

Senate Council
October 26, 2009

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, October 26, 2009 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair David Randall called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:08 pm.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair announced that he would be absent the following week, and that Vice Chair Swanson would take his place. Chappell and Jensen were absent for the day's meeting. He added that Mrs. Brothers asked him to note that she was misquoted a number of times in the recent [Kentucky Kernel](#) article on fall break. The Chair then invited the guests to come to the table; those present introduced themselves.

The Chair asked SC members to look over the vetting team (VT) compositions as presented in the handout. A variety of the individuals who were suggested by the SC during the previous meeting had declined, and there was a need to identify additional individuals for various VT. SC members discussed the decision made during the October 19 meeting to include a librarian as an ex officio member on any VT that did not have one elected by the Senate. It was ultimately decided that those librarians should be regular members, not ex officio members. SC members suggested a few additional names of faculty members to contact.

Turning to the charge letter, SC members were asked to review the draft version in the handout. The SC was concerned that the language in track changes did not adequately describe the nature of interim approval. Since the intent was clear, the Chair suggested that discussion on the issue end, and that he draft clearer language the following day. SC members agreed.

There were a variety of names suggested for the search committee for a dean of libraries. SC members identified one particular person as a first choice, removed one name, and asked that the remaining names also be transmitted to the Office of the Provost as possible nominees.

Due to the presence of invited guests, the Chair noted that he would move to agenda item numbers six and seven.

6. Duplicate Credit

The Chair recognized the chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee, Joe Sottile. Guest Sottile explained that he was not involved in drafting the original language of *Senate Rules* 5.3.1.2, but became involved through the fallout when implementation occurred. He said that there were two issues that needed to be addressed. Currently, if a student took a course three times and failed each attempt, the last two attempts were removed from the transcript. That was a simple problem to resolve, in that the prohibition of duplicate credit should not be invoked since the student never passed the course. No change in wording is required. The second issue, that of quality points and quality hours, might involve changing the language. Sottile opined that if a student failed a course, there was no duplicate credit issue.

Wood commented that both she and Ford were on the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) when the issue on prohibition of duplicate credit was discussed, and that the intent was that if a student

successfully completed a course and received credit hours, the student could not receive quality and credit points the second time the course was taken unless the repeat option was utilized. The phrase “if awarded credit hours” was used because if a student failed, no credit hours would be awarded. Sottile expressed agreement with Wood’s explanation.

Mrs. Brothers explained that the word “successfully” was removed because of confusion with that word – some thought that successfully completing a course meant receiving a passing grade, when its intent was to mean receipt of a letter grade.

Provost’s Liaison Greissman asked about earned degree credits, and Sottile explained that that encompassed the other problem with the language. Wood explained that the problem involved both quality points and quality hours. The original intent of language was to prevent a situation in which a student earned a D grade (and received the associated three hours of degree credit and three quality points) and returned to take the course again – the student should not be able to receive earned credit or quality hours for the retake unless the student used the repeat option.

Guest Jacquie Hager (associate registrar) said that she was surprised to see quality hours mentioned, since duplicate credit relates to quality hours. She said that if a course was taken six times and was failed every time, each attempt should be reflected in the GPA. Wood agreed with Hager, saying that the issue was not so much a student with a series of E grades, but rather a student taking a course and receiving a D, which is considered successfully completed, and then come back and retake the course, earn a B grade, and receive the associated earned credits and quality points. There could be differential computations for program admission issues, but the first time a student took a course and passed it, unless the repeat option were used, it could be on the transcript but not count for anything. Wood referred to a situation in which a student was told to retake a 500-level course for degree credit, when it was taken previously (with an A grade received), for a previous masters degree. She said that should be prevented.

