

Senate Council
November 26, 2012

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, November 26, 2012 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Lee X. Blonder called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:04 pm.

1. Minutes from November 19 and Announcements

The Chair reported that the minutes were not ready for review. She had a few announcements. First, the Chair invited President Capilouto to the December University Senate (Senate) meeting. The President will arrive at 3 pm and will speak briefly before taking questions.

The Chair suggested SC members make a few decisions regarding the election process for SC officers (chair and vice chair). The Chair noted that Davy Jones, Chair of Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, had sent out an email to senators listing those eligible to serve as SC chair on November 21; he asked that nominations be sent to him by 3 pm November 28. The Chair then read the names of the individuals eligible to be nominated and elected to the position of chair:

- Debra Anderson
- Lee Blonder
- Gail Brion
- Mark Coyne
- Elizabeth Debski
- Robert Grossman
- Katherine McCormick
- David Pienkowski
- Greg Wasilkowski
- Connie Wood

The chair noted that if there is more than one nominee who is willing to serve, the next step is to give nominees the opportunity to write an election statement that will be distributed to faculty senators by Monday, December 3 (two weeks before the election which will take place on Monday, December 17). Senators will also be asked for comments on the nominees.

SC members discussed how the election for the chair should proceed. There were no objections to having Davy Jones, receive and de-identify the comments and share them with SC members prior to voting for the chair during the regular meeting on December 17.

Grossman nominated Chair Blonder for the position of chair. Other SC members supported the nomination.

The Chair then read the names of those SC members eligible to be elected to the position of vice chair.

- Debra Anderson
- Gail Brion

- Elizabeth Debski
- David Pienkowski
- Greg Wasilkowski
- Connie Wood

SC members next discussed how the election for the vice chair should be conducted. There were no objections to having those eligible notify Jones of their interest or lack thereof. Jones will notify the rest of the SC about which eligible members are willing to serve. The election for Vice Chair will take place at the regular SC meeting on December 17.

The Chair said that the SC can go into closed session for discussions about voting, but final tallies must be announced in open session. She said that Jones and Ms. Brothers will count the ballots. The Chair further explained that the meeting on December 17 will be the last SC meeting of the year. The SC terms for Marc Coyne, Robert Grossman and Katherine McCormick will end December 31.

The Chair noted that discussion on agenda item number six was postponed due to illness.

2. Old Business

a. Faculty Response to Budget Cuts

The Chair said she was not sure if there needed to be any more discussion regarding budget cuts. No one present indicated a desire to continue discussion on the topic.

On a related note, Wood commented that she spent a morning recently comparing the slides from Interim Provost Tim Tracy's recent presentation to the Senate to the slides from President Capilouto's presentation to the Senate in May. She said that they were identical with respect to assumptions made about the 2013 budget. The new, decreased budget cuts were based on \$12million of found money. Wood said that although she tried, she could not identify \$12 million – the number she came up with was \$8.4 million in increased tuition revenues, a difference of about \$4 million. There was brief discussion among SC members. Those present agreed to Wood working with the Chair to send an email to Provost Tracy asking for additional information.

b. Proposed New Standing Senate Committee: Senate Advisory Committee on Disability Accommodation and Compliance

Provost's Liaison Greissman explained that the SC had previously had a question about whether students, or students and faculty, could approach the proposed new Senate Advisory Committee on Disability Accommodation and Compliance (SACDAC) for assistance. The decision was made to limit it to students for now, since there should be other forums through which faculty with disabilities can be helped. Another change to the draft charge involved language that seemed to suggest that SACDAC's responsibilities might have usurped the Office of Institutional Equity's role as the official agency to the federal government. The language was tweaked to clarify that SACDAC would be involved with how educational policy is applied.

Guest Davy Jones asked to whom SACDAC would render advisory opinions, which was a change from rendering decisions. After Greissman offered an explanation, Jones asked if SACDAC's recommendations could be ignored, given the revised language of the draft charge. Greissman indicated that the SC could give SACDAC more adjudicating authority if it so desired. Jones commented that the Senate must make the final decision on educational policy.

