

Senate Council
August 22, 2016

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, August 22, 2016 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Katherine M. McCormick called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:04 pm.

The Chair welcomed new SC member Mark Lauersdorf (AS/Linguistics). The Chair commented that this was a result of Kraemer having to step down due to his having been appointed interim assistant provost for academic enrichment. Those present introduced themselves to Lauersdorf.

1. Minutes from August 15, 2016 and Announcements

The Chair announced that due to new commitments, Kraemer was not able to attend the day's SC meeting and could not give the planned update on the Provost's area reorganization.

Wood **moved** to approve the SC minutes from August 15, 2016 and Blonder **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair offered a variety of announcements.

- On behalf of SC and University Senate (Senate), the Chair approved the addition of students DH-71 and SH-54 to the May 2016 degree list
- The Chair approved changes to the Pharmacy 2016-17 calendar on behalf of SC and Senate, to add a reference to first-year students' exam dates.
- The Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) has an interest in the inventory of UK's various degree titles. Someone from the Registrar's office will be attending a SC meeting in September to explain more to SC members about the CPE's request.
- The Chair asked SC members for guidance about what type of stakeholder vetting needs to be done regarding the syllabus proposal from the College of Arts and Sciences' Educational Policy Committee.

There were a variety of comments from SC members. Among those members expressing an opinion, SC members agreed that input from the Senate's academic councils was most important; input from college faculty councils and from associate deans was informative, but not critical.

Many SC members expressed a desire for a campuswide syllabus repository that students and faculty could easily peruse.

- The Undergraduate Council met last week and reviewed the Arts and Sciences' syllabus proposal, among other things. The UC is already taking steps to standardize its review of syllabi attached to course proposals.

2. Request to Waive *Senate Rules 5.2.4.8.1* ("Common Examinations") for CHE 532-001

Grossman explained his request. Wood **moved** to approve Grossman's request to waive *Senate Rules 5.2.4.8.1* ("Common Examinations") for CHE 532-001 for fall 2016 and Brown **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Teacher-Course Evaluation (TCE) Implementation: Two Questions

The Chair explained that there were two issues that Provost Tim Tracy asked for additional guidance on:

- Penalty for not submitting TCE – Senate voted not to delay release of grades. Does this mean there is no penalty for not submitting a TCE, or does it mean Senate rejected a delay of grade release but another penalty is possible?

Wood noted that the *Senate Rules* prohibited the awarding a grade based on anything other than course performance, so there could be no academic penalty. Grossman commented that the Senate's discussion focused on penalties, but the Provost could offer an incentive without Senate weighing in on the matter again. A couple SC members mentioned that instructors could provide in-class time for students to fill out TCEs, but that instructors themselves were prohibited from offering any other inducement for students to submit TCEs.

- TCE window – the Senate vote rejected amendments that would have changed the TCE window. Does this mean that the window for TCE is unchanged from previous years or does it mean Senate rejected the proposed changes but that other windows are possible?

SC members opined that the assumption among senators was that if they did not change the window during the TCE discussion, the TCE window remained the same as in the past.

The Chair said she would pass the information on to the Provost, noting that she had concurred with the Provost's suggestion that Senate partner with the Office of Faculty Advancement and with the Center for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching on how to implement the TCE changes.

The Chair explained again that Kraemer could not attend and would therefore be unable to give a presentation on the Provost's area reorganizations.

4. Update on Provost's Area Reorganization – Phil Kraemer

SC members discussed a variety of issues in the remaining time.

SC suggested the Chair touch base with the Office for Faculty Advancement regarding an amorphous statement requiring faculty to hold at least four hours of office hours weekly. SC would like to know in advance the other issues that Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement G. T. Lineberry plans to share with deans and associate deans.

SC members remained deeply concerned about how *Administrative Regulations 6:2* ("Policy and Procedures for Addressing and Resolving Allegations of Sexual Assault, Stalking, Dating Violence, and Domestic Violence") was not vetted in accordance with UK's own regulation review policy (*Administrative Regulations 1:6*, "Formulation and Issuance of University Governing Regulations and Administrative Regulations"). Not only were the University Senate and Senate Council not consulted, neither were the Staff Senate nor the Student Government Association. While *AR 1:6* gives senior

Senate Council
August 22, 2016

leadership the ability to create interim regulations, *AR 1:6* also explicitly describes how an interim regulation must be vetted within a year of being instituted.

SC members opted for a call to senators for self-nominations to serve on the ad hoc review committee for the staff, students and faculty representative bodies [as voted on by the SC at its June 17 meeting] to provide official input into the existing *AR 6:2*. SC members also saw a second, related issue, that of senior leadership doing a better job of meeting the spirit of shared governance and being more inclusive in decisions that affect faculty, in particular. SC members concurred that the content issues should be given to the ad hoc committee, but that the lack of collegiality demonstrated by senior leadership was something that should be left to the SC as a whole, or to the SC chair. Wood commented that it was particularly not collaborative given that language rejected by the [2014-15] Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Disciplinary Action regarding disciplinary policies somehow found its way into the appendix of *AR 6:2*.

There was some discussion regarding the possibility that someone disciplined under *AR 6:2* could appeal the disciplinary action to a court of law under the justification that the regulation was invalid because it was obviously not vetted in accordance with UK's own policies.

The Chair commented that SC was engaging in a substantive discussion about something that was not on the agenda. She suggested that she put *AR 6:2* on the next agenda so SC could officially have a discussion and move any motions that may be appropriate.

Given that there was no further business to attend to, Blonder **moved** to adjourn and Wood **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 4:12 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine M. McCormick,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bailey, Blonder, Brown, Grossman, Lauersdorf, McCormick, Porter, and Wood.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, August 23, 2016.