

University Senate
September 12, 2011

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, September 13, 2011 in the Auditorium of W. T. Young Library. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Hollie I. Swanson called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:03 pm. She noted it was the 129th year of the Senate.

1. State of the University Address - University Senate Chair Eli Capilouto

University Senate Chair Eli Capilouto began his remarks to the University Senate (Senate) at 3:04 pm. After about 15 minutes, he took questions until there were no more.

2. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair offered a presentation to the Senate. She stated that there were a variety of announcements in the handout [see end of these minutes] as well as those in the presentation.

Prats gave an update from the Work-Life Advisory Council, specifically the new childcare center on campus, near the Arboretum. Peek offered an update on the joint staff-faculty committee on an employment ombud.

3. Officer and Other Reports

a. Chair

The Chair offered a report to senators, which focused primarily on the steps taken since spring 2011 to address the issues within the curricular approval process. She ended by inviting senators to email her with additional suggestions.

There were no additional reports.

4. Proposed Changes to Senate Rules 1.3.3.A ("Senate Council Chair")(2nd reading & vote)

The Chair explained the history of the proposal for the benefit of new senators. Steiner **moved** to approve the proposed changes¹ to *Senate Rules 1.3.1.3* and Grossman **seconded**.

CURRENT RULE FOR ELECTING A SENATE COUNCIL CHAIR

1.3.1.3 Officers of the Senate Council [US: 9/8/97]

The Senate Council shall elect its Chair in December preceding the academic year during which the Chair shall serve. All nine of the elected faculty representatives then serving on the Senate Council shall be eligible for election to the position. The incumbent Chair, if in his or her first year as Chair, shall also be eligible for reelection.

PROPOSED RULE FOR ELECTING A SENATE COUNCIL CHAIR

1.3.1.3 Officers of the Senate Council [US: 9/8/97]

Given that the chair of the Senate Council is also chair of the University Senate, the Senate Council chair shall be elected by a majority of a voting quorum of elected faculty

¹ Underline denotes added text

members of the University Senate. The election shall be held in the December preceding the first academic year during which the Chair shall serve. Members of the Senate may nominate current members of the Senate Council by notifying the chair of the Rules & Elections Committee at least one month in advance of the election date. The chair of the Rules & Elections Committee shall ascertain the nominees' willingness to serve. Candidates will be required to write a short description of their views of the role of Senate Council Chair. This information will be posted on the Senate web site at least two weeks prior to the election date. If the chair of the Rules & Elections Committee identifies only one candidate, then the election can be held at a regular meeting of the University Senate by a show of hands.

The term of the Senate Council chair shall be two years. The Senate Council chair is eligible to run for a second consecutive term. A Senate Council chair is not eligible to run for a third consecutive term. After a Senate Council chair steps down, he or she is not eligible to serve as Senate Council chair again for two years.

Senators debated the pros and cons of the proposed changes. There were some concerns that senators were left out of the current process to select the SC chair, although Lowry noted that senators do have input, through the process of electing SC members. Another issue raised was that SC members may be better able to identify the best candidate for SC chair, since the SC meets on a weekly basis and has a good feel for how a SC member would serve as SC chair.

After additional discussion, Butler **moved** to return the proposed changes to the SC at its next meeting for further consideration of the issues discussed in the Senate, and be reconsidered in the Senate at a future date. Wood **seconded**. After additional brief discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to return the proposed changes to the SC at its next meeting for further consideration of the issues discussed in the Senate, and be reconsidered in the Senate at a future date. The motion **passed** with a majority in favor.

5. UK August 2011 Degree List

Jones **moved** that the elected faculty senators approve UK's (second) August 2011 degree list, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Brion **seconded**.

Senators discussed the first and second lists. Guest Jacquie Hager (Associate Registrar) explained that the first list (approved by the Senate in April or May) is comprised of students who are in a program that requires licensure, etc. and if the approval of their degree comes in September, it causes problems in terms of employment. The second list is comprised of students who do not have any such issues. After brief discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with one opposed.

6. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Research Committee (SRC)

i. 2010-2011 Final Report on Animal Care

Whiteheart, member of the SRC, presented the SRC's report on animal care. Afterwards, he took questions from senators.

ii. 2010-2011 Final Report on Graduate Studies

DeWall presented the SRC's report graduate studies. Afterwards, he took questions from senators.

Grossman **moved** that the Senate receive the two reports from the Research Committee and Steiner **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC)

Lee presented the SAOSC's report. The Chair stated that the editorial suggestions offered by Prats would be incorporated into the report prior to posting.

Jones **moved** that the Senate receive the report from the SAOSC and post them online as official Senate guidelines and Grossman **seconded**. After brief discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstaining.

7. Academic Ombud Report for 2010 - 2011 - Past Ombud Lee Edgerton

Former Academic Ombud Lee Edgerton gave senators the Ombud's report for 2010 – 2011. He answered the questions that were asked.

8. Proposed Changes to Senate Rules 6.2.1.1, 6.5.1.2 and 6.5.1.3

The Chair explained that the intent of the proposed changes was to codify the existing method by which a student makes a grade appeal. There was brief discussion.

