1	UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
2	SENATE COUNCIL MEETING
3	
4	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
5	
6	April 22, 2019
7	
8	* * * * * *
9	
10	JENNIFER OSTERHAGE, CHAIR
11	JOANIE ETTMIMS, SENATE COUNCIL OFFICE
12	DOUG BLACKWELL, PARLIAMENTARIAN
13	BRENDA YANKEY, COURT REPORTER
14	
15	
16	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
17	
18	
19	
20	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Quick adaptation to our new room. This is an okay room. There are no lights at all in the upstairs room. So they said, You can meet there anyway, but I thought maybe you didn't want that. So we're here. I appreciate your flexibility, and I appreciate your flexibility getting here at two o'clock. This is great.

2.1

2.2

If you looked at the agenda, you see why I asked you to start at two o'clock today as senate council voted to do this, so thank you. The other thing that you might notice is that we have -- Sheila Brothers is out on a medical leave for -- probably won't be back before the next senate meeting.

Joanie Ettmims, who also works in the senate council office, is here helping us run the meeting.

This is the first time she's done this -- to a senate meeting. She's been just at a council meeting before. We are in a different space, so I will ask for your participance and patience as we get through this meeting today and your attention and for you to stay as long as you can stay.

So we will, I have very high hopes we will be done by 5:00. Let's see what we can do. So thank you for being here. So quick reminder as we always do about the rules of our meeting, we ask for your

```
participation and also that you report back to your
 1
 2
     colleagues in your own colleges and departments what
 3
     we talk about here today and get their feedback and
 4
     of course we'll follow as always with Robert's Rules
 5
                And we ask you to return the clicker.
 6
     Again, our next senate meeting is actually two weeks
 7
     from today. We have one more before the -- the
 8
     school year ends.
                        So we don't want to have to find
 9
    your clickers.
10
         So we'll start with our attendance slides.
11
     we've asked what movie title describes today's
12
              So let's see if our (laughter) setup is the
1.3
     way we want it just so you can go ahead and vote.
14
     Uh-oh.
             This is what always happens.
15
              MS. ETTMIMS:
                            What happened?
16
              CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                  So somehow it close --
17
     it closed out of the voting before we had a --
18
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:
                                          So we --
19
              CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Yes.
20
              MS. ETTMIMS: All right.
                                        Go ahead.
21
              CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. So go ahead and
2.2
     vote. Well, hold on. We can't vote from this
            So can you advance it one slide, and that
23
     slide.
24
     will --
25
             UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:
                                         Yes.
```

```
CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. Why is it going
 1
    so quickly? Oh, my goodness. All right.
 2
    to redo this with --
 3
             MS. ETTMIMS: Uh-huh.
 4
 5
             CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: And then re -- oh, I
 6
    got it. Okay. Try to vote now. Why is it going
 7
    away?
 8
             MS. ETTMIMS: It's still coming in right
 9
    now.
10
             CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Oh, they are coming in?
11
             MS. ETTMIMS: Yeah.
             CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. Everyone with a
12
13
    clicker, please vote.
14
             MS. ETTMIMS: Oh. Okay. All right.
                                                  I'm
    offline.
15
16
             CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. Oops.
                                               Oh, my
17
    goodness.
18
              MS. ETTMIMS: I am trying --
19
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I think it's
20
21
               CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: No. No. No.
                                                  No.
                                                       Ι
2.2
23
               UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:
                                           It's not you.
24
                CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay.
                                           There we go.
25
    That -- oh, there we go. All right. Great.
                                                  So
```

thank you for being here. And I think we -- those numbers will go up as -- as the hour progresses.

Many people have other obligations to get to. So thank you for being here.

1.3

2.1

2.2

Okay. Our minutes from the March 18th senate meeting were circulated. We actually didn't receive any changes. So unless I hear objections from anyone now — okay. So hearing none, those March 18, 2019, minutes will stand approved, as distributed, by unanimous consent.

I'm very excited about this. We have lots of people in the room and our colleagues across campus who've been recognized for various achievements over the last month. And so I wanted to put these up here now, and many -- in particular, Beth Guiton's award from arts & sciences for promotion of diversity and inclusion.

Remember, she's the chair of our senate advisory committee on diversity and inclusion and was recognized by her college for that. Of course, we have the alumni association, great teachers who are now stuck in class, several current and former senators on that list from lots of our great faculty colleagues.

Also just last week the provost award for

upstanding teaching was announced, and the vice chair of the senate council is a recipient of that award in addition to lots of other fantastic folks.

2.1

2.2

And the teaching assistants who were awarded prizes are also identified on this slide. And then we've also got up here the inclusive excellence awards for 2019, including one of our student senators. And then senate council member Brett Spear was awarded the Sturgill Award in recognition of his support in graduate education.

So please just join me in acknowledging the hard work from a lot of our (applause.) That's always really exciting. So another announcement. Some of you might have heard — those of you who care a lot about Curriculog might have heard that we had — we have been working for almost a year now on integrating our program approval process into Curriculog.

Right now courses are in Curriculog, but — but programs themselves are not, and so those of you who work on our various — on the programs committee or have served on undergraduate or graduate council or health care colleges council have seen this in process, how sometimes clunky it can be to get our programs approved.

So we've been working to try to make that happen to put that whole program approval process into Curriculog as well as including our forms and things like that.

