

University Senate ACTIVITY Report for Committees & Academic Councils
2022-23 Academic Year

<i>Committee name and charge:</i>	Rules and Elections: Responsible for codifying and interpreting the Rules of the University Senate and can initiate changes. The SREC is also responsible for certifying faculty member eligibility in the elections of Faculty Trustees, and in elections of University Faculty representatives to the Senate, to the Senate Council, and to a Presidential Search Committee.
<i>How the committee spent its time this past month:</i>	Reviewing proposals and discussing issue(s)
<i>Items completed:</i>	2
<i>Items reviewed but still under discussion:</i>	2
<i>Items left to be reviewed:</i>	2
<i>Issues other than course/program proposals being discussed:</i>	
<i>If any, what topics not assigned by the SC office are being discussed?</i>	
<i>What would you like to say about your group's work?</i>	

SREC Minutes

September 29, 2022

Attending: Brown (Presiding), Grossman, Hoch, Jones, Michael, Okoli, Soult, Tagavi

Liaison to Ombud: Ansel

Brown called the meeting to order.

Orientation

Brown oriented all members of the functioning and processes of the Senate Rules and Elections Committee (SREC). He drew attention to the 'welcome' email he [sent](#) previously, and links a [web page](#) of (i) SREC charge, (ii) election process information, (iii) a list of MDRC/MDRIs (an updated list has been submitted to SC), (iv) an archive of past versions of the SRs, (v) faculty governance information (e.g., history of title series), and (vi) past SREC meeting minutes.

Brown also reviewed that most recent version of the SRs is posted on the Senate website ([here](#)), as well as approved-but-not-codified SR changes. There are also at the same webpage links to university level regulations (e.g., ARs and GRs) and links to colleges' rules and units' Statements of Evidence.

Minutes

Soult moved, Jones seconded the approval of the SREC meeting minutes from May 9, 2022. The minutes were approved by unanimous consent ([PDF](#))

Processes

Brown reviewed the following SREC processes

- Written comments on agenda items will be typically solicited a week before meetings (e.g., via email)
 - We will discuss every agenda item as much as needed.
 - If an agenda item requires an unexpected amount of live meeting time to discuss, we may "table" that agenda item and schedule an additional meeting.
 - Members are encouraged to provide written comments in advance of each meeting (e.g., via email) to improve efficiency.
 - In meetings, we will examine written comments first.
- Minority reports
 - We will record the number of members who are "for", "against", and "abstain" from each vote. The minutes will reflect both minority and majority opinions.

Elections Update

Brown reviewed the following upcoming election processes

- Election of three SC members

- Will start with email to senators to solicit nominations on Monday, October 10 at 3pm (i.e., start of Senate meeting). SC Chair will announce the same live at that meeting.
- This year we will solicit a one-page PDF election statement from each willing candidate and post them on the Senate website.
- This election will conclude by noon on Friday, November 4, 2022
- Detailed timeline and other details are [here](#).

The SREC evinced concurrence with the planned process as reviewed by Brown.

- SC Chair and SC Vice Chair election
 - Email to SC members on Monday, November 7 to describe election process and highlight the fact of interdependent preferences
 - Email Senators on Monday, November 7 to solicit nominations for SC Chair
 - Nomination period ends on Friday, November 11 and list of nominees is shared with SC members
 - SC members discuss candidates among themselves, if desired
 - Nominees may indicate their willingness to serve, if desired. If it becomes clear that only one candidate is willing, the election ends, and a winner is announced.
 - At the SC meeting on Monday, December 5, SC members elect SC Chair from among those who are or may still be willing to serve. SC members also elect SC Vice Chair

The SREC had no questions for Brown about the SC Chair and SC VC elections.

SREC Leadership

Brown reviewed the following aspects of SREC organization.

- Identified Davy Jones as SREC Vice Chair to act upon request of and on behalf of the SREC Chair. SREC evinced concurrence with this appointment.
- Identified chairs of two subcommittees (“Rules” and “Elections”)
 - Each subcommittee chair takes the lead in answering “rapid response” inquiries from its relevant area.
 - In the “Rules” area, the chair (Jones) consults with other subcommittee members via phone and email to form the initial informal rule interpretation that gets shared with all SREC members for feedback.
 - In the “Elections” area, the chair (Brown) consults with other subcommittee members via phone and email about urgent election-related decisions that must be made before the next SREC meeting.
 - Election subcommittee members have the discretion to respond to inquiries by either (1) making a final decision by majority rule on the election-related inquiry or (2) calling an “emergency” SREC meeting (e.g., if need CYA decision from entire SREC)
 - If you become a candidate in an election supervised by SREC, you will be dropped temporarily from the “Elections” subcommittee to avoid a conflict of interest.
 - Anyone can be a member of either or both subcommittees, but membership signals that you are willing to engage in time-sensitive discussions via phone calls and/or emails.

- After discussion about the method of identifying membership on the two subcommittees, Brown described that after the present meeting, he will send out a solicitation to SREC members to advance themselves for membership on any of the subcommittees.
- Anyone can request SREC discuss at a meeting and issue a formal interpretation.
- If there is an interpretation request that has an obvious, routine, and/or uncontroversial answer, the chair or designee from SREC will respond to interpretation requests and report those instances to members at the next SREC meeting.

Rules Update

Brown introduced the action item re: approval of the annual update to the Senate Rules, for posting at the Senate web site.

- Every year at this time the SREC codifies changes to the SRs and publishes an updated rules document. We start with a list of Senate-approved changes and other mechanical or clarifying edits suggested by the Senate Council office (available [here](#), but the SC office edits are incorporated into list of mechanical edits below). Next, SREC adds to this list other proposed mechanical and clarifying edits.
- The following documents were referred to:
 - A **list of mechanical edits** ([PDF](#))
 - A **list of clarifying edits** ([PDF](#))
 - A **track changes document** showing all edits ([PDF](#)) ([.docx](#)) (attached as an appendix to these minutes)
 - NOTE: The track changes document also includes potential substantive changes (see below) that are coded with yellow highlighting, that might be discussed in the future but which are not an action item for the September 29 SREC meeting
- SREC needs to review, edit (as needed), and approve all edits that are mechanical and clarifying edits.

Hoch motioned to approve; Jones seconded. Discussion followed. Tagavi suggested making some additional clarifying edits. Brown advocated holding those additional clarifying edits until the next annual round of SR update. There was further discussion. Ultimately no changes were proposed to be made to the listed mechanical edits and clarifying edits.

Brown noted that there is an issue of contradiction within the draft updated SR 5.2.5.6 (“Prep Week”) that is part of the current edits on the table for a vote. The contradiction centers around the use of the word “week” and when does the “week” start and end. Grossman motioned an amendment to the main motion, that the proposed edit changes to SR 5.2.5.6 not be made and the wording return to its pre-update version. Okali seconded. The motion to amend was unanimously approved. Brown noted that the SREC at an upcoming SREC meeting can specifically address SR 5.2.5.6.

A vote was taken on the amended main motion, which was unanimously approved.

Upcoming SREC action items

Brown reviewed that the Senate Council is currently making an omnibus reorganization of Section 1 of the Senate Rules. Once the Senate Council decides a draft version that

reflects Senate Council intent, the document will be sent to the SREC. The SREC will then contemplate clarifying edits that better render Senate Council intent, as well as draft corresponding edits to Section 3 that are necessitated by the changes to Section 1.

Other items

Note was made that a role of the SREC Vice Chair is to draft meeting minutes.

Adjournment

Brown adjourned the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank.

University Senate ACTIVITY Report for Committees & Academic Councils
2022-23 Academic Year

<i>Committee name and charge:</i>	Nominating: Review and offer recommendations on: requests for faculty representatives, considering all aspects of a nominee (race, gender, ethnicity, unit affiliation, discipline, tenure status, rank, administrative position, previous service to the Senate, etc.) and the purpose of the committee for which the nominee was requested; policies to promote diverse memberships; and any other similar topic assigned to it.
<i>How the committee spent its time this past month:</i>	Discussing issue(s)
<i>Items completed:</i>	2
<i>Items reviewed but still under discussion:</i>	N/A
<i>Items left to be reviewed:</i>	N/A
<i>Issues other than course/program proposals being discussed:</i>	
<i>If any, what topics not assigned by the SC office are being discussed?</i>	
<i>What would you like to say about your group's work?</i>	We need a more college-diverse committee.

University Senate ACTIVITY Report for Committees & Academic Councils
2022-23 Academic Year

<i>Committee name and charge:</i>	Calendar: Review and offer recommendations for action on: the Academic Calendars submitted by the Registrar; program- and course- specific requests for calendars that deviate from the Academic Calendar; issues related to closures, academic holidays, and waivers for academic holidays; and any other similar topic assigned to it.
<i>How the committee spent its time this past month:</i>	Reviewing proposals and discussing issue(s)
<i>Items completed:</i>	1
<i>Items reviewed but still under discussion:</i>	4
<i>Items left to be reviewed:</i>	N/A
<i>Issues other than course/program proposals being discussed:</i>	The Committee discussed a draft survey and a draft form for future proposals. Tangentially the Committee also raised queries about some Senate Rules.
<i>If any, what topics not assigned by the SC office are being discussed?</i>	Tangentially the Committee also raised queries about some Senate Rules.
<i>What would you like to say about your group's work?</i>	Answers to the other questions address this.

University of Kentucky Senate Calendar Committee, notes from October 2022 meetings

Note: Committee members were asked to attend one out of two meetings; the meetings were scheduled to maximize the number of Committee members who could participate synchronously.

Friday 14 October, 12 Noon by Zoom (Attendance: Richard Charnigo, Rosie Lanphere, Renee Kaufmann, Karen Clancy)

Wednesday 19 October, 4 p.m. by Zoom (Attendance: Richard Charnigo, Jennifer Bird-Pollan, ToniMarie Marchioni, Brian Murtha, Karen Clancy, Joanie Ett-Mims)

1. Draft form and draft survey

These were discussed on both Friday 14 October and Wednesday 19 October. Committee members were, in general, positively disposed to the draft form and draft survey. Suggestions were made to: (a) allow the end user to navigate backward and forward through the survey during its completion; and, (b) clearly identify when the next click will actually submit the survey rather than go to another screen with questions. Committee members also opined that modifications might be needed in the future and hoped that such modifications could be made expeditiously.