Grossman **moved** that the Senate approve the proposed changes² to *Senate Rules 6.2.1.1, 6.5.1.2 and renumbering of 6.5.1.2 (to 6.5.1.3)*, effective immediately:

6.2.0 THE ACADEMIC OMBUD

The Academic Ombud is the officer of the university charged with consideration of student grievances in connection with academic affairs. [US: 4/10/00]

6.2.1 FUNCTIONS, JURISDICTION AND PROCEDURES OF THE OFFICE

6.2.1.1 Functions

The Office of the Academic Ombud shall provide a mechanism for handling issues for which no established procedure exists or for which established procedures have not yielded a satisfactory solution. They are not intended to supplant the normal processes of problem resolution. In some cases where there is a clear need to achieve a solution more quickly than normal procedures provide, the Ombud may seek to expedite the normal processes of resolution.

Students who wish to appeal a finding of an academic offense (see section 6.3), a penalty for an academic offense, a grade in a course, or an action in any other academic matter must confer with the Academic Ombud before they can appeal to the University Appeals Board. The procedure for appealing a finding of or a penalty for an academic offense is outlined in rule 6.4.4; the procedure for appealing a grade or another academic action is outlined below. In cases of academic offenses, the Ombud's office shall notify the appropriate parties (as described in rule 6.4.4) if a student fails to exercise his or her right of appeal within the allotted time. [US 9/12/11]

6.5.0 UNIVERSITY APPEALS BOARD

6.5.1 FUNCTIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY APPEALS BOARD

² Underline formatting denotes added text.

6.5.1.1 Cases of Academic Offenses [see Section 6.4.4, above; US: 3/10/86; US: 12/12/05]

6.5.1.2 Cases of Grade Appeal [see section 6.2.1, above; US: 9/12/11]

6.5.1.3 Cases of Student Academic Rights [US: 12/8/86]

After hearing a case involving a violation of student academic

Brion **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with one opposed and one abstention.

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

The Char explained the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 5.2.4.7*. Senators debated the intent of the proposed changes to the language, as well as individual assumptions. A question arose as to whether some colleges routinely gave two-hour final exams, and if the proposed changes would negatively affect those colleges.

Porter **moved** to table the proposal until the length of various colleges' final exam times was clarified. Brion **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The meeting was adjourned about 5:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Robert Grossman,
University Senate Secretary

Invited guests present: Lee Edgerton and Jacquie Hager.

Absences: Adams*; Anderson, D.*; Anstead; Ballard; Bensadoun; Brennen; Brown-Wright; Capilouto; Conners; de Beer; DeSantis; D'Orazio*; Eckman; Ettensohn*; Feist-Price; Fielden; Hackbart; Harris; Jackson; Kirk; Kirschling; Lester; Martin; Mazur; McCormick; Meyer*; Mock; Newman; Richey; Scutchfield; Smith; Smyth-Pinney; Speaks; Stewart; Subbaswamy; Tick; Tracy, J.; Tracy, T.; Turner; Voro; Wasilkowski; Wells; Wiseman; Witt; Wyatt*.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, October 5, 2011.

* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.

University Senate
September 12, 2011

Announcements

August 2011:

- The SC received the Clinical Title Series report, as per Administrative Regulations 2:6 (see last page of this document)
- Please remember the “substantive change” notification: the SACS liaison will send out a call twice a year to remind appropriate individuals regarding the substantive change policy and to request notification of planned changes that may meet the substantive change definition. An email with this information will be sent out during the week of September 12.
- A new *Senate Rule* is in effect regarding religious holidays:
Faculty shall give students the opportunity to make up work (typically, exams or assignments) when students notify them that religious observances prevent the students from doing their work at its scheduled time. Faculty should indicate in their syllabus how much advance notice they require from a student requesting an accommodation. Faculty may use their judgment as to whether the holiday in question is important enough to warrant an accommodation, although the presumption should be in favor of a student’s request. The Offices of Institutional Diversity, the Dean of Students, and the Ombud are available for consultation.

Summer 2011:

- The Senate Council held two Advances this year, with a concentration on learning from last year’s initiatives and planning for this year’s goals/committee charges.

May 2011:

- The Chair approved student to be placed retroactively on December 2010 degree list, because a clerical error in Graduate School prevented the student’s inclusion on the December 2010 degree list.
- The Chair granted provisional approval for a change to the Minor in Art Studio.
- The Chair granted provisional approval for series of UK Core courses:

Courses Approved by UG Council, pending minor syllabi updates

1. CME 455
2. GEO 222
3. PHI 343
4. PS 101 - Approved as Change and DL on May 16. But, GE separated.

UGC Approved, Need to be Sent to SC:

- | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1. PLS 104 | 12. UKC 300-309 |
| 2. UKC 100-109 | 13. UKC 310-319 |
| 3. UKC 110-119 | 14. UKC 320-329 |
| 4. UKC 120-129 | 15. UKC 330-339 |
| 5. UKC 130-139 | 16. UKC 340-349 |
| 6. UKC 140-149 | 17. UKC 350-359 |
| 7. UKC 150-159 | 18. UKC 360-369 |
| 8. UKC 160-169 | 19. UKC 370-379 |
| 9. UKC 170-179 | 20. UKC 380-389 |
| 10. UKC 180-189 | 21. UKC 390-399 |
| 11. UKC 190-199 | |