2.2

That has been more complicated than we had originally thought it would be and we've also discovered that the University and the registrar's office are in conversations about purchasing Acalog, which is a program -- I'm not going to go -- I don't know the details, but has -- it's in -- it's related to Curriculog and, therefore, if we have Acalog, Curriculog may be easier to use for this process.

So what we've decided to do is sort of hit pause on the whole process of integrating programs into Curriculog. We're going to work on senate forms over the summer, and then when we come back in the fall and we learn more about the — what the status is with Acalog, we'll make additional decisions about — about that process.

These are our curriculum proposal deadlines for next year. We are past all the curriculum proposals deadlines for 2019, as you could see from this — from today's agenda. If you want Fall 2020 as an effective date, these are the dates that we're talking about, but notice up there at the top we say

these are tentative. These are the -- these are dates that echo the dates we used this year.

2.

2.1

2.2

One of the things that we've always required is that these are the dates that rep -- represent when we expect things to get into the senate council office, but they have to be at the academic councils before then -- sufficiently before then to be remove -- reviewed by either undergraduate, graduate, or a health care college's council.

So what that means is really there's an earlier deadline for those academic councils. So what we're -- we're in the process of discussing with the academic councils what the dates are that they should get to those bodies. If you have feedback about this, we'd be very happy to hear it.

We're going to talk explicitly with the members and chairs of those departments in the meantime. So these are tentative deadlines for now. Obviously, the earlier the better. We don't have to have three-hour senate meetings if some of -- some of our proposers get proposals in earlier.

So we'll be very glad to hear from you whenever you have it. But those are our tentative deadlines for the next calendar year. I wanted to put this up here. So Seth Debolt is here. He's the initial

director of the newly announced Jim B. Beam

Institute for Kentucky Spirts. You might have read
about this in -- on the UK Now or in the local
paper. Last week this -- this new -- new institute
was announced.

1.3

2.2

Part of the reason that I asked Seth to come here — and he was excited to be here — is because I just wanted to clarify some things. So it is called an institute, but it is not an educational unit under all of the rules that we contemplate at the University of Kentucky. So that's why you have not heard about it at the senate. So it's an administrative unit for now.

Seth and I have been in conversations about how to make this into an educational unit, and he's working to put together a proposal which you will likely see next academic year. Davey Jones has volunteered his expertise to help put that proposal together.

So, I think, Seth will happily talk to anybody who has questions about what's going on with the institute. Why you haven't heard about it at the senate? We're -- we're talking to you in particular to sort of say, This is why you haven't heard about it at the senate yet. There was sort of a chicken

and an egg problem about not wanting to get ahead of the announcement of the very generous donation.

So Seth is here.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

We don't really have time for questions for Seth, but he's a very nice guy, and he'll take your questions via email and — and so — so it's very exciting and congratulations to Seth and others for getting this great institute off the ground, and we expect to hear more about it — about the senate next year.

MR. DEBOLT: We also accept free samples.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. Thanks, Seth.

All right. Great. So that's the end of my

announcements.

The next item is the chair's report. So, as you know, the senate rules give senate council authority to make some minor calendar changes as long as we report those to the senate. So we've done a couple of that — a couple items like that over the last month.

In February we approved changes to the 2018-19

-- so this year's calendar -- regarding the window
when majors cannot be changed. And there's a window
every year when students aren't permitted to change
their majors. We slightly adjusted that window at

the request of some folks from across campus.

On March 25th at the senate council meeting, we approved a minor change to the — to this year's calendar for the college of dentistry, which is — specifically we changed the hooding date at the request of the students.

2.

2.1

2.2

We also approved for next year multiple nonstandard calendars for some of the home sciences courses, and these changes all had to do with the fall break and — and these are all classes where students have some obligations off campus so special calendars were sought in order to allow them to keep up with their educational content.

The other thing that we mentioned to you before is that senate council formed last semester an ad hoc committee on academic engagement, which is specifically in response to the Title IV requirements that were implemented this year.

Roger Brown agreed to serve as chair of that committee. Is Roger here? Yes, there he is. Okay. Great.

And so he came and presented both the documents that the committee put together and the specific -- well, some general recommendations to the senate council on April 8th.

Senate council accepted that report, but asked him to -- asked him and his committee to go back and sort of come up with more specific concrete proposals regarding what they think folks around campus should do in response to Title IV.

2.1

2.2.

And so if you're interested in reading their report, which is excellent and very thorough, that's actually posted on the senate council agenda from April 8th.

And Roger and his committee, I think, are continuing to work on items around Title IV, and that's — that's been, I think, a really great collaborative committee that's included faculty representatives but also representatives from the registrar's office. So folks are working together closely on that.

I hope you've seen in your in-box a request to complete the evaluation of the president. Every year the -- the -- well, for the last, I guess, probably six years now that the senate has organized the faculty's evaluations of presidents.

This is a document that gets sent and, once the results are compiled, presented to the board of trustees. Any comments that you put into the survey are read by no one but the president. They're

collaborate -- they're -- they're compiled on a thumb drive and we -- we hand the thumb drive to the president. We don't read them ourselves. But the -- the numerical results are shared with the board of trustees and then posted on the senate's website.

1.3

2.2

As I understand it from the board of trustees, they find this information very helpful. Of course, it's most persuasive if the response rate is high.

So I — please fill the evaluation out yourself and please encourage your faculty colleagues to do so as well.

But I learned the hard way last year, you actually can't forward your own email because the link in there is unique to you. So what you need to do is remind your faculty colleagues to open their own email and click through the link. If anybody loses the link or something like that, please have them reach out to me directly. We can get them back on the list. But people have to sort of log in themselves. And then the deadline for that is May 1st. So the — the survey will be open through May 1st.