2. Omnibus calendar request (2023-2024 final and 2025-2026 tentative)

The 2023-2024 final calendars were discussed on Friday 14 October, and the 2025-2026 tentative calendars were discussed on Wednesday 19 October. Because most comments apply to both timeframes (2023-2024 and 2025-2026), the two discussions (from Friday 14 October and Wednesday 19 October) are summarized together.

a. University calendar

i. The summer session appears to begin 6 days later than indicated by Senate Rules 2.1.2.3 and 2.1.2.5. If adjustments are made to conform with the aforementioned Senate Rules, then there may also be impacts on registration windows.

ii. The winter intersession appears to involve some holidays which are not explicitly identified, and Senate Rule 2.1.3 is itself vague on this point. Are the relevant holidays December 25 (Christmas Day), December 31 (New Year's Eve), and January 1 (New Year's Day) ? If so, can these be explicitly identified in the University calendar ?

iii. Some Mondays in Fall and Spring are identified as "Midterm", but then a parenthetical note refers to the end of the ninth week of classes. Should the end of the ninth week be a Friday (or Saturday) ? Actually, because the last date for assigning midterm grades is already specified, is it necessary to have a separate entry for "Midterm" ?

iv. A suggestion was made to offer an Outlook calendar with key dates from the University calendar, which users could choose to superimpose on to their own personal Outlook calendars.

v. A suggestion was made to create additional entries for the ends of important ranges of dates, such as those for registration of classes. *Chair's Note: Some such additional entries do appear to be included, in the part of the calendar that applies to the next term or semester.*

vi. A query was made about whether final examinations are limited to Mondays through Thursdays in the Fall and Spring semesters. *Chair's Note: Final examination schedules currently assign two-hour windows only on Mondays through Thursdays in the Fall and Spring semesters. However, there appears to be some allowance for final examinations to occur on Friday or Saturday (e.g., if a class meets only once per week on that day). That being the case, it is not clear that the Fall or Spring semester really ends on the Friday of finals week.*

b. Dentistry

i. There appears to be no Fall Break. The Committee wishes to inquire whether that is purposeful (if so, what is the rationale ?) or an inadvertent holdover from when UKY did not have a Fall Break.

ii. Dentistry Thanksgiving Break does not include Saturday. The Committee wishes to inquire whether that is purposeful (if so, what is the rationale ?) or an inadvertent holdover from when UKY did not recognize Saturday as part of Thanksgiving Break.

iii. Please check the date of the University Commencement (in 2023-2024); is this still on a Sunday ?

iv. Dentistry Spring Breaks are not aligned with UKY Spring Breaks. The Committee wishes to inquire about the rationale. In addition, a concern was expressed that (in 2025-2026) aligning the Dentistry Spring Break with a conference may not allow students to actually have a break for the benefit of physical and mental health.

v. Some dates listed as Academic Holidays are actually University Holidays. There is some concern about identifying them as Academic Holidays, since faculty members who rely on the calendars may be under mistaken impressions about their own obligations on those days.

c. Medicine

i. Medicine Fall Break is different for first-year students than for second-year students, with both times differing from the standard UKY Fall Break. In addition, no Fall Break is offered to third-year and fourth-year students. The Committee wishes to inquire about the rationale for the timing of Fall Break (first-year and second-year) and its omission (third-year and fourth-year).

ii. Medicine Thanksgiving Break is shorter for third-year and fourth-year students, including only Thursday and Friday. The Committee wishes to inquire about the rationale.

iii. Medicine Spring Break for first-year students is not concurrent with UKY Spring Break, and Medicine Spring Break is only offered to first-year students. The Committee wishes to inquire about the rationale for the timing of Spring Break (first-year) and its omission (second-year and later).

iv. Memorial Day is absent from the Medicine calendars.

v. The 2023-2024 calendar has an internal discrepancy regarding the graduation date; one place lists May 11, and another place identifies 5/13/24.

d. Pharmacy

i. Pharmacy Fall Break is combined with Thanksgiving Break to give off for one full week in November, although Saturday is not listed as part of Thanksgiving Break. The Committee wishes to inquire about the rationale for putting Pharmacy Fall Break in November. If the omission of Saturday from Thanksgiving Break is purposeful, the Committee also wishes to inquire about that.

ii. Because fourth-year students will have a rotation beginning in mid-December, it will be helpful to definitively identify which days in late December/early January are regarded as holidays. Senate Rule 2.1.3 is itself vague on this point.

iii. Pharmacy Spring Break does not include Saturday. The Committee wishes to inquire whether that is purposeful (if so, what is the rationale ?) or an inadvertent holdover from when UKY did not recognize Saturday as part of Spring Break.

iv. Memorial Day and July 4th are absent from the Pharmacy calendars.

v. Please check whether the Spring term really ends in mid-August, or whether what begins on May 6 is really a Summer term. (It seems odd for the Fall term to have four months while the Spring term has eight months.)

vi. If exams and graduation occur by May 3, how do fourth-year students begin a rotation on May 6 ? (Are fourth-year students on May 6 the people who were third-year students on May 3 ? If so, are first-year students on May 6 new to the program as of that date ?) *Chair's Note: These questions occurred to me after our meetings, and so I added them here.*

e. Law

i. The last day to add a class for Fall 2023 appears to be one week later than really intended (compare Spring 2024 and Fall 2025).

ii. The 2025-2026 calendar has a typo "2023" at the beginning.

iii. Law Fall Break is different from UKY Fall Break. One of our committee members explained that Law Fall Break was chosen to coincide with Fayette County Public Schools Fall Break.

iv. Law has an extra holiday on Election Day, which is not required by UKY in years without a presidential election. One of our committee members explained that this was in response to a Law student campaign for such a holiday; some Law students may have interest in civic participation on Election Day (e.g., working at a polling station).

3. Request from Dentistry (correction to 2022-2023 calendar)

This request was discussed on Friday 14 October. Dentistry wished to amend its 2022-2023 calendar to correct two errors, one relating to observing a Sunday holiday on a Monday and the other relating to the timing of Spring Break. The Committee was favorably disposed to this request, with some curiosity about the timing for Dentistry Spring Break and noticing the omission of Juneteenth from the amended calendar.

4. Request from Physicians' Assistant Studies (waiver of reading days)

This request was discussed on Wednesday 19 October. Physicians' Assistant Studies sought a waiver from reading days for nine courses which operate on four-week rotation patterns. Shortening two of the rotations by two days (for reading days) doesn't really make sense. The Committee was favorably disposed to this request, although an eventual sunset might be preferable to perpetuity. In any case, the Committee also wondered whether Physicians' Assistant Studies wanted a waiver from strictures for the rest of prep week? Possibly a waiver from strictures for dead week (as prep week was once known) was already sought and granted in some previous year, before reading days were carved out?

5. Miscellaneous items

a. Senate Rule 2.1.4

i. A question was raised about the validity of the 4/9/2001 citation in Senate Rule 2.1.4. Possibly the Senate Rules and Elections Committee could investigate.

ii. The four Colleges referenced in Senate Rule 2.1.4 construct calendars in relation to their professional programs. If a new undergraduate program were offered by one of these Colleges at a future point in time, one may ask whether the College should use the standard UKY calendar for that program. In this case, should the wording of Senate Rule 2.1.4 be fine-tuned to refer to special calendars for professional programs in certain Colleges?

iii. The preceding leads to the further question of whether Colleges not referenced in Senate Rule 2.1.4 can seek special calendars for some of their programs. It appears that they can, if by no other means than posing a formal request that would be reviewed by the Calendar Committee and then Senate Council.

b. Meeting pattern

A question was raised about whether there would be a standing meeting pattern for the Calendar Committee. This was perhaps infeasible for Fall 2022 because people's weekly schedules were more or less determined by the time that the Calendar Committee was formed. For the time being, the Chair is using a "catch as catch can" approach. However, if members of the Committee like the idea of a standing meeting pattern for Spring 2023, that can be pursued.

This page is intentionally left blank.

University Senate ACTIVITY Report for Committees & Academic Councils
2022-23 Academic Year

<i>Committee name and charge:</i>	Academic Planning and Priorities: Charged with concern over major, broad, long-range plans and priorities. The SAPPC is responsible for recommending to the University Senate plausible academic goals for the institution, identifying major academic problems likely to be faced by the University, and developing procedures and criteria for recommending academic priorities.
<i>How the committee spent its time this past month:</i>	
<i>Items completed:</i>	
<i>Items reviewed but still under discussion:</i>	
<i>Items left to be reviewed:</i>	
<i>Issues other than course/program proposals being discussed:</i>	
<i>If any, what topics not assigned by the SC office are being discussed?</i>	
<i>What would you like to say about your group's work?</i>	N/

University Senate ACTIVITY Report for Committees & Academic Councils
2022-23 Academic Year

<i>Committee name and charge:</i>	Undergraduate Council: It shall consider all proposed new courses and changes in courses which may be used for credit toward an undergraduate degree and also consider all proposed new undergraduate programs, changes in undergraduate programs, including degree titles, from all colleges offering an undergraduate degree. Further, it shall consider all changes in the University requirements. The Undergraduate Council shall recommend on all of the above to the Senate Council. In addition, it shall review all undergraduate programs.
<i>How the committee spent its time this past month:</i>	Reviewing proposals and discussing issue(s)
<i>Items completed:</i>	23
<i>Items reviewed but still under discussion:</i>	3
<i>Items left to be reviewed:</i>	88
<i>Issues other than course/program proposals being discussed:</i>	We discussed and voted to support the DHN student code of conduct in our October 11 meeting.
<i>If any, what topics not assigned by the SC office are being discussed?</i>	
<i>What would you like to say about your group's work?</i>	As a committee we are working hard to get proposals reviewed and passed along to the next stage of review. Proposals will be assigned to reviewers in the order in which they are received by the Council and we do not prioritize the proposal of one program over another. In order to ensure that proposals are moved through in as timely of a manner as possible once they are received by UC, programs are strongly encouraged to use the Senate-provided syllabus template for courses and pre-reviewing their course and program proposals using the Senate-provided checklists. There was a considerable backlog in proposals at the start of the academic year and it has taken a while to identify sufficient committee members to serve on this committee, so we would ask for patience as we work on reviewing these proposals. Please keep in mind that all committee members are faculty members as well and only have a very small portion of their DOE designated for service on this committee. Of the ~88 proposals currently sitting with UC, all except 7 have been assigned to reviewers (5 are a part of a new program where the new program proposal has not yet been received by Undergraduate Council and the remaining 2 have been received within the last week).

Undergraduate Council Minutes
October 11, 2022 | 3:00 – 5:00pm | 009 Main

Members Present:

Kristine Urschel (chair)
Eric Welch
Ray Archer
Becky Davis
ZaDonna Slay
Troy Cooper
Jim Lumppp
Bryant Tandy

Dima Strakovsky
Nathan Congleton
Justin Nichols
Olivia Davis
Chris Swartz
Joe Dvorak
Edison Shipley

Members Absent:

Melinda Hines
Cathy Catlett

Meeting Agenda:

Approval of Sept. 27, 2022 meeting minutes

Motion was made to approve the minutes by Welch and seconded by Archer. A vote was taken, and the motion passed with none opposed or abstained.

Approval of agenda

Proposed reviews

After a brief discussion Archer moved and O. Davis seconded to approve the consent agenda with one change. Archer asked for CEF 475 to be moved from the consent agenda to the discussion agenda. A vote was taken, with none opposed or abstained.

Consent agenda

Nichols, Swartz, B. Davis

[EES 130](#)

Strakovsky, O. Davis, Dvorak

[ISC 431](#)

[ISC 472](#)

Nichols, Cooper, Dvorak

[PLS 465](#)

Swartz, O. Davis, Cooper

[BSC 534](#)

Lumppp, Archer, Swartz

[AEC 535](#)

Welch, Catlett, Archer

[PHI 135](#)

Discussion agenda

Cooper, B. Davis, Archer

[CEF 475](#)

Archer led a brief discussion concerning the lack of robust outcomes for the measurable outcomes in the proposal. A change in language is needed. Cooper will discuss with the proposer. No vote was taken.

Cooper, Swartz, Catlett

[BA/BS Criminal Justice](#)

A brief discussion about the program proposal was led by Cooper who found the proposal to be ready for approval by UGC. A motion was made by Cooper and seconded by Tandy to approve the proposal. A vote was taken, and the motion passed with none opposed or abstained. The proposal will be held until the supporting coursework for the program have been reviewed and approved.

Lumpp, Strakovsky, Nichols

[ICT 302](#)

A brief discussion occurred regarding the 'ungrading' grading scale on the syllabus. A course checklist was sent to the proposer by Lumpp but there has been no response. In the group discussion it was also noted that the course description needs more details. Cooper will discuss this with the proposer. No vote was taken.

Lumpp, B. Davis, Strakovsky

[Certificate - CI](#)

A brief discussion regarding the need to move the major courses to the guided electives section in the proposal. Lumpp will talk to the proposer and qualify the level and list of courses. No vote was taken.

Discussion

DHN Student Code of Conduct

A discussion regarding the Dietetics Human Nutrition code of conduct was held. The Undergraduate Council had been asked to review the code of conduct and give their feedback/vote of support to the Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee. A motion to approve the adopted healthcare code was made by Archer and seconded by Slay. A vote was taken, with approval by all except for two abstentions.

Announcements – None

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 3:58pm.

Minutes submitted by Ann B. Eads

This page is intentionally left blank.