Courses approved by GEOC, but have not been approved by UGC yet:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. A-H 105 | 7. GLY 151 (in course catalog as A&S 100, sections 19-22) |
| 2. ARC 314 | 8. HIS 104 |
| 3. CLA 191 | 9. PHY 231 & 241 |
| 4. ECO 101 | 10. PLS 103 |
| 5. ENG 191 (in course catalog as A&S 100, section 43) | 11. PS 210 |
| 6. GEO 221 (in course catalog as A&S 100, sections 28-33) | 12. SOC/AAS 235 |

Course approved by SC, but not Gen Ed approved, a Pre-GEOC course.

1. GER 105 – New course approved by SC on 11/15/2010 - PreIGEOC, no indication of GE

At SC, not yet approved

1. A-H 106 - Sharon sent to Sheila on 2/8/11 but left off Gen Ed forms. It was PRE-IGEOC APPROVED.
2. GLY 185 (in course catalog as A&S 100, sections 401-402)– Sharon sent to Sheila on 4/19/11 for Natural Science. The form was incorrect and should instead be Quantitative Foundations. Sharon, could you please make this adjustment and notify Sheila?
3. HIS 108 – Sent to SC on 5/16/11
4. HIS 109 – Sent to SC on 5/16/11
5. PSY 215 –Marked as approved May 16, Pre-IGEOC, not listed on transmittal as GE
6. SPA 208 – Sharon sent to SC on 4/19/11 and cc'd me. The document appears to be complete. Sheila has that this course was received by SC on 5/6/11. Not sure why the discrepancy?
7. TA 273 – (formerly TA 371). This course was sent to SC on 4/20/11 with course change forms and Gen Ed forms, files look complete.
8. TA 274 - (formerly TA 471). This course was sent to SC on 4/20/11 with course change forms and Gen Ed forms, files look complete.
9. WRD 111 – I have this recorded as UGC approved on 12/1/10 and that Sharon sent it to Sheila in December. CIS 110, 111, and WRD 110 are all approved as Gen Ed on April 11 transmittal. WRD 111 is same course as CIS 111, only difference is the prefix.

Courses on the Books, Approved for GEN ED by PRE_IGEOC Vetting Teams:

- | | |
|------------|------------|
| 1. A-H 310 | 3. ANT 311 |
| 2. A-H 334 | 4. LAS 201 |
| | 5. SOC 350 |



- Two web transmittals of courses and programs were provisionally approved on May 16 and May 18.

May 16 Courses:

ANT 242
CHE 105
CHE 111
CLS 120
CLS 822
CLS 835
CLS 836
CLS 843
CLS 844
CLS 848
CLS 856
CLS 860
CLS 881
CLS 882
CLS 883
CLS 884
CLS 885
CLS 890
CLS 895
HJS Courses
MLS 400
MLS 430
MLS 440
MLS 465
MLS 466
MLS 467
MLS 468
MLS 464
MLS 469
MLS 476
MFS 609
PHI 300
SPA 371

May 16 Programs:

Minor in Judaic Studies
PhD in Statistics
BHS in Clinical Laboratory Sciences

May 18 Courses:

A-E 685
A-H 101
A-H 106
A-H 628
A-S 380
AAD 150
AAD 202
AAD 302
CIS 110
CIS 111
EDC 533
EE 499
ENG 518
GEN 100
GEO 255
GEO 320
HIS 112
LIN 318
MA 111
MA 113
MA 137
MA 514
PT 686
TA 271
WRD 110

May 18 Programs:

Agriculture BS Programs
BA/BS Linguistics
BS Computer Science
MA Art Education
MA Middle School Education
BA Art Studio
BFA Art Studio
BA Arts Administration
BS Nursing, Second Degree Nursing Option

Clinical Titles Series Report as of July 1, 2011					
College	Number of CTS Faculty	Total Faculty ¹	Ratio (%)	New Ratio (where > 25%) ²	Number of Exemptions by Provost ³
Agriculture ⁴	2	258	0.78%	NA	
Arts & Sciences	1	379	0.26%	NA	
Dentistry	17	48	35.42%	40%	1
Education	3	94	3.19%	NA	
Graduate School	1	13	7.69%	NA	
Health Sciences	5	50	10.00%	NA	1
Law	2	34	5.88%	NA	
Medicine	370	417	88.73%	100%	
Nursing	9	35	25.71%	NA	1
Pharmacy	15	46	32.61%	50%	1
Public Health	6	47	12.77%	NA	
Social Work	7	18	38.89%	35% ⁵	

¹ Tenured and Untenured (Regular, Special, Extension, Librarian)

² When ratio exceeds 25%; Indicate percent voted by College Faculty Council

³ Number exemptions to funding source granted by Provost for this fiscal year

⁴ Approved by Provost, individual to work in animal diagnostic services

⁵ College has been notified requesting the Faculty Council to vote on ratio increase