I also just wanted to let you know I participated, not just alone but with the chair of the undergraduate council and some other faculty

members and senate participants, in a -- in several meetings between college representatives regarding concerns about new programs and duplication of programs or replication of programs.

2.

2.1

2.2

In particular, the programs committee, through their chair, Aaron Cramer, has asked the senate council to look -- deliberate on this larger question of what we do about proposals that look like they have some duplicate component or have broad names for our disciplinary areas.

So that's an item that sort of -- that we -we expect to consider at the senate council retreat.
But if any of you have feedback that you'd like to
share with senate council either after the retreat
or before the retreat, I'm more than happy to hear
about that and I know members of the programs
committee would be happy to hear additional
information from you as well.

Oh, there is one other announcement. I made a note for myself, but then I missed it. Roger, do you want to make a special announcement from the --

MR. ROGER BROWN: Well, everyone -- a lot of you and maybe every one of you should have received several emails over the past week and particularly today because the election is now complete as of

The new faculty trustee will be Lee noon today. So please join me in the -- (applause). don't see her in here now -- oh, there you are. CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: She has --TRUSTEE BLONDER: Thank you so much. MR. ROGER BROWN: And Lee Blonder. TRUSTEE BLONDER: I really appreciate your support. I'm honored to have the opportunity to I -- I especially want to thank the serve again. other two candidates, Bart Ryan and Chris Boss, for their participation and their service and being so fair in the way it was handled. And I want to thank Roger Brown, who worked tirelessly on the election, as well as Davey Jones, Kavel Tagavi, and Connie Wood, who are on the -- the scrap election subcommittee, and Sheila Brothers, who was instrumental in getting the election up and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

running.

But I'm really honored to be able to do this for three more years. And, please, contact me if there are issues that I'm not aware of that I should be aware of as your faculty trustee. Thank you.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Thanks, Lee. And thanks to you all for participating in that and encouraging your colleagues to participate. I think

we had a pretty good turnout, a turnout we feel pretty happy about. You know, maybe it can be higher in the future, but -- but as always, I think, thanks so much to Lee and others for -- for their service.

2.1

2.2

Okay. So the next item is a provost report.

You don't have to make one if you -- you don't -
PROVOST BLACKWELL: I promised Jennifer to

keep my remarks under 45 minutes -- I meant seconds.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Oh, okay. Okay. Okay.

Okay.

PROVOST BLACKWELL: I real -- really, all I -- all I wanted to do today is to let you know that this is the last senate meeting I'll be able to attend this year because May 6th I'll -- I'll be on a road trip on University business.

That date was out of my control, but I -- I've looked at this agenda today and -- and seen past agendas and I haven't been here long enough to say that this is remarkable, but certainly during my time at UK, the workload that the -- that the councils and the senates -- senate and its process is -- is remarkable from my eyes.

And it reminds -- it reminded me of a lunch that you and I and Katherine McCormick had about -- maybe

```
about a year --
 1
 2
             CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                 Oh --
 3
             PROVOST BLACKWELL: -- ago --
 4
             CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                 -- yeah.
 5
             PROVOST BLACKWELL: -- at Burger Fi when we
 6
     were trying to figure out how in the world are we
 7
     going to get all this stuff through -- through the
     senate to -- to help with our path forward and --
 8
 9
     and just for the -- the growth and innovation we
     need, and I know a lot of hours -- a lot of hours
10
11
     have gone into this agenda today in particular.
12
          I just want to thank all of you really
13
    profusely for that work and for agreeing to two
14
     extra long senate sessions. I can't thank you
15
     enough. And -- and on behalf of the president as
16
     well, thank you. It's been a great collaboration
17
     and I look forward to more.
18
             CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: But earlier in the year
19
    next time.
20
             PROVOST BLACKWELL:
                                 Yeah.
21
             CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: All right. Our vice
2.2
     chair?
23
             VICE CHAIR:
                          No report.
24
             CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Nothing to report.
25
     Okay. Parliamentarian?
```

PARLIAMENTARIAN BRENNEN: I did the math.

There's about five minutes per proposal. It's not necessarily true that the items later on the agenda are less worthy of your attentions, though.

1.3

2.2

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. Thank you for that. Our trustee?

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Okay. Okay. Two things. First of all, I just want to congratulate Lee.

TRUSTEE BLONDER: Well, thank you.

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: I did want to let you know there will be another trustee election next year whenever my term is up. I will not be running again, because I've -- I'll have been doing it for six years, and I think it's time for a change.

So please think about whether you would like to run or if you know one of your colleagues who plays well with others, but is able to stand up and -- and express their opinion even if it causes some discomfort. Those two things together, I think, are what make a -- a really good trustee. So, like I said, please think about if you would like to run. If -- if you can, encourage one -- any of your colleagues to run.

I'm sure Lee and I would happy to talk to anyone about what the job entails. The other thing I also

-- I wanted to say is echoing something that

Jennifer said earlier about the president's

evaluation. Last year when the board of trustees -
CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Right.

1.3

2.1

2.2

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: -- discussed the faculty evaluation of the president, they specifically asked, Why is the turnout so low for -- on the faculty president's evaluation, and we have to an aw and say, well, people are very busy, blah, blah.

But some people don't fill out surveys ever.

But, nevertheless, if you can please vote in the -- in the survey or -- and encourage your colleagues to complete the survey, they -- like I said, the board does pay attention to the participation rate. Yeah.

