

Senate Council
October 15, 2018

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, October 15, 2018 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 Vice Chair Jennifer Osterhage called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:03 pm. The Vice Chair suggested that SC members and guests introduce themselves. Wood asked if quorum was present and the Vice Chair affirmed that a quorum was present, with seven voting members present.

The Vice Chair explained that the Chair, Jennifer Bird-Pollan, was at a conference and unavailable, so the Vice Chair was filling in for the day.

1. Minutes from October 1, 2018 and Announcements

The Vice Chair said that no comments had been received for the minutes from October 1. There being no objections, the minutes from October 1, 2018 were approved as distributed by unanimous consent. There were no announcements.

Due to the presence of invited guests, the Vice Chair suggested that the agenda be rearranged to move to Committee Reports. There were no objections from SC members. The Vice Chair further noted that one of the committee chairs had not yet arrived, so suggested moving to the report from the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC). There were no objections.

3. Committee Reports

b. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) – Aaron Cramer

i. Proposed New BA in African American and Africana Studies

Guest Aaron Cramer (EN/Electrical and Computer Engineering), chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), described the proposal. The Vice Chair solicited questions of fact from SC members and requested that Cramer and Guest Anna Bosch (AS/Linguistics, associate dean for undergraduate programs) respond.

Grossman wondered why such a proposal had not come forward before and expressed support for it. Spear asked about the form and said that he was able to find similar programs at other SEC schools, but he wondered why the question pertaining to whether or not the proposed new degree program was offered at other schools was answered with “no.” [Q13k] “Are there similar programs in other Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) states in the nation?” Bosch responded that she was not sure about the answer to that specific question, but that she would be happy to find out the answer. She agreed that the program was common at large institutions. Grossman asked about the inclusion in the faculty of record of a faculty member who had recently left UK. Bosch said the edit could be made and sent in.

The Vice Chair asked if there were further questions of fact, but there were none. The Vice Chair stated that the **motion** on the floor was a recommendation from the SAPC that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new BA degree in African American and Africana Studies, in the College of Arts and Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. The Vice Chair asked if there was debate on the proposal. Hamilton expressed support for the proposal, saying that it was long overdue and that many students would be excited to see it. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

a. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) – Herman Farrell, Chair

i. Proposed Change to BS Digital Media and Design

Guest Herman Farrell (FA/Theatre and Dance, chair of Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC)), explained the proposal. The Vice Chair solicited questions of fact from SC members and requested that Farrell and Guest Rob Jensen (FA/Art and Visual Studies, school director) respond, but there were no questions.

The Vice Chair then stated that the **motion** on the floor was a recommendation to approve the proposal from the College of Fine Arts, School of Art & Visual Studies, BS Digital Media and Design program involving a name change, a change to a GCCR course, change to total credit hours, a change to the outside concentration requirement and the addition of entrance requirements for the program. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. The Vice Chair asked if there was debate on the proposal and there was none. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Vice Chair returned to "Old Business."

2. Old Business

a. Possible Charge to Senate's Committee on Committees

The Vice Chair explained that when the Chair reviewed the *Senate Rules (SRs)* regarding the committee charges, structure, etc. of the Senate (Senate), it was not clear why some committees must be chaired by, and comprised of a majority of faculty senators, and why other committees did not have that same restriction. For example, she said that some were charged by the *SRs* with responsibilities that are actually carried out by an administrative office. She said that the agenda item was a request from the Chair that the issue be reviewed, specifically by the Committee on Committees.

In response to a question from Wood, the Vice Chair explained that the request was coming to SC because the *SR* language describing the charge to the Senate's Committee on Committees did not include reviewing the Senate's committee structure. Wood opined that the recommended language was too prescriptive and suggested a simpler approach.

Grossman **moved** that the SC ask the Senate's Committee on Committees (SCC) to review the committee structure of the Senate, and specifically look at the roles of senators versus non-senators in terms of membership and chairing committees and to gather input from different committees in formulating any recommendations. Grossman responded to a comment from Wood by suggesting that the questions originally associated with the recommended motion could be provided to the SCC without including them in the motion. Wood **seconded**. The Vice Chair noted that the SCC was chaired by the SC chair. There was no further discussion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

c. Request to SREC for Codification of Calendar-Related Changes

i. Single Summer Session

ii. "New" Fall Break (Approved by Senate on April 23, 2018)

iii. Winter Intersession (Approved by Senate on September 13, 2010)

The Vice Chair explained that the recommendation from the Chair was to codify what SC has expressed that it believes Senate has done, specifically having approved the implementation of a single summer session, not just a pilot. She noted that Ms. Brothers sent out a detailed timeline of all discussions by SC and Senate about the single summer session and further explained that after a lot of email discussion among SC members, it seemed somewhat apparent that the Senate's action regarding a single summer session was not a pilot, but was approval of its implementation. The Vice Chair noted that SC members had been provided with a recommended motion, but said any similar motion was welcome.

Grossman **moved** that the SC affirm that the action taken by the University Senate on May 2, 2016 was to approve the implementation of a single summer session. Hamilton **seconded**. In response to a question from Brion, Provost's Liaison Turner explained that this past summer was the first time the single summer session had been implemented/offered and her sense was that people were happy with it. She clarified that she had not heard any complaints about it, noting that the change gave faculty complete freedom to structure courses as they liked.

