

University Senate  
September 12, 2016

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, September 12, 2016 in the Athletics Association Auditorium of W. T. Young Library. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via electronic voting devices and a show of hands because some newly seated senators did not have voting devices. Votes listed below include both electronic votes and raised hands. Specific voting information can be requested from the Office of the Senate Council.

Senate Council Chair Katherine McCormick (ED) called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:06.

The Chair explained that the Senate follows Robert's Rules of Order and reminded senators to be civil to one another and to guests. She commented that many senators are silent and that discussions sometimes involve the same people. She asked for help from senators in encouraging other senators to speak up and make comments during discussions. She also asked senators to remember to return their clickers to the table before leaving.

Because some senators did not yet have clickers, the Chair explained that those members would need to vote via raised hands.

The Chair called for an attendance vote and 92 senators registered their presence.

*Senate Rules 1.2.3* ("Meetings") requires that minutes, agenda, and supporting documentation be sent to senators six days in advance, but the GCCR items were modified on Friday. Grossman **moved** to waive *SR 1.2.3* to allow consideration of the agenda, etc. for September 12, 2016 and Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 96 in favor and none opposed.

She noted that no changes had been received for the minutes from the May 2, 2016 Senate meeting. There being **no objections**, the minutes were **approved by unanimous consent**.

1. President Eli Capilouto - University Senate Chair

The Chair explained that there were index cards for questions from senators, although senators were welcome to raise their hands and ask questions in the traditional fashion.

The Chair welcomed Senate Chair President Eli Capilouto to the podium. President Capilouto said he appreciated the suggestion that his presentation slides be distributed in advance and then highlighted a few slides. Provost Tim Tracy also spoke briefly and offered some information. Provost Tracy then called for questions.

Grossman referred to the Provost's comment about hiring new counselors and asked how far along the Provost was in that exercise and if it was also addressing requests from students of color who asked for counselors who specialize in race-related issues. The Provost said that there was indeed an effort to hire culturally competent counselor; of the four counselors hired already, some do have additional expertise in cultural competency, which is one of the key components of the job description. No more questions were raised from the floor so the Provost addressed questions submitted via note cards.

Note card question read by Provost Tracy: "What percentage of the undergraduate population is students of color?" The Provost said that about 18.6% of undergraduate students are underrepresented minorities. For fall 2016, about 12% of the first-time freshmen were African American, compared to about 10.5-11% for the last few years.

Note card question read by Provost Tracy: "What is the projected maximum number of undergraduate students we can reasonably house and teach?" The Provost answered that UK has opened up 6,300 beds in the last four years. Most universities house about one-quarter of their undergraduate population on campus and UK is about there. There is an 8% absolute percentage retention rate increase for students living on campus, which makes a difference. UK is at about a 82% - 84% classroom utilization rate, although benchmarks are closer to 80%. The faculty to student ratio is about 17.5 or 18 to one, which is also in line with benchmark institutions. It was hard to know exactly how many more UK can handle, but with more students UK can grow its tuition income and grow a little more.

Note card question read by Provost Tracy: "The Provost has suggested that progress toward greater retention will be measured in the aggregate. What are the advantages of doing this rather than holding colleges accountable?" The Provost explained that if measuring in the aggregate, when a student changes majors UK hopefully incentivizes faculty and advisors to get students to the program where they are happy and will succeed. If retention is rewarded on a college-by-college basis, it may incentivize a college to hang on to a student who may not find the college to be a good fit. All deans have metrics on graduation and retention rates for their colleges and UK is financially tying it to colleges in the hope that colleges feel they are rewarded by helping students get to the right place.

