

# Senate Council

Monday, October 3, 2022

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3:00 PM on Monday, October 3, 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 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 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.

## 1. Minutes from September 19 and September 26 and Announcements

The Chair informed SC members that edits were received for the September 26 minutes. There being **no objections**, the minutes from September 19 and September 26 were approved as amended by unanimous consent.

The Chair asked SC members to email Katie Silver (SC office) if they were planning to be absent during Fall Break.

The Chair reported that she had received email notices that the Regulation Review Committee (RRC) was going to be meeting. The Chair informed SC members that she invited Senior Associate General Counsel Marcy Deaton to attend today's meeting to go over changes to *Administrative Regulations (AR)* 1:4 but noted that Deaton emailed her that morning and declined to attend. The Chair informed SC members that Deaton offered the following explanation of the vetting process, noting that the process seemed to differ from prior experiences:

*"If the Senate Council discusses AR 1:4 (as they did 3:16 last week) and have any comments, the Senate Council Chair in their role on the Regulation Review Committee should submit the comments to the Regulation Review Committee. The "owner" of the regulation (in this case the Provost) will then determine the extent that comments are incorporated into the regulation."*

The Chair explained that she asked Deaton for some clarity in her declination of the meeting, noting the importance of upholding the shared governance process outlined in the *Governing Regulations (GR)*.

## 2. Appointment of Member to Senate UK Core Education Committee

The Chair explained the nomination to members. Bob Grossman (AS) **moved** to appoint the recommended faculty member to the SUKCEC. Faculty Trustee Hollie Swanson (ME) **seconded**. A **vote** was taken by show of hands, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

## 2. Finals Week and Assignments

The Chair explained that the SC office was contacted by Associate Dean Kim Anderson (EN) at the end of the Spring 2022 semester about Finals Week after a student approached her because a homework assignment was due during Finals Week. The Chair informed SC members that the term "Finals Week" occurred twice in the *SRs*, both in the context of Prep Week in *SR* 5.2.5.6.5. The Chair commented that she believed most assumed nothing could be made due during Finals Week, except for the exception noted in the *SR* on Prep Week. The Chair asked SC members to discuss the issue and offer feedback. SC members discussed the following:

- Whether homework could be due during Finals Week
- Assigning homework due during Finals Week as a study mechanism but giving students sufficient lead time by posting the homework prior to Prep Week
- Assigning homework to be due during Finals Week in place of a final exam
- Being mindful of other courses students were taking and the impact on the student of homework being due during Finals Week
- Not putting unreasonable restrictions on take-home final exams
- The unnecessary burden placed on the student by assigning a final project and a final exam
- Assignments due during Finals Week before an exam would not allow enough time for an instructor to grade the homework and the student to review the feedback
- Not allowing homework to be due during Finals Week could limit Prep Week to no new material

Faculty Trustee Aaron Cramer (EN) noted that since SC members could not reach a general consensus, it would be most reasonable to refer the matter to a committee. Cramer **moved** to refer the matter to the Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC). Olivia Davis (BE) **seconded**. The Chair asked if there was any debate. Grossman **moved** to amend Cramer’s motion to replace SAASC with the Senate Calendar Committee (SCC). Cramer **seconded**. The Chair asked if there was any debate. Kaveh Tagavi (EN) noted that he objected to the item going to the SCC. SC Vice Chair Leslie Vincent (BE, Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC)) stated that she did not believe the SCC was the appropriate committee to refer the item to. Richard Charnigo (PbH) (SCC chair) commented that he also believed the item was more appropriate for the SAASC. A **vote** was taken by show of hands for the amended motion on the floor, and the motion **failed** with nine opposed, one in favor, and two abstained. A **vote** was by show of hands taken on the original motion to refer to the SAASC, and the motion **passed** with two opposed and five abstained.

#### 4. Discussion on Non-Credit-bearing Educational Activities

The Chair explained there was a similar issue that Senate resolved the previous year when it was discovered that there were a number of credit-bearing courses that lacked faculty oversight. The Chair noted there were also educational programs with curricular content that seemed to be managed outside the Senate’s authority. As an example, the Chair explained the Senate worked with former Associate Provost Kathi Kern for two years regarding the issue of badging. The Chair noted that given the University’s topic for the QEP (“Transdisciplinary Educational approaches to advance Kentucky (TEK)”), badges were something that Senate wanted to keep its arms around. The Chair asked SC members to recall that badges were approved through the end of the Spring 2023 semester.

