

Senate Council

Monday, November 7, 2022

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3:00 PM on Monday, November 7, 2022, in 103 Main Building, although a video conference link was also available for members. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken electronically otherwise specified. Specific voting information can be requested from the Office of the Senate Council (SC).

Senate Council Chair DeShana Collett (HS) called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:01 PM. The Chair welcomed those present. She informed everyone that the session was being recorded for notetaking purposes and noted that it was an open meeting. She asked that all attendees, online and in person, state their name and affiliation prior to speaking, to ensure everyone knew who was speaking. The Chair asked SC members to be ready to vote via Poll Everywhere. The Chair reminded SC members that regarding the ability to speak, members must raise their hand to be called upon. The Chair also reminded everyone that SC members would have priority speaking, noting that others may be called upon as needed and given a chance to speak only if there were no additional comments from SC members.

1. Minutes from October 31, 2022 and Announcements

The Chair informed SC members no edits were received for the October 31, 2022 minutes. There being **no objections**, the minutes from October 31, 2022 were **approved as distributed by unanimous consent**.

The Chair informed SC members that the SC office had recently been made aware that the Registrar's office staff regularly felt obligated to respond to requests from units to turn course prerequisites on and off throughout the semester. The Chair noted this practice raised concerns among staff in both offices, but that it was difficult to stop a practice used regularly by some faculty. The Chair explained that after some internal discussions, the SC office would work with the Registrar's office to let units know that course changes to prerequisites must be made using the appropriate Senate course approval process.

The Chair announced that she had been invited by Senior Associate Vice Provost for Administration and Academic Affairs Kathryn Cardarelli to review the outline of a proposal from the associate deans about changing *SR 5.4.1.2 ("Academic Suspension Policies")*, which pertained to undergraduate students. The Chair explained that although there was no concrete proposal yet, the proposal would remove the *SR* clause that requires suspension if a student had below a 0.6 GPA after their first term. The Chair noted there had been at least one assertion that deans do not have to suspend students who meet the thresholds in the Senate rules for suspension. She said she would make it clear that deans have authority to provide exceptions for an individual student's suspension, but a blanket policy would be inappropriate. The Chair informed SC members that she requested a formal proposal including a rationale, description of the problem that the proposed change would solve, and clear descriptions of what the "rebound program" would look like. The Chair noted that she had a meeting scheduled this week with Associate Dean Kim Anderson (AS) and Vice Provost Cardarelli to discuss the matter further.

2. Committee Reports

a. Senate Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAASC) – Leslie Vincent, Chair

i. *Proposed Change to BA/BS Communication*

The Chair noted that proposer Kelly McAninch (DS) was not present. SC Vice Chair and SAASC Chair Leslie Vincent (BE) explained the proposed change to the BA/BS Communication. The Chair noted that there was a recommendation from committee for Senate to approve the changes to the BA/BS

Communication. Because the **motion** came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair asked if there was any discussion.

Bob Grossman (AS) **moved** to table the item until a future meeting when a representative was available to answer questions about the proposal. Marilyn Duncan (ME) **seconded**. Kaveh Tagavi (EN) noted that if proposer attendance was not a known condition, then it was unfair to table the item. Faculty Trustee Aaron Cramer (EN) suggested it would only be reasonable to table the item if SC members had questions that the committee chair was unable to answer. Grossman noted that he had questions for the rationale for lowering GPA requirements. A **vote** was taken, and the motion to table the item until a future meeting when a representative was available to answer questions **passed** with three opposed and one abstained.

Tagavi asked what the outcome would be if the proposer was unable to attend the next SC meeting. Senate Parliamentarian Gregg Rentfrow (AG) clarified that the item would be tabled until the proposer was able to attend.

b. *Senate Calendar Committee (SCC) – Richard Charnigo, Chair*

The Chair invited SCC Chair Richard Charnigo (PbH) to provide a report to SC members. The Chair explained that *SR 2.2* gave authority for SC to approve minor changes in a calendar so long as the action was reported to Senate at the next Senate meeting.

i. *Proposed Change to College of Dentistry (DMD) 2022-23 Calendar*

Charnigo explained the proposed changes to the College of Dentistry (DMD) 2022-23 calendar.

The motion from committee was a recommendation that the SC approve the proposed changes to the 2022-23 DMD calendar. Because the **motion** came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair asked if there was any debate. Faculty Trustee Aaron Cramer (EN) commented that the specific request from the College of Dentistry, for the DMD 2022-23 Calendar's Spring Break to align with Fayette County Public Schools (FCPS) Spring Break was quite reasonable, but the *SR* states that professional calendars should conform as much as possible to the University Calendar. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

ii. *Proposed Requirements for Calendar-Related Proposals*

The Chair explained that *SR 3.1.3.2* refers to SC-approved forms for programs and *SR 3.2.3.2* refers to SC-approved forms for courses. The Chair noted the forms from the committee did not necessarily require SC approval for use, but that it would be good for the SC to codify the forms' use and purpose. The Chair stated the form was similar in format to other Senate-promulgated forms and that the Qualtrics survey requested pedagogical justification and other related information. The Chair explained that both were designed to require a proposer to carefully consider the request and provide similar information from different perspectives.

The Chair asked Charnigo if he had any additional comments. Charnigo thanked the Chair for the introduction. Charnigo noted that one change requested by the committee had been implemented and one was awaiting implementation. He asked SC members for feedback about the form and the survey. Charnigo noted that the committee was seeking SC approval for the concept of the form and survey so both could be used and adjusted as needed.

