changes, etc.); and April 15, 2019 for courses, all other program changes, and minors. The Chair reiterated that academic council review (Graduate Council, Health Care Colleges Council, and Undergraduate Council) can vary from two weeks to a few months, depending on a proposal's quality and/or complexity. The deadlines are in place to ensure reasonable time for review, not to guarantee an effective date. Incomplete proposals, those with unresponsive contact persons, etc. may not be approved in time for a fall 2019 effective date.

3. Officer and Other Reports

a. Chair

The Chair reminded senators that both the Chair and the SC have the authority to waive some *SRs*, as long as those waivers are reported to Senate. On behalf of SC and Senate, on March 26 the SC approved a rule waiver for a student (waived enrollment requirement in *SR 5.2.1.2*) to allow a student to take a special exam for course credit although the student was not enrolled.

On April 9, the SC heard report on the percentages of clinical title series (CTS) faculty in the colleges. Three colleges are above their faculty council-approved percentages. As a result, Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement G.T. Lineberry is working with them to encourage faculty councils to vote on ratio increase.

UK's current Ombud, Joe McGillis, is interested in serving another one-year term. Per *SR 6.2.3.D*, the SC voted to allow McGillis to serve a second one-year term.

SC reviewed and endorsed the charge for the Graduate Education Implementation Committee, which is comprised of five components: 1. identify and prioritize action items and propose timelines based on the recommendations provided by the Blue Ribbon Committee; 2. demonstrate linkage of prioritized action items to the University Strategic Plan Goal #2 (Graduate Education); 3. work with the Graduate School and Provost Budget Office to estimate costs of the prioritized action items; 4. building on the work done by the Blue Ribbon Committee, consider and provide input on any structural, policy, or governance changes necessary to effectively implement prioritized action items; and 5. determine how the effectiveness of the action items will be measured. The Blue Ribbon Implementation Committee will have available a set of resources including: Blue Ribbon Committee report and appendices; recordings/notes from most recent open forums; UK Strategic Plan (Graduate Education); Provost Budget Office staff; and support from UK Institutional Research and Advanced Analytics and the Graduate School.

The SC recently modified the standard for faculty to follow when creating program proposals that utilize a course(s) from outside that particular faculty member's unit. If a proposal involves a course offered by another unit, the department chair, director of graduate studies, or the director of undergraduate studies must approve; no vote by the faculty is necessary. For lists of prefixes (no specific course prefix and number), no consultation or approval is required. The Chair explained that the intent was to make it a little easier to collaborate on courses and relieve a little of the burden on proposers.

The Chair noted that the SC office was aware of some proposals initiated by the Registrar, including a proposal regarding financial aid and student attendance and a proposal regarding the deadline by which final grades must be submitted. Both proposals are likely to affect SRs or the Senate-approved calendar. The Chair stated that she appreciated the Registrar's initiatives and looked forward to reviewing the proposals.

4. Degree Recipients

a. May 2018 In Memoriam Degree Recipients

i. College of Medicine Student RC-05

The Chair invited Guest Andrew Hoellein (ME/Internal Medicine, associate dean for student affairs) to explain the request. Hoellein did so, noting that it was supported by College of Medicine Dean Robert DiPaola and also by the student's classmate. The Chair explained that the **motion** was a recommendation from the SC that the elected faculty senators approve College of Medicine student RC-05 as the recipient of an In Memoriam honorary degree, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions or comments from senators.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 67 in favor and two abstained.

ii. College of Engineering Student GR-90

The Chair invited Guest Kim Anderson (EN/Chemical and Materials Engineering, associate dean for administrative and academic affairs) to explain the request and she did so. The Chair explained that the motion from the SC was a recommendation that the elected faculty senators approve College of Engineering student GR-90 as the recipient of an In Memoriam honorary degree, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There were no questions or comments.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 68 in favor.

iii. College of Engineering Student TM-15

Anderson explained the request. The Chair explained that the motion from the SC was a recommendation that the elected faculty senators approve College of Engineering student TM-15 as the recipient of an In Memoriam honorary degree, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There were no questions or comments from senators.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 68 in favor and one abstained.

b. May 2018 Degree List

The Chair explained that the **motion** from SC was that the elected faculty senators approve UK's May 2018 list of candidates for credentials, for submission by the President to the Board of Trustees. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. She noted that senators received a revised version of the May 2018 list and the early August 2018 list via email, earlier in the day.

