

Senate Council  
February 1, 2016

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, February 1, 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 Andrew Hippisley called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:00 pm.

1. Minutes from January 25, 2016 and Announcements

The Chair explained that he received a request to add language to the minutes, which would record a request for Guest Mary Vosevich to share the comments that SC made during Vosevich's presentation on the Campus Core Revitalization. As yet, however, Ms. Brothers was unable to verify when the statement was made. Wilson suggested that in the interim, the Chair convey the comments to Provost Tim Tracy and Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration Eric Monday. The Chair said that would convey the message and that meeting's minutes would be ready for review at the next SC meeting.

Turning to the newest member, the Chair introduced SC student member Armanee Doyle, who replaced Michelle Rueff. Those present introduced themselves.

The Chair commented that he had been invited to attend the faculty meeting of the Gatton College of Business and Economics when they discussed the creation of the John H. Schnatter Institute for the Study of Free Enterprise. The Chair said Dean David Blackwell gave a presentation to faculty, followed by about 30 minutes of Q&A. A vote was taken by secret ballot, with added space for comments.

Faculty Trustees Wilson and Grossman offered a brief update on the steep cuts to college and university budgets proposed by the governor.

2. Old Business

a. Chairs in Senate (From 2014 and 2015 Retreat Discussions)

The Chair explained that the issue of allowing department chairs in the University Senate (Senate) had come up during the last two SC retreats in 2014 and 2015. He offered some background information on the issue.

SC members discussed the issue at length, some speaking in favor and others speaking against. Below are representative comments.

"Pro" department chairs in Senate:

- It is a "University" Senate, not a "faculty" senate and it makes sense to include stakeholders.
- Chairs who are engaged in faculty governance are often offended by their exclusion from Senate.
- Chairs are the only campus administrative voice not represented in Senate.
- SC should argue for inclusion, particularly because the faculty already have an established majority in the Senate.
- Chairs are governed by the academic policy promulgated by the Senate, yet have no opportunity for input.

"Con" department chairs in Senate:

Senate Council  
February 1, 2016

- Nothing prevents department chairs from attending Senate meetings or being appointed to committees.
- By state law, department chairs can never be elected faculty representatives or vote on degree lists.
- There is no faculty senate, so SC should preserve the role of rank-and-file faculty as much as possible.
- Some chairs could be good members of Senate, but they are also represented in Senate by their deans.
- A chair can serve in Senate after their chair term is over.
- *Governing Regulation IV* (“The University Senate”) would need to be changed if chairs were allowed in Senate; it could be dangerous to open that up for discussion, in case faculty prerogatives begin to be opened up for discussion by higher administration and/or the Board of Trustees.
- If a faculty member wants to serve in Senate, they are free to decline to serve as chair.

Additional comments regarding department chairs in Senate:

- There are some colleges and units where the model seems to be more of an “administrator-for-life” department head system, as opposed to the more common and predominant structure of department chairs who serve two or three terms as chair and then return to the faculty. The units essentially run by department heads make the conversation more difficult.
- The more pertinent issue would be to answer the question, “why are deans allowed in Senate?”
- The only thing preventing chairs from serving in Senate is an interpretation by the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), not an actual vote to disallow chairs by the Senate as a whole.
- Neither the *Governing Regulations* or *Administrative Regulations* outline the specific Senate membership requirements that exclude chairs; so the policy could be changed by simply removing the interpretation in the SRs [SR 1.2.2.1.B] that prohibits chairs from serving.

As discussion wound down, the Chair summarized that there was a complex set of sentiments within SC, but no energy to pursue the question of including chairs in Senate. There were no additional comments or suggestions.

b. Proposed Program Change - MA Classics (Earning a Graduate Certificate by Completing a Master's Degree)

The Chair explained that program changes typically go on web transmittal, but the proposal in question had a couple of issues embedded within it. First, the proposal intends to add two concentrations, one for “Latin and Greek” and the other for “Latin”; the Latin concentration is targeted at teachers. Second, students who enroll in the Latin concentration will have different admissions requirements for students who enroll in the Latin and Greek concentration. Next, one requirement for the Latin concentration is enrolling in and receiving the Graduate Certificate in Latin Studies, which means that the relationship between the master’s degree and the associated graduate certificate is subsumption – everything done in the graduate certificate is subsumed by the master’s degree.

SC members discussed at length the various issues in the proposal. Wood said that only nine hours of coursework from one graduate program can be counted towards another degree program being done at

the same time, but no hours used from a previously earned degree can be used towards another graduate degree. Schroeder added that the current practice was to allow “double dipping” only if the appropriate forms are filled out within the first two semesters. Wood **moved** to send the MA Classics proposal to the Senate's Academic Programs Committee to help determine if the proposed changes rise to the level of a new degree program. Grossman **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Schroeder commented that the proposal did not truly belong in the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) because there were two issues as yet not discussed. First, the issue of earning a graduate certificate by virtue of completing a master's degree has not been resolved, as the SREC has not yet returned to SC with an answer for that question. Schroeder commented that SAPC has seen three such proposals this year and committee members are tired of waiting for SREC guidance. Secondly, if SAPC is to be involved in reviewing program changes, the SACS-COC (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges) definition of major program changes should be utilized. Every program change proposal includes paperwork to determine if a change is truly a change or if a change actually creates a new degree program. Schroeder commented that if the program change forms required documentation of communication with UK's liaison to the Council on Postsecondary Education, who also is knowledgeable about SACS-COC policies regarding program changes versus new programs, it might flesh out sufficient information to guide the approval process at UK (program change route, or new program route).

