

# Senate Council

Monday, August 14, 2023

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3:00 PM on Monday, August 14, 2023, in 103 Main Building, although a video conference link was also available for members. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken by show of hand unless otherwise specified. Specific voting information can be requested from the Office of the Senate Council (SC).

Senate Council Chair DeShana Collett (HS) called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:00 pm. The Chair welcomed those present. She informed everyone that the session was being recorded for notetaking purposes and noted that it was an open meeting. She asked that all attendees, online and in person, state their name and affiliation prior to speaking, to ensure everyone knew who was speaking. The Chair asked SC members to be ready to vote via Poll Everywhere. The Chair reminded SC members that regarding the ability to speak, members must raise their hand to be called upon. The Chair also reminded everyone that SC members would have priority speaking, noting that others may be called upon as needed and given a chance to speak only if there were no additional comments from SC members.

The Chair asked SC members and guests to introduce themselves.

## 1. Minutes from May 15, 2023 and Announcements

The Chair informed SC members that no edits were received to the May 15, 2023 minutes. There being **no objections**, the minutes from May 15, 2023 were **approved as distributed by unanimous consent**.

The Chair informed SC members that on behalf of SC and Senate, she approved the following:

- A change to the 2023-2024 academic calendar, regarding registration windows for Fall 2023
- A waiver of the *Senate Rules* related to the application deadline for BSN students to allow the addition of a second admissions cycle in the fall, as the college had not met state-mandated enrollment deadlines with their spring cycle
- A late addition to the December 2022 degree list for a graduate student

The Chair noted that Provost and Co-Executive Vice President for Health Affairs (EVPHA) Bob DiPaola had requested to share information with SC members. The Provost shared the following:

- Updates about the restructure related to the Provost and Co-EVPHA roles
- Assurance that the restructure would not diminish the Provost's role in academic support
- Plans for enhancing the Provost's role in academic support and the addition of a Vice Provost role
- Planned efforts for enhancement of faculty development
- Planned efforts to enhance the academic health system by engaging colleges broadly
- Plans for activities related to the University's Strategic Plan, including TEK, which will enhance STEM and non-STEM work, and educational opportunities for more collaborations
- Information about the UK ADVANCE committee tasked with examining and making recommendations regarding the implications about generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools

SC Vice Chair Sandra Bastin (AG) congratulated the Provost on his role as Co-EVPHA and expressed excitement about the opportunities mentioned. Bastin noted that she expected the Provost to continue to report to SC on the information shared.

The Chair made the following announcements:

The Chair announced that the SC Office and the Office of the Registrar were planning to move forward from the planning stages to action regarding requiring units to maintain Senate-approved course prerequisites, and not turn them on or off. The Chair provided information about the situation and the plan moving forward.

The Chair informed SC members that Sheila Brothers (SC office) was working on an initiative with the Office of the Registrar, the Office of the Provost, Office of the President, and the Graduate School regarding the degree list. The Chair provided information about the initiative and anticipated outcomes.

The Chair reminded SC members many graduate programs had dropped the requirement for the GRE/GMAT.

The Chair informed SC members that she met with Acting Dean of the Graduate School and Acting Associate Provost for Graduate and Professional Education Martha Peterson and Senior Associate Dean of Academic Administration Brian Jackson (GS) to review issues related with 767 residency courses. The Chair explained that the *Senate Rules* clearly stated that 767 courses were for students who had passed their qualifying exam but noted that there was an issue with students being enrolled in the course who had not passed the qualifying exam prior to beginning the course. The Chair stated that SC members should expect to hear more from the Graduate School.

The Chair announced that the Senate's GenAI Committee began working in July and had already provided instructors with guidance for the academic year. The Chair noted that the committee would continue to work throughout the year.

The Chair informed SC members that the Senate's new website would likely be going live within the coming weeks. The Chair asked SC members to note that SC Office had a significant amount of work to do once the site was live and that seeing some outdated information should be expected while the office work to get everything updated. New functionality will allow Senate committee chairs to post meeting agendas and minutes directly on the Senate site.