A **vote** was taken and the motion passed with 66 in favor and one abstained.

c. Early August 2018 Degree List

The Chair said that the **motion** from SC was that the elected faculty senators approve UK's early August 2018 list of candidates for credentials, for submission by the President to the Board of Trustees. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

A **vote** was taken and the motion passed with 63 in favor and three abstained.

d. Late Addition to December 2017 Degree List (per Senate Rules 5.4.1.1.D.1-2)

i. College of Arts and Sciences Student KD-06

The Chair invited Guest Ruth Beattie (AS/Biology, associate dean for advising) to explain the request, which she did. The Chair said that the motion from Senate Council was a recommendation that the elected faculty senators amend the December 2017 degree list by adding the BA Economics for student KD-06 and recommend through the President to the Board of Trustees that the degree be awarded effective December 2017. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There were no questions or comments from senators.

A **vote** was taken and the motion passed with 66 in favor.

The Chair said that unless anyone objected, the next presenter would serve as acting chair for purposes of answering questions of fact only. There were no objections from senators.

5. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) – Margaret Schroeder, Chair

i. Proposed New PhD in Forest and Natural Resource Sciences

Schroeder (ED), chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal. She said that the **motion** from Committee was a recommendation that the Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees through the President, the establishment of a new PhD in Forest and Natural Resource Sciences, in the Department of Forestry and Natural Resources within the College of Agriculture, Food and Environment. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was

necessary. There were no questions of fact and there was no debate. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 71 in favor and one opposed.

ii. Proposed New MAT in Secondary STEM Education

Mark (ED), a member of the SAPC, explained the proposal. She said that the **motion** was a recommendation that the Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, through the President, the establishment of a new MAT in Secondary STEM Education, in the Department of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics Education within the College of Education. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. The Chair explained that the proposal came from Schroeder's department and Schroeder had asked an SAPC member to present the proposal. Ederington (BE) asked if there was a memorandum of understanding included with the proposal and Mark replied affirmatively. There was no debate. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 67 in favor, two opposed, and three abstained.

iii. Recommendations for Significant Changes

Schroeder (ED) explained the proposal and described the changes that had been made since the proposal was presented to Senate on February 12. There were a couple of factual questions from senators. The Chair said that the motion was a recommendation that the Senate approve the SAPC's recommendations regarding significant program changes. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 60 in favor, one opposed, and four abstained.

The Chair said that unless anyone objected, the next presenter would serve as acting chair for purposes of answering questions of fact only. There were no objections from senators.

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

i. Proposed Changes to BSMAE Materials Engineering

Farrell (FA), chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), explained the proposal. There were no questions of fact from senators. The Chair stated that the **motion** from SAASC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the proposal from the College of Engineering, Department of Chemical and Materials Engineering (BSMAE Materials Engineering) to change required credit hours to 128. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There was no debate on the proposal.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 41 in favor and one opposed.

ii. Proposed Changes to BSMIE Mining Engineering

Farrell (FA) explained the proposal. There were no factual questions from SC members. The Chair said that the motion from SAASC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the proposal from the College of Engineering, Department of Mining Engineering (BSMIE Mining Engineering) to change the required credit hours to 128. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There were no factual questions.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 61 in favor and three abstained.

iii. Proposed Changes to BSCHE Chemical Engineering

Farrell (FA) explained the proposal. The Chair stated that the motion from the SAASC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the proposal from the College of Engineering, Department of

Mining Engineering (BSCHE Chemical Engineering) to change the required credit hours to 128. Brion (EN) noted that there was a typo in the motion as displayed on the slide – the degree program was housed in the Department of Chemical and Materials Engineering, not Mining Engineering. The Chair thanked Brion for the correction and noted that the correct **motion** was a recommendation that the Senate approve the proposal from the College of Engineering, Department of Chemical and Materials Engineering (BSCHE Chemical Engineering) to change the required credit hours to 128. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There were no factual questions and no debate.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 60 in favor and three abstained.