University Senate ACTIVITY Report for Committees & Academic Councils
2022-23 Academic Year

<i>Committee name and charge:</i>	Libraries: Charged with the responsibility for recommending to the University Senate policies to promote the educational interests of the University with respect to the Libraries, the faculty body of which is equivalent to the faculty of a college.
<i>How the committee spent its time this past month:</i>	Discussing issue(s)
<i>Items completed:</i>	2
<i>Items reviewed but still under discussion:</i>	3
<i>Items left to be reviewed:</i>	3
<i>Issues other than course/program proposals being discussed:</i>	Open Access Publishing Predatory Journals Communications between library and faculty
<i>If any, what topics not assigned by the SC office are being discussed?</i>	topics listed above
<i>What would you like to say about your group's work?</i>	topics under discussion above

The University Senate Library Committee (SLC) meeting was held via Zoom on Oct 5, 2022 from 3:30-4:30 PM via Zoom.

In attendance were:

- Marilyn Duncan (Chair)
- Loka Ashwood (Member)
- Eric Blalock (Member)
- Ramakrishnan Pakath (Member)
- Sean Peffer (Member)
- Doug Way (Dean)

After introductions, Dean Way provided an update on the following Library issues

- Budget
- Publisher negotiations (e.g., Elsevier and Wiley, special concern with Wiley)
- Facilities (special concern with irreparable compact shelving mechanical failure)
- Website ("most visited branch of the library")
- Open Access Publications (new associate Dean position focuses on this)
- New initiatives (strategic lending, access for students with disabilities)

In the follow-up Q&A, subjects were identified for subsequent meetings. These include (but are not limited to):

1. Open Access (management, fees, alternatives)
2. Predatory journals
3. Communication between Library and Faculty across all Colleges

It was unanimously agreed by the SLC committee that the next SLC meeting would focus on Open Access issues, that a different SLC committee member would take minutes at each meeting on a rotating basis, that these minutes would then be distributed through the Chair to all SLC members for approval, and that future meetings would be held monthly on the first Wednesday of the month through May 2023.

The meeting closed at 4:30.

This page is intentionally left blank.

University Senate ACTIVITY Report for Committees & Academic Councils
2022-23 Academic Year

<i>Committee name and charge:</i>	Health Care Colleges Council: It shall consider, (i) all proposed new courses and changes in courses offered in a professional health care program, or (ii) undergraduate or graduate courses that involve students in health care practices that originate from a college represented on the HCC Council and all proposals for new academic professional programs, changes in academic professional programs, changes in professional degrees or degree titles, changes in the admission or graduation requirements, and other academic issues concerning professional health care programs that originate from a college represented on the HCCC.
<i>How the committee spent its time this past month:</i>	Reviewing proposals and discussing issue(s)
<i>Items completed:</i>	8
<i>Items reviewed but still under discussion:</i>	None
<i>Items left to be reviewed:</i>	1 (new item)
<i>Issues other than course/program proposals being discussed:</i>	The HCCC will be reviewing the DHN Code of Conduct update from the College of Agriculture, Food, and Environment. Comments were received from the Graduate Council, and HCCC will add to Grad Council comments. Council has been discussing best practices fo
<i>If any, what topics not assigned by the SC office are being discussed?</i>	
<i>What would you like to say about your group's work?</i>	The Health Care Colleges Council (HCCC) HCCC is currently awaiting finalized membership from the College of Dentistry. Currently, only one primary and one alternate represent the College of Dentistry. The HCCC has also been working

Health Care Colleges Council

Tuesday, October 18, 2022

The Health Care Colleges Council (HCCC) met in a regular session at 3:00 PM on Tuesday, October 18, 2022 via Zoom. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken by hand unless otherwise indicated.

HCCC Chair Frank Romanelli (PH) called the meeting to order at 3:00 PM. The Chair welcomed members and introduced agenda items.

1. New Business

a. FM 853, OTH 901, URO 901

Reviews for the course proposals from the College of Medicine for FM 853 (major course change), OTH 901 (new professional course), and URO 901 (new professional course) were presented.

Robert Lodder (PH) **moved** to consider the items together. Leslie Scott (NU) **seconded**. There being **no objections**, the consideration of the three proposals as a single vote was approved by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair asked if there were questions and there were none. Scott **moved** to approve the three proposals. Thamer Musbah (DE) **seconded**. The Chair asked if there was any debate and there was none. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

b. PharmD/MS

The review for the proposed change to the PharmD/MS pharmaceutical sciences dual degree were presented. Additional clarification regarding credit hours for the proposal was provided.

The Chair asked if there were any questions and there were none. Lodder **moved** to approve the proposed change to the PharmD/MS pharmaceutical sciences dual degree. Martha Riddell (PbH) **seconded**. The Chair asked if there was any debate and there was none. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

c. Grad Certificate in Teaching Nursing, NUR 640, NUR 641, and NUR 642

The reviews for the proposed change to the Graduate Certificate in Teaching Nursing and associated course proposals NUR 640 (major course change), NUR 641 (major course change), and NUR 642 (new course) were presented. It was noted that a clerical change was made to the online delivery form for the graduate certificate in teaching nursing to include NUR 641, in addition to NUR 640 and NUR 642.

Lodder **moved** to consider the items together. Douglas Oyler (PH) **seconded**. There being **no objections**, the consideration of the proposals as a single vote was approved by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair asked if there were any questions and there were none. Oyler **moved** to approve the items from the College of Nursing. Lodder **seconded**. The Chair asked if there was any debate and there was none. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

2. Proposed New DHN Student Code of Conduct

The Chair informed HCCC members that a new item had reached the HCCC from the College of Agriculture, Food and Environment (AG). Given the proposed item's similarity to the Health Care Colleges Code of Conduct and the item's involvement with clinical settings, the proposal was sent to HCCC for consideration. The Chair informed HCCC members that he would distribute the proposal to HCCC members to review before voting on the item at the next meeting. The Chair asked HCCC members to provide any feedback or comments on the proposal before the next meeting.

3. Items from the Floor

There were no items from the floor.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:26 PM with **no objections**.

Prepared by Katie Silver on Tuesday, October 18, 2022

HCCC Members Present: Carrie Baker, Beth Lacy, Julie Marfell, Thamer Musbah, Douglas Oyler (alternate), Martha Riddell, Frank Romanelli, Stephanie Rose, Leslie Scott, Oleg Tsodikov

HCCC Members Absent: Somu Chatterjee*, Sanjay Dwarakanath (alternate), Kara Lee* (alternate, primary member present), Pratihtha Mishra (alternate, primary member present), Sara Police* (alternate, primary member present), Kenneth Record (alternate, primary member present), Jia Rong Wu (alternate, primary member present), Crystal Totten*, Jami Warren (alternate), Al Wiemann (alternate), Lovoria Williams (alternate, primary member present)

* *denotes absence explained*

Curriculog Links to Proposals

Title	Reviewer	Link
FM 853	Beth Lacy	https://uky.curriculog.com/proposal:8465/form
OTH 901	Beth Lacy	https://uky.curriculog.com/proposal:8909/form
URO 901	Beth Lacy	https://uky.curriculog.com/proposal:8907/form
PharmD/MS	Carrie Baker	https://uky.curriculog.com/proposal:9063/form
Grad Cert – Teach Nur	Somu Chatterjee	https://uky.curriculog.com/proposal:9108/form
NUR 640	Somu Chatterjee	https://uky.curriculog.com/proposal:9153/form
NUR 641	Somu Chatterjee	https://uky.curriculog.com/proposal:9146/form
NUR 642	Somu Chatterjee	https://uky.curriculog.com/proposal:9130/form

This page is intentionally left blank.

University Senate ACTIVITY Report for Committees & Academic Councils
2022-23 Academic Year

<i>Committee name and charge:</i>	Academic Programs: Charged with recommending action to the Senate on all new academic programs and significant program changes approved by prescribed lower levels of review.
<i>How the committee spent its time this past month:</i>	Reviewing proposals and discussing issue(s)
<i>Items completed:</i>	9
<i>Items reviewed but still under discussion:</i>	N/A
<i>Items left to be reviewed:</i>	N/A
<i>Issues other than course/program proposals being discussed:</i>	Badges
<i>If any, what topics not assigned by the SC office are being discussed?</i>	
<i>What would you like to say about your group's work?</i>	

Senate Academic Programs Committee

Zoom Time: noon – 1:00pm; 1st and 3rd Wednesday

Zoom Link: <https://uky.zoom.us/j/5042017256>

October 19, 2022 Minutes

Members

- ^Francisco Andrade, Medicine, Physiology
- *Sandra Bastin (chair), Agriculture, Food and Environment, Dietetics and Human Nutrition
- *Stefan Bird-Pollan, Arts and Sciences, Philosophy
- ^Molly Blasing, Arts and Sciences, Modern & Classical Languages, Literatures & Cultures
- *Richard Charnigo, Public Health, Biostatistics
- *Mia Cinelli, Fine Arts, Art and Visual Studies
- *Alberto Corso, Arts and Sciences, Mathematics
- ^Bobi Ivanov - Communication and Information, Integrated Strategic Communication
- *Stefan Kiessling - Medicine, Nephrology
- *Justin Nichols – Education, Kinesiology and Health Promotion
- *Zixue Tai, Communication and Information, Journalism and Media
- TBD, Director of Institutional Effectiveness, ex officio

Note: *In attendance; ^Not in attendance

Announcements

Old Business

1. Below are the changes in curriculog made in each program based on previous discussions. Since all questions were addressed, a motion was made by Alberto and seconded by Stefan BP to give the committee members to look again at each of the Aerospace Engineering and Mechanical Engineering programs for accuracy and then vote for approval. It passed unanimously, 8-0-0. Committee members will respond by October 26, 2022.
 - [BS Aerospace Engineering and MS Aerospace Engineering \[8069\]](#)
 - [BS Aerospace Engineering and PhD Aerospace Engineering \[8068\]](#)
Leadership of Aerospace Engineering Programs assigned to Stefan BP and Mia.
 - [BS Mechanical Engineering and MS Mechanical Engineering \[8067\]](#)
 - [BS Mechanical Engineering and PhD Mechanical Engineering \[8034\]](#)
Leadership of Biomedical Engineering Programs assigned to Richard and Stefan K.
- For clarification in all your proposals, please add a sentence in 2a. “BSAE, etc acronyms are used for identification purposes only.” Decided this is not needed based on explanation already there.
- Please make typo correction in the BS to MS Program. In 2a, please change from the current BS to PhD to BS to MS. Could not find error.

- Please provide a curriculum map or listing of courses in all your proposals to 4b. As Sheila Brothers indicated last week, "The broad/vague description of types of courses that can be used is fine, but the response refers to a categorization of courses within the Bulletin that I cannot find. The Bulletin description of the BS Aerospace Engineering or Mechanical Engineering program do not have separate sections for "technical electives," "engineering/science" electives, or "math/statistics electives." Replaced with Any 500/600-level AE technical electives in Mechanical Engineering and any 400G/500/600-level courses in other programs in the College of Engineering. 600-level courses will be selected in consultation with the undergraduate academic advisor and the Director of Graduate Studies. A USP student can take a 600-level course if they have completed all pre-requisite courses for that 600-level course. Note that it is possible for an undergraduate to satisfy this requirement by successfully completing 500-level pre-requisites for a 600-level course prior to enrolling in the 600-level course. Furthermore, note that some 600-level courses have only undergraduate-level courses as pre-requisites.
 - Please provide a letter showing support from faculty. Please include a date for the vote and numbers of how faculty voted. This can be done for all the programs in one letter and the vote can be done via email, if it hasn't been done already. Please upload under files. Uploaded to Files.
 - On the BS to PhD Programs, please clarify in 5a that the BS goes directly into a PhD program and the student will not receive a MS. Decided this is not needed based on explanation already there.
 - If there are any 600/700 level courses included in the USP, please add a justification of why undergraduates should be able to take the course(s) in 2a. See justification in 5a.
2. Below are the changes in curriculog made in each program based on previous discussions. Since all questions were addressed, a motion was made by Mia and seconded by Richard to give the committee members to look again at each of the Biomedical Engineering programs for accuracy and then vote for approval. It passed unanimously. Committee members will respond by October 26, 2022.
- [BS Biomedical Engineering and PhD Biomedical Engineering \[8184\]](#)
 - [BS Biomedical Engineering and MS Biomedical Engineering \[7407\]](#)
Leadership of Biomedical Engineering Programs assigned to Molly and Alberto.
 - On the BS to PhD Programs, please clarify in 5a that the BS goes directly into a PhD program but did not include that the student will not receive a MS. In 5a and 5b the PhD was added to make clarifications.
 - Please provide a curriculum map or listing of courses in all your proposals to 4b. No curricular map was provided but it was clarified that the electives listed are what is available at this time.
 - If there are any 600/700 level courses included in the USP, please add a justification of why undergraduates should be able to take the course(s) in 2a. The justification for the 600-level courses allowed in the USP was provided in 4b.

