

Senate Council

Monday, September 19, 2022

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3:00 PM on Monday, September 19, 2022, 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 electronically 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 commented that there were no votes scheduled. The Chair reminded SC members that regarding the ability to speak, members must raise their hand to be called upon.

1. Minutes from August 29 and Announcements

The Chair reported that a clerical edit was received for the minutes from the August 29 SC meeting. There being **no objections**, the minutes from August 29 were **approved as amended by unanimous consent**.

The Chair announced that a nominee was requested to serve on the UK Online Steering Committee. The Chair explained that in the future, she would utilize the Senate Nominating Committee, but had sent forward Senate Technology Committee Chair Ken Calvert (EN) as the nominee so he could begin participating as soon as the group began to meet.

The Chair reported that she was asked for a QEP representative and recommended Faculty Trustee Aaron Cramer (EN) as he was willing and a former chair of the Senate Academic Program Committee (SAPC). The Chair informed SC members that both she and Senate Council Vice Chair Leslie Vincent (BE) were both part of the QEP working group. The Chair explained that Cramer would be able to participate when she and the Vice Chair had conflicts with committee meetings.

The Chair informed SC members that she requested monthly updates to the SC on the QEP from Susan Cantrell (ED) and Provost Robert DiPaola.

The Chair announced that the SC office had submitted requests for 19 listservs (one for each college) as a result of requests from the SC retreat in May. The listservs will be provided to faculty senators to use to communicate with constituents.

The Chair noted that she had expressed concerns to President Capilouto and Provost DiPaola about the long period of inactivity of the Regulation Review Committee. The Chair explained that a few meetings had taken place recently, but that the group had not met for two years prior to June 2022. The Chair informed SC members that the SC office had offered multiple times to put proposed changes forward for SC and Senate, but that the group had not closed the loop and responded about attending SC and Senate meetings. The Chair explained that currently, there was no clear plan in place to seek SC or Senate input after the interim regulation was issued. She noted that this model was not a satisfactory implementation of the University's shared governance model.

The Chair explained that she would put the revised regulations on upcoming SC agendas and provide feedback.

The Chair reminded SC members that the new senator handbook advised Senate members to review agenda items during the meeting via a personal computer or personal printed copy. She informed SC members that she would not be able to show these agenda items on screen during Senate meetings to both those in person and

those online. The Chair noted that line numbers were now added to complex file to ensure ease of access to agenda items. The Chair said she expected SC members to mirror the practice of accessing agenda items on their own during SC meetings.

The Chair announced that several individuals had contacted her regarding the SC's and Senate's role in UK Invests, a new University initiative to enhance student financial wellness. The Chair asked SC members for their feedback about SC and Senate engagement with UK Invests.

2. Committee Reports

a. Senate Advisory Committee on Disability Accommodation and Compliance (SACDAC) – Justin Lane, Chair

i. Response to SC Request for Information about Reasonable Accommodation Process

The Chair explained the response to the SC request for information about reasonable accommodation. The Chair then introduced SACDAC Chair Justin Lane (ED) to SC members. Lane presented the report to SC members.

SC members discussed the following:

- The process seemed different in the past; one SC member recalled more opportunity for faculty to provide feedback about alternative arrangements for accommodations
- How extra time was determined for exams and who makes the determination
- Increasing transparency in the decision-making process about accommodations and communications between the Disability Resource Center (DRC) and University faculty
- Lack of clarity around what sorts of issues require an accommodation
- Ensuring that accommodations granted were compliant with ADA law
- The lack of rationale for accommodations provided
- The increased workload of the DRC without them being provided an increase in staffing or resources
- If the DRC can allow a third party to interact with the instructor and student needing an accommodation (FERPA/HIPAA)
- Involving faculty in less common accommodations to better help faculty support their students
- A list of possible accommodations and how to implement such accommodations for faculty to consider when creating course syllabi
- Giving instructors time before the semester begins to develop accommodations
- Improvements to the University's website for DRC accommodations to increase transparency and understanding of expectations among students, faculty, and staff, similar to those at Oregon State University
- Concerns with accommodations that affect course content, such as requiring an instructor to provide different models for a color-blind student (specific colors are used in anatomy diagrams, etc.)
- A lack of onboarding related to student accommodations for new faculty, which causes difficulty for students and faculty alike
- A repository of types of accommodations used in the past for certain disabilities that instructors can use as a guide
- Questions about whether the DRC can dictate an accommodation that violates Senate Rules (allowing a student to miss more than 20% of the course)