iv. Proposed Changes to BSCOE Computer Engineering

Farrell (FA) explained the proposal. The Chair stated that the motion from the SAASC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the proposal from the College of Engineering, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering (BSCOE Computer Engineering) to change the required credit hours to 128. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There were no factual questions and there was no debate.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 62 in favor, one opposed, and two abstained.

v. Proposed Change to Master of Public Policy

Farrell (FA) explained the proposal. Guest Ron Zimmer (GS/Martin School of Public Policy and Administration, director) participated in the discussion and answered questions. Visona (FA) asked for more information about what the students in the proposed new executive track would not be required to complete. D. Jones (ME) clarified that at the master's level, a particular emphasis was referred to as a "concentration," not a "track." Brion noted that she expressed concern about the proposal when it was presented to SC and she detailed her concerns.

When there were no further questions, the Chair said that the **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the proposal from the Martin School of Public Policy and Administration involving a change in the Master of Public Policy (MPP). Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 43 in favor, 13 opposed, and eight abstained.

vi. Proposed Suspension of Admissions into Dual Degree Program: MS Physician Assistant Studies and PharmD

Farrell (FA) explained the proposal. He said that the **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the proposal from the College of Health Sciences and College of Pharmacy involving the suspension of admissions to the PharmD/Master of Science in Physical Assistant Studies Dual Degree Program. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. English (HS) noted that the degree name was typed incorrectly – it should have referred to "MS Physician Assistant Studies" and not "MS Physical Assistant Studies." The Chair thanked him for the correction and noted that the motion should be amended thusly. There were no factual questions and there was no debate.

A **vote** was taken and the motion to approve the proposal from the College of Health Sciences and College of Pharmacy involving the suspension of admissions to the PharmD/Master of Science in Physician Assistant Studies Dual Degree Program **passed** with none opposed.

vii. Proposed Changes to College Medicine Grading System for MD Students (Proposed Changes to SR 5.1.2.3 (“Grading Systems,” “College of Medicine”); SR 5.3.3.3.A (“Attendance and Academic Discipline in the Professional Colleges,” “College of Medicine,” “Assessment of Student Learning”); and SR 5.3.3.3.B (“Attendance and Academic Discipline in the Professional Colleges,” “College of Medicine,” “Promotion and Retention Criteria”))

Farrell (FA) explained the proposal. In response to a question from English (HS), Farrell said that the change was for all medical students.

The Chair said that the motion from the SAASC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the proposal from the College of Medicine to change the grading system for the College of Medicine and *Senate Rules 5.1.2.3, 5.3.3.3.A, and 5.3.3.3.8*. There was general consensus in the room that the last *SR* reference erroneously included an “8” instead of a “B.” The Chair clarified that the **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the proposal from the College of Medicine to change the grading system for the College of Medicine and *Senate Rules 5.1.2.3, 5.3.3.3.A, and 5.3.3.3.B*. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There were no questions of fact and there was no debate.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 54 in favor, four opposed, and five abstained.

The Chair said that unless anyone objected, the next presenter would serve as acting chair for purposes of answering questions of fact only. There were no objections from senators.

c. Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) – Davy Jones, Chair

i. Proposed Change to *Senate Rules 1.2.3* (“Meetings”)

D. Jones (ME), chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SREC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 1.2.3* (“Meetings”). The proposed new language codified the manner of determining the effective date for *SR* changes. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There were no factual questions and there was no debate.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 58 in favor and one abstained.

d. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) – Al Cross, Chair

i. Proposed New Center for Health Equity Transformation

Cross (CI), chair of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC), explained the proposal. Cross said that the first **motion** from the SAOSC was a recommendation that the Senate approve a proposal from the College of Medicine for a new MDRC [multidisciplinary research center] based on its academic merit. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There was no debate.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 54 in favor, two opposed, and five abstained.

Cross (CI) said that the second motion from the SAOSC was a recommendation that the Senate endorse a proposal from the College of Medicine for a new MDRC based on its organizational and structural merit. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There were no questions of fact and there was no debate. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 51 in favor and 10 opposed.

ii. Proposed Transfer of Undergraduate Certificate in Universal Design from Undergraduate Education to School of Interiors (within the College of Design)

Cross (CI) explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAOSC was a recommendation that the Senate endorse the proposal to transfer the Undergraduate Certificate in Universal Design from Undergraduate Education to the School of Interiors, within the College of Design. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There were no factual questions and there was no debate. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 59 in favor.