Leslie Vincent (BE) **moved** to approve the proposed requirements for calendar-related proposals. Bob Grossman (AS) **seconded**. The Chair asked if there was any discussion.

SC members asked a variety of questions and discussed the following:

- The types of calendar requests that the committee expected to consider
- The justification was for both a Qualtrics survey and form
- If requests could be made to make calendar exceptions retroactively, after the date of the exception had already passed
- Whether Senate had the authority to allow for exceptions to University holidays, which are determined by the President
- The difference between when a holiday was observed compared to not observing a holiday
- The importance for some holiday observances to occur on a specific date

The Chair noted that the Senate had the authority to make an exception for when a holiday was observed but recognized that a University holiday must be observed. The Chair informed SC members that she met with President Capilouto about holiday observances and commented that the President was surprised that there were some units not observing certain University holidays at all. Kaveh Tagavi (EN) stated that he did not believe the SC had the authority to make calendar exceptions for University holidays. Davy Jones (emeritus professor) commented that the conversation between the SC Chair and President and Senate Chair Capilouto indicated no objection from the Senate Chair regarding the SC Chair's interpretation of the Senate Council's authority for exceptions to when holidays were observed.

SC members discussed holiday observances in clinical settings, University staffing, and reasonable exceptions for specific programs. The Chair noted the SCC was balancing pedagogy with practicality in considering such requests and noted that President Capilouto believed there to be reasons for exceptions in the health care colleges. Akiko Takenaka (AS) expressed concerns about whether the form would indicate an impression that such requests were okay to make, specifically noting the list of holidays in the survey. Charnigo commented that it was well established by historical precedent that while there was some flexibility on Academic holidays, there was no flexibility with University holidays. Charnigo noted that if SC preferred, he would convey to the committee that there should be no entertainment of deviation from the established University Holidays. Charnigo reminded SC members that SC would always have the final approval on recommendations from the committee and that the committee would consider requests carefully on a case-by-case basis.

The Chair reminded SC members that there was a motion and a second on the floor to approve the use of a new form for calendar-related requests. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with one opposed and one abstained.

Vincent thanked Charnigo for his work and the committee's work, noting her appreciation of the structure of the review provided by the committee.

3. Proposed Change to *Senate Rules 6.5.2.2 ("Composition of the University Appeals Board," "The Student Membership")*

The Chair described the proposed change to *Senate Rules 6.5.2.2 ("Composition of the University Appeals Board," "The Student Membership")*. The Chair explained the proposed change would remove gender-binary language and replace it with gender-neutral language.

Leslie Vincent (BE) **moved** to approve the proposed change to *SR 6.5.2.2*. Bob Grossman (AS) **seconded**. The Chair asked if there was any debate. Kaveh Tagavi (EN) **moved** to suggest the proposers consider changing the language to describe the student membership as representative of the constituents and consider bringing different language forward. The motion **failed** with no second. Grossman **offered a substitute motion** to ask the Ombud's office to propose new language that did not use gender but broadly represented the student body. Susan Cantrell (ED) **seconded**. The Chair asked if there was any discussion and there was none. A **vote** on the

motion to return the language to the Ombud's office was taken by show of hands, and the amended motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

4. Results of 2021-22 Faculty Evaluation of the President

The Chair presented the Faculty Evaluation of President Capilouto for the 2021-22 year. The Chair noted that the presentation was first presented to the Board of Trustees. SC members offered a variety of feedback and discussed the following:

- Data visualization considerations such as time frame, chart type, and color consistency
- Whether markers of variability/standard deviations would be useful
- Whether faculty were sufficiently informed to evaluate the President on certain topics like cost effectiveness
- The impact of COVID-19 on scores from the 2020-21 and 2021-22 academic years
- How the results impacted the President and Board of Trustees
- Differences in perspective between faculty members and board members
- Response rates
- Whether the status of the faculty had increased or decreased
- Faculty morale and faculty job satisfaction
- The possibility for initiatives to improve faculty morale, similar to current initiatives for improving staff morale

5. Tentative Senate Agenda for November 14, 2022

The Chair explained the tentative Senate agenda, noting that items for the "Proposed Change to BA/BS Communication" and "Proposed Change to Senate Rules 6.5.2.2" would be removed based on today's discussion. The Chair also asked SC members if they would consider putting the item for "suspensions and closures" on the Senate's consent agenda in the interest of time. Leslie Vincent (BE) **moved** to approve the tentative Senate agenda for November 14, 2022, with the appropriate changes. Bob Grossman (AS) **seconded**. The Chair asked if there was any discussion and there was none. There being **no objections**, the tentative Senate Agenda for November 14, 2022 was **approved as amended**.

6. Update on the QEP Process – Co-chair Susan Cantrell

The Chair invited Susan Cantrell (ED) to provide an update on the QEP process. Cantrell provided an update to SC members. SC members asked a variety of questions and expressed a variety of opinions about the following:

- The Digital Badge Program Pilot and the relationship to the QEP
- Whether there would be an effort to inform faculty of common core requirements to satisfy multiple requirements
- The potential burden for faculty that such courses for the QEP initiative could cause
- The types of problems undergraduate students would be solving and how progress would be monitored
- Whether it was reasonable to assert that students were being trained to meet the Kentucky and regional workforces, rather than solely Kentucky
- Faculty of record

The Chair thanked Cantrell for her report.

7. Items from the Floor (Time Permitting)

The Chair asked if there were any items from the floor and there were none. The Chair noted that SC members could discuss any other items over the SC listserv.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 PM with **no objections**.

Respectfully submitted by,
DeShana Collett

Prepared by Katie Silver on Tuesday, October 4, 2022

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

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