

Senate Rules and Elections Committee

January 9, 2014

Jones (Chair), Brion, Grossman and Pienkowski

The Senate Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) met and acted on the following matters.

1. Final editorial touches to updating of Senate Rules

The SREC incorporated into SR 5.4.3 an explanatory note concerning current Senate policy on the graduation writing requirement, which exists as a consequence of several Senate and Senate Council actions dating back to 2004 but which had never actually been written into the Senate Rules. The current Senate policy dated 05/06/2013 is awaiting confirmation of administrative feasibility.

2. Explanation of role of HCCC and of the discretion of College Faculty

Arising from an inquiry made by a college dean on procedures for processing proposals through the Health Care Colleges Council (HCCC), the SREC drafted an explanatory letter. The letter reviews the Senate's adoption of the current role of the HCCC. The letter re-elaborates a previous interpretation provided to the HCCC by the SREC that there is nothing in the Senate Rules to prevent a College Faculty from opting to seek HCCC review on a proposal that does not otherwise require HCCC review, and that the HCCC in turn is not prohibited by the Senate Rules from agreeing to provide such a review. The current letter further explaining these points is attached here and made a part of the minutes of this SREC meeting.

3. Relationship of Director of Graduate Studies to Instructor of a Graduate Course

In response to an inquiry, the SREC interpreted the Senate Rules to mean that if a student has a disagreement with a course Instructor over the course assignments and the Instructor's grading of submitted material, the DGS has at most only an informal mediating role. The DGS should not direct the student not to respond to communications. The Academic Ombud is the designated office for complaints by the student regarding violation of academic rights, and the department chair and dean are the designated individuals for any needed enforcement action in regards to the course Instructor.

4. Content of UK Diplomas

As of June 2005, the Board of Trustees has delegated to the University Senate the responsibility for UK diplomas. The SREC reviewed the contents displayed on past and current UK diplomas, in relation to the current Governing Regulations and Senate Rules. The current wording on the UK Diploma does not clearly reflect current process regarding recommendation and approval of degrees. The SREC identified wording that more clearly reflects these current processes and the SREC Chair will interact with the Registrar's Office regarding more accurate wording on the UK Diploma.

5. Spring 2014 Faculty Trustee Election

The SREC reviewed and endorsed a timetable proposed by the SREC Chair for the spring 2014 Faculty Trustee election.

6. Posthumous Degree

The SREC revised the draft policy for In Memoriam Posthumous Degree for resubmission to the Senate Council.

Lee Blonder
Senate Council Chair

Thank you for your request that the Senate Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) examine a request from a college dean as to whether the dean's understanding is correct on the vetting of changes to an academic program of that college. We much appreciate the inquiry of the college dean to correctly understand what the Senate Rules both *permit* and *require* in terms of vetting academic proposals. The current vetting rules were unanimously adopted by the University Senate on May 7, 2012, after the prior circulation of the draft changes to all University senators, which includes the Provost, the deans of all health care colleges and other colleges, and all the elected Faculty Senators from those colleges.

All professional health care program proposals go to HCCC. It is correct that proposed changes to an existing professional health care program that are approved by the college Faculty must be submitted to the Health Care Colleges Council (HCCC). It is correct that the University Senate has delegated to the HCCC the authority to make final approval of those changes and report those changes to the Senate Council.

College Faculty Discretion to Reach HCCC on Other Proposals is Unfettered. We emphasize that the Senate Rules allow a College Faculty of a health care college to seek the review of the HCCC on any undergraduate or graduate program proposal that does not otherwise require HCCC review. The Senate Rules also safeguard the academic prerogative of the College Faculty not to seek that review if in the College Faculty's judgment an optional HCCC review is not sufficiently warranted. In turn, the Senate Rules do not prohibit in any way the HCCC from agreeing to provide a discretionary review. In response to a request, the SREC last May 17, 2013, rendered a written rules interpretation explaining this College Faculty option to the Provost, to the academic associate deans of health care colleges and other colleges, and to the HCCC coordinator (attachment 1), and explaining that this interpretation will be noted into the Senate Rules (attachment 2).