Hager acknowledged Wood’s comments, but gave an example of a different situation, found elsewhere. In the College of Engineering (CoE), many courses must be passed with a C grade. If a student takes CME 200 and fails it, and then retakes it and then earns a D, under the current interpretation the student received three earned hours and the quality hours associated with a D, but cannot use that course to progress in CoE since there was no C grade earned. The degree audit system would not recognize it. If the student takes CME 200 and fails it, and then retakes it and earns a D, the student will get three earned credit hours, and three hours of quality points. If the student takes it a third time and finally earns that C grade required by CoE, the student would not receive the earned hours (since they were already earned with the D grade), but would be allowed to progress in CoE. Wood opined that no quality hours would be earned for the C. Hager noted that the C grade would not be entered into the GPA, either.

Sottile said that if the student fails subsequent attempts, the language was fine as is. However, it still prevented the quality hours and quality points from being captured. He thought a rewrite might be needed.

The Chair asked if a motion was necessary; Jones replied that he would take the minutes from the meeting to identify clearer language, but Steiner thought that additional conversation would be beneficial. Sottile said that if the student never passed the course, the three Es would remain on the

transcript, as should be done. The issue of quality points and quality hours, however, needed to be hashed out.

Rohr **moved** that Jones utilize the minutes from the day's meeting to try to codify the language regarding a prohibition on duplicate credit, and return the language to the SC at a future date for review. Jones noted it was possible that he would return with additional questions to clarify matters. Swanson **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. [Make the Difference Suggestion – Make Last Day to Drop Fall on Last Day to Add a Class](#)

The Chair explained that the concept of making the last day to drop a class fall on the same day as the last day to add a class had been approved by the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), but that the particular date still needed to be identified.

Those present engaged in lengthy discussion regarding the pros and cons of pushing the last day to add back, or forward, and the pros and cons of moving the last day to drop a class forward, or back. Sottile noted that one issue of particular sensitivity was that of a W grade. He could not speak to how seriously a W grade was interpreted, and thought that the possible negative impact of the W was the crux of the matter. Guests Mike Shanks (Office of the Registrar, and past chair, Advising Network), Matthew Deffendall (Central Advising Services, and chair elect, Advising Network) and Hager actively participated in the discussion. Wood noted that the end of the add period used to be Wednesday evening. Registrar Don Witt discovered that per the *Senate Rules* the add period must end on a Tuesday night. When there was a Wednesday night drop deadline, there was an opportunity for students in Tuesday/Thursday night classes to be dropped for not showing up, opening up seats for students on waiting lists.

After additional discussion, Wood **moved** to table the proposal and Steiner **seconded**. Wood said that the SC was not in the proposal-making business, and that a formal proposal needed to be presented to the SC. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **failed** with three in favor and four opposed.

There was additional discussion on the proposal. After some time, the Chair asked Anderson to take over the duties of the Chair, and she agreed. Randall stated that the proposal was a balance of pluses and minuses – if the last day to drop was moved to be commensurate with the last day to add, there would be better utilization of resources and students would have a chance to add a class before it is impossible to catch up. The flip side was that there was an increased likelihood of additional W grades on student transcripts. Anderson returned the responsibilities of the Chair to Randall.

Greissman noted that the issue was one with profound implications for undergraduate students; he suggested that the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mike Mullen should be consulted. Greissman said that it was reasonable for the SC to at least posit the premise that the W grade would be the lesser of two evils, since it would allow an additional day to add after the last day to drop. It was an issue that also involved time to graduation and student success.

SC members directed the Chair to share the minutes from the day's meeting with Mullen and ask that he recommend a direction. Anderson requested that students be included in any decision making.

7. [Dead Week and 400G-/500-Level Classes](#)

The agenda item dealt with the opinion of the SREC chair that it was permissible to give quizzes to graduate students (and not undergraduate students) during Dead Week (DW). Jones elaborated, saying that DW only applied to undergraduate students. Since the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) forced differential grading for undergraduate and graduate students, one way to do so would be to have an exam during DW that did not apply to undergraduate students. Wood opined that graduate students could also make presentations during DW, and Jones thought projects for graduate students were also acceptable. Kirk added that he agreed with the comments.