Note card question read by Provost Tracy: "We have grown our education abroad and international program yet our facility remains inaccessible and unwelcoming. What are we doing to move the UKIC [UK International Center] or to make it more welcoming and accessible?" Provost Tracy agreed that the International Center was not welcoming. The Provost explained that shortly after the appointment of Sue Roberts (AS/Geography) to the position of associate provost for international affairs, she met with campus officials to see about developing a plan to improve the aesthetics related to the International Center (UKIC). The Provost said that the UKIC was a key part of UK's internationalization strategies, with 17% of students now having a study abroad experience, a number that puts UK in line with benchmark institutions and best practices.

Note card question read by Provost Tracy: "What is UK's second- to third-year retention rate?" Provost Tracy answered that the second- to third-year retention rate is about half what it is from the first year to the second year. The third- to fourth-year is about half again. If there was approximately an 18% loss last year, it will be roughly 73%. He noted that the first eight weeks of a student's collegiate career set a pattern for their success.

Note card question read by Provost Tracy: "What are our strategies to increase the recruitment, employment and retention of faculty from underrepresented populations?" The Provost deferred to interim Vice President for Institutional Diversity Terry Allen and Senior Assistant Provost for Faculty Affairs Sonja Feist-Price. Guest Allen said that there were many strategies being put into place, although efforts began with an effort to better understand what is already available on campus. He said efforts started with looking at data and asking questions and talking with groups, such as fireside conversations, in which groups from marginalized areas sat down and spoke with him and Feist-Price. He began with African-American faculty and then Asian faculty, Muslim faculty, those identifying as LGBTQ, and so on. He said individuals from all these groups were asked two questions: How are you? and What do you recommend to make UK better? From there, plans will be put together and he referred to plans to form a council of diverse faculty to carry out recommendations gleaned from the chats. Allen said that most recently, efforts were made to identify the chief diversity officer (CDO) from each college and ask that those individuals identify someone who can serve as their delegate in case the CDO cannot attend every

session. Allen said they were seeking information and putting groups together to work closely with the Provost and President and they were in the process of creating diversity plans. These diversity plans will be in conjunction with and in compliance with regulations promulgated by the Council on Postsecondary Education and will be fully aligned with the diversity component of UK's current strategic plan. Allen said he did not have the absolute statistics about numbers of faculty who are underrepresented minorities but that there was an increase from two years ago; he said he would report the numbers when they became available. He concluded by saying that because UK is a recipient of federal contracts, under the Department of Labor UK is obligated to act affirmatively in all phases of employment for women and other groups. He suggested Feist-Price share some of her information.

Guest Feist-Price said that efforts were ongoing in three key areas. First, the unconscious bias initiative has spread to optional training sessions for members of faculty search committees. Those sessions are used as opportunities to help search committees understand the ways in which biases affect the hiring process, both for and against candidates. There are new best practices for diversity hiring and diversity hiring guidelines and she is working in tandem with Human Resources to have those incorporated into hiring processes and procedures to describe how search committees can be diverse. The last initiative involved hiring liaisons who serve on search committees. She commented that there were tentative plans to train college diversity and inclusivity officers to participate in some search committees. Feist-Price closed by saying there are an array of excellent ways to positively impact the hiring of diverse faculty. Provost Tracy added that about \$375,000 was allocated for diversity hiring two years ago and this past year it was increased to \$750,000, with more expected to be allocated next year.

Note card question read by Provost Tracy: "One of the most successful retention programs is the Robinson Scholars program. What is being done to ensure its success continues?" The Provost said that he and others were working very hard to ensure its successes continue. There are 130 students in the Robinsons Scholars program and the Provost said they were trying to see what they could learn from the Robinson Scholars program to make it more scalable to the entire University.

Note card question read by Provost Tracy: "Why do colleges and departments still have no budgets?" Provost Tracy explained that because raises were delayed until September 1, all the budgets were delayed until then. He assured senators that budgets should finish loading into colleges and departments by the end of the day or so.