MS. DUNCAN: Marilyn Duncan, College of Medicine. About this issue with people not responding, I wanted to but I feel — and I've also heard other people mention — is the fact that a lot of faculty feel that they don't have enough information.

When we're evaluated every year as faculty,
we're asked to submit a CV and a list of our
accomplishments and our activities in the last 12
months, and we never see this for the president.

The eval -- you know, people are asked to evaluate 1 2 his accomplishments, but they really don't know his 3 accomplishments -- what he --4 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: You know, that is a very 5 6 MS. DUNCAN: So --7 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: -- good point. 8 MS. DUNCAN: Well, I --9 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: And maybe --If there was documentation 10 MS. DUNCAN: 11 attached to the survey, you might get a better 12 response. 13 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: He -- he does prepare a -- such a document for the board when the board does 14 15 its evaluation of him, and so it might not -- I 16 don't know. I'm not sure what the timeline would 17 be, but it wouldn't be impossible for him to prepare 18 a similar document for the faculty. So maybe we 19 could put it on our agenda to mention it to him for 20 next time. Thanks. 21 MS. DUNCAN: Thank you. 2.2 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Any -- any other questions for me? No. We have a board meeting next 23 24 I believe it is first -- first two days of

So we haven't had a board meeting since the

25

finals.

last time we met -- we met, yeah.

2.2

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Yeah. The -the only thing I wanted to do was elaborate a little
bit on that. So next Monday and Tuesday is our
board meeting in April. We have another one at the
end of June. This meeting -- the detailed agenda
hasn't been posted yet, but it should be in the next
few days.

If you're interested, you can go to the board website. We're meeting in the college of fine arts building on Boulevard, which is new for us, and we're meeting in a large gallery there. So that should be very interesting. But I don't have any other things to report.

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Okay. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Thank you.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: All right. So -- so the first set of degrees we're going to consider today are in Memoriam degrees, and I thought we'd just -- I'd start by putting this up on the board for those of you who haven't thought about it recently.

This is the senate rule regrading in Memoriam degrees, and it's explicitly the eligibility for an in Memoriam degree.

So our rule says an in Memoriam degree "allows

for recognition of a student's connection to the
University of Kentucky regardless of their progress
toward completion of degree requirement
undergraduate, graduate, or professional students
who are registered in a degree program at the time
of their death that do not complete degree
requirements are eligible for an in Memoriam
degree."

2.

2.1

2.2

So each of the people who's going to be brought in front of you today satisfies this requirement — this eligibility requirement. And these — the colleges who will come up to speak have each asked the senate to award this special in Memoriam degree. So the first one we have is from the college of engineering. So Kim Anderson is here.

MS. ANDERSON: Thank you.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Uh-huh.

MS. ANDERSON: So the first student that

I'm requesting an in Memoriam degree is for

Mr. Samuel Ward. Sam was scheduled to graduate with

his BS in electrical engineering in December of

2019, but passed away on September 5th of 2018. He

has 60 hours left to complete his degree.

He was born on November 8, 1996, in Ashland,

Kentucky, graduated from Sheldon Clark High School in 2015 and was one of the top ten students of this class. Sam enjoyed his electrical engineering major. Working at UPS while attending his classes, he was known as kind-hearted, very intelligent, and had a promising career ahead of him.

2.

2.1

2.2

In his memory, Sam's mom has created a scholarship for students at Sheldon Clark High School who plan to pursue an engineering major in a college with preference to those who attend UK. So I am sure that his parents and Sam would be honored to receive this degree.

motion here. The senate council considered this
last week and recommended approval of the student as
a recipient of an in Memoriam degree for submission
to be presented to the board of trustees.
Is there any discussion of that motion? Any debate?
Okay. So remember only elected college faculty
members can vote to award these in Memoriam degrees.
So please now vote. Any final votes, college
faculty senators? Okay. That motion passes.
Okay. Great. One more from the college of
engineering.

Mr. Shawn Michael Culley. Shawn was a first-year engineering student who passed away on January 23, 2019, during his second semester here at UK. He was born and raised in Griff, New Jersey, attended St. Dominique School and St. Rose High School. At both schools he was very active in sports. At St. Rose High School, he was a standout basketball player, ran cross country, and continued to devote himself to sports and people.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

He was known as a listener, someone with whom other youth felt free to share troubles and joys.

He gave -- gave comfort and encouragement whenever it was needed, even at the expense of his own time and interests.

His first-year engineering professor here at UK commented: "Shawn was quiet but very attentive in class. He was active in small group discussions, and he put a lot of thought into his written assignments. It was clear that Shawn was well liked by his peers. For his final project for his first-year engineering class, he made a deck of cards about how to succeed as an engineering student and future engineer. I found it to be very creative and well done."

So, again, I'm sure Shawn and his family would

be honored to receive this degree.

2.

2.1

2.2

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. Thanks, Kim.

So, again, senate council considered this and made a recommendation last week to award the in Memoriam honorary degree to Shawn Culley. Any discussion of that motion? Okay. So, then, I'll open voting.

Again, just the faculty senators. Okay. Any final votes from our faculty senators? Okay. That motion passes.

All right. The next one is from the college of nursing. I think Shelly Ann Davis is here.

MS. DAVIS: The college of nursing is requesting to award an in Memoriam degree to McKayla Cruse. She's a 2015 graduate of Lafayette High School in Lexington. She attended UK in the summer of 2015 through the fall of 2015.