New Business

1. The discussion for the BS Computer Science and MS Data Science program was led by those indicated below. In response to Brian Seale the committee felt our questions had been answered. Zixue made a motion to approve the program and Alberto seconded the motion. The motion passed with a 7-0-1 vote.

- [BS Computer Science and MS Data Science \[8159\]](#)
Leadership assigned to Richard and Mia
Requested from Brent Seales on October 19, 2022
How many students might pursue the USP or, more generally, what UKY may lose by not offering the USP. The market demand or need mentioned in the proposal is from the perspective of the United States economy, which is a legitimate perspective. However, how about a statement like this... "We anticipate that, in a typical year, X undergraduate students may seek admission to this USP. We estimate that about Y % of those admitted to this USP would not otherwise pursue the graduate study component at UKY."
Response by Brent Seales on October 19, 2022, Hard to estimate this since the DS program itself is nascent (although growing). But the national trends are clear (w.r.t. interest in Data Science as a pathway). In a typical year we graduate 100 undergraduates in Computer Science. We anticipate that 25 of those undergraduates would be eligible to pursue any USP, with the MS degree in Data Science likely topping the list. In our experience the USP is a strong incentive for attracting students who would otherwise leave UK. We estimate that 75% of those students admitted to this USP would not otherwise pursue the MS in Data Science at UK.

- 2. The discussion for the Certificate in Integrated Strategic Communication was led by those indicated below. Stefan BP made a motion to approve the certificate with a second from Zixue, with a caveat that ISC 562 and ISC 597 are approved as new courses. The motion passed with unanimously, 8-0-0.

- [Certificate in Integrated Strategic Communication \[8319\]](#)
Leadership assigned to Stefan BP and Zixue

- 3. The discussion for the Graduate Certificate in Leadership for Early Childhood and Family Policy was led by those indicated below. Most of the discussion surrounded the fact that it was very structured, mainly the courses were not interdisciplinary; there were few options to keep students on track if faculty were lost or the courses couldn't be offered in a timely fashion; and there was little student freedom to choose. This may lead to the need to revise the program in the future. The new courses listed have been approved. Alberto made a motion to approve with a second from Stefan BP. It passes unanimously, 8-0-0.

- [Graduate Certificate in Leadership for Early Childhood and Family Policy \[8217\]](#)
Leadership assigned to Justin, Stefan K, and Alberto
An email was sent to Beth Shouse on 10/1/22 but no response has been received.

From Sheila:

Curriculog

- The attachment named "Feasibility of a Graduate Certificate in Early Childhood Policy" has a numbered clause on the second page (clause #2) that appears to prohibit sharing the document with anyone in any way. We'll keep this as an attachment.

- Q3d: More information is needed about the half-semester courses? Depending on how they are arranged, it may be necessary to request Senate Council's approval of a nonstandard calendar for each course arranged that way.

- Q4a: The group of faculty who are elsewhere described as the faculty of record are referred to within the context of recruitment, but it should be noted that those five faculty will jointly be responsible for the academic content of the program, not just recruitment.

Letters

- It would be helpful to have documentation of the vote by faculty to offer program online.

Faculty of Record

- It is not clear if any of the proposed faculty of record have administrative appointments, nor is the total number of members clear.
- Q1a: The members of this faculty of record come from a variety of departments. So, instead of selecting the first option, it would be more appropriate to describe the faculty of record as being a subset of the Graduate Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership Studies. If so, the other questions in Section 2 should have responses. It might be useful to include minutes from the meeting where this approval occurred.
- It is not clear why there are members of the faculty of record from four different units but the coursework is from a single department. (see Curriculog Q3d)

Completed Items

- **Clarification of SR. 4.2.2.2.6**
A SACP discussion concluded that according to SR 3.2.1.2 *Exceptions to the requirements for admission to courses may be made as follows [US: 11/14/2016]: Seniors with superior ability or preparation may be admitted to courses numbered between 600 and 799, upon approval of the instructor, the dean of the student's college and the dean of the Graduate School.* As the Graduate School has indicated there is no problem on their end with admitting these students, SACP supports that the authority rests with the department faculty advisor and course instructor to determine that specific students can successfully complete these advanced courses. However, the use of these courses should be justified in the USP program proposal. We do not believe any changes to SR 4.2.2.2.6 are needed at this time. Voting on October 5, 2022, during a regularly scheduled was unanimous 7-0-0.
- **Proposed New USP BA International Studies and MA Diplomacy and Int'l Commerce**
A motion was made to approve the program by Zixue and seconded by Stefan K, pending that a list of advisory members who voted on the USP approval is received. The motion passed unanimously, 7-0-0. Approved and sent forward 10/19/22 to University Senate on Transmission Form.

This page is intentionally left blank.

University Senate ACTIVITY Report for Committees & Academic Councils
2022-23 Academic Year

<i>Committee name and charge:</i>	Retroactive Withdrawal: Decides all student requests for retroactive withdrawals as provided by Senate Rules 5.1.7.5.
<i>How the committee spent its time this past month:</i>	Reviewing proposals
<i>Items completed:</i>	45
<i>Items reviewed but still under discussion:</i>	4
<i>Items left to be reviewed:</i>	3
<i>Issues other than course/program proposals being discussed:</i>	We are receiving files that should be handled by the ombud. Of the 45 above, we referred 5 to the ombud.
<i>If any, what topics not assigned by the SC office are being discussed?</i>	
<i>What would you like to say about your group's work?</i>	

University Senate ACTIVITY Report for Committees & Academic Councils
2022-23 Academic Year

<i>Committee name and charge:</i>	Academic Organization and Structure: Charged to review and recommend to the University Senate priorities on all proposals regarding educational units, make appropriate recommendation to the University Senate regarding educational units, and study and report to the University Senate on matters pertaining to faculty size and strength, and student enrollment.
<i>How the committee spent its time this past month:</i>	Reviewing proposals and discussing issue(s)
<i>Items completed:</i>	1
<i>Items reviewed but still under discussion:</i>	1
<i>Items left to be reviewed:</i>	1
<i>Issues other than course/program proposals being discussed:</i>	The interpretation of SR 3.3 language on affected parties issuing statements and votes on proposed changes to an academic unit.
<i>If any, what topics not assigned by the SC office are being discussed?</i>	
<i>What would you like to say about your group's work?</i>	Oct. 3, 2022 meeting minutes have already been uploaded.

University Senate ACTIVITY Report for Committees & Academic Councils
2022-23 Academic Year

<i>Committee name and charge:</i>	Distance Learning and e-Learning: Responsible for identifying and monitoring issues related to distance learning (DL) and e-learning (e-L); responding to Senate concerning external regulations regarding DL and e-L; recommending strategies regarding DL and e-L; and collaborating on issues relating to DL & e-L.
<i>How the committee spent its time this past month:</i>	Reviewing proposals and discussing issue(s)
<i>Items completed:</i>	1
<i>Items reviewed but still under discussion:</i>	1
<i>Items left to be reviewed:</i>	1
<i>Issues other than course/program proposals being discussed:</i>	- Proposed changes to Senate Rules related to the DLeL committee. - TCE (Teacher course evaluation) DL questions
<i>If any, what topics not assigned by the SC office are being discussed?</i>	- TCE (Teacher course evaluation) DL questions
<i>What would you like to say about your group's work?</i>	The DLeL committee is meeting once monthly to discuss issues related to distance education. Current topics of discussion include course modality approval processes and the TCE questions used for DL courses (these are outdated and need revision; Chair Collett has been contacted for advising in this regard). Review of online proposals occurs via email unless there are significant issues with a proposal.

Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLeL)

October 11, 2022

Membership: highlighted names were present; # prepared minutes

<u>Faculty Members:</u>	<u>Student Members:</u>	<u>Ex Officio Members</u>
Sara Police (Chair) #	Zack Wasson	Jay Miller
Roger Brown	Bailey Pierce	Miranda Hines
Karen Clancy		
Henry Dietz		
Allison Gibson		
Brad Lee		
Akiko Takenaka		

1. Review proposed changes to Senate Rules regarding the SCDLeL committee.
 - a. Overarching question: Are administrators/dean-level faculty permitted to serve on Senate Committees? If this is a limitation that is a 'given' (already in place), then we do not have recommendations to the Composition. If this is not a regulation in place, then we would like to provide additional guidance related to the Composition of this committee. We are generally recommending that a majority of the committee should be composed of either elected faculty senators or faculty who are eligible to be faculty senators.
 - b. Recommended edits are described here (referring to the track changes document with these line numbers)
 - i. Line 1745: Change or to nor, such that the Composition reads, "*The SCDLeL is not required to be chaired by an elected faculty senator **nor** composed of more than one-half of members who are elected faculty senators.*" KC mentioned composition influences the function of the committee and its ultimate impact.
 - ii. Line 1756: SP suggests adding the distinction that the Voting Student Members be enrolled in online courses, program, or have experience with online courses either as a student or instructor.
 - iii. Line 1763: Add the phrase, "***In consultation with the Chair**, there shall be up to four ex officio members...*". RB suggested loosening the verbiage here to add more flexibility. As it stands, we are in violation of our own Senate Rules.
2. Discuss TCE DL Questions
 - i. *AT proposed strategizing before launching into research of benchmark institutions and their evaluation practices as it relates to DL/online programming.*
 - ii. *The committee agreed that SP would email DeShana Collett to seek advice and guidance around whether and the best way to proceed with this item. Draft email forthcoming.*
 - iii. *BL provides question set from University of Florida; a solid benchmark and great example: <https://gatorevals.ua.ufl.edu/resources--policies/question-set/>*

Action items:

- S. Police to email Senate Chair Collett, after review of draft by committee.
- S. Police to send recommendations regarding Senate Rules (edits) to Sheila Brothers and Chair Collett, after review by committee.

This page is intentionally left blank.

University Senate ACTIVITY Report for Committees & Academic Councils
2022-23 Academic Year

<i>Committee name and charge:</i>	Disability Accommodation and Compliance: Recommends educational policies and implementation practices/standards relating to disability accommodation and regulatory compliance.
<i>How the committee spent its time this past month:</i>	
<i>Items completed:</i>	
<i>Items reviewed but still under discussion:</i>	
<i>Items left to be reviewed:</i>	
<i>Issues other than course/program proposals being discussed:</i>	
<i>If any, what topics not assigned by the SC office are being discussed?</i>	
<i>What would you like to say about your group's work?</i>	This month we discussed via email upcoming agenda items (actionable items or topics for future meetings). This month was focused on brainstorming ideas and developing responses to Senate Council inquiries from September. We will meet via Zoom to discuss these topics in November and December.

University Senate ACTIVITY Report for Committees & Academic Councils
2022-23 Academic Year

<i>Committee name and charge:</i>	Diversity and Inclusion: Charged to increase diversity among senators, in particular representation of URM; work with senior leadership to disseminate best practices for recruiting & retaining faculty of color and other underrepresented groups; and addressing other related issues.
<i>How the committee spent its time this past month:</i>	Discussing issue(s)
<i>Items completed:</i>	2
<i>Items reviewed but still under discussion:</i>	2
<i>Items left to be reviewed:</i>	N/A
<i>Issues other than course/program proposals being discussed:</i>	#NAME?
<i>If any, what topics not assigned by the SC office are being discussed?</i>	
<i>What would you like to say about your group's work?</i>	N/A but see minutes for additional details

This page is intentionally left blank.