Operational Facilitation of Option to Reach to HCCC on Other Proposals. Also, the Senate Council Chair wrote the HCCC Chair on November 6, 2013 (attachment 3), explaining the Senate Council Office's further facilitation of this college option. As had been discussed at a May 9, 2013 meeting of the SC Chair and SREC Chair with representatives of the administrations of health care colleges (attachment 3), the SC Office then secured the programming of eCATS to send *all* health care college undergraduate and graduate proposals to the HCCC *unless* the college specifically 'opts out' for that particular proposal (attachment 4). The same principle can extend to upcoming eCATs programming for program change proposals, and even now while program proposals are still being submitted by email pdf. Thus, it is clear that the Senate Council Office has maximized reasonable operational deference to the HCCC while still preserving the integrity of the educational policy role of each College Faculty.

In summary, under the 'Provost' organization of the University, adopted by the UK Board of Trustees in 2001, no college or group of colleges has an academic status that

is exalted above any other. The University Senate program vetting rules adopted unanimously in May 2012 reflect both this academic equality and the need for expediency in times of short resources. Hence, the only Senate procedural vetting requirements are made on a *program by program* basis, not the pre-Provost 'silo' organization that sectorized health colleges as a block into an academic status different than other University colleges. Undergraduate proposals are required to go to the UC (which has a health college member), graduate proposals are required to go to the GC (which has 3 health college members), and health professional program proposals are required to go to the HCCC.

However, as elaborated above, any College Faculty has the unfettered discretion to opt at any time to seek the review of any other academic council that is not otherwise required to review the proposal, and any academic council can agree to provide the discretionary review. In fact, any dean can propose at any time to the College Faculty that it approve a standing college educational policy that the review of the UC, GC or HCCC will be requested on proposals not otherwise required to be reviewed by the particular Senate academic council.

We make a standing offer here for the Chair of the SREC to meet with any dean, with any group of deans, with the UC, GC or HCCC, or with any elected College Faculty Council, to further explain and discuss the above.

Senate Rules and Elections Committee

Davy Jones, Chair
Gail Brion
Robert Grossman
David Pienkowski
Connie Wood

Cc: Provost, College Deans, HCC Academic Associate Deans; Undergraduate Council, Graduate Council, Health Care Colleges Council

From: Lindsay, Jim D.
Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 11:48 AM
To: Jones, Davy
Subject: RE: Senate Rules on Program/Course Processing

Hi Davy...

Thanks for the prompt action.

I have a few follow-up questions (nothing major) if you wouldn't mind calling me about: 3-6638

Warm regards,

Jim

Jim Lindsay
Digital Measures Coordinator

From: Jones, Davy
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 11:41 PM
To: Blonder, Lee
Subject: Senate Rules on Program/Course Processing

To: Lee Blonder, Chair, University Senate Council

From: Davy Jones, Chair, Senate Rules and Elections Committee

Date: May 17, 2013

The *University Senate Rules* prescribe procedures for routing of proposals concerning programs in the three primary degree areas for UK identified by the Council on Postsecondary Education, i.e., **undergraduate**, **graduate** and **professional** programs (SR 3.2, SR 3.3). A question has been raised as to whether these Senate Rules prohibit a college from seeking the opinion of a Senate academic council or committee that is not otherwise required by the above rules.

The *University Senate Rules* both strive for

- a minimum of duplication effort in formal academic approval processes (pursuant to Board Gov. Reg. VII, pg. 1), and
- cooperation among the educational policy-making units established by the Board of Trustees, in its Provost model of academic organization for the University (GR VII.A.3-7).

Given the many meritorious academic activities that exist in a wide variety of formal and informal cooperative groupings of the various University colleges, the Senate Rules do

not elevate one particular cooperative self-grouping of colleges over any other. In promotion of interaction among the colleges, while the Senate Rules do prescribe a 'minimal duplication framework' by which proposals are reviewed by successive bodies, the Senate Rules do not prohibit any college from seeking additional input from other college groups or Senate bodies, when the college feels that value can be added by such input. In order to make this meaning of the Senate Rules clear, the Senate Rules and Elections Committee has rendered the following formal interpretation to be inserted into the Senate Rules at the end of SR 3.2.3.A and at the end of SR 3.3.3.A.