- Cooperative designing for accommodations between faculty and the DRC to ensure successful accommodation
- A resource to provide faculty members with ideas about best practices for specific accommodations

Kaveh Tagavi (EN) asked Lane if faculty were permitted to know the nature of a student's disability who was being provided accommodations. Lane clarified that it was the student's discretion whether to share the disability with their instructor, noting that the focus of the communication from the DRC was about accommodations.

The Chair asked SACDAC to consider the following items based on the discussion from SC members:

- Benchmarking practices from other higher education institutions and ADA laws, including accommodations not covered by such laws
- The creation of more transparent website for the DRC (the Chair referenced Oregon State University's website as a transparent and clear example)
- Whether the current composition of SACDAC was effective to satisfy the committee's charge

The Chair thanked Lane for his report.

3. Clinical Title Series (CTS) Faculty

The Chair welcomed Sue Nokes (acting associate provost for faculty advancement) to provide the annual CTS Report to SC members. The Chair explained the *Administrative Regulations* required the report to come to SC.

Prior to the discussion, the Chair asked Faculty Trustee Hollie Swanson (ME) to explain to SC members about a recent item on the Board of Trustees' consent agenda and how it is related to the day's discussion. Swanson explained that a clinical department had suggested a change in their endowed chair professorship so that it could be given to a CTS faculty member, noting that their justification was that their department had no regular title series faculty so they wanted to award it to a CTS faculty member. Swanson explained that the processes for determining sufficient requirements for such positions was not consistent across the University. Swanson noted that Faculty Trustee Aaron Cramer (EN) informed her that there was a well outlined process in the College of Engineering, but that no similar process could be found for the College of Medicine. Swanson added that the purpose of an endowed chair is to provide regular title series faculty with opportunities to increase funding for their research.

- a. Annual CTS Report (April 2022)
- b. Administrative Regulations 2.6 ("Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion in the Clinical Title Series (Approved by the Board of Trustees)")

Nokes provided the Annual CTS Report to SC members. SC members asked a variety of questions and discussed the following:

- Whether there were issues regarding straying too far from tenure-track faculty
- What the justification was for the high percentage of allowable non-tenure track faculty in the College of Medicine (212%)
- That the Provost approves colleges with total faculty in clinical title series in excess of 25%
- Distribution of Effort (DOE) metrics for research time and clinical efforts
- If the Office of the Provost could provide similar information and a trajectory regarding lecturer title series

Tagavi offered suggestions for improving the readability of the report. Provost DiPaola expressed interest in accessing data that provides more information about research responsibilities for those in CTS. Swanson explained to SC members that the Board of Trustees approved the creation of a second practice plan group for community-based physicians who will not be categorized as faculty. SC members discussed the following:

- Whether this was an amendment to the *Administrative Regulation (AR)*
 - Swanson clarified that this request would involve creating an *AR*
- This could offer a solution for practicing physicians that were not seeking a faculty title series
- The lack of participation from CTS faculty in shared governance
- Departments in the College of Medicine that did not have any regular title series faculty, such as Emergency Medicine

4. Proposed Changes to Senate Rules 1.3 ("Councils of the Senate") and SR 1.4.1 ("Structure of University Senate Committees") - Discussion Only

The Chair explained the proposed the Changes to *Senate Rules (SR) 1.3 ("Councils of the Senate") and SR 1.4.1 ("Structure of University Senate Committees")* and informed SC members that this agenda item was intended for discussion only. The Chair asked SC members if there were any concerns with continued vetting of the proposed changes and there were none.