She was killed in an accident prior to the opening of the spring 2016 semester. Because she has only completed 21 hours but not in -- she's not eligible for a degree, but an in Memoriam is appropriate in this case.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. Again, the senate council considered this on Monday last week, and recommended awarding this degree. Any discussion of the motion? Yes.

THE COURT REPORTER: 1 Is the podium mic on? 2 You can barely hear this. 3 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: There is not a podium 4 mic. 5 THE COURT REPORTER: Okay. I support the 6 vote. 7 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Thank you. Is this --8 okay. 9 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: There's plenty of seats 10 up here. 11 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: There are lots of seats 12 in the front. If you want, we can hold this. 1.3 All right. Does anybody need to hear the 14 description again? Okay. Any further debate on the motion? All right. So I'll open voting. Again, 15 16 just the college senator -- the faculty senators. 17 Okay. Any remaining votes. All right. That motion 18 passes. Thank you. Okay. Next we have one from 19 the college of law. Our parliamentarian will 20 present that. 2.1 PARLIAMENTARIAN BRENNEN: Thank you. I'm 2.2 not your parliamentarian here. I'm stepping out of role a bit. I'm associate dean at the college of 23 24 law. Can you hear me? 25 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yeah, that's

good. Yeah.

2.

2.1

2.2

PARLIAMENTARIAN BRENNEN: I am requesting an in Memoriam degree for Joe Green. Joe was a student in our JD program. He died unexpectedly in May of 2017 just after completing his first year of law school. He was from Bowling Green. He came to UK after his bachelor's program at Purdue University. Between undergrad and law school, he served his country in the US Army in the 159th Combat Aviation Brigade.

He was a public information officer deployed to Afghanistan where he won the department of defense photo of the week award six weeks running. Even though the only thing he shot was a camera, he was injured in the line of duty, returned home in 2015. He had successfully completed his first year of law study. We ask for an in Memoriam degree. It will mean a lot to his parents and to his fellow students with whom he would have graduated in a couple of weeks.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. So we have -- a senate council forwards this motion to you as of last week. Any discussion of the motion?

Okay. So I'll open voting on Joe Green. Only college faculty senators, please. Okay. And that

motion passes. Okay. One more from arts and sciences, and it's Ruth Beatty presenting this one.

2.

2.2

MS. BEATTY: The college of arts and sciences petitions for awarding the in Memoriam degree to Taniah Jones. Taniah was a sophomore pursuing a bachelor of science in biology with a minor in modern and classical languages, literatures, and culture. She was in good academic standing at the time of her death. Taniah tragically drowned in July of 2018 while on a study abroad trip to Jordan where she was studying Arabic culture and language.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. Again, this was considered and this motion comes from senate council to award Taniah an in Memoriam degree. Any debate on that motion? Okay. So I'll open voting. Again, faculty senators, please. Any last votes.

Okay. That motion passes.

All right. Thanks, everyone.

So next on our list is the May 2019 degree list. We circulated this — the revised version of the list on — or around 11:30 today, but that was a complication of everything you've received already and a few additions that we received over the weekend. There are hard copies of it in the back for those of you who were not able to check the

emailed list.

2.

1.3

2.2

Again, remember, what we're approving here is their -- is their available -- eligibility to be on the degree list. So the actual confirmation of the degrees will be confirmed by the degree audit through the registrar's office after the semester is over.

We do have a motion from the committee -And, actually, I have a question, parliamentarian.
We didn't talk about this. The -- the list is
different than the list that the senate council
voted on. Do you have a view about this? No.
Should I take a new motion?

PARLIAMENTARIAN BRENNEN: Just take a motion from the floor.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: I would take a motion from the floor to approve the revised degree list from 2019. Bob Grossman makes that motion.

A second for that?

Jennifer Osterhage. Thank you.

Okay. So that's a motion to approve the revised degree list circulated today for May 2019. Any debate on that motion? Okay.

So, again, college faculty senators can vote on this degree list. So you can go ahead and vote

now. Okay. Any final votes. And the motion passes. Excellent.

2.

1.3

2.2

Okay. And then same for the August 2019 degree list. This is the students who've already applied for August 2019. They actually have -- as of right now, they have until July 1st to apply for that degree. So there will be additional people added to this list, but these are the -- the students we could vote on now, which will allow them to get their diploma a little earlier in the summer.

Again, because you saw a revised list this morning, i would take a motion from the floor to approve the revised August 2019 degree list.

Bob Grossman. A second for that. And a second, Lee Blonder. Thank you. Okay. So any debate on the motion to approve the revised August 2019 degree list?

Okay. So, then, we'll open voting on that.

Again, the college faculty senators. Any final votes. Okay. That motion passes.

Okay. So now we have — are a couple of amendments. So these were clerical errors. We've got three of these degrees. So what was awarded in August of 2018 was an educational and counseling psychology degree in educational psychology, but it should have

been a PhD in educational school and counseling 1 2 psychology -- school counsel -- school psychology. 3 So the first one here is for a student we're 4 identifying as WW86. This has been considered by 5 senate council, and so you have a motion from the 6 senate council to rescind the -- the August 2018 7 degree and award a new P -- a PhD in educational 8 school counseling psychology, school psychology 9 effective August 2018. Any debate on that motion? 10 Okay. And we'll open voting. Again, only the 11 faculty senators, please. 12 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Somebody's -the back. 1.3 14 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: I'm sorry? UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: 15 There's a 16 question. 17 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Oh, I'm sorry. There was 18 a question. Okay. Do you want to ask the question? 19 Who -- who was it? No. 20 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: No it's been 2.1 answered. 2.2 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: No question anymore. 23 Okay. All right. Okay. Okay. Motion passes. 24 The next one is the same clerical mistake for

Student RA38. We're rescinding a December 2018

25

degree in Ph -- a PhD in educational and counseling psychology, educational psychology and conferring instead effective December 2018 a PhD in educational school and counseling psychology in school psychology.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

Any discussion or debate on that motion from senate council? Questions? It's a clerical mistake. Again, only faculty senators shall vote.