6. Proposal from Student Government Association (SGA) on Proposed New Fall Break – Ben Childress, SGA President (Second Reading – Discussion and Vote)

The Chair welcomed Childress to the podium and Childress thanked her and senators for an opportunity to have a second reading on the proposal, which was intended to be effective for fall 2019. Childress said that there were two primary suggestions from senators after the first reading. One was to change the proposed dates of fall break to match that of the fall break for Fayette County Public Schools (FCPS); Childress said that after conversations with the Counseling Center and others, it made the most sense to keep the fall break date as originally proposed and not tie it to one particular school system's fall break. The other concern pertained to Thursday- and Friday-specific courses that would lose another instructional day. He acknowledged that the proposed fall break could result in an extra burden for faculty, but asked faculty to be willing to make the changes in support of student mental health and well-being.

Farrell (FA) noted that he was still concerned that the Thursday and Friday fall break would negatively affect rehearsals, recitals, and other curricular activities outside the classroom that are required for some students. He wondered if the weekend would be affected or if it would just encompass Thursday and Friday. Childress said that the fall break would consist of the Thursday and Friday only and would not include the weekend. In response to another question from Farrell, the Chair said that Registrar Kim Taylor was present but had previously expressed support for the proposal. Guest Taylor said she and her office would work with constituents on campus to implement the proposed new fall break.

Kellum (AS) said that she wanted to make a case for changing the fall break days from Thursday and Friday to Monday and Tuesday. She explained that with the time off for Thanksgiving, the proposal would result in losing more Thursday and Friday instructional days, which would make it difficult to schedule labs for students so that every student in every lab had the same experiences. Childress expressed willingness to consider that change and Kellum added that the proposal as currently written would require the Department of Biology to drop one lab exercise for students. After a few additional comments, Grossman **moved** to amend the proposal so that the fall break would be changed to a Monday and Tuesday of the ninth week instead of a Thursday and Friday of the eighth week. Brion **seconded**. There was additional discussion and debate among senators.

A question arose as to which week of the instructional calendar included midterms. Grossman **amended** his motion so that the proposed new fall break would occur on the Monday and Tuesday of the week following midterms and Brion **accepted**. When there was no further discussion, a **vote** was taken via a show of hands to approve the proposed revision and the motion **passed** with none opposed. A vote was then taken on the amended proposal, to approve a change to the University calendar to implement a fall break on the Monday and Tuesday of the week following midterms. The motion **passed** with 42 in favor, eight opposed, and six abstained.

University Senate
April 23, 2018

The Chair thanked senators for staying to finish business. The meeting was adjourned by general consensus at 5:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine M. McCormick,
Senate Council Chair

Absences: Bailey, A.; Bailey, C.; Beck; Birdwhistell; Blackwell; Brady; Brennen; Cassis; Caudill; Cheng; Childress; Cofield; Collett; Collins; Couti; Cox; Crofcheck; Danner; DiPaola; Dobson; Effgen*; Escobar; Farrell; Feist-; rice; Fields; Freeman*; Gent; Griffin; Gunasena; Guy; Holloway; Hopkins; Iocono; Jackson; Kearney; Kerns; Koch*; Kyrkanides; Lauersdorf*; Lephart; Lovan; Mardini; Martin; Mazur; McClure; Murray; Murrell Taylor; Noland; O'Hair, D.; O'Neil; Peloza; Richey; Sandmeyer; Scaggs; Shanda; Sheff; Skinner; Tracy; Vernon; Vines; Vosevich; Warshawsky; Wasilkowski; Whitaker, M.; White*; Wilson, M.*; Wilson, K.; Witt; Wittkamp; Woods; Zadeh; and Zhang.

Invited guests present: Kim Anderson, Margaret Bausch, Ruth Beattie, Malachy Bishop, Andrew Hoellein, Carl Mattacola, Eric Monday, Nancy Schoenberg, Jeff Stringer, Jarod Stallones, and Jennifer Wilhelm.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, April 24, 2018.

* Denotes an explained absence.