The Chair explained that the Office of Student Success was currently advertising badges for students as part of the UK Invest program and it was unclear under what authority those badges were being offered. The SC Chair suggested that an ad hoc committee be composed to look at such issues, noting there was no obvious Senate committee that had such an issue in the area of their charge and had the bandwidth to delve into philosophical discussions. The Chair noted that exploration of such issues would require expertise that spanned across multiple committees and suggested asking for an initial report to SC from an ad hoc committee in December, and final report to the SC and Senate in early spring. The Chair commented that the committee would initially be asked to survey the landscape and make recommendations for next steps.

The Chair explained the approach that was taken with the formation of the ad hoc committee to review courses without faculty. SC members discussed the following:

- Suggesting the ad hoc committee approach the issue similarly to the way courses without faculty oversight were reviewed

- If a non-credit bearing course was zero credit or a null value (the Chair noted this was a null value, as 0 credit hour courses still had a course prefix)
- Whether the Board of Trustees could create a course (Trustee Cramer clarified that while the Board of Trustees could theoretically do this lawfully, they exercised restraint from doing so, because doing so could damage the University's accreditation)
- What the scope of non-credit bearing courses was
- How educational activity was defined

Vincent **moved** to form an ad hoc committee to survey the landscape and make recommendations on next steps for non-credit bearing educational activities if warranted. Grossman **seconded**. The Chair asked if there was any discussion. SC members briefly discussed the following:

- The Chair's leadership of the ad hoc committee for courses without faculty oversight from the prior year and the excellent model used by the committee
- Whether Senate should have purview over activities that were not listed on the transcript
- Senate should have purview over activities not listed on the transcript if the activities were educational

There was a brief exchange about the Senate's badge pilot. The Chair reminded the Provost that the Senate would like there to be a replacement for the associate provost who initiated the badge proposal, to assist moving the pilot along. A **vote** was taken by show of hands, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

#### 5. Tentative Senate Agenda for October 10, 2022

The Chair informed SC members that the consent agenda was originally omitted from the tentative Senate agenda and needed to be added. The Chair announced that Vice President for Student Success Kirsten Turner was unable to attend on October 10 and would need to be rescheduled, noting that this item needed to be removed from the tentative Senate agenda. The Chair explained that regarding the proposed changes to Section I in the *SRs*, she was planning to provide the Senate with the same documents seen by the SC. The Chair noted that she would instruct senators to send requested edits to Sheila Brothers (SC office) by the end of the week.

The Chair explained that the SC office's goal was to have a final version of the proposed *SR / changes* ready for the Senate to review in November or December at the latest. The Chair noted that if the *SR changes* were effective January 1, then the Senate Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) could officially take over the responsibility of certifying the elections of Senate's academic councils. Grossman commented on the vacancies in the College of Arts and Sciences for Undergraduate Council and asked how those vacancies were filled. The Chair explained that nominations were solicited from associate deans, and college faculty were supposed to vote. Grossman noted that no such election took place in the College of Arts and Sciences for academic councils.

Grossman **moved** to approve the Senate Agenda for October 10 as amended. Vincent **seconded**. A **vote** was taken, and the motion passed with none opposed or abstained.

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

The Chair asked if there were any items from the floor.

Provost Robert DiPaola provided an update to SC members about the searches for the Associate Vice President/Associate Provost for Faculty Diverse Success and for a permanent Dean of the Graduate School and Associate Provost for Graduate and Professional Education. The Provost also informed SC members that in the interest of promoting shared governance, a town hall for department chairs would be held in the Harris Ballroom on October 26<sup>th</sup> from 3:00 pm to 5:00 pm.

Tagavi asked that SC members reconsider allowing guests to attend SC meetings via Zoom. The Chair explained that the sentiments offered by the SC at its May retreat was to presume in-person for members unless the member wished to participate via Zoom, but that guests would be required to attend in person. There was brief discussion about the matter. Trustee Cramer suggested allowing the Chair to resolve the matter and there were no further comments.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:42 PM by **unanimous consent**.

Respectfully submitted by,  
DeShana Collett

Prepared by Katie Silver on Tuesday, October 4, 2022

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

Invited Guests Present: Sheila Brothers, Robert DiPaola, Gregg Rentfrow