Note card question read by Provost Tracy: "How will UK meet the budget deficit for 2016-17 and for the following year?" Provost Tracy said that in June discussions were had about ways to increase revenues and looked at strategic allocations and the possibilities of vertical reductions. The reductions for 2016-17 have already been made. He noted that it was unclear what the future will hold, but UK is growing revenues and exploring strategic reallocations; only a few cuts were made but they were not across-the-board cuts. The Provost concluded his remarks and President Capilouto returned to the podium.

The President commented that he wanted UK to be good before being big. The budget passed by legislators in Frankfort last year puts 5% of every university budget at risk via the performance funding model, which was currently still under development. He said that all university presidents, representatives from the Kentucky House and Senate and the governor's office met last week and he promised to share more information in the future. President Capilouto then turned to the issue of sexual assaults and privacy concerns and said it was important to continue the discussion with senators. He spoke strongly about the need to protect the privacy of sexual assault victim-survivors and said UK must do everything in its power to protect the privacy and confidentiality of students and of their records –

no one has the right to tell those students' stories about confidential matters except those students themselves. The President said that in his opinion, that is what was legally at risk. He went on to say that at the same time, UK needed to ask itself if UK was doing everything possible together to protect students from misconduct.

President Capilouto shared a variety of facts about sexual assaults and victim-survivors with senators and reiterated his desire to protect victim-survivors' privacy. He said that the problem is that while the Kentucky Kernel says they do not identify victim-survivors by name, those same survivors have indeed been identified. The Kernel printed enough salacious details for anyone who does a little digging to identify the victims. Someone could find out the names of faculty in a particular department and compare that to UK's degree programs, the publicly posted lists of students receiving degrees who are approved by the Board of Trustees, and Commencement information that lists the faculty who advise doctoral students. He went on to say that while an anonymous spokesperson purported to represent the victims, the victim-survivors who filed the sexual assault complaints [against former UK professor James Harwood] were not quoted anywhere and there was no confirmation that either of the victim-survivors from that case wanted to have their stories made public. President Capilouto explained that the Kernel published a letter from a victim-survivors advocacy group on page 11, in which the advocates write that the no person other than the survivor and those disclosing information have the right to know the specifics about a sexual assault. He noted that as far as he knew, the Herald-Leader had refused to print that letter online or in print. The President added that no media outlet had highlighted in substantive detail or given space to the letters from the Harwood sexual assault victim-survivors that had been in the possession of the media since the previous Friday.

The President outlined the requirements for keeping certain information private and described some of the penalties for releasing private information. He went on to say that on at least two occasions Kentucky's attorney general said that confidential details of sexual assault matters should not even be shared with the attorney general's office. The President stated that if it is determined that the media outlets have ready access to private and protected information, it will mean that everyone has access to that sort of information, including a survivor's classmates, employers, prisoners, and stalkers – everyone else who has time to file an open records request. He said that losing in court did not worry him as much as fighting for the confidentiality of victim-survivors. President Capilouto then read two letters from the victim-survivors from the recent Harwood case, noting that they were available to the media but had received very little coverage. The second letter included an assertion by the anonymous student that tenure revocation takes the better part of two years. When he was finished he took questions from senators.

Fiedler (AS) said that what concerned him the most about the [Harwood] situation was how to keep someone who has been abusing his authority from being able to hide that later if there is no public punishing of the infraction(s). If someone committed a crime, it should not remain private. President Capilouto responded that a victim-survivor of sexual assault or sexual harassment had two paths. If they chose the legal and judicial path, information will be public. If the student chooses the Title IX path as guided by the U. S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights, the student can have more privacy; Harwood's victims chose the private Title IX path. The President said that UK had to respect the privacy that a victim-survivor may choose, but attendant to that is how UK can work to say that if a perpetrator is in the UK community, UK wants to know about it. He said he hoped other universities begin doing the same thing, which is the only way to get to the heart of the matter. Anyone can get a recommendation for a job but it was not a certainty that a university could compel someone to release information about being a perpetrator.