Hamilton asked for additional information about why the motion was needed. The Vice Chair explained that there was language in the proposal for a single summer session regarding adding flexibility to the summer schedule as a first step in increasing the overall flexibility of the academic calendar. She said that it seemed that after some discussions, many were of the opinion that the single summer session was not a pilot, but rather the single summer session was one way in which to add general flexibility to the academic schedule. Wood added that someone had questioned whether it was a pilot or not, so the motion would be providing clarification.

There was additional discussion among SC members. Wood noted that the meeting minutes of the pertinent Senate meeting did not include any reference to a "pilot." Brion wondered how the SC's action would be reported to the Senate. Wood suggested that the alternative to approving the motion would be to put an interpretation into the SRs. She asked Senate Parliamentarian Douglas Michael to clarify rules relating to changing meeting minutes. Michael replied that the minutes could not be changed, but rather a new action would need to be taken.

The Vice Chair reminded SC members that the motion would affirm that the Senate's action was to approve implementation of a single summer session, not a pilot. Grossman suggested that the Senate could simply be informed that a question was raised, the SC reviewed the available information, and it came to the conclusion that the proposal was discussed and voted on by Senate as a permanent change. If anyone is present and remembers differently, then the Chair can moderate that discussion, although he suggested that it was unlikely anyone would raise an objection. Further, it would be an additional opportunity to publicize the change to a single summer session.

There was no further discussion. The Vice Chair asked if there was further discussion on the motion that the SC affirm that the action taken by the University Senate on May 2, 2016 was to approve the implementation of a single summer session. A vote was taken and the motion passed with none opposed.

The Vice Chair then turned to the second recommended motion, that the SC request the SREC codify the single summer session-related change(s) in the Senate Rules, paying special attention to whether or not single summer session-related change affect other sections of the SRs when drafting changes for SC and Senate approval. After brief discussion, Grossman **moved** that the SC charge the SREC with updating the SRs, particularly *Section 2.0* ("Rules Relating To Calendar"), to reflect the implementation of a single summer session. There was brief discussion about the wording of the motion and Brion **seconded**. SC members discussed the possibility of combining all the calendar-related actions into one motion. The Vice Chair noted that one aspect of the recommended motion included a request to differentiate between the two existing fall academic holidays. Grossman **moved to amend** his motion to include references to the new fall break and the winter intersession. Brion **agreed** to the amended motion. Parliamentarian Michael noted that unanimous consent of those present was required to change a

motion. The Vice Chair solicited input but there were no objections. A **vote** was taken and the motion to amend **passed** with none opposed.

The Vice Chair stated that the **amended motion** was that the SC charge the SREC with updating the *SRs*, particularly *Section 2.0* (“Rules Relating To Calendar”), to reflect the implementation of a single summer session, the new fall break, and winter intersession. The Vice Chair asked if having the SREC address the matter of two differently dated holidays (both being potentially referred to as “fall break” in the *SRs*) needed to be included in the motion. In response to a question from Grossman, Ms. Brothers explained that, in contrast, the draft official University calendar for 2019-20 was currently written to refer to the Wednesday before Thanksgiving as an “academic holiday” but the time off in October would be “fall break.” Grossman said that the terminology issue could be part of the SREC’s work.

A **vote** was taken on the amended motion to charge the SREC with updating the *SRs*, particularly *Section 2.0* (“Rules Relating To Calendar”), to reflect the implementation of a single summer session, the new fall break, and winter intersession. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Senate Meeting Roundtable

The Vice Chair solicited comments from SC members about the October 8 Senate meeting. Below are various comments.

- It was brief.
- The Provost’s presentation was nice.
- The report from the chair of the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee (SRWAC) made it logical to think about the rationale behind some of the *SR* language related to the review of *RWAs*, especially in regards to how the language affected the size of the SRWAC’s workload. There was quite a bit of discussion regarding possible changes to the *SRs* that describe *RWA*-related activities, including the repeat option. On a related note, Past Chair McCormick added that it was possible SC could see a proposal in the near future regarding which grades (including those earned prior to utilizing a repeat option) should be included in the GPA.

5. Items from the Floor (Time Permitting)

Grossman asked for an update on the subject of undergraduate students taking undergraduate certificate programs without being in a degree seeking status. He noted that this sort of theme could address the theme of capturing more students and revenue that appeared in various presentations from leadership, including from Provost Blackwell at the recent Senate meeting. The Vice Chair asked Guest Annie Davis Weber, assistant provost for strategic planning and institutional effectiveness, to respond and Weber said that the issue was under review by the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) and was scheduled to be discussed in the very near future. There was brief discussion about requirements for enrollment in graduate certificates and transferring credits.

Blonder **moved** to adjourn and Hamilton **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 3:54 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Jennifer Osterhage,
Senate Council Vice Chair

Senate Council
October 15, 2018

SC members present: Blonder, Brion, Grossman, Hamilton, Osterhage, Spear, Walker, and Wood.

Invited guests present: Anna Bosch, Aaron Cramer, Herman Farrell, Robert Jensen, and Annie Davis Weber.

Provost's Liaison present: Turner.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, October 17, 2018.