After very brief discussion, Grossman **moved** to change the language from “advisory opinions” to “decisions.” Debski **seconded**. Debski suggested including a change from “educational policies and practices for disability accommodation” to “educational policies as they relate to practices for disability accommodation.” Grossman **accepted** that amendment. There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair asked SC members if the proposed language was ready for review by the Senate. Grossman **moved** that the SC recommend to the Senate that it approve the addition of the language regarding the proposed new standing committee (see Appendix 1) “Senate's Advisory Committee on Disability Accommodation and Compliance (SACDAC)” to the Senate Rules in a place to be determined by the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee. Brion **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC)

i. Codification of Senate Policies on UK Core into *Senate Rules*

Jones explained that when the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) revised and updated the new version of the *Senate Rules (SR)*, it recognized that the curricular content of the University Studies Program (old general education program) was null and void due to the Senate having replaced it with UK Core. The SREC did not feel equipped to provide language that codifies the academic content of UK Core into the *SR*. Jones added that Ruth Beattie, chair of the UK Core Education Committee (UKCEC), reported that she and the rest of the committee were ready to accept a charge of drafting language for review and then insertion into the *SR*. Grossman **moved** that UKCEC be charged with drafting language for review and then insertion into the *SR*. Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Unclear Senate Policy on Graduate Writing Requirement

Jones said that there were still clarifications that needed to be made regarding the Graduation Writing Requirement (GWR). Guest and Interim Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Ben Withers explained that the GWR is not part of UK Core, but is potentially tied to it; the GWR should be a link between the writing requirements of UK Core with advanced writing courses. The *Senate Rules* refer to a writing requirement and includes reference to the GWR; he suggested working together to align the two with the GWR that is still in effect. When UK Core was implemented, the required writing requirement course (ENG 104) that had been part of the University Studies Program (USP) was no longer offered. He clarified that there is a freshman writing requirement, a graduation writing requirement, and a question about how those two things are affected now that UK Core has been implemented without a change to corresponding language in the *Senate Rules* regarding the freshman writing requirement, the GWR pilot has been ended without plans to continue although discussions are approaching final resolution, and that the *Senate Rules* outline processes and requirements that are no longer adhered to. This is also causing confusion among students, advisors and others.

There was extensive and wide-ranging discussion among SC members and the invited guests (College of Arts and Sciences Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs Anna Bosch; SREC Chair Davy Jones, and Interim Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Ben Withers). SC members asked many questions, particularly about the dates when various activities/requirements began and ended.

Grossman commented that they were in a position where the Senate has rules that require courses that are not being offered, so students cannot graduate. In addition, a pilot program was used as a substitute

for formal *SR* language, and the pilot was subsequently terminated. Grossman **moved** that the rules of the Graduation Writing Requirement remain in effect until the University acts otherwise. Brion **seconded**. After additional discussion, Wood **offered a friendly amendment** to add “and that the current courses that were approved during the pilot program serve to satisfy the Graduation Writing Requirement for those students who matriculated up and through fall 2012. Grossman **accepted**. After brief discussion, Grossman **offered a substitute motion** that the courses listed in APEX as satisfying the Graduation Writing Requirement (GWR) will continue to satisfy the GWR for all students who matriculated since 2004, until the Senate acts otherwise. Pienkowski **offered a friendly amendment** that the motion applies to undergraduate students. Grossman **accepted**.

A **vote** was taken on the **motion** that the courses listed in APEX as satisfying the Graduation Writing Requirement (GWR) will continue to satisfy the GWR for all undergraduate students who matriculated since 2004, until the Senate acts otherwise. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

It was agreed that Withers will return to SC with historical GWR information for future discussions on the GWR.

Jones suggested he deal with the item on the I grade, so he could more likely be able to leave while the SC discussed the other item. There were no objections.

iv. Reference to Nonexistent Form in *Senate Rules 5.1.3.2* ("Grade I")

Jones explained that the Registrar informed the SREC that the form previously required for an I grade was no longer used – the process is completely electronic. The information on the I grade collected on the form was helpful, particularly notes about why the student was given an I. The *SR* are also out of date. The SREC recommends that the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee examine the matter and recommend if an electronic form should be created and what data should be created.

