**Senate Rules and Elections Committee**

**March 26, 2014**

**Minutes**

**Jones (Chair), Grossman, Pienkowski, Wood**

**1. Clarification of course cross-listing rule (SR 3.3.3.E)**

**E. Cross-listing**

1. If an educational unit Faculty wishes to cross-list an existing course, then it shall first seek the approval of the Faculty of the educational unit that currently offers the course. If each Faculty of the two units approves the cross-listing (which shall be attested to by each unit chair/director in the proposal documentation), then the requesting educational unit shall submit a form for a minor course change of the existing course. If the units are in different colleges, both deans must signify approval in the similar respective capacities as described above for the two unit chair(s)/director(s). Cross-listing shall not be used as justification for duplication of teaching effort. The chair of the home educational unit of the course must agree on the time, place and instructor(s) in scheduling of the cross-listed course.

2. If both the primary (home) educational unit and the secondary (cross-listing) educational unit request, and their respective college faculty mechanisms approve, then the secondary unit may become the primary unit by exercise of the course minor change approval process, and the former primary unit becomes the secondary unit. If the now secondary unit wishes to drop cross-listing the course, then a minor change to uncross-list the course must be taken per SR 3.3.3.G.2.d.

3. If a secondary (cross-listing) unit that becomes a primary unit for the course wants at the same time to cause more than a minor change to the content of the course, then the change in primary unit for the course and the change in course content shall be submitted through the regular course change process (SR 3.3.2.A-D).

**2. Two year waiver rule for retroactive withdrawal**

The SREC was tasked by the Senate Council to draft what the revised Senate Rule would look like if it were made to show that the Senate Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee has the authority to waive the two year time limit on filing appeals. The language draft by the SREC is shown below

SR 5.1.8.5.A.3.

Requests for retroactive withdrawals shall be made of the Dean of the college in which the student was enrolled at the time the classes were taken. The complete request shall be made before a student has graduated and not later than two calendar years from the last day of classes for the semester for which the withdrawal is requested~~.~~, unless the SRWAC votes to waive the two year time limit. The fully complete request shall be submitted using the University Senate Retroactive Withdrawal Application, which includes a form on which an instructor can offer feedback, along with the documentation required by the University Senate as described on that form (http://www.uky.edu/Faculty/Senate/forms.htm ). [US: 4/9/07; 5/7/07]

**3. FERPA**

The SREC reviewed the most currently issued federal FERPA requirements concerning access of students to their educational records. Under the current FERPA policies, the University cannot have a policy of not allowing students to examine their educational records, despite the difficulties such access may cause for courses in which it is desirable that exam questions not be disseminated even after the exam. The SREC requests that the Senate Council recommend to the University Senate that it approve the following changes to SR 7.2.2 (Code of Faculty Responsibilities):

“Be available to students for advising and other conferences, ~~preferably~~ by posting office hours ~~and/~~or by allowing students to arrange for appointments at other mutually convenient times.”

~~“Return to, discuss with, or make available to students all papers, quizzes and examinations with a reasonable period of time.”~~  Per federal FERPA requirements, allow students to review all of their educational records, including but not limited to papers, quizzes, examinations (both the questions and the student’s own responses) within reasonable parameters as outlined in the syllabus.

**4. Faculty Vacation Leave Policy**

The Senate Council Chair has asked the SREC for advice on how to Senate Council might vet questions that have been posed on interpretation of AR 3:6 and GR X on the relationship between sabbatical leave and vacation leave. The SREC’s advice is that the Senate Council appoint an ad hoc advisory committee to the Senate Council to which the Senate Council will appoint interested and competent faculty.

**5. Faculty Phased Retirement**

The SREC was asked by the Senate Council Chair to frame issues concerning proposed changes to the Phased Retirement Administrative Regulations, to facilitate the Senate Council’s discussion of the subject. The essential issue is what privileges and responsibilities tenured faculty ought to continue to possess when they change from regular full-time assignment to a phased retirement assignment (of 50-80% time). The SREC suggests that the Senate Council discuss

1) the eligibility of phased retirement faculty to vote in or run as a candidate in elections fora college or University-level elected faculty representative (e.g., college Faculty Council, University Senate or councils of the Senate, Faculty Trustee, Faculty member of Presidential Search Committee).

2) whether shall continue the same status of required consultation and letter writing in faculty personnel actions as was possessed as a regular full-time faculty member (e.g. GR VII.B.5).

3) whether shall continue the same status to vote in administrative advisory matters such as GR IX.III (majority vote of unit faculty to cause an off cycle review for Chief Unit Administrator) and AR 1:4.III.E.3 (unit faculty approval of unit implementation plan following periodic unit review)

4) eligibility to hold part-time administrative appointments at the department, college and University level, or to be appointed to such administrative appointments that are normally held by a person with a full-time University employment status.

Grossman then left the meeting.

**6. Election**

Jones reviewed the current status of the election process, including the current ‘mock vote’ among committee members to exercise the planned election site.

**7. Forced Withdrawal Rule (SR 5.2.4.2)**

The SREC was tasked by the Senate Council to draft further revision to update the ‘forced withdrawal’ policy for situations including and beyond the situation of excused absence for more than 20% of the class meetings. The SREC determined that the issue is quite substantive and requests that the initial action by the Senate Council on the ‘missed 20% with excused absence’ case not be forwarded in isolation to the Senate, but rather that it be held for incorporation to the larger revision to the Senate Rules of which this recent SC action is just one part. The SREC will continue working on this at its next meeting.