Discussion then turned to the matter of earning a graduate certificate by virtue of completing a master's degree. Wood suggested giving the issue to the Graduate Council so that body could deliberate and report back to SC on what should be the relationship between a graduate degree (master's or doctoral) and a graduate certificate. There were no objections so the Chair said he would contact the Graduate Council.

### 3. Committee Reports

#### a. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) - Scott Yost, Chair

##### i. Excused Absences vs Unexcused Absences: Contradiction in *Senate Rules 5.2.4.2*

Guest Scott Yost, chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), explained the changes to the proposal since SC last saw it. One issue pertained to documented disabilities and reasonable accommodations. Yost explained that federal law trumps anything in the SRs and UK has procedures for addressing documented disabilities, through the Disability Resource Center. Because of that, there was little support for adding an “out” clause in cases of documented disability, although there was support in the SAASC for including in the SRs (likely at the beginning of the document) a statement acknowledging federal laws governing disabilities and reasonable accommodations.

There was extensive discussion and questions among SC members, Yost, and Guest Michael Healy, the academic ombud. Guest David Beach, director of the Disability Resource Center, also participated. Healy and Yost supported continued use of “petition for” a W instead of “receive.” Brown spoke in favor of “receive,” noting that a student should not have to ask permission, but rather have that unalienable right to receive.

Brown **moved** to amend the language of the proposal as follows<sup>1</sup>:

---

<sup>1</sup> Underline formatting denotes added text; strikethrough indicates deleted text.

Senate Council  
February 1, 2016

Excused Absences: If a student has excused absences in excess of one-fifth of the class contact hours for that course (participation activities for an online courses, as defined in 5.2.4.1 A), the student shall have the right to ~~petition for~~ receive a "W", or the Instructor of Record may award an "I" for the course if the student declines to ~~petition for~~ receive a "W."

Wood **seconded**. Discussion continued; Healy and Yost expressed concern about the amendment, saying that a W is only granted in certain circumstances. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with five in favor and two opposed.

Grossman **moved** to strike the sentence beginning, "If the course syllabus defines either policies...." as well as the new paragraph on excused absences. Wilson **seconded**. Grossman said the entire section was confusing. SC members discussed the motion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **failed** with none in favor.

Yost commented that the distance-learning related changes to *SR 5.2.4.1* were not under discussion, but rather he wanted SC to know they were in the first steps of identifying appropriate wording to define what attendance means for distance learning classes. The Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLLeL) will need to finalize the language.

The Chair noted that the **motion** to approve the proposed (and amended) changes to *SR 5.2.4.2* came from the SAASC, so no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and two abstentions.

ii. Proposed Changes to Senate Rules 6.3.1 ("Plagiarism")

Yost explained the proposed changes. The **motion** from SAASC was to approve the proposed changes to *SR 6.3.1* ("Plagiarism"). Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. SC members and Yost agreed that the phrase "instructor of record" should be used in place of "faculty of record."

Wood **moved** to amend the language to remove "or that person's designee" and Brown **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

A **vote** on the amended motion was taken and the motion **passed** with one opposed.

iii. Standard of Evidence in Academic Offenses (Proposed Changes to Senate Rules 6.3 ("Academic Offenses and Procedures"))

Yost explained the proposal. The Chair noted that the **motion** to approve the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 6.3* ("Academic Offenses and Procedures") came from committee, so no **second** was required.

Mazur read a comment from one of the SC's student members, as the student members had had to leave prior to the discussion. There were concerns about voting on such a proposal without having students present. Brown **moved** to table the proposal until the following meeting, when students would be present, and Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Tentative Senate Agenda for February 8, 2016

Senate Council  
February 1, 2016

At the Chair's request, Grossman **moved** to add a presentation on the budget situation to the tentative Senate agenda and Kraemer **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Wood asked if the meeting could continue so the SREC's agenda item could also be on the February Senate meeting agenda.

b. Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) - Connie Wood, Chair

i. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 1.4.4.2.B* ("Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure (SACPT)")

Wood, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), explained the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 1.4.4.2.B* ("Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure (SACPT).") There were a couple questions. The Chair said that the **motion** on the floor was to approve the proposed changes to *SR 1.4.4.2.B*. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Wood **moved** to approve the tentative Senate agenda and Brown **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:22 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Hippisley,  
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bailey, Blonder, Brown, Doyle, Gower, Grossman, Hippisley, Kraemer, Mazur, Mullen, Schroeder, Wilson, and Wood.

Invited guests present: David Beach, Michael Healy, Ben Withers, and Scott Yost.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, February 8, 2016.