Collett (HS) said that she understood the victim's standpoint, but wondered when UK would start to say that the perpetrator's behavior was unacceptable and had violated the code of the UK community. She wondered when it would become a part of the perpetrator's employment record. President Capilouto responded that under Title IX policy guidelines, once an institution gets to the point of having enough evidence for a hearing panel, an informal resolution can be pursued. The President said that sometimes as an administrator he is faced with a Hobson's choice – either make the campus as safe as possible as quickly and efficiently as possible, or compared to what campus has seen in the past with a protracted three years-long effort with full salary [for the faculty member], protections and everything else they [the faculty member] get while still trying to resolve the situation. He said he wanted to work with faculty on that issue; he was tired of having only those two choices.

Grossman (AS) noted that at the request of President Capilouto, the Senate created and proposed a regulation on faculty discipline. If the President wished to work with the Senate, that would be one way to start. President Capilouto replied that the policy recommended by the Senate was not the policy originally proposed. Given the context of the environment he did not think that the Senate-approved policy could move forward and receive a successful conclusion. He said it did not get UK to where it needed to be and that it would be necessary to start again and noted he could propose and send such a policy to the Senate pretty quickly.

Wood (AS) spoke and noted that she had been a member of the committee that put together the regulation on faculty discipline. She said that since then, *Administrative Regulations 6:2* [“(“Policy and Procedures for Addressing and Resolving Allegations of Sexual Assault, Stalking, Dating Violence, and Domestic Violence”)”] had been promulgated and it applied to faculty, staff and students; it was basically the disciplinary process for sexual harassment matters. She said that regulation was completed without input from faculty, staff, or students and wondered if faculty would have the opportunity, as obvious stakeholders, to have input into that process. President Capilouto replied that that policy was the responsibility of UK's administration and that UK followed the directives of the Office for Civil Rights. He said it was possible to improve it and learn lessons from other universities. The President commented that when he received the “Dear Colleague” letter from the federal Department of Education, he asked how long UK had to make the necessary changes and was told he had to do it by “tomorrow.” He said that Grossman [faculty trustee] had raised serious concerns about it with him, and that the President was told there were concerns from faculty from the College of Law. His response to both was that any comments would be welcomed and he still welcomed input. It was necessary to have a policy in place to ensure that everyone's rights, even those of the accused perpetrator, were protected and that a solid investigation could be conducted. Capilouto gave a brief overview of the process followed in such cases and reiterated he welcomed any and all comments.

Mazur (ED) said that her concern relates to some extent to issues reported by the news media. She said her concern was what she perceived as a tangential disregard for UK following its own procedures and rules. The idea that the President would invite faculty to provide input was not sufficient – it was the administration's responsibility to seek out the Senate's advice, even if the President did not want to follow it. She said it would be helpful if faculty and the Senate were invited to have access to AR 6:2 and other regulations, as prescribed by UK's rules, which would go a long way towards feeling that the administration and Senate were working collaboratively. She said she doubted anyone with ethical standards would disagree about what to do with rogue professors but that what made things difficult for her was not being engaged. She said she did not always get the sense that the President sought out the Senate's advice. The President thanked her for sharing and said there was an issue on which the

Senate and he could work together. He noted that there was a review committee that reviewed regulations to ensure they intersected properly with other regulations. Mazur commented that the President was chair of the University Senate and soliciting input from it would go a long way toward establishing the sort of collaborative relationship he talked about, going forward.

D. Jones (ME) said that Capilouto's two predecessors [presidents Charles Wethington and Lee Todd] regularly sent announcements to campus about new regulations. D. Jones (ME) contrasted this with the changes to AR 6:2 and said that General Counsel Bill Thro did not announce the substantive changes to AR 6:2 after they were made by administration in June 2015, nor did he announce the changes after another revision in June 2016. Jones stated that in addition to not getting access to participate in the process before regulations were promulgated, faculty were not even getting good management communications after changes were made. President Capilouto responded that he would check on those details and if that was the case, he would ensure that the Senate received everything.