The Chair informed SC members that the UK Core Committee had announced its processes for study abroad courses and course substitutions submitted by the Disability Resource Center (DRC) for students with learning disabilities. The Chair noted that the Provost, Legal Counsel, and Student Success had expressed concerns about the authority of the UK Core Committee to make the final determination regarding these course substitutions. The Chair explained that those parties wanted the responsibility to remain with the DRC, but that she and the UK Core Committee Chair had been steadfast in maintaining that faculty in general (and the UK Core Committee in this specific case) had control over educational policy.

The Chair explained that SC Office staff regularly worked on projects over the summer and provided information about some of the projects.

The Chair informed SC members that Program Coordinator Ann Eads had diligently to clean up "stuck" proposals (proposals inactive for over 90 days) in Curriculog in an effort to improve speed and accuracy for Curriculog searches. The Chair explained that as of May 2023, there were 472 "stuck" proposals, some of which had been stuck since July 2016. The Chair noted that Eads contacted proposers responsible for stuck proposals to reach a collaborative decision regarding the future of the course and program proposals. As of August 8, 2023, only 24 proposals remained in a "stuck" status, as some of the proposers were unavailable during the summer months.

The Chair informed SC members that Kate Silver (SC office) was working to standardize the way the office tracked activity data related to courses and programs, as well as implement new workflows in order to maintain data integrity and improve reporting efforts. The Chair noted as a result of Silver's expertise, the office will be able to perform analyses about curricular activity and be able to more easily generate reporting in the future using the new implemented workflows.

The Chair informed SC members that Sheila Brothers (SC office) had worked on processes in Curriculog to automatically route proposals that go to a Senate committee. The Chair noted that up until now, most proposals were routed manually. Brothers was also working on building in steps required after Senate approval for online programs, as there were multiple administrative steps after Senate approval that caused confusion for proposers. Brothers' work in Curriculog will make it easier for proposers to know the approval process steps at the very beginning, as well as see what steps remain before a program can be offered online.

## 2. 2023 – 2024 Orientation for Senate Council Members

The Chair provided a brief orientation for SC members for the 2023 – 2024 academic year. The Chair provided information to SC members about the following:

- The date, time, and modality for SC meetings
- Deadlines for requests to add items to an upcoming agenda
- Expectations for in-person attendance
- The charge and expectations of the SC (the executive body of the Senate)
- Expectations for SC members to prepare for meetings
- Information about participation in discussion and debate
- Expectations for SC members attending via Zoom

## 3. Old Business

The Chair announced that there were three items left from the prior academic year.

### a. (SREC) *Senate Rules 5.2.5.2.3.1* (Twenty Percent Rule)

The Chair explained that Senate Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) Chair Roger Brown (AG) was attending to report on *SR 5.2.5.2.3.1*. The Chair informed SC members that if SC affirmed the language suggested by SREC, an *SR* change for "I" grades would be required to avoid a contradiction caused by the proposed changes from SREC. Brown explained the proposed changes to *SR 5.2.5.2.3.1*.

The Chair stated that the **motion** was a recommendation from the committee for Senate to approve the proposed changes. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate.

SC members briefly discussed the proposed language. Brown noted that interpretation on this particular rule had varied in the past, which justified the need to change the language in order to clarify Senate intent. The Chair asked Brown if SREC had considered the requirements in the *SR* pertaining to "I" grades. SC members discussed the following:

- It was unclear who the twenty percent rule was intended to benefit
- The narrow circumstances where the procedure outlined in the rule could not be met and would require consultation with the Academic Ombud
- A clause to indicate when the twenty percent rule superseded the rule on "I" grades would be helpful
- A "W" grade was not a penalty for students

Bob Grossman (AS) asked if there were comments from the student members of SC that were in attendance. There were none.

A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with one opposed and none abstained.