October 25, 2022 meeting

- Should we make a statement/recommendation to college Deans about actively trying to find ways to increase diversity of faculty senate representatives?
 - Term limits for Senators or other ways to give more junior senators a voice in an intimidating senate floor?
 - Kevin reached out to Sheila Brothers and Katie Silver to get faculty senate demographics
- So much investment in recruitment and so little effort placed on retention.
 - What happens when the 'newness' wears off?
 - Start-up packages for all faculty with a given % research effort
 - Expand the Research Scholars Program
 - Reach out to Dr. Sue Nokes (Acting Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement) about retention of faculty #s, %
- What about student retention? Largest classes ever, but are the students staying and prepared for college?
 - Rural Appalachia vs other marginalized communities?
 - Transparency for URM data (who is included?)
 - <https://pres.uky.edu/student-success>
 - Who is the right person to contact for a presentation on the 5 year trajectory and such?
- Kevin to ask Senate Council Chair Collett to fill vacant ex officio and faculty slots for SACDI (A & S? Dr. Christia Spears Brown?) Kevin to reach out to VP Dr. Katrice Albert about attending a SACDI meeting or meet-and-greet elsewhere.

Meeting with Senate Council Chair Collett

10/28/2022

Kevin and Cindy met with Chair Collett

- The first listed charge for our committee is to increase diversity of University Senate.
 - We keep leaning on the same individuals.
 - Chair Collett mentioned that she recently presented to the Deans about how the Senators represent their college, and they should be proactive in the election of highly engaged individuals.
 - *Our recommendation is that Senate Council send an email to the Deans of the colleges to request they assess and update the ways that elections are held in order to elect a more diverse and productive Senate.*
- Asked for the open slots to be filled on SACDI
 - *Chair Collett will ask Katie to contact Vice President Albert for the two ex officio member nominations.*
 - *Kevin recommended that Katie also let the VP know that it was formerly a college Dean and the Associate Provost of the Office of Faculty Affairs.*

Similar individuals would continue to bring unique perspectives to the committee that the faculty and student SACDI members may not have.

- Chair Collett will send an official invitation for Cindy to serve as a faculty member on SACDI.
- Cindy will reach out to Dr. Christia Spears Brown to see if she is willing to serve as our final open faculty member on the committee. If so, Chair Collett will send an official invitation. If not, Cindy will ask Dr. Brown to suggest other individuals as we would prefer a representative from A & S since it is such a large college.
- We next discussed faculty and student retention numbers.
 - Kevin will contact Dr. Sue Nokes to ask her to present the retention numbers for faculty—not just overall but broken down by demographics, rank, etc.
 - Chair Collett stated that Kirsten Turner (VP for Student Success) will present the student retention data at the next University Senate meeting. We have at least 2 Senate representatives on SACDI so hopefully one or both will be able to attend the meeting.
- Kevin will email Dr. Albert to invite her to attend and present her university level perspectives on the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) we face in this space at a SACDI future meeting. We can also plan to present work we have done via the committee.
- Chair Collett then brought up a new item. She mentioned that a new committee on Faculty Affairs was being created. One item they will focus on is faculty salaries and equity to others of similar rank, expertise, colleges as well as other benchmark institutions. While not an issue that our committee will tackle directly, there is likely cross-over with this and lower faculty retention in our underrepresented faculty members. Chair Collett suggested that we mention and discuss this with Dr. Nokes when she visits our SACDI meeting for the retention piece mentioned above.
 - Kevin noted this is likely a bigger issue than the SACDI committee and there should be a university-wide working group on the topic.
 - Kevin mentioned that College of Medicine recently created the ACE compensation plan that is supposed to remove inequities and create transparency in basic science faculty salaries. Could something similar be done in other colleges?
 - Kevin also mentioned that it would be awkward to discuss faculty salaries in front of student representatives so this topic should be approached with caution on the SACDI.
 - Cindy mentioned that the Deans vary on their use of fighting funds to retain faculty. Some are proactive and others wait until there is an offer, which is often too late. Can there be some consistency, especially to retain faculty from URM groups?

This page is intentionally left blank.

University Senate ACTIVITY Report for Committees & Academic Councils
2022-23 Academic Year

<i>Committee name and charge:</i>	Academic Advising: Responsible for regularly reviewing the effectiveness and accountability of academic advising throughout the University, setting standards for the quality of academic advising, making recommendations to the Senate Council regarding academic advising, and advising the Senate Council about all recommendations or proposals to the Senate regarding academic advising.
<i>How the committee spent its time this past month:</i>	Reviewing proposals and discussing issue(s)
<i>Items completed:</i>	999
<i>Items reviewed but still under discussion:</i>	888
<i>Items left to be reviewed:</i>	777
<i>Issues other than course/program proposals being discussed:</i>	There are strange things afoot at the Circle K
<i>If any, what topics not assigned by the SC office are being discussed?</i>	Slide slide slipety slide
<i>What would you like to say about your group's work?</i>	I'm walking on sunshine

2022-2023 Senate Academic Advising Committee (SacAC)

Committee Meeting

Ming-Yuan Chih, October 2022

Agenda

Time	Item	Lead
2-2:10	Welcome & Introduction . Recoding ?	Ming
2:10-2:20	Review the charge and handbook	Ming
2:20-2:30	Plan future meeting	All

Membership

First Name	Last Name	Term End	Role	College	Department	Membership	Email
Ming-Yuan	Chih	8/15/2023	Fac Sen	AH	Health and Clinical Sciences	Chair	m.chih@uky.edu
Yanira	Paz	8/15/2024	Fac Sen	AS	Hispanic Studies	Member	Yanira.Paz@uky.edu
Martha	Yip	8/15/2023	Fac Sen	AS	Mathematics	Member	mpyi222@uky.edu
Three Professional Advisors Selected by the Advising Network							
Jaime	Wainscott	8/15/2024			Advising Network Rep		jaime.wainscott@uky.edu
Bethany	Fugate	8/15/2023			Advising Network Rep		bethany.fugate@uky.edu
Jennifer	Garlin	8/15/2025			Advising Network Rep		jennifer.garlin@uky.edu
Students							
Edison	Shiple	5/31/2023					edisonshiple@uky.edu
Kendall	Pearson	5/31/2023					kendall.pearson@uky.edu
Bryant	Tandy	5/31/2023					bryant.tandy@uky.edu
Ex Officio							
Kirsten	Turner				VP for Student Success		kirsten.turner@uky.edu

Charter: Senate Rules 1.4.3.5

<https://www.uky.edu/universitysenate/committee/academic-advising-committee>

The Senate's Academic Advising Committee (SacAC) shall consist of three elected faculty members from the University Senate who are currently advising students; three students (two student senators and one student at large) to be selected by the Senate Council upon the recommendation of the President of the Student Government Association; three professional advisors, selected by a process adopted by the UK Advisors Network and the Senate Council; and one ex officio member: the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education. The committee shall:

- Regularly review the effectiveness and accountability of academic advising throughout the University
- Set standards for the quality of academic advising
- Make recommendations to the Senate Council regarding academic advising
- Advise the Senate Council about all recommendations or proposals to the Senate regarding academic advising.

Committee Handbook

2022-23 University Senate Handbook for Committees and Academic Councils

INTRODUCTION

There is a need to describe what the University Senate and the broader University community expects from members of Senate's committees and academic councils. Through the Senate's committees and academic councils, the Senate conducts its statutory responsibilities and provides outstanding academic and curricular content and guidance to those the Senate is responsible to.

This handbook is an amalgamation of requirements from the Senate Rules and best practices for proposal reviews. Senate's committees and academic councils are asked to review a wide variety of proposals and these proposals follow different paths; some committees review things that academic councils never see and vice versa. Therefore, some aspects of this handbook may be less applicable to the specific body YOU are serving on.

The Senate Rules require proposals to follow the rules within the local unit and college, although the Senate's approval process officially begins when a proposal has left the college. Generally speaking, proposals related to courses and programs take the path described below. (See the flow charts for courses and programs in the appendices for more detail about approval paths.¹)

1. *Begins with the unit (department) faculty*
2. *Progresses to the college-level representative body for faculty*
3. *Reviewed by one or more academic councils*
4. *Submitted to the Senate Council office, which routes proposals*
 - a. *If the proposal is significant enough, it warrants review by a Senate committee, then presentation at a Senate Council, then a formal recommendation during a Senate meeting*
 - b. *If the proposal is more routine, it receives final approval via a ten-day web posting where the item will be posted online for senators to review and will be considered approved by lack of objection after the 10 days have lapsed.*

Governing Regulations VII ("University Organization") describes the responsibilities of department faculty as the following: "The department faculty has primary responsibility for the development of policies on such matters as academic requirements, courses of study, course offerings, graduate and research programs, and service functions." Therefore, unless faculty at the department level approve, a proposal will move no further. Approvals within Curriculog indicate approval that has been granted by the unit being represented, not approval by the individual clicking "Approve."

The following pages describe how committees and the academic councils are generally expected to function, as well as provide guidance about how the body should be reviewing curricular proposals. With few exceptions, when an item is sent to a committee, the general expectation is that the committee will review the item. Upon request, the committee or academic council can also

¹ The flow charts are a simplification of approximately 30 pages of rules; Senate Rules describe the official approval paths and processes. For less common types of proposals, the Senate Council Chair typically determines the appropriate approval path.

Future Meeting

- Schedule: Every 1st Friday, 2-2:30pm
- Potential Items:
 - Ming will find out reports on effectiveness and accountability of academic advising
 - Dr. Paz will reach out to UK Advisors Network for standards for quality of advising
 - Advisors sometimes miss AP course credits or other high school credits transfer
 - Student-Advisor ratio (100:1) The workload of advisor

This page is intentionally left blank.

University Senate ACTIVITY Report for Committees & Academic Councils
2022-23 Academic Year

<i>Committee name and charge:</i>	Academic Facilities: Charged with the responsibility of providing information and recommendations to the Senate about the alteration, construction, and allocation of all property and physical facilities that may affect the educational objectives of the University.
<i>How the committee spent its time this past month:</i>	Reviewing proposals and discussing issue(s)
<i>Items completed:</i>	1
<i>Items reviewed but still under discussion:</i>	2
<i>Items left to be reviewed:</i>	3
<i>Issues other than course/program proposals being discussed:</i>	blah blah blah
<i>If any, what topics not assigned by the SC office are being discussed?</i>	
<i>What would you like to say about your group's work?</i>	stop

University Senate ACTIVITY Report for Committees & Academic Councils
2022-23 Academic Year

<i>Committee name and charge:</i>	Disability Accommodation and Compliance: Recommends educational policies and implementation practices/standards relating to disability accommodation and regulatory compliance.
<i>How the committee spent its time this past month:</i>	
<i>Items completed:</i>	
<i>Items reviewed but still under discussion:</i>	
<i>Items left to be reviewed:</i>	
<i>Issues other than course/program proposals being discussed:</i>	
<i>If any, what topics not assigned by the SC office are being discussed?</i>	
<i>What would you like to say about your group's work?</i>	This month we discussed via email upcoming agenda items (actionable items or topics for future meetings). This month was focused on brainstorming ideas and developing responses to Senate Council inquiries from September. We will meet via Zoom to discuss these topics in November and December.

SREC Minutes

September 29, 2022

Attending: Brown (Presiding), Grossman, Hoch, Jones, Michael, Okoli, Soult, Tagavi

Liaison to Ombud: Ansel

Brown called the meeting to order.

Orientation

Brown oriented all members of the functioning and processes of the Senate Rules and Elections Committee (SREC). He drew attention to the 'welcome' email he [sent](#) previously, and links a [web page](#) of (i) SREC charge, (ii) election process information, (iii) a list of MDRC/MDRIs (an updated list has been submitted to SC), (iv) an archive of past versions of the SRs, (v) faculty governance information (e.g., history of title series), and (vi) past SREC meeting minutes.