The Chair asked if there were any further questions for the President and there were not. She thanked the President for attending and senators thanked him with a round of applause.

Referring to the time [4:26 pm], the Chair said she would move as quickly as possible through the rest of the agenda.

## 2. Minutes from May 2, 2016 and Announcements

[Meeting minutes were approved prior to the President speaking.]

The Chair welcomed all new senators and noted there would be a "Welcome Back" reception later in the week. She asked senators to contact Ms. Brothers if they had not received the invitation. She said it was a great opportunity to meet new senators and encouraged returning senators to welcome new faces.

The Chair offered a variety of announcements.

- UK has a new curriculum management system in place, Curriculog, and senators should have already received several emails from college deans and other members of the college.
- The spring deadlines for receipt of curricular proposals was March 31 for proposals requiring committee review (new programs, changes to organizational structure, new departments, etc.) and April 15 for courses, program changes, and minors.
- Phil Kraemer resigned from Senate and Senate Council due to new administrative duties. Bailey was elected by SC to replace Kraemer as vice chair and Mark Lauersdorf was now on SC due to Kraemer's departure.
- The Senate and SC are sponsoring a lecture on Monday for Constitution Day, entitled "Faculty Speech and Academic Freedom," given by Scott Bauries (Law). The event will take place in the W. T. Young Library Auditorium and no RSVP was required.
- The Senate has transitioned to a newly designed website (<https://www.uky.edu/universitysenate>). If there are any problems with the site, please contact Ms. Brothers.

- The SC reviewed and sent forward nominees for the search committee for associate provost for student and academic life and the search committee for vice president for institutional diversity.
- The Chair is convening a small group of curriculum stakeholders, which is working to identify ways to improve the curricular approval process.
- The SC asked the Graduate Council (GC) to deliberate on the intersection of credits earned for graduate certificates and credits earned for graduate programs (master's and doctoral). Three specific questions were posed – these came up repeatedly when Senate's Academic Programs Cmte discussed new graduate certificates and new master's and doctoral programs.

Question #1: Is it permissible for a student to begin coursework for a graduate certificate and then choose to pursue a graduate degree in the same field, eventually earning both the graduate certificate and then graduate degree? GC response: YES

Question #2: Is it permissible for a student to begin coursework for a graduate degree program and also earn a graduate certificate *en passant* by virtue of completing the graduate degree? GC response: YES

Question #3: Under the scenarios above, if allowable, what is the maximum number of credit hours that can be transferred/double-dipped between the graduate certificate and graduate degree? GC response: GC agreed unanimously that there should be no limit to the number of hours that can be applied to both the degree and the certificate (unless the program and/or certificate owners specify otherwise)...in the vast majority of cases it is likely that 12 credit hours or less would be eligible for transfer/double-counting.

### 3. Officer and Other Reports

#### a. Chair

The Chair said she was happy to be with Senate as its chair and was looking forward to working with senators. By way of background, she said she worked in early childhood development and has been at UK since 2007. She is active in University efforts to advance service learning and civic engagement.

The Chair approved web transmittal with courses and programs posted in May and June but both will be presented to Senate for final approval this month.

The Chair also approved changes to the College of Pharmacy's 2016-17 calendar on behalf of SC and Senate, to add a reference to "1st" year students regarding exam dates.

On behalf of Senate, the SC waived *Senate Rules 1.3.3.4* ("Undergraduate Council," "Terms and Vacancies") to allow the chair of the Undergraduate Council to identify up to five current members to be allowed to serve an additional three-year term. The SC also waived *SR 5.4.3.1* ("Composition and Communication"), *SR 4.2.2.1* ("Admission to College of Nursing"), and *SR 4.2.3.3* ("College of Medicine") and allowed the proposed policies (as described in the Senate's May agenda items) to be in effect provisionally until the Senate discusses it at today's meeting.