SC members discussed the following:

- A lack of editorial consistency among capitalization in section headers and titles
- Verbiage concerns regarding the voting faculty of the Graduate Council language where “elected” should have been used in place of “appointed”
- A clerical error in *SR 1.3.5.2.3* where “UC” was placed instead of “HCCC”
- Authority among academic councils to require edits to course and program proposals
- Clarifying the language across the proposed changes to ensure consistency

The SC Chair noted the academic councils were asked to provide feedback on the change by October 10, after which SC members could provide additional feedback before the proposed changes were sent to the Senate Rules and Elections Committee (SREC). The Chair asked members to send additional feedback to Ms. Brothers.

5. Senate Meeting Roundtable

The Chair invited Senate members to participate in a Senate meeting roundtable to discuss the recent September 12 Senate meeting. The September 12 Senate meeting piloted a hybrid meeting format between Zoom and in-person attendees in the Gatton College of Business and Economics. SC members offered the following comments:

- The meeting went smoothly, and the technical assistance provided by the Gatton College of Business and Economics was a key part of the success of the meeting
- Some Senate members in-person using table mics were difficult to hear and their corresponding video was sometimes difficult to see
- The camera did not seem to focus on members seated towards the back of the room
- Poll Everywhere issues on some devices
- The hybrid format was clear and went well
- The refreshments provided were a pleasant added value to the meeting
- The hybrid Senate meeting was the best hybrid meeting she has attended
- The logistics and work coordinated by SC Vice Chair Leslie Vincent (BE), the SC Chair, Sheila Brothers (SC office), and Katie Silver (SC office) was commended by SC members

- SC members who attended in-person left the meeting feeling more energized

Silver commented that she had been in communication with the building's technical support team and changes such as those mentioned during the roundtable were being worked on. She recommended that persons online have their Zoom set to "pin to active speaker" to allow them to see the person speaking. The Provost noted that he thought the meeting was run incredibly well and informed SC members that 14 deans attended in-person. The Chair commented that she was surprised to see so many members attend in-person and was pleased with the level of engagement before and after the meeting between colleagues who attended in-person. Akiko Takenaka (AS) noted that the President highlighted three faculty members during the meeting and requested that such mentions be communicated in advance to allow faculty to attend to be honored in person.

The Chair informed SC members that the President would host a reception later in the fall for Senate members. Given such positive feedback, SC members discussed continuing to host Senate meetings in a hybrid fashion and sending a survey after another meeting to Senate members, to gauge their interest in continued hybrid meetings. The Chair noted that the President was pleased that Senate was able to meet in this fashion.

6. Senate Council Liaisons

The Chair explained that liaisons to the SC were needed for each of the academic councils. The Chair noted that SC members were sent a list of compositions for the Undergraduate Council (UC), the Graduate Council (GC), the Health Care Colleges Council (HCCC), the Senate Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), and the Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) earlier that day.

a. Undergraduate Council

The Chair informed SC members that SAPC and UC members Justin Nichols (ED) was willing to serve as the SC liaison to the UC.

b. Graduate Council

The Chair asked Richard Charnigo (PbH) if he was able to serve in the capacity again, noting his excellent service in the role previously. Charnigo respectfully declined due a teaching conflict with GC meetings. Bob Grossman (AS) suggested Alberto Corso (AS) be solicited to serve as the SC liaison to the GC. Charnigo informed SC members of the GC meeting dates and times.

c. Health Care Colleges Council

The Chair suggested that Paco Andrade (ME) be solicited to serve as the SC liaison to the HCCC again this year. SC members offered no objections to this suggestion.

7. Items from the Floor

The Chair announced that Gregg Rentfrow (AG) was appointed as Senate Parliamentarian. She explained that Rentfrow would meet with past Senate Parliamentarian Clayton Thyne (AS) and that Rentfrow planned to attend SC meetings in addition to Senate meetings.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:39 PM with **no objections**.

Respectfully submitted by,
DeShana Collett

Prepared by Katie Silver on Tuesday, September 20, 2022

SC Members Present: Bastin, Cantrell, Collett, Charnigo, Cramer, Davis, Duncan, Grossman, Laws, Raglin, Swanson, Takenaka, Tagavi, Vincent

Invited Guests Present: Sheila Brothers, Robert DiPaola, Justin Lane