**Senate Rules and Elections Committee**

**Minutes**

**March 9, 2012**

**In a specially called meeting, the SREC discussed the following two items**

**1. The role of the College Faculty and the dean in situations of off-site offerings of a degree program. The SREC agreed that a College Faculty (not a dean) has the role to close a concentration within a master’s degree, and to create a new concentration within a master’s degree (with Senate approval). The responsibility of the dean is to provide the necessary resources to support deliver of the master’s program. The particular focus of the discussion was the role of the College Faculty in the situation where the dean wants to deliver the program at an off-site location. If the dean were to want the program to be delivered in part as ‘face to face’ and in part as distance learning (by CPE definition), then it was clear to the SREC that the College Faculty has the role, and not the dean, to determine and approve as to whether the program (originally approved for face to face delivery) lends itself to delivery in part by distance learning. More discussion ensued on a situation in which the College Faculty had approved the delivery of the program in a ‘face to face’ mode, in a background context that the delivery would be ‘on site’ at UK, but the dean now wants to also deliver it, in toto, face to face, at an ‘off site’ location. It was noted that the SACS substantive approval requirements, and UK’s compliance with those requirements codified at Administrative Regulation 1:5, require approval by the Board of Trustees for delivery of more than 50% of the required credit hours of a degree program at an ‘off site’ location. The AR 1:5 also codifies that in cases where 25% or more of the program would be delivered off-site, it is considered that the environment of an off-site location can have such an impact on the academic delivery of the approved content of the academic program, that the College Faculty and University Senate have roles to approve (or not) the given academic program for delivery at the off-site location (with final approval by the BoT on academic grounds and on administrative feasibillity). The SREC noted, but did not address, that AR 1:5 does not address the role of the College Faculty and Senate in situations where less than 25% of the credit hours of the otherwise approved program are administratively proposed to be delivered at an off-site location.**

**2. The SREC discussed a request for an interpretation, from the Ombud, on the issue of excused absence for reason of illness. In the particular case, the instructor wants to require the student to produce from the Student Health Services a medical statement in which a nurse or doctor formally attest in writing that the severity of the illness was such as to warrant the student to miss class. The representative from Student Health Services stated it is their policy to refuse to provide such a statement. The SREC reviewed a recent discussion of this general topic by the Senate Council. The Senate Council discussion had determined that the ‘blue slip’ at the Student Health Services that contains a pre-printed statement on it that the individual obtained the slip at the Student Health Services does not have to be accepted by the instructor as being sufficient evidence that the student had an illness that warranted missing class, because even a healthy student can pick up this blue slip. The SREC interpreted that at this time, the Senate Rules do not specify what level of documentation is minimally sufficient to necessitate that the instructor must excuse the student’s absence due to illness. In the absence of such specification, and in the present situation of refusal of Student Health Services to cause documentation for the instructor that provides a medical opinion of sufficient illness to miss class, then contested cases will become ad hoc resolved by the University Appeals Board.**