In addition to those actions, the SC also endorsed proposed revisions to *Governing Regulations II* and the deletion of *Governing Regulations XII* on behalf of Senate. The first reading of both regulations occurred at the Board of Trustees meeting on June 24 and the second reading was this past Friday.

The SC waived *SR 5.2.4.8.1* ("Common Examinations") for CHE 532-001. On behalf of Senate, the SC approved the second August 2016 degree list and two honorary degree recipients. Senators will hear an informational presentation later on those nominees. The Chair acknowledged that there are degree list errors from time to time, even though individuals work very hard to ensure the list is correct. She explained that Ms. Brothers reviewed past lists and found that degree list errors amounted to a fraction of a percent when calculated against total number of degrees awarded. The Chair noted that the errors might be annoying to address, but when mistakes occur they must be fixed.

Finally, on behalf of Senate the SC approved two fixes for two degree list errors: approved a motion to amend something previously adopted (May 2016 Degree List) for Communication and Information Student BA-17 to bestow BS Communication and rescind BA Communication; and approved a motion to amend something previously adopted (May 2016 Degree List) for Communication and Information Student ED-08 to bestow BS Media Arts and Studies and Rescind BA Media Arts and Studies on behalf of Senate.

b. Vice Chair

E. Bailey (AG) said he had no report.

c. Parliamentarian

Seago (LI) said she would postpone her report until October.

d. Trustee

Blonder (ME) introduced herself to senators as their newly elected faculty trustee. She said both she and Grossman attended the recent Board of Trustees (Board) meeting in Bowling Green that senators may have already heard about. Blonder said she attended committee meetings as well as the Board meeting and had an opportunity to tour the Gatton Academy. She noted that the meeting was well publicized so she thought it was not necessary to elaborate. Blonder told senators that one way to follow the proceedings at Board meetings was to look at Twitter feeds; she said a reporter for the Herald-Leader sends out a lot of information that way, as do other reporters.

Grossman (AS) said he did not have anything to add to Blonder's description of the Board's meetings. Regarding the Board's discussion on the University's current legal standoff with the Attorney General about open records and the University's lawsuit against the Kentucky Kernel, he explained that he made comments during the closed session discussion and that was why Blonder was quoted in the media and he was not – other trustees said what he was thinking and there was no reason to prolong the discussion when there was not going to be a vote. Grossman reminded senators to contact him and Blonder if they needed anything.

Cross (CI) asked how many trustees would have supported a motion to withdraw the lawsuit. Grossman said he doubted anyone knows that, even the Board member who asserted to the media that 17 trustees would have voted against it. However, Grossman (AS) opined that if a vote had been taken, it would have failed resoundingly. D. Jones (ME) referred to his past service as faculty trustee and asked Blonder if there was anything particularly relevant or interesting in her orientation as a new trustee. Blonder (ME) replied she received information on UK's strategic plan and a few trustees asked questions. She said new trustees were told that neither *Administrative Regulations (ARs)* nor *Governing Regulations (GRs)* carried the force of law and are not in force in a court of law. She said she had not done any research on the issue but thought there were cases where *ARs* and *GRs* were enforced by a



court; she planned to do more research on the matter. Blonder also told senators they were welcome to contact her.

#### 4. Old Business

The Chair noted that it was time to move to old business. She explained that the “Old Business” agenda items that followed were left over from May, when Senate ran out of time and lost quorum before voting on the proposals. She added that the Senate would be asked to vote on splitting the first agenda item into two pieces for consideration.

##### a. Committee Reports

##### i. Advisory Committee for Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement (ACGGC) - Jane Jensen and Scott Yost, Co-chairs

##### 1. Proposed Changes to Senate Rules 5.4.3.1 (“Composition and Communication”)

Yost (EN) explained that in May, an item was put on the Senate agenda as one proposal because it dealt with the same section of the *Senate Rules (SR)*, even though it included two separate issues [assessment policy and substitution policy]. Yost **moved** that the University Senate approve dividing the proposal into two separate sections: substitution policy and assessment policy. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 79 in favor, one opposed, and one abstained.