The Chair agreed to present the comments regarding DW during the next University Senate (Senate) meeting.

2. [Steiner Report on Senate Committees](#)

The Chair noted that since the motion was not from a committee, it would require a second. The Chair read the language of the motion that began on the first page of Steiner's report.

1. Towards the end of the spring semester, the Senate should identify issues of importance for consideration for the following academic year. (The reports of the Senate committees as to their findings and recommendations should be a valuable component in this process.)
2. At the summer Faculty Council retreat, the above issues, as well as any other relevant issues should be discussed and specific issues, requiring consideration and action should be identified. On the basis of the specific issues identified, charges for the appropriate Senate committees should be drafted. Each committee's charges should include a projected timetable for the committee's dealing with its charges, provision of timely updates and specified date of submission of a final report (or interim report) for each charge to the Faculty Senate.
3. These draft charges should be circulated to the faculty at the beginning of the fall semester, with a request for faculty comments and suggestions.
4. Soon after the draft charges have been circulated (e.g., 10 days), the Senate Council should meet with the chairs of all the standing Senate committees, and finalize the charges.

The above timetable should not preclude the addition to or modification of charges, based on new developments or situations, as the academic year proceeds.

Steiner **moved** thusly, and Wood **seconded**. Steiner offered additional information about his proposal, saying that he had heard numerous comments over the years about the top-heavy nature of UK's administration. Steiner said that there was little sensitivity for faculty, and that the Senate had committees that should put forward suggestions regarding building priorities, but did not. Although the Senate could not make final decisions, it could certainly publicize issues and speak out with the support of reports from Senate committees. Steiner expressed great concern at the lack of regard for undergraduate education at UK, citing the lack of new buildings for basic sciences or statistics and the increasing student-to-faculty ratio.

Greissman said that he respected Steiner's opinion, yet was concerned that Steiner's comments illustrated how the investments in undergraduate education made in the past three years had been badly communicated. SC members largely agreed that the Senate should address major issues and offer the input it is authorized to give. Greissman asked that the Senate also consider how it should be represented when urgent issues arose during the summer that should receive faculty input.

Wood **offered a friendly amendment** that the Provost and other administrators be contacted to help identify current and future issues. The Chair commented that while the motion on the table was clear in its intent, it was very wordy and somewhat nonspecific. He suggested that the motion be tabled to allow time to hone the language of the motion into something more succinct. Steiner suggested that SC member send their suggestions to help tighten it, and he would work on it based on input.

Anderson **moved** that the motion be tabled for three weeks, and Ford **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Proposal on Senate's Institutional Finance and Resource Allocation Committee

The Chair introduced Holly Clark (Staff Senate administrative assistant) and Bryan Back (chair of the Staff Senate). It was explained that the Senate's Institutional Finance and Resource Allocation Committee (SIFRAC) was a joint committee with the Staff Senate, and that it reported jointly to both and dealt with issues pertaining to the University's finances.

SC members then discussed the proposed language relating to the charge for SIFRAC with Guests Back and Clark, and offered a variety of suggestions to the language. Clark said that she would revise the language and return it to the SC for additional review.

8. Cliff Vesting

Yanarella led SC members in a discussion regarding the proposed cliff vesting. A motion was **made** and **seconded**, and there was no further discussion. A **vote** was taken and there were three in favor and three against. To break the tie, the Chair voted in the affirmative to table, so the motion to table **passed** with four in favor and three opposed.

The meeting was adjourned after 5:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Dave Randall,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Ford, Kelly, Kirk, Rohr, Randall, Steiner, Swanson, Wood and Yanarella.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guests present: Mike Adams, Bryan Back, Holly Clark, Matthew Deffendall, Jacquie Hager, Davy Jones, Mike Mullen, Mike Shanks and Joe Sottile.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on November 16, 2009.