Brown also reviewed that most recent version of the SRs is posted on the Senate website ([here](#)), as well as approved-but-not-codified SR changes. There are also at the same webpage links to university level regulations (e.g., ARs and GRs) and links to colleges' rules and units' Statements of Evidence.

Minutes

Soult moved, Jones seconded the approval of the SREC meeting minutes from May 9, 2022. The minutes were approved by unanimous consent ([PDF](#))

Processes

Brown reviewed the following SREC processes

- Written comments on agenda items will be typically solicited a week before meetings (e.g., via email)
 - We will discuss every agenda item as much as needed.
 - If an agenda item requires an unexpected amount of live meeting time to discuss, we may "table" that agenda item and schedule an additional meeting.
 - Members are encouraged to provide written comments in advance of each meeting (e.g., via email) to improve efficiency.
 - In meetings, we will examine written comments first.
- Minority reports
 - We will record the number of members who are "for", "against", and "abstain" from each vote. The minutes will reflect both minority and majority opinions.

Elections Update

Brown reviewed the following upcoming election processes

- Election of three SC members

- Will start with email to senators to solicit nominations on Monday, October 10 at 3pm (i.e., start of Senate meeting). SC Chair will announce the same live at that meeting.
- This year we will solicit a one-page PDF election statement from each willing candidate and post them on the Senate website.
- This election will conclude by noon on Friday, November 4, 2022
- Detailed timeline and other details are [here](#).

The SREC evinced concurrence with the planned process as reviewed by Brown.

- SC Chair and SC Vice Chair election
 - Email to SC members on Monday, November 7 to describe election process and highlight the fact of interdependent preferences
 - Email Senators on Monday, November 7 to solicit nominations for SC Chair
 - Nomination period ends on Friday, November 11 and list of nominees is shared with SC members
 - SC members discuss candidates among themselves, if desired
 - Nominees may indicate their willingness to serve, if desired. If it becomes clear that only one candidate is willing, the election ends, and a winner is announced.
 - At the SC meeting on Monday, December 5, SC members elect SC Chair from among those who are or may still be willing to serve. SC members also elect SC Vice Chair

The SREC had no questions for Brown about the SC Chair and SC VC elections.

SREC Leadership

Brown reviewed the following aspects of SREC organization.

- Identified Davy Jones as SREC Vice Chair to act upon request of and on behalf of the SREC Chair. SREC evinced concurrence with this appointment.
- Identified chairs of two subcommittees (“Rules” and “Elections”)
 - Each subcommittee chair takes the lead in answering “rapid response” inquiries from its relevant area.
 - In the “Rules” area, the chair (Jones) consults with other subcommittee members via phone and email to form the initial informal rule interpretation that gets shared with all SREC members for feedback.
 - In the “Elections” area, the chair (Brown) consults with other subcommittee members via phone and email about urgent election-related decisions that must be made before the next SREC meeting.
 - Election subcommittee members have the discretion to respond to inquiries by either (1) making a final decision by majority rule on the election-related inquiry or (2) calling an “emergency” SREC meeting (e.g., if need CYA decision from entire SREC)
 - If you become a candidate in an election supervised by SREC, you will be dropped temporarily from the “Elections” subcommittee to avoid a conflict of interest.
 - Anyone can be a member of either or both subcommittees, but membership signals that you are willing to engage in time-sensitive discussions via phone calls and/or emails.

- After discussion about the method of identifying membership on the two subcommittees, Brown described that after the present meeting, he will send out a solicitation to SREC members to advance themselves for membership on any of the subcommittees.
- Anyone can request SREC discuss at a meeting and issue a formal interpretation.
- If there is an interpretation request that has an obvious, routine, and/or uncontroversial answer, the chair or designee from SREC will respond to interpretation requests and report those instances to members at the next SREC meeting.

Rules Update

Brown introduced the action item re: approval of the annual update to the Senate Rules, for posting at the Senate web site.

- Every year at this time the SREC codifies changes to the SRs and publishes an updated rules document. We start with a list of Senate-approved changes and other mechanical or clarifying edits suggested by the Senate Council office (available [here](#), but the SC office edits are incorporated into list of mechanical edits below). Next, SREC adds to this list other proposed mechanical and clarifying edits.
- The following documents were referred to:
 - A **list of mechanical edits** ([PDF](#))
 - A **list of clarifying edits** ([PDF](#))
 - A **track changes document** showing all edits ([PDF](#)) ([.docx](#)) (attached as an appendix to these minutes)
 - NOTE: The track changes document also includes potential substantive changes (see below) that are coded with yellow highlighting, that might be discussed in the future but which are not an action item for the September 29 SREC meeting
- SREC needs to review, edit (as needed), and approve all edits that are mechanical and clarifying edits.

Hoch motioned to approve; Jones seconded. Discussion followed. Tagavi suggested making some additional clarifying edits. Brown advocated holding those additional clarifying edits until the next annual round of SR update. There was further discussion. Ultimately no changes were proposed to be made to the listed mechanical edits and clarifying edits.

Brown noted that there is an issue of contradiction within the draft updated SR 5.2.5.6 (“Prep Week”) that is part of the current edits on the table for a vote. The contradiction centers around the use of the word “week” and when does the “week” start and end. Grossman motioned an amendment to the main motion, that the proposed edit changes to SR 5.2.5.6 not be made and the wording return to its pre-update version. Okali seconded. The motion to amend was unanimously approved. Brown noted that the SREC at an upcoming SREC meeting can specifically address SR 5.2.5.6.

A vote was taken on the amended main motion, which was unanimously approved.

Upcoming SREC action items

Brown reviewed that the Senate Council is currently making an omnibus reorganization of Section 1 of the Senate Rules. Once the Senate Council decides a draft version that

reflects Senate Council intent, the document will be sent to the SREC. The SREC will then contemplate clarifying edits that better render Senate Council intent, as well as draft corresponding edits to Section 3 that are necessitated by the changes to Section 1.

Other items

Note was made that a role of the SREC Vice Chair is to draft meeting minutes.

Adjournment

Brown adjourned the meeting.

Appendix

DJ's rules of thumb for his informal organization of the cited SR items

If words are being cut and pasted from a Senate action into the SRs, or is a spelling/capitalization correction,, that is a **mechanical edit**. This edit is **a physical part of the officially binding SRs**.

If words of an SR are being grammatically rearranged but the policy meaning and applications of the rearranged sentence are already present in the original sentence, then that is a **clarifying edit**. This edit is **a physical part of the officially binding SRs**.

If the wording of a new paragraph is being literally constructed from words/text already existing somewhere else as Senate-approved words/text inside the SRs, then assembly of the new paragraph is a **clarifying edit** and is **a physical part of the officially binding SRs**.

If the wording of a new paragraph is being literally constructed from words/text already existing somewhere else external to the SRs that are officially/legally binding policy onto the Senate (e.g., a UK Governing Regulation or a Kentucky Revised Statute), then assembly of the new paragraph is a **clarifying edit** and is **a physical part of the officially binding SRs**.

If the meaning and application of the policy to a situation is not already present per se in the sentence, but its meaning and extension to a situation has been inferred by the SREC using is various methods to infer such meanings, then that is an **asterisk SREC interpretation** that accompanies an adjacent text of the SRs but **is not a physical part of the officially binding SRs**. The SREC interpretations are not binding on the SC or other University entities, but are advisory and given great deference in the way an attorney general opinion is not binding on state agencies, but the state agencies may give great deference to AG opinions ... if an entity inside UK is officially assigned inside UK to exercise a Senate Rule, and that entity relies upon an SREC interpretation (especially when formally solicited from the SREC by that entity), then for internal purposes at UK that entity cannot be considered as having acted in bad faith.

Substantive policy issues arising for various reasons from currently existing SR wording, that the SREC might either

- (1) decide it is actually a nonissue needing no further attention
- (2) decide it can be resolved by a “clarifying edit”
- (3) decide it can be handled by an “asterisk interpretation” or
- (4) decide to consider initiating a recommendation of new SR policy wording

are shown in **bold with a yellow highlight**

Table of Contents

1.3.2.1 Remove extraneous paragraph of text from TOC (yellow highlighted)

1.4.4.4 Senate SACDAC ... Advisory is misspelled

1.4.4.4 and 1.4.4.5 SACDAC and SACDI are not “advisory” committees in this meaning. They are group 2 standing committees ... Move up to positions 1.4.3.9 and 1.4.3.10

1.5.2.2 Here and in text, capitalize major words in the section title

1.5.2.3 Here and in text, capitalize major words in the section title

- 3.2.1.1 Here and in text, capitalize major words in the section title
- 3.2.1.5 Here and in text, capitalize Courses
- 3.2.2 Remove extraneous line of text from TOC (yellow highlighted)
- 4.2.1.3 Here and in text, capitalize major words in the section title
- 5.2.4.1 Here and in text, capitalize major words in the section title
- 5.3.2.2 Here and in text, capitalize major words in the section title
- 6.1.1.1 Here and in text, capitalize major words in the section title
- 6.1.1.2 Here and in text, capitalize major words in the section title
- 6.1.1.3 Here and in text, capitalize major words in the section title
- 6.1.1.4 Here and in text, capitalize major words in the section title
- 6.1.1.4 Remove extraneous paragraph of text from TOC (yellow highlighted)
- 6.1.1.5 Here and in text, capitalize major words in the section title
- 6.1.3.1 Here and in text, capitalize major words in the section title
- 6.1.3.2 Here and in text, capitalize major words in the section title
- 6.1.3.3 Here and in text, capitalize major words in the section title
- 6.1.3.4 Here and in text, capitalize major words in the section title
- 6.1.3.5 Here and in text, capitalize major words in the section title
- 6.4.2.1 Here and in text, capitalize major words in the section title
- 6.4.2.2 Here and in text, capitalize major words in the section title
- 6.4.2.3 Here and in text, capitalize major words in the section title
- 6.4.2.4 Here and in text, capitalize major words in the section title
- 6.4.3.1 Here and in text, capitalize major words in the section title
- 6.4.3.2 Here and in text, capitalize major words in the section title
- 6.4.3.3 Here and in text, capitalize major words in the section title
- 6.4.3.4 Here and in text, capitalize major words in the section title

Section 1

- 1.1.1.1 remove extra space between words
- 1.1.1.1 Underline *Governing Regulations*
- 1.1.2.1 clarified wording on faculty member vs. faculty employee
- 1.2.1 item 8 unclear why 4.1 is both strikethrough and inset
- 1.2.1 item 10 unclear why the strikethroughs/insertions are there
- 1.2.1 item 11 unclear why the strikethrough/insertion
- 1.2.2.1.1 clarified wording stating the formal rank, as per earlier in the paragraph
- 1.2.2.1.1 clarified to use “eligible” for students as done just earlier for faculty
- 1.2.2.1.2 remove extra space between words
- 1.2.2.1.2 unclear why the strikethrough/insertion
- 1.2.2.1.4 clarified “vacation” to “vacancy”, the latter used elsewhere
- 1.2.2.2.3 clarified that the Senate uses “Rules” not “regulations”
- 1.2.2.2.3.1 clarified to gender neutral
- 1.2.2.2.3.2 clarified meaning of when new student senator term begins re: special meeting
- 1.2.3.3 here and it all places change “Web site” or “web site” to “website”
- 1.2.3.3 clarified to gender neutral
- 1.2.4.1 clarified to gender neutral
- 1.3.1.3.2 unclear why the strikethrough/insertion
- 1.2.5.1 clarified to gender neutral
- 1.2.5.1 unclear why the strikethrough/insertion
- 1.2.5.2 clarify edit “UK” to be “University”
- 1.3.1.2.2.1 Note: is not clear who “certifies” the election of the two SC student members
- 1.3.1.2.2.3 clarified to gender neutral in both places