Brown noted that SREC could update the proposal to include language about “not-withstanding” to clarify the rule.

b. (SREC) Recommendation for SC Related to Summer Session Courses and Prep Days

Brown explained the recommendation from SREC related to summer session courses and prep days. The Chair asked why SREC was looking into the particular matter. Brown noted that members of SREC noted the issue should be addressed while reviewing the SRs. Doug Michael (LA) suggested that “part of term” courses, rather than just summer courses, were the issue at hand. SC members discussed the following:

- A need for standardization among course procedures
- That Prep Days belonged not to courses but belonged to a semester
- Concerns regarding the number of contact hours required for credit hours
- The experience in the summer session differed from that in the spring and fall semesters

Doug Michael (LA) **moved** to send the recommendation from SREC to the Senate Calendar Committee for further review, to provide recommendations about Prep Days and the summer session. Sandra Bastin (AG) **seconded**. The Chair asked if there was any debate and there was none. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with one opposed and none abstained.

c. (SREC) Recommendation SC Related to Named, Recognized Accrediting Associations

Brown described the recommendation from SREC for SC related to Name, Recognized Accrediting Associations. The Chair commented that the changes to SR 4 approved by Senate in March 2023 included a fix for the issue regarding language in the SRs and asked whether the recommendation was still relevant. The Chair asked if Brown had consulted with Director of Planning and Accreditation RaeAnne Pearson. Brown commented that he had and noted that he recognized the issue was substantive and beyond the scope of SREC to evaluate the significance. The Chair added that Pearson felt like having the six accrediting associations listed was the best option for Senate to move forward. Brown asked about the process for students who took courses at institutions that were not accredited by those listed in the *Senate Rules*. Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management Christine Harper explained that the current practice was for the college to ask the student for information about the course work and grades in order to make a determination on whether to accept the course or allow credit to be granted with an exam. Bastin commented that the current rule allowed for colleges to consider coursework completed at institutions not accredited by the list in the *Senate Rules* but noted that it may be beneficial to codify the procedures.

The Chair asked if there were any objections to tasking the Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) to provide a recommendation about procedures for courses from institutions not accredited by those listed in the *Senate Rules*. There were **no objections**.

4. Proposed Change to *Senate Rules 1.4.2.3 (“Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee”)*

The Chair explained there was no individual proposer for the proposed change to *Senate Rules 1.4.2.3 (“Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee”)*, but that it was on the agenda because SC voted to approve the committee structural change at its May retreat. The Chair explained the proposed change.

SC Vice Chair Sandra Bastin (AG) **moved** for SC to recommend that the Senate approve the proposed changes to *SR 1.4.2.3 (“Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee”)* and *SR 4.2.2 (“Cooperative Education Agreements”)*, effective immediately. Molly Blasing (AS) **seconded**. The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate.

SAASC Chair Leslie Vincent (BE) informed SC members that the vision for the proposed changes to the committee was address an issue that occurred the prior year regarding inactivity from the Senate Admissions Advisory Committee (SAAC). Vincent noted that the issues across both SAASC and SAAC were very much intertwined and that making SAAC a permanent subcommittee of SAASC would promote communication and collaboration. The Chair commented that there would be two permanent subcommittees of SAASC, the Admissions Subcommittee and the Academic Standards Subcommittee.

The Provost talked about including content expertise on Senate committees and asked about including voting ex officio representation from the President's cabinet. The Chair commented that SC took action at the SC retreat to ask the Senate Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) to remove from the SRs the specific titles mentioned for ex officio members of Senate committees, add language that directs the president to nominate individuals who have certain specific responsibilities (i.e. "job description"), and change all ex officio members of Senate committees to being nonvoting. The Chair explained this change had already been approved by SC members. Faculty Trustee Aaron Cramer (EN) commented that committee meetings did not tend to involve contentious votes. Cramer noted that the Provost, among other administrators, were voting members of the Senate and stated that the change wouldn't meaningfully interfere with shared governance.

Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management Christine Harper offered comments about the committee's charge in the proposal. Harper suggested amendments to some of the proposed language to the admissions subcommittee charge. The Chair asked Harper to send proposed changes to the SAASC for review.

President Capilouto asked for clarification about how Harper's suggestions would be addressed. The Chair noted that Harper would work with SAASC to incorporate edits before the proposed changes went to the Senate. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

#### 5. Proposed Change to Senate Rules 1.4.1.3.1 ("Subcommittees")

The Chair explained the proposed change to *Senate Rules 1.4.1.3.1 ("Subcommittees")*. The Chair stated the **motion** on the floor was a recommendation that SC recommend Senate approved the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 1.4.1.3.1 ("Subcommittees")*, effective immediately. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate.