**This rule does not have the intent or effect of prohibiting any college from seeking and utilizing the opinion of any willing academic council or committee of the Senate before the proposal is submitted to the first officially required academic council of review.*

Cc:
Chairs, University Senate Academic Councils
College Academic Associate Deans
Senate Rules and Elections Committee
Provost Office

3.2.2 Forms to be Used

Senate Council-approved forms and other mechanisms to initiate proposals for new undergraduate, master's, and doctoral degrees, and for undergraduate, graduate or first professional certificates, or to initiate changes to these academic programs, are available at <http://www.uky.edu/Faculty/Senate/forms.htm> and shall be used to initiate proposals under SR 3.2. In the case of academic programs in the health care colleges, the initiator of the proposal shall contact the chair of the Health Care Colleges Council (HCCC) or, in the case of the College of Law, the appropriate associate dean, for information on the appropriate proposal submission format.

3.2.3 Procedures to be Used

A. Approval by the Educational Unit Faculty [US: 5/7/12]

1. The Faculty of the originating educational unit makes the decision whether to approve proposals for new academic programs or changes to academic programs (including changes to the educational unit's University Scholars program and to dual degree programs) (GR VII.A.6(b); SR 3.2.A.3, below). For the Honors Program and UK Core, the "Faculty" within the meaning of this rule is the body identified by the University Senate to perform the educational policy-making functions of the respective program. For graduate programs, "the Faculty" is the voting graduate faculty of that program (SR 3.2.A.4, below). [US: 5/7/12]

In a manner prescribed by the College Faculty Rules, the chair/director shall forward to the College Faculty a proposal arising under SR 3.2. The chair/director's transmittal attests thereby that the proposal has been approved in accordance with the Rules of the Faculty of the originating unit. The chair(s)/director(s) may include separate opinion(s) on the academic merits or on the administrative feasibility of the proposal.

* If a program was originally approved for face to face delivery, and the dean later wants it to be delivered in part as 'face to face' and in part as distance learning, then the College Faculty has the role, and not the dean, to determine and approve as to whether the academic content of the program lends itself to delivery in part by distance learning. [RC:3/09/12]

Dual degree programs are simultaneously considered for approval by the respective unit faculties pursuant to the above procedures. One of the department chair(s)/director(s) shall forward the approved proposal to the College Faculty, or, in the case of dual degree programs that cross colleges, to the each College Faculty.

2. In cases of proposals concerning undergraduate or professional certificates or degrees, the respective College Faculty makes the decision whether to approve the proposal, in a manner pursuant to its College Rules (GR VII.A.4.(c)). The dean shall forward an approved proposal to the appropriate academic council of the Senate (SR 3.2.B), attesting thereby that the proposal has been approved in accordance with the College Faculty Rules. The dean

may include a separate opinion on the academic merits of the proposal (GR VII.B.3). The dean shall include a statement of administrative feasibility. Proposals concerning degree programs, or concerning certificates that report to an office outside of a college, shall also include a statement of administrative feasibility from the Office of the Provost.

Dual degree programs are simultaneously considered for approval by the respective college faculties pursuant to the above procedures. The respective deans may include separate opinions on the academic merits or the administrative feasibility of the proposal. One of the deans shall forward a single dual degree proposal to the appropriate academic council of the Senate.

3. In the case of proposals for graduate certificates or degrees, a proposal approved by the Faculty of the graduate program shall be forwarded by the Director of Graduate Studies to the dean of the college that contains the home educational unit of the graduate program. If so prescribed by the College Rules, the proposal may be reviewed by, and advisory opinion added by, faculty committees/councils of that college and by the dean of that college. That dean shall include a statement of administrative feasibility from the perspective of that college administration, and shall also include a statement of administrative feasibility from the Office of the Provost. The Director of Graduate Studies shall then forward the proposal to the Dean of the Graduate School. If the proposal is for new graduate program and is arising from faculty in an educational unit that does not already home a graduate program, then the dean of the college containing that educational unit shall perform the administrative processing roles prescribed in this paragraph for the Director of Graduate Studies.