- 1.3.1.2.2.3 Note: is not clear who declares the vacancy that is based on student ineligibility
- 1.3.1.2.3 Note: Is not clear who declares the vacancy to SC that is based on SC nonattendance
- 1.3.1.3.1 Note: in highlighted, there is no affirmative vote or attestation by majority of SC members that they want the sole interested candidate (who perhaps selfnominated) to be the Senate Council Chair
- 1.3.1.3.1 clarified to gender neutral in three places
- 1.3.1.3.1 unclear why the strikethrough/insertion
- 1.3.2.2.3 Note: when/how should the parts that are superseded by deleted
- 1.3.2.5 clarified to gender neutral in three places
- 1.3.3.1.1 clarified to reflect the fuller Undergraduate Council codified in Section 3
- 1.3.3.2 mechanical deletion extra space between words
- 1.3.3.2 mechanical correction to spelling of Gatton
- 1.3.3.3 mechanical edit to make calendar nomenclature comport with adopted elsewhere
- 1.3.3.5 Note: SC has observed this committee is no longer being appointed or functioning
- 1.3.4.1.1 mechanical edit renumbering caused by renumbering elsewhere
- 1.4.1 mechanical edit insertion of wording adopted by Senate 5/2/22 re faculty bodies outside a college
- 1.4.1 clarifying edit to insert missing word “committees”
- 1.4.3.2.1 clarifying edit on entities referred to in the sentence
- 1.4.3.2.1 clarifying edit that the Senate Council Chair is being referred to
- 1.4.3.3.1 clarifying edit to insert missing word “terms”
- 1.4.3.3.2 mechanical edit insertion of wording adopted by Senate 5/2/22 on SUKCEC charge
- 1.4.3.3.2 clarifying edits that for items 1, 2 and 4 the SUKCEC role is to recommend to Senate Council per 1.4.3.3.3
- 1.4.3.8.3 mechanical edit to correct spelling of “residential”
- 1.4.4.2.2.2.1 clarified to gender neutral in two places
- 1.4.4.2.2.2.2 clarified to gender neutral in three places
- 1.4.4.2.2.2.4 clarifying edit to remove extraneous phrase
- 1.4.4.2.2.2.4 clarifying edit that it is the President’s decision being referred to
- 1.4.4.2.2.7 clarifying edit to remove duplicated paragraphs
- 1.5.1.1 clarifying edit to remove extra space between words
- 1.5.2.1 clarified to gender neutral
- 1.5.2.3 clarifying edit that the “by them” means from each candidate

Section 2

SREC

- 2.1.2.1 clarifying edit that “this period” for Fall Semester uses the same phrase as “this five day period” that is used in the Spring Semester rule (2.1.2.2)
- 2.1.3 mechanical edit insertion of Senate 9/13/2021 action

Section 3

- 3.1.1 green/blue SREC Issue Note:– reconcile with elsewhere wording on who is “the college” that makes “curriculum substitutions” (delete these highlights from final draft SRs**
- 3.1.1 yellow SREC Issue Note: - Sheila suggests putting section number in front of the three yellow highlighted phrases. This will cause renumbering of subsequent sections. DJ suggests incorporating this edit into next year’s SRs update (delete these highlights from final draft SRs**

- 3.1.1 mechanical edit last sentence, hanging comma replaced with period
- 3.1.1.1.1 clarifying edit to update numbering of cited SRs.

- 3.1.1.1.5 mechanical edit to make a deletion previously rendered by Senate
- 3.1.1.2 clarifying edit to update numbering of cited SRs.
- 3.1.1.3.1.1 **yellow** SREC Issue Note: - **Sheila suggests putting section number in front of the four yellow highlighted phrases. This will cause renumbering of subsequent sections. DJ suggests incorporating this edit into next year's SRs update (delete these highlights from final draft SRs**
- 3.1.1.3.1.1 clarifying edit to delete obsolete word "new"
- 3.1.1.3.1.1 mechanical edit to correct typographical misspell
- 3.1.1.3.2.1 **yellow** SREC Issue Note: - **Sheila suggests putting section number in front of the two yellow highlighted phrases. This will cause renumbering of subsequent sections. DJ suggests incorporating this edit into next year's SRs update (delete these highlights from final draft SRs**
- 3.1.1.3.2.1 mechanical edit to delete a duplicated paragraph
- 3.1.1.3.2.4 mechanical edit to correct citation format
- 3.1.3.1.3 mechanical edit to make a changed previously rendered by Senate
- 3.1.3.2 mechanical edit to update numbering of cited SR
- 3.1.3.3.1.2 clarifying edit that the type of degree referred to is graduate degree
- 3.1.3.3.1.2 **yellow** SREC Issue Note: **This procedure is not what is current programmed in Curriculog**
- 3.1.3.3.1.3 mechanical edit to update numbering of cited SR
- 3.1.3.3.2.1.2 mechanical edit to update numbering of cited SR
- 3.1.3.3.3.2.1 **yellow** SREC issue: **this SR and the cited AR 1:5 cite each other in a circular manner and is not clear what exactly is Senate responsibility as portrayed here to SACS**
- 3.1.3.3.3.2.3 clarifying edit that the Senate is taking the final University action
- 3.1.3.3.4.1 clarifying edit to use 'disapprove and stop' nomenclature used elsewhere
- 3.1.4.1 **green/blue** SREC Issue Note:– **reconcile with elsewhere wording on who is "the college" that makes "curriculum substitutions" (delete these highlights from final draft SRs**
- 3.2.1 mechanical edit to insert text approved by Senate; causes ensuing renumbering
- 3.2.2.3.2.2.2 clarified to gender neutral
- 3.2.2.3.3 mechanical edit to insert text approved by Senate
- 3.2.3.2 **yellow** SREC issue: **Sheila Brothers does not foresee any time under Curriculog structure that this provision can be implemented. Propose to delete?**
- 3.2.3.2 mechanical edit to insert text approved by Senate
- 3.2.3.3.3.1 mechanical edit to update numbering of cited SR
- 3.2.3.3.3.1.2 mechanical edit to update numbering of cited SR
- 3.2.3.3.3.1.7 mechanical edit to update numbering of cited SR
- 3.2.3.4 **yellow** SREC issue: **Here and throughout SRs, need to clarify 'bulletin' names; "Graduate Bulletin", "College Bulletin", "Undergraduate Bulletin," "University Bulletin"**
- 3.3.2 mechanical edit to update numbering of cited SR

Section 4

- 4.1 **yellow** SREC issue: **Here and throughout SRs "professional college" vs. prof. program**
- 4.1 item 4 CHECK DELETION about native language. No date is given for that Senate action, and the same wording is still retained in the Glossary. Why is this deleted?
- 4.2.1.1.1 mechanical edit to update numbering of cited SR
- 4.2.1.1.1.2.2 clarified to gender neutral
- 4.2.1.1.1.3 **yellow** SREC issue: **The Registrar confirms that there is no "Evening Weekend Program" that has an enrollment process referred to. Suggest deleting archaic second sentence.**
- 4.2.1.2 clarified to gender neutral

- 4.2.1.3.1 clarified to gender neutral
- 4.2.1.3.1 mechanical insertion of wording rendered by Senate
- 4.2.1.3.1 clarifying edit to use in rule the same wording each for “University of Kentucky”
- 4.2.1.3.1.3 mechanical insertion of wording rendered by Senate
- 4.2.1.3.3 clarifying edit to define the “this” University as the University of Kentucky
- 4.2.1.3.3 **yellow** SREC issue: here and elsewhere look at how “first time freshman” is used
- 4.2.2.1.1 clarified to gender neutral
- 4.2.2.2.2 **yellow** SREC issue: is this Provost reporting to the SAASC being done?
- 4.2.2.2.3 **yellow** SREC issue: Brian Jackson describes that there is no longer exercised a policy for “provisional admission”. Suggest Grad School subject proposal to appropriately delete relevant wording
- 4.2.2.2.6 item 4 clarified to gender neutral
- 4.3.3 clarifying rewording of second sentence of original paragraph

Section 5

- 5.1 **yellow** SREC issue: what consistent format should be used throughout SRs: “p/f” or “P/F” and “pass/fail” or “Pass/Fail”
- 5.1 **yellow** SREC issue: throughout SRs a long term unresolved nomenclature problem. I.e., reference is made to “does not bear academic credit” in some situations probably intends to mean “is not a Senate numbered course” but in other situations is meaning “is a Senate numbered course for which the quality points and credit hours are zero (0).”
- 5.1 **yellow** SREC issue: the SRs defining grades in Senate-numbered courses is inconsistent in referring to “no credit hours” in some definitions but to “zero (0) quality points” in other definitions. Registrar prefer uniform use of “quality points” nomenclature. Change throughout?
- 5.1.2.1 **yellow** SREC issue: the Registrar confirms that there are no offered University courses that are “correspondence” in the old meaning of ‘not face to face and is student self-paced’. However, the Senate Rules is several places still uses “correspondence” nomenclature, and may in some cases mean the current Federal/SACS/CPE definition of “distance learning” (that includes the meaning is not self-paced). Suggest appropriate attention to SR defining “distance learning” vs. “correspondence” in terms of mandatory external definitions that apply onto UK.
- 5.1.2.2 mechanical edit to capitalize Instructor of Record consistently in this section
- 5.1.2.2 mechanical edit to correct spelling of word “in”
- 5.1.3 **yellow** SREC issue: does reference to just “elective” in two places in this rule mean “free elective” or “supportive elective” or “guided elective”? Need to fix locally here, and also suggest appropriate attention to defining/resolving use of wording “elective” in Senate Rules and Glossary
- 5.1.3 **yellow** SREC issue: does “full semester’s duration” actually mean “full term’s duration?”
- 5.1.3 **yellow** SREC issue: does “student’s academic dean” mean “dean of the student’s college”? (If so, suggest change for use consistent with elsewhere in SRs)
- 5.1.3 mechanical edit to capitalize Instructor of Record consistently in this section
- 5.1.4 clarifying edit that current SR definition is summer has a “session”
- 5.1.4 **yellow** SREC issue: does “full semester’s duration” actually mean “full term’s duration?”
- 5.1.4 clarified to gender neutral
- 5.1.4 mechanical insertion of wording rendered by Senate
- 5.1.5.2.1-3 **yellow** SREC issue: these sections only require ‘consult to Instructor of Record’ for grade assignment, in contrast to all other places in which the Instructor of Record controls the grade assignment. Also, several places here uses passive tense and is unclear whether “unit head” (chair/dean?) or “program head” has responsible control. Suggest

appropriate attention to these aspects.

5.1.6 mechanical insertion of wording rendered by Senate

5.1.7.3 clarified to gender neutral

5.1.5.5.1 mechanical edit to correct spelling error

5.1.7.5.2.3 clarified to gender neutral

5.2.1.2.2.2 clarified to gender neutral

5.2.1.2.2.3 clarified to gender neutral

5.2.1.2.2.4 clarified to gender neutral

5.2.1.3 **yellow SREC issue: see above about “correspondence” courses**

5.2.2 **yellow SREC issue: unable to discern from the reachable record what is the status of action in regard to the ‘student load in compressed courses during the summer session’.**

The final resolution of this previous issue that SREC sent to SC needs to be reached.