SC Vice Chair Sandra Bastin (AG) commented that SC had already discussed the rationale for the proposed change at length. SC members briefly discussed the proposed changes. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

#### 6. Proposed Change to Senate Rules 1.4.3.2.1 ("University Hearing Panel (Privilege and Tenure) (USHP)," "Composition and Jurisdiction")

#### 7. Proposed Change to Senate Rules 1.4.3.1.1 ("Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure (SACPT)")

The Chair explained the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 1.4.3.2.1 ("University Hearing Panel (Privilege and Tenure) (USHP)," "Composition and Jurisdiction")* and *Senate Rules 1.4.3.1.1 ("Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure (SACPT)")*. The Chair stated the **motion** on the floor was a recommendation that SC recommend Senate approved the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 1.4.3.2.1 ("University Hearing Panel (Privilege and Tenure) (USHP)," "Composition and Jurisdiction")* and *Senate Rules 1.4.3.1.1 ("Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure (SACPT)")*. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate.

SC members briefly discussed the proposed changes. Molly Blasing (AS) suggested that the language be amended to specify a “tenured full Professor or Librarian I” for clarity. SC members agreed. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

#### 8. Proposed Change to *Senate Rules 1.4.2.1.18.5 (“Senate Academic Advising Committee”)*

The Chair explained the proposed change to *SR 1.4.2.1.18.5 (“Senate Academic Advising Committee”)*. The Chair noted that the change would remove one ex officio nonvoting member, the Associate Provost for Student and Academic Life. The Chair added that the University did not have an Associate Provost for Student and Academic Life. The Chair stated the **motion** on the floor was for SC members to recommend that the Senate approve the amended proposed changes to Senate Rules 1.4.2.18.5 (*“Senate Academic Advising Committee”*), effective immediately. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

Bob Grossman (AS) noted that the title “ex officio voting members” conflicted with the way they were described within the composition of the committee as “ex officio nonvoting members.” The Chair stated that it was a typo.

Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management Christine Harper commented that historically, membership of the Advising Network included members not employed by the University and suggested that the language specify that the three professional advisors on the committee be employed by the University. Bob Grossman (AS) **moved** to amend the language in the proposed change to reflect that the three professional advisors be employed by UK. Sandra Bastin (AG) **seconded**. The Chair asked if there was any debate and there was none. A **vote** was taken, and the motion to amend the proposed change **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management Christine Harper suggested that the Vice President of Student Success serve on the committee or that President be allowed to nominate a designee to serve on the committee. The Chair commented that position was struck from the committee’s composition because the position did not exist. Faculty Trustee Aaron Cramer (EN) commented that SC discussed this previously but shared concerns specifically about three staff members participating on a committee with another ex officio member who supervised them. In response to a comment by Harper, the Chair shared that the SREC was already working on language to prevent any type of power differentials in Senate committees.

A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

#### 9. SC Nominees to Participate in Board’s Evaluation of the President

The Chair stated that agenda item 9 would be discussed at the next SC meeting.

#### 10. Items from the Floor (Time Permitting)

In response to a comment by Harper, the Chair shared that the SREC was already working on language to prevent various types of power differentials in Senate committees.

The Chair informed SC members that the next SC meeting would take place on August 21 and the first Senate meeting would take place on September 11.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:09 PM with **no objections**.

Respectfully submitted by,  
DeShana Collett

Prepared by Katie Silver on Monday, August 14, 2023

SC Members Present: Bastin, Blasing, Collett, Cramer, Davis, Duncan, Duncan, Grossman, Hornung, Michael, Salt, Tagavi, Takenaka, White

Guests Present: Sheila Brothers, Roger Brown, Eli Capilouto, Katie Cardarelli, Robert DiPaola, Christine Harper, Davy Jones, Katherine McCormick, Gregg Rentfrow, Lisa Tannock, Leslie Vincent