##### Proposed Changes to GCCR Substitution Policy in Senate Rules 5.4.3.1 (“Composition and Communication”)

Yost (EN) explained the proposal, including which types of students would be affected by the substitution policy (students within UK who change majors and students who transfer into UK) and who would oversee substitutions. He added that the additional items on the agenda (instructions and forms) were there just for additional detail and context. Yost noted that all transfer agreements for GCCR course substitutions were eliminated last year [in anticipation of the Senate approving a new substitution policy at its May 2016 meeting]. He said the issue before the Senate was establishing a substitution policy and spelling out what it entailed. The **motion** was a recommendation that the Senate approve the substitution policy-related changes to *SR 5.4.3.1* (“Composition and Communication”). Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

Grossman (AS) noted that there were a lot of students who double majored in biology and chemistry and asked if it was possible to create a substitution policy programmatically for all students who have a double major in chemistry and biology. Yost (EN) replied that the only option currently was to do it on a case-by-case basis. Guest Jensen (ED), co-chair with Yost, clarified Yost’s statement, saying that if the change was approved by the Senate, it would mean that program faculty could submit a change to their GCCR plan to include a reciprocity agreement for common double majors that would affect all students who double majored in chemistry and biology.

Rice (AS) asked for more information about what exactly was moving out of local (faculty) control and was being shifted to the ACGCCR. Yost explained that underlying the entire concept was the program requirement. Program faculty will still have total control, but with an asterisk. Using the chemistry and biology double major as an example, he said that if the faculty want to set up a system where one program accepts the GCCR requirements from another program, that can be done with a program change. He cautioned senators to be careful when substituting one UK class for another to ensure that the informational literacy component remains intact. It is necessary to affirm that the “other” program’s GCCR requirements included communication in a manner that is acceptable to the program allowing the

substitution. The change then needs to be approved by the associate dean, too. In addition, the ACGCCR is always available to offer feedback and opinions if program faculty would like help. If the substitute course is not a UK course, the program faculty will have to consult with ACGCCR as well as the associate dean.

Tagavi (EN) objected to the proposed new language in *SR 5.4.3.1.D.3* that said only tenured faculty could participate in a petition for a substitution in special circumstances. Yost (EN) said it was intended to have read “tenure-track faculty” and that he would accept a change to “tenure-track faculty” as a **friendly amendment** by Tagavi. Tagavi said another problem with the proposed language was that a student could potentially make a petition without the director of undergraduate studies (DUS) or department chair knowing about it. Further, the department chair (chair) could make a decision about substitution without informing the program faculty or the DUS. Tagavi suggested letting the DUS be the individual to approve substitutions as that person is duly identified person to represent the faculty of an undergraduate program. While all petitions could start with the student, the petition should go through the DUS and not the chair. Yost replied that the details of the language in *SR 5.4.3.1.D.1.a.ii* allowed either the DUS or the chair to approve a petition for substitution. Tagavi opined that the language was not specific and that Yost was reading something into the language that was not actually there. Jensen (ED) said that anyone could start the process (student, advisor, DUS, chair) but at some point someone would have to approve it. She added that not all departments have a DUS so it was necessary to have the chair included in the process.

Whitaker (AS) said his first concern was that of the DUS in his department, which was that it made more work for the DUS. He explained that a DUS in his department was a fully functional faculty member with a research program and having to spend an hour or two putting paperwork together for a GCCR substitution petition was too much. His second concern pertained to ACGCCR approving the petition, not the program faculty. Whitaker stated that only those faculty within the department should be making a judgement about substitution requests. If a student has done an independent study or research project and in the eyes of the program faculty it merits substitution for GCCR, the ACGCCR should not have the authority to deny the petition. He said he would hesitate to make a judgement about a GCCR requirement in another disciplinary field; even within Anthropology there are differences between oral presentations and written reports. Whitaker asserted that the Senate needed to be very careful to ensure that a GCCR course substitution is made by the faculty qualified to make that sort of judgement.