Grossman **moved** that the SC submit the question of the now-nonexistent I form use to the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) and direct the SAASC to examine if an electronic form should be created and what data should be collected. Brion **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iii. Unclear Senate Policy on Foreign Language Admissions Requirement

Jones said that the issue was analogous to the ambiguity of the Graduation Writing Requirement – there are various contradictions that exist between the language in the *SR* and what the UK Core documentation asserted the *SR* said about the status of having foreign language as an admissions requirement. He said it was way beyond the SREC's ability to define the intent, but invited, with the assistance of the associate provost, a clarification to present to the Senate that presents an action item on what the foreign language requirement is for admissions. There was extensive discussion among those present, including Withers and Guests Associate Provost for International Programs Susan Carvalho and Arts and Sciences Associate Dean Anna Bosch.

Wood **moved** that the matter be sent back to the UK Core Education Committee (UKCEC) for clarification and proposed language for both the Bulletin and the *Senate Rules*, with the suggestion that the discussion in UKCEC be led by Susan Carvalho, with a formal recommendation to the Senate Council by January 21, 2013. Brion **seconded**. There was brief discussion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. UK's December 2012 Degree List

Grossman **moved** that the SC recommend to the Senate that the elected faculty senators approve UK's December 2012 list of candidates for credentials, for submission to the Senate and then through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board.

. Wasilkowski **seconded**. There was brief discussion about not removing students from the degree list. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Academic Calendars

Grossman **moved** that the SC recommend the Senate approve the proposed calendars on pages nine through sixty of the handout: 2013 - 2014 Calendar; 2015 - 2016 Calendar, Tentative; 2013-2014 Dentistry; 2015 - 2016 Dentistry, Tentative; Fall 2013 Law; Spring 2014 Law; Summer I (four-week) 2014 Law; Summer 2014 Law; Fall 2015 Law, Tentative; Spring 2016 Law, Tentative; Summer I (four-week) 2016 Law, Tentative; Summer 2016 Law, Tentative; 2013 - 2014 Medicine; 2015 - 2016 Medicine, Tentative; 2013 - 2014 Pharmacy; 2015 - 2016 Pharmacy, Tentative; 2013 - 2014 Winter Intersession; and 2015 - 2016 Winter Intersession, Tentative. Wasilkowski **seconded**. There was some discussion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair led the SC in discussion about a variety of topics, including inviting President Capilouto, and later Board of Trustees Chair E. Britt Brockman, MD, to a future SC meeting and the University Appeals Board and adherence to parameters in the *Senate Rules*. Grossman reported that the ad hoc Committee on Centers, etc. will meet on Friday to vote and hopefully pass a proposal outlining proposed changes to *Governing Regulations VII*. McCormick reported that the Provost's Committee on Metrics met and approved the values. The committee is working on indicators. There is a possibility that it will continue working past the expected end date in December. The Chair asked SC members to send her nominations for faculty to serve on the advisory committee for Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement G. T. Lineberry.

Grossman **moved** to adjourn and McCormick **seconded**. The motion **passed by unanimous consent**. The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Lee X. Blonder,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Blonder, Brion, Coyne, Debski, Edwards, Grossman, McCormick, Pienkowski, Wasilkowski and Wood.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guests present: Anna Bosch, Karen Badger, Susan Carvalho, Davy Jones and Ben Withers.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, November 28, 2012.

Appendix 1

Senate Advisory Committee
on
Disability Accommodation and Compliance
(SACDAC)

The SACDAC is a standing committee of the University Senate. The voting members of the SACDAC are the Director of the Center for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching (CELT), or that person's designee, and four University Faculty members appointed by the Senate Council. The four University Faculty members shall serve staggered three-year terms. Ex officio, non-voting members of the Committee are the Academic Ombud, the Director of the Disability Resource Center (DRC), a DRC learning specialist, and the Associate Vice President for Institutional Equity or that person's designee. The committee shall be chaired by one of the four appointed University Faculty members. The SACDAC is responsible for recommending educational policy within general guidelines established by the University Senate. The SACDAC is charged to:

1. Recommend to the Senate Council educational policies and implementation practices that appropriately address the accommodations standards stipulated in the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Law and Sections 504/508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 for students who have documented disabilities.
2. Hear and render a decision on issues from faculty members or the DRC pertaining to the implementation of educational policies as they relate to practices for disability accommodation and regulatory compliance.
3. Monitor the alignment between the University Senate's educational policies and federal compliance and accommodation regulations, and recommend educational policy revisions, as warranted.
4. Issue an annual report on the work of the SACDAC for consideration by the Senate Council, the University Senate and the wider University community.