4. UK Core Program. Changes in the UK Core Program need approval of only the Senate's designated UK Core Education Committee prior to submission to the Senate Council and do not need the approval of any other college or academic council. Courses offered as a part of UK Core are processed through regular procedures under SR 3.3. [US: 5/7/12]

* This rule does not have the intent or effect of prohibiting any college from seeking and utilizing the opinion of any willing academic council of the Senate before the proposal is submitted to the first officially required academic council of review.

B. Approval by Academic Council [US: 10/11/99; SREC: 6/8/06; US: 5/7/12]

1. Jurisdiction. The dean shall forward the proposal to the appropriate academic council as provided in this subpart SR 3.2.B.1. Responsibility for the approval of proposals concerning academic programs shall be vested in the appropriate academic council as follows: [US: 5/7/12]

From: Blonder, Lee
Sent: Wednesday, November 06, 2013 10:31 AM
To: Beeman, Cynthia S
Cc: Lindsay, Jim D.; Brothers, Sheila C; Jones, Davy; Ellis, Janie
Subject: HCCC eCATs Functionality

Dear Cynthia,

I am writing to check in with you about the eCATS opt out language that HCCC was going to review at its Sept 17th meeting. As you know, the solution allows a health care unit proposing an undergraduate or graduate course the option of routing through the HCCC, or opting out of HCCC review. There would be text for approval buttons with these alternatives:

Course Approval (through HCCC)

Course Approval (opt-out of HCCC review)

Unfortunately, we are seeing more health care college courses being routed via PDF because of the lack of HCCC functionality in eCATS. That is causing problems with routing and tracking. For these types of courses, we are forced to go back to emailing a handful of people to try to figure out where something is, which is very time consuming.

May we go ahead and proceed to ask Kathy Crouch and her team to make the opt in/out language above functional in eCATS?

Thank you so much,

Lee

Lee Blonder, Ph.D.

Senate Council Chair

From: Beeman, Cynthia S
Sent: Wednesday, November 06, 2013 4:18 PM
To: Blonder, Lee
Cc: Lindsay, Jim D.; Brothers, Sheila C; Jones, Davy; Ellis, Janie
Subject: RE: HCCC eCATs Functionality

Dear Dr. Blonder,

The HCCC is still opposed to the change in Senate Rule 1.3.4 and is working on a response regarding this change. However, until that is resolved, eCATS functionality should reflect the current rule.

Cynthia S. Beeman, D.D.S., Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Orthodontics
Associate Dean for Academic and Student Affairs
M134 College of Dentistry
800 Rose Street
Lexington KY 40536-0297

From: Brothers, Sheila C
Sent: Thursday, May 09, 2013 10:05 AM
To: Jones, Davy
Cc: Blonder, Lee; Lindsay, Jim D.
Subject: HCCC Logic for eCATS

Hi, Davy. Lee indicated there needs to be additional work on the HCCC logic for eCATS. Once you send it to me, I'll send it off to the programmers.

Sheila

Staff Representative to the Board of Trustees
Office of the Senate Council
Phone: (859) 257-5872

From: Blonder, Lee
Sent: Wednesday, May 08, 2013 5:31 PM
To: Brothers, Sheila C
Subject: RE:

Sheila- We had a fruitful meeting today. Davy and Jim Lindsey attended. Please check with Davy about the language for Kathy before sending it as it needs tweaking.
Thanks,
Lee

eCATS screen shot showing operational deference arranged by Senate Council Office for the HCCC.

All undergraduate and graduate course proposals from a health care college automatically go to the HCCC unless an explicit 'opt out' decision is made and entered here by the College.

(This screen appears whenever a health care college is seeking to forward a course proposal to the next stage of review above the college level).

THIS CURRICULAR PROPOSAL WILL NOT MOVE FORWARD IN THE APPROVAL PROCESS
UNTIL YOU TAKE ACTION USING ONE OF THE BUTTONS BELOW.

You may enter optional comments in the box below . Note: Comments by others
will appear to the right of this screen, under "You can also: View Memos".

If you have technical questions, please contact the Customer Service
Center. For curricular questions, please contact your associate dean.

Enter your comments in the box below (mandatory):

Course Approval (opt-out of HCCC review)

Course Approval (through HCCC)

Request Withdraw n/Denied

Return for Revision