5.2.1.3 **yellow SREC issue: need to resolve ‘the professional colleges’**

5.2.2 clarified to gender neutral

5.2.2 **yellow SREC issue: need to resolve ‘the professional colleges’**

5.2.2 clarifying edit to current nomenclature of “summer session”

5.2.4.2 **yellow SREC issue: need to resolve ‘the professional colleges’**

5.2.5.1 clarified to gender neutral

5.2.5.1 mechanical edit to update numbering of cited SR

5.2.5.2.1 mechanical insertion of wording rendered by Senate, in several places

5.2.5.2.1 mechanical edit to update numbering of cited SR, in two places

5.2.5.2.2 clarifying edit to fix typo (change 5.2.5.2.3 to “5.2...4.2.1 item 3”

5.2.5.2.3.2 clarified to gender neutral

5.2.5.4 clarified to gender neutral

5.2.5.4 **yellow SREC issue: is this provision an archaic relic, superseded by other SRs, appropriate for deletion? Registrar reports has never exercised this and has no way to implement an exercise of this.**

5.2.5.5 **yellow SREC issue: the list of external associations is out of date. How does SREC propose to fix?**

5.2.5.6 mechanical insertion of wording rendered by Senate, in several places

5.2.5.7.1 **yellow SREC issue: here and throughout SRs: is “Spring Semester” and uncapitalized season or is it a capitalized title of an official event? (and with Fall Semester, etc.)**

5.2.5.7.1 **yellow SREC issue: should there be an *SREC interpretation made for here stating that the last Friday also can be used for make-up final exams?**

5.2.5.7.2 clarified to gender neutral in several places

5.2.5.7.4.1 mechanical insertion of wording rendered by Senate, in several places

5.2.5.7.4.2 clarifying edit per Senate action re renaming of “catalog”

5.2.5.7.4 clarified to gender neutral

5.2.5.8 clarifying edit per Senate action re renaming of “catalog”

5.2.5.9 **yellow SREC issue: should the actual hour times be stated instead of “prime time”?**

5.3.2.1 mechanical insertion of wording rendered by Senate

5.4.1.2 clarifying edit that the suspension and probation referred to are “academic”

5.4.1.4 mechanical edit to capitalize University

5.4.1.4 clarified to gender neutral

5.4.1.5 mechanical edit to capitalize major word in heading

5.4.1.5 clarified to gender neutral in several places

5.4.2.3 clarifying edit to current nomenclature of “summer session”

5.5.1.1.1 and 5.5.1.1.3 **yellow SREC issue: need in all places to standardize the name of the “calendar.” E.g. “University Calendar” or “Academic University Calendar” or “University Academic Calendar”**

5.5.1.2 clarified to gender neutral in several places

- 5.5.2.2.1 **yellow** SREC issue: What does the disqualifying “correspondence study” mean?
- 5.5.2.2.1 mechanical insertion of SREC wording approved by Senate and of SREC rearrangement tasked by Senate/SC (SREC 3/21/22)
- 5.5.2.2.2.1 first para. clarifying edit to relate the Senate’s policy wording with how the honor is portrayed by the Registrar on the transcript
- 5.5.2.2.2.1 second para clarifying edit to the new wording on how the departmental honors and professional honors relate to the respective program and to the educational unit homing the respective program
- 5.5.2.2.2.1 third para. mechanical edit to update numbering of cited SRs
- 5.5.2.2.2.2 mechanical insertion of wording rendered by Senate
- 5.5.2.2.2.3 mechanical insertion of wording rendered by Senate
- 5.5.2.2.2.4 mechanical insertion of wording rendered by Senate
- 5.5.2.2.2.5 mechanical insertion of wording rendered by Senate; correct spelling of department; mechanical moving of SREC interpretations as rendered moved by Senate reorganization of section
- 5.5.2.4.2 clarified to gender neutral in several places
- 5.5.2.2 mechanical insertion of wording rendered by Senate; clarifying grammatical correction to add word “the”

Section 6

- 6.1.1 mechanical insertion of wording rendered by Senate
- 6.1.2 **yellow** SREC issue: Need to resolve this new rule on deadline for syllabus sharing to class (“third day of the ... semester”) vs. other wording about information presented by the “second day of class” at 5.2.5.1 and 5.2.5.10. vs. 6.1.4.1 “first class meeting”
- 6.1.2 mechanical edit to update numbering of cited SR in three places last paragraph
- 6.1.2.1 items 1 and 5 **yellow** SREC issue: Here and throughout SRs, need to clarify ‘bulletin’ names; “Graduate Bulletin”, “College Bulletin”, “Undergraduate Bulletin,” “University Bulletin”
- 6.1.2.1 item 16 **yellow** SREC issue: Suggest SREC reword different descriptor than fuzzy “late policies” (i.e. it is not the policies that are late).
- 6.1.2.1 item 17 mechanical correction of spelling of “Permissible”
- 6.1.2.1 item 20 mechanical edit to update numbering of cited SR
- 6.1.2.1 item 26 **yellow** SREC issue: hot link to external Senate web page is not active. When to correct such inactive links to external sites?
- 6.1.4.1 **yellow** SREC issue: should we make style of item 1 be the same as items 2 and 3 (i.e., “the end of the Monday” vs. “the third day” and “the second days”)?
- 6.1.4.2 **yellow** SREC issue: Need to resolve this new rule on deadline for syllabus sharing to class (“third day of the ... semester”) vs. other wording about information presented by the “second day of class” at 5.2.5.1 and 5.2.5.10. vs. 6.1.4.1 “first class meeting”
- 6.1.4.4 clarifying edit to cite current number of the referenced GR
- 6.1.8 clarifying edit that the Senate Rule is controlling “academic” appeal parameters
- 6.2 mechanical edit to capitalize “University.”
- 6.2 and elsewhere in Senate Rules **yellow** SREC issue: need to choose a consistent style of reference throughout SRs either “Ombud” or “Academic Ombud” (currently is inconsistent even in same paragraph)
- 6.2.1.2 clarified to gender neutral
- 6.2.1.3 clarified to gender neutral
- 6.2.1.5 clarified to gender neutral
- 6.2.2 clarified to gender neutral in several places
- 6.2.3.1 clarifying addition of missing word “candidates”
- 6.2.4 clarified to gender neutral in several places

6.4.1 **yellow** SREC issue: this is the only place that refers to “directors of programs”; all other places in this section refer only to “Chair”; this single place creates an issue of which person has the responsibility, the Chair or the program director? When would the program director ever be responsible, because there are no longer any programs outside of a college. Delete “includes directors of programs” as obsolete?

6.4.2.2 item 6 mechanical insertion of wording rendered by Senate

6.4.2.4 **yellow** SREC issue: is this clause obsolete? This paragraph dates to when there was an Asso Provost for Undergraduate Education, which was abolished in 2017, and there was a brief period for students to find a college, and the 2017 amendment to the paragraph directed the Provost to determine a college for such ‘as yet unassigned’ students if this paragraph became operable to them. However, there are no longer any students who are not registered in a college. Delete as archaic, or is there still such a thing as a person who is a “student” but “not yet matriculated.” See last item at this link:

[https://www.uky.edu/universitysenate/sites/www.uky.edu.universitysenate/files/senate/2017-](https://www.uky.edu/universitysenate/sites/www.uky.edu.universitysenate/files/senate/2017-18/20171113/DJ-)

[18/20171113/DJ-](https://www.uky.edu/universitysenate/sites/www.uky.edu.universitysenate/files/senate/2017-18/20171113/DJ-JM.Review%20by%20SREC.Summary%20of%20SR%20Changes_Undergrad%20Ed.11-1-17Updates.%20Reorg_toSC%20with%20change.pdf)
[JM.Review%20by%20SREC.Summary%20of%20SR%20Changes_Undergrad%20Ed.11-1-17Updates.%20Reorg_toSC%20with%20change.pdf](https://www.uky.edu/universitysenate/sites/www.uky.edu.universitysenate/files/senate/2017-18/20171113/DJ-JM.Review%20by%20SREC.Summary%20of%20SR%20Changes_Undergrad%20Ed.11-1-17Updates.%20Reorg_toSC%20with%20change.pdf)

6.4.2.4 and elsewhere **yellow** SREC issue: the SRs here and in other places depend upon the status of a student as “registered” with a college, but does not define what is “registered”. Relatedly, the SRs use “matriculated” without defining what is “matriculated” and how that differs from “registered.” SRs do not even define what is a “student” for the purposes of the person gaining SR student ‘rights’ or being subject to SR student ‘academic discipline.’ Suggest SREC consider this situation.

6.4.4.1.1 clarifying edit that the meeting itself happens within 10 days, not that the effort to schedule a meeting happens within 10 days.

6.4.4.1.3 and 6.4.4.2.1.1 clarifying edit that it is the Instructor of Record who decides the course grade (to comport with the SRs elsewhere establishing this Instructor of Record responsibility)

6.4.4.4.1 clarified to gender neutral

6.4.5.2.5 clarified to gender neutral in two places

6.4.5.2.6 clarified that if the penalty reaches rendering a grade of E or F, then it is the Instructor of Record who renders that penalty

6.4.5.2.6 clarified that on these aspects the Appeals Board “decides” (not “recommends”) about the penalty, because the subsequent role of the Instructor of Record or dean is to “implement” what the Appeals Board did.

6.4.7.1 clarified to gender neutral

6.4.8.4 clarifying that “term” in this place means with respect to the academic calendar, and not in the meaning of ‘terms and conditions.’

6.5.2.1 clarified to gender neutral

6.4.2.4 mechanical correction of official name of “*University Senate Rules*”

6.5.2.4 clarified an unclear “this” by noting the specific SR intended to be referred to

6.5.2.4 clarified to gender neutral

6.5.2.4 mechanical correction to noncapitalized generic wording

6.5.2.4 clarified that the particular body might be named a council or a committee (per elsewhere in this section number)

Section 7

7.2.1 clarified to gender neutral

7.3 clarified to gender neutral in two places

7.3.1 clarified to gender neutral in two places

7.3.5.2 clarified to gender neutral

7.3.6 clarified to gender neutral

Section 8

8.1 mechanical insertion of wording adopted by Senate re “Schedule of Classes”

8.1 mechanical insertion of wording adopted by Senate re courses homed outside a college

Section 8 **yellow SREC issue:** The SREC and Registrar need to resolve how the following are intended to be used in this section, in using “catalog” rather than “bulletin” title:

University Bulletin

Undergraduate Bulletin

Graduate Bulletin

College of Medicine Bulletin

College of Dentistry “new College Bulletin”

and other such bulletins identified on the Registrar web site

Suggestion: SREC task Rules Subcommittee to consult with Registrar, because the change to SR wording was initiated by Registrar

Section 9 Glossary (uses new SR numbering)

9.2 ACADEMIC POLICY STATEMENTS. Mechanically cut and pasted from wording at 6.1.2

9.6 ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS - SREC will mechanically cut and paste the official definition in GR 13.B.2: *Administrative Regulations* are issued by the President to “provide interpretation and implementation of University-wide policies set forth by the Board of Trustees in these Governing Regulations and the Minutes of the Board of Trustees. Administrative Regulations promote the responsible and efficient administration of the University and the accomplishment of its goals.”

9.7 CLASSIFICATION – clarifying edit that it is referring to undergraduate students

9.8 EXCUSED ABSENCE - SREC to wordsmith here to do a ‘clarifying edit’ a new Glossary term, rendered by drawing together already approved parts of the Senate Rules.

“FINAL EXAMINATION PERIOD” DJ Suggests add as a Glossary term, mechanically cut and pasted from several existing SRs

9.12 GOVERNING REGULATIONS SREC will mechanically cut and paste the official definition written in GR II.

9.14 MAJOR - SREC clarifying edit to incorporate Senate 2012 action codified elsewhere in SRs to define track, concentration and specialization that replace the old nomenclature “option.”

9.17 ONELINE PROGRAM DELIVERY – SREC mechanically cut and paste here the wording of the Senate action to create this Glossary definition

9.18 PREP WEEK – SREC mechanically cut and paster here definition of Prep Week from SR 5.2.5.6

9.19 clarifying grammatical correction “doctorate” to “doctoral”

9.20.1 clarifying grammatical correction to remove capitalization

9.20.2 grammatical style change

9.21 READING DAYS – SREC mechanically cut and paste here definition of Prep Week from SR 5.2.5.6

9.23 REGULAR AND SUBSTANTIVE INTERACTIONS - SREC mechanically cut and paste here the wording of the Senate action to create this Glossary definition

9.28 UNSCHEDULED CAMPUS CLOSING - SREC mechanically cut and paste here definition of Prep Week from SR 5.2.5.2.1

Have not addressed situations in which manually needs to fix a link “Error!”