Jensen (ED) explained that the language in *SR 5.4.3.1* gave the ACGCCR the responsibility for approving courses for GCCR credit, which meant the ACGCCR must also approve course substitutions. She noted that the paperwork submitted for a substitution helps the ACGCCR make a good decision about substitutions. She said the ACGCCR did not work independently, but that the paperwork submitted helped the ACGCCR to work collaboratively with program faculty. Jensen added that having GCCR embedded in a senior-level course was a perfect example of what should happen – by the junior or senior level, a student should have enough disciplinary experience. Most of the problems arise when program faculty perceive the GCCR requirement as very similar to the old “Graduation Writing Requirement” which was often completed at the sophomore level.

Debski (AS) noted that the proposed substitution policy will increase the workload in her department (Biology), in part because over 25% of biology majors are also double majors. She said she understood the need to attest to GCCR substitutions but it would require a tremendous amount of work. Debski also noted that even though a department could submit a program change, it takes over a year to have it

processed. Jensen (ED) clarified that the type of program change she referred to would only be sent to ACGCCR for approval. Debski responded that if the Senate gave the ACGCCR committee a particular mandate, it made more sense to revisit that than to allow faculty outside the department to make decisions on GCCR substitutions. Yost (EN) said that anyone was welcome to propose changes to how the GCCR requirement is described in the SRs. He said the GCCR was put in place at the program level to replace the old Graduation Writing Requirement and that the ACGCCR was walking a tightrope between program GCCR-related requirements and the decisions made at the program level, and the University-level mandates in the SRs about what is expected for GCCR. Yost added that only one undergraduate programs needed to have their GCCR requirement approved – every other undergraduate program’s GCCR was already in place. The trouble was that if there is no substitution policy, then every student who would like a substitution will be treated individually – having a substitution policy in place will allow programmatic substitutions.

Wood (AS) spoke against the motion and said that transfer equivalencies had always been in the purview of the program faculty. All degrees are approved by Senate and by virtue of that, they fall under the SRs. Substitutions and waivers of degree requirements have always resided with a college’s chief academic officer; never in the history of the Senate has a committee been charged with making substitutions for degree requirements. She opined that the request for substitutions should come from the program faculty and be approved by the dean or the dean’s designee and that it should not involve a Senate committee. Wood said there were many situations where various requirement substitutions were approved within the college; she did not see GCCR substitutions as different just because they are specified in Senate minutes. She said it would be a big mistake to approve the substitution policy and involve a Senate committee in making academic decisions regarding a student’s degree.

The Chair noted the time and suggested a vote. There were no further comments from senators so a **vote** was taken on the motion approve the substitution policy-related changes to SR 5.4.3.1 (“Composition and Communication”) and the motion **failed** with 18 in favor, 22 opposed, and six abstained. The Chair said the issue would likely return to SC for further discussion.

Wood **moved** to adjourn and Mazur **seconded**. Senators departed and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:13 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Ernie Bailey,  
University Senate Secretary

Absences: Allen, Bird-Pollan, Birdwhistell, M., Brennen, Butler, K\*, Cassis, Clark, Cofield, Cox, de Beer, DiPaola, Ederington, Escobar\*, Ford, Healy\*, Hippisley, Holloway, Huja, Jackson, Kearney, Kerns\*, Kyrkanides, Martin, T., Mitchell, Murray, Peffer\*, Richey, Smith, Sogin, Vaillancourt\*, Vosevich, Wilson, K., Witt.

Invited guests present: Chris Feddock, Jane Jensen, and Darlene Welsh.

Guests accompanying President Eli Capilouto: Terry Allen and Sonja Feist-Price.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, September 29, 2016.

---

\* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.