Any final votes from the faculty? Okay. The motion passes.

And then one more with the same clerical error from May 2017 for Student DM46 rescinding that erroneously identified PhD and conferring a PhD in educational school and counseling psychology in school psychology.

Any debate on that motion from senate council?

Okay. Then, we'll open voting. Again, only for faculty senators. Any final votes?

Okay. That motion passes. Thank you.

All right. And then we have one clerical mistake which is now -- we need to fix the addition. So this is a student who should have been added to the May 2018 degree list, student who we're identifying as TK79 who should have been awarded a BA in sociology with a minor in journalism. Again,

a clerical error left her off the degree list by mistake, and the senate council voted last week to award her that BA effective May 2018.

Any debate on that motion from the senate council?

Okay. So, again, just the faculty senators, please, vote on the awarding of this degree. Any final votes?

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

Okay. That motion passes. Okay. Great. I think that's all the degrees. That's very exciting. All right. Okay. So the next item on our agenda is an item of old business from our last meeting. We ran out of time and we did not get to vote on this item. So remember this is a -- a proposed change to the senate rules.

It came to you through the senate admissions background and standards committee. Herman Farrell presented the proposal to you. We had a — a number of questions and discussion on — on the factual portion of the — of the rule change and we also, then, moved forward and had the motion on the floor for debate, and we started debate when we ran out of time.

Actually, Joanie, can you open the TV up just so we can pull this up? So I just wanted to remind you -- so we're sort of already in the debate

```
portion of this motion. So just a reminder,
 1
 2
     Herman's here. I think he can help answer questions
                                 I think there's a number
 3
     and facilitate the debate.
 4
     of people in the audience.
                                 But I just want to
 5
     remind you before we get to the debate -- remind you
 6
     what the crux of the rule change would be.
 7
     Is it opening?
                        What do you -- yeah.
 8
           MS. ETTMIMS:
                                               Where do
 9
     you want it to open?
10
           CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                               I want to see the language
11
     change itself -- the rule change.
12
            MS. ETTMIMS:
                          So the --
13
            CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: It should be in there.
14
            MS. ETTMIMS:
                           Oh.
                                        It's all right.
15
             CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Yeah.
16
            MS. ETTMIMS:
                           Sorry.
17
             CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                 It's this.
                                             Yeah.
18
            MS. ETTMIMS:
                           Okay.
19
             CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: But I can't -- you can't
20
     see it up here. Why can't we see it up here?
2.1
             UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:
                                        Can you --
2.2
             CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Do you have to -- can we
23
24
             MS. ETTMIMS:
                           I don't know what --
25
             CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                 I don't know either.
                                                       Do
```

```
we have to close out of --
 1
 2
             PARLIAMENTARIAN BRENNEN: And begin the
 3
     slide show.
 4
             MS. ETTMIMS:
                          Okay.
 5
             CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: So we have to close out
 6
     of the slide show --
 7
              MS. ETTMIMS:
                            I'm trying.
 8
              CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Argh.
 9
                            Still trying.
              MS. ETTMIMS:
              CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Yeah. Why don't you
10
11
     close out of the --
            MS. ETTMIMS: We're just going to have to use
12
1.3
    the --
             CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. Now it's black.
14
15
     Okay.
16
              PARLIAMENTARIAN BRENNEN:
                                        Okay.
17
              CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. Here we go.
18
    Here we go. There it is. Okay. Can you --
19
    perfect. All right. So a reminder, under the
20
     current rules -- the current senate rules our
21
    undergraduate certificates are not available to
2.2
    nondegree students, which is to say if you're not
23
     enrolled in a degree program at the University of
24
    Kentucky right now, you may not enroll in an
25
    undergraduate certificate.
```

The intent of the proposal is to extend enrollment in undergraduate certificates to students who are nondegree students. And so -- so that's the proposal on the table. We are in the debate portion. Yeah.

1.3

2.2

MR. GIANCARLO: Matt Giancarlo, arts and sciences. I have a prepared statement and I'm -- in the interest of time, I'm going to try and be quick, after which I am going to make a motion and ask for a second.

The rule change under consideration should be amended to account for normal admission standards and requirements pursuant to University Senate Rules 4.2.1.3.1 and 4.2.1.3.2 and also the admissions requirements as spelled out in the University Senate Rules 4.2.1.1.2.1 and the following rule, 4.2.1.1.3, high school's nongraduates.

Specifically, undergraduate certificates should maintain the minimum admissions requirement of a high school diploma and/or its equivalent as established by the University admission's standard. The proposed change in University Senate Rule 4.2.8 widens the scope of availability of undergraduate certificates at the University of Kentucky to potentially include applicants who have not

graduated from high school and who have not demonstrated basic readiness to undertake college level work either through the normal standards of high school level accomplishment or through standardized testing, that is, high school GPA, ACT, SAT scores, or the clear internal and external procedures as delineated in the University senate rules.

2.

2.2

This opens the proposals to the possibility that such undergraduate certificates would be offered and even marketed to a constituency that would not be well served by such certificates. It also opens the possibility, however unlikely, that programs and departments would feel pressure for financial reasons to develop and extend such certificates to potential applicants who have not demonstrated a record of basic college readiness.

The current wording about the scope of undergraduate certificates and the wording about nondegree-seeking students in University Senate Rule 4.2.1.3 is fundamentally and unavoidably ambiguous. This must be stressed. The current University senate rule wording does not make it clear that graduation from high school is a basic requirement for admission. Furthermore, this ambiguity leaves

open the possibility that individual programs and departments would, then, become the de facto adjudicators of admission standards.

2.2

Not just for degree seeking or nondegree seeking status, but also for the basic educational status of nondegree-seeking applicants who have not passed through the purview of University admissions review.

In other words, the current wording of the change as proposed would potentially create a backdoor into undergraduate certificate programs allowing non-high school graduates to enroll.

This is deeply problematic both for the University and for any potential enrollees. The proposed amendment would make explicit minimum admissions standards as guardrails against potential future problems.

Therefore, I move that the proposed change to University Senate Rule 4.2.8 as it stands and as we read it be modified to include the following language in the last sentence: "The faculty of record of an undergraduate certificate program may establish policies to extend enrollment to nondegree-seeking students as consonant with the basic admission standards of the University of

Kentucky and with the procedures for admissions 1 2 exceptions as set forth in University Senate Rule 3 4.2.1 and its subsections." 4 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. Matt, can I have a 5 hard copy of --6 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Yeah --7 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: -- of that rule? Okav. 8 All right. So -- so we have a motion to 9 to -- this is really a replacement of the new 10 sentence. 11 MR. GIANCARLO: Yeah. 12 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Yeah. So the -- so 13 instead of that new sentence, the -- the replacement 14 would be "The faculty of record of an undergraduate 15 certificate program may establish policies to extend 16 enrollment to nondegree-seeking students as 17 consonant with the basic admissions standards for 18 the University of Kentucky and with the procedures 19 for admissions exceptions as set forth in 4.2.1 and 20 its subsections. "So there's a motion for that. 2.1 Is there a second? 2.2 MS. FIREY: Second. 23 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Abigail Firey. 24 there -- okay. So -- so a -- before we debate that

motion, are there factual questions about that

25

motion?

2.1

2.2

2 MR. HOLLOWAY: So we --

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Your name?

MR. HOLLOWAY: Larry Holloway, college of dentistry. So with this -- sorry. That's -- that's my role here right now. So, anyway -- so would this, in fact, require a transcript before anybody was eligible to get -- to register for an online certificate? According to those other rules, they have to go through the whole University admissions process in order to be eligible to obtain a certificate.

MR. GIANCARLO: My knowledge is that the University senate rules do not set forth procedural standards or procedural requirements. They set forth academic standards and academic requirements, and then leave the procedural questions to the unit that administers.

So, therefore, setting these standards from the University senate rules would then create the guidelines for which the University would then go forward to determine how best to determine that the people who are enrolling in certificates have the minimum standards that are consonant with the University of Kentucky.

```
CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. Further factual
 1
 2
     questions about the proposal?
 3
            MR. FARRELL:
                           So I have a --
 4
             CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: And your name?
 5
              MR. FARRELL: -- question. Herman Farrell.
 6
    And -- and --
 7
              CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: College of fine arts.
 8
               UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: And he is
 9
     chair of --
10
                            Herman Farrell, college of
               MR. FARRELL:
11
     fine arts. So I'm trying to understand.
                                               This is
    the first time I've -- I've heard about this.
12
1.3
     guess this is really an amendment to --
              CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: It's an amendment.
14
15
              MR. FARRELL: Okay.
16
              CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: So this is a motion and
17
     a second to amend the proposal.
18
              MR. FARRELL: Okay. So -- so the -- the
19
     standards you're seeking or the -- or the -- the
20
     reference back to our admissions standards, how does
21
     that align with what we ended up passing back in
2.2
    December with regard to nondegree-seeking students?
            MR. GIANCARLO: Not the degree but --
23
24
            UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:
25
            MR. FARRELL:
                           I -- I'm just asking you when
```

you were going -- I -- I'm -- you're throwing the 1 2 numbers at me and I'm trying to look at the actual 3 senate rules that are being affected here. 4 did actually revise nondegree-seeking students --5 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Uh-huh. 6 MR. FARRELL: -- to basically expand the 7 number of people who could come in as 8 nondegree-seeking students period. 9 MR. GIANCARLO: Well --10 MR. FARRELL: And then now we're attempting 11 to --12 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I understand 13 14 MR. FARRELL: -- obviously, expand the 15 undergraduate certificates as well to allow it for 16 them. 17 MR. GIANCARLO: Well, it does not change 18 Senate Rule 4.2.1.3.1, which is rules governing the 19

MR. GIANCARLO: Well, it does not change
Senate Rule 4.2.1.3.1, which is rules governing the
admission of nondegree-seeking students. It simply
refers and makes clear that those rules would also
be consonant with the minimum requirements as set
forth in the prior rule that I was referring to that
is -- and I've just lost my sheet of paper -- 4.2.1.
So that in looking at admission standards, you
wouldn't just look at the subpart of the rule which,

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

in fact, does not clarify whether or not somebody 1 2 has to have a high school diploma, but looks at the 3 minimum standards of the University which says that 4 they have to have a minimum standard of a high 5 school diploma or its equivalent or the exception. 6 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Uh-huh. 7 MR. FARRELL: Can I continue? Can I --8 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Yeah. Uh-huh. So I'm doing this on the fly, 9 MR. FARRELL: 10 and I'm trying to remember when we were going 11 through the -- and I was looking at the statutory 12 scheme just in terms of -- our process right now has 13 rules for the admission of degree-seeking and 14 nondegree-seeking students, and that was -- and 15 that's longstanding. What was changed back in 16 December was the --17 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. 18 MR. GIANCARLO: Herman --19 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: This is the language 20 from December. 2.1 MR. FARRELL: -- the character and nature 2.2 of the nondegree-seeking --23 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Essentially --24 MR. FARRELL: -- students which is apart 25 from -- a different standard, actually, and not

consonant with degree seeking. That's the what -that's been the statutory scheme all along.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: So what, though?

1.3

2.1

2.2

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. FARRELL: So what you're asking to do now, which I -- I -- I'm just trying to understand what's going on here -- is that -- do you want to then sort of I guess -- I wouldn't say obliterate what -- the changes we made, but to modify even these changes so that they're consonant with the degree-seeking rules, and that's not what we did in December.

In December we revised the nondegree-seeking rules that are separate and apart from the degree-seeking.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: So just a --

MR. FARRELL: So let me say --

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: -- reminder. This is

the new language we approved in December and it says

-- this is the category -- the new category "other

nondegree students." These students are not

currently enrolled in a degree program at a high

school, college, or university but wish to take

undergraduate coursework."

So this was -- we were not talking about certificates at the time, just courses "at the University of Kentucky without pursuing a formal degree. Applicants will be asked to self-certify that they have obtained a high school diploma, GED, or meet the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education college -- college readiness indicators."

1.3

2.1

2.2

And then, "Students wishing to change the degree-seeking status after enrolling as a nondegree student must apply using the same application process as those who are degree-seeking."

So that was our new language regarding degree students that we voted on in December.

MR. GIANCARLO: Yeah.

MR. FARRELL: And we were -- and we were mindful of the degree-seeking status. Part of the argument that I was making all the way through was to -- to ensure that we weren't allowing students in that were subpar and all this language is not degrading.

MR. GIANCARLO: Okay. Well, then, what this motion would do -- would hopefully just refer back to that so that under nondegree-seeking students 4.2.1.3 --

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Uh-huh.

```
MR. GIANCARLO: -- it meets that
 1
 2
     requirement.
 3
               CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                   Uh-huh.
                                            Uh-huh.
               UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:
 4
                                             Council will
 5
 6
                MR. GIANCARLO:
                                Yeah.
 7
                CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. Any other
 8
     factual questions on the motion to amend?
 9
                 MR. CRAMER:
                              Is --
10
                 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Aaron Cramer.
11
                 MR. CRAMER: Yes, Cramer, engineering.
     Is the language here -- is that under the same rule
12
1.3
    numbering that --
14
                 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                     Yes.
                 MR. CRAMER: -- the motion --
15
16
                 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: 4 point --
17
                 MR. CRAMER: -- is on --
18
                 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: This is -- Can you
19
     scroll up --
20
                MR. CRAMER: Or it's not just --
                CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: -- just a little bit?
21
2.2
     This is 4.2.1. This is the new language --
23
     Stop .2.1.3.1. This is the reference Matt made.
24
     The admissions exceptions as set forth in 4.2.1.
25
     This is one of the subcategories. Yeah. Say your
```

1 name? 2 MR. KORNBLUH: Mark Kornbluh, arts and 3 sciences. So you're referring to this rule so I 4 don't quite understand a -- the incentives to refer 5 back to what is already our existing rule --6 MR. GIANCARLO: Okay. 7 MR. KORNBLUH: -- and why --8 MR. GIANCARLO: Well, my --9 MR. KORNBLUH: -- it's --10 MR. GIANCARLO: My concern and the concern 11 of the people who raised the issue earlier was that 12 this rule is -- as being passed was not -- did not 13 clearly refer back to the rules governing admissions 14 of nondegree-seeking students as I understood it at the time. 15 MR. KORNBLUH: All right. I'm -- we did --16 17 we were very careful to be --18 MR. GIANCARLO: Okay. 19 MR. KORNBLUH: -- what was happening with 20 regard to the degree --2.1 MR. GIANCARLO: Well --2.2 MR. KORNBLUH: -- seeking --23 MR. GIANCARLO: So as you remember, I put 24 out that nine-page description of -- of everything 25 to consider as you were making those changes.

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: We did. 2 MR. GIANCARLO: And one of the things that 3 I was doing on my own -- and -- and I can help with 4 this -- was to advocate for making sure that the 5 standards would be reasonable. 6 MR. CRAMER: It is. 7 MR. KORNBLUH: Even though that's going 8 to be a -- as a -- a. 9 Nondegree students we're --MR. CRAMER: 10 we're not end running our admissions process. 11 MR. KORNBLUH: Okay. So that -- I was --12 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: So the language --13 MR. KORNBLUH: I think we got to be careful 14 or we --15 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: -- the --16 MR. KORNBLUH: -- or we can't pull it off. 17 MR. CRAMER: Well --18 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: The language in the 19 original motion is that the faculty of record of an 20 undergraduate certificate program may establish 21 policies to extend enrollment to nondegree-seeking 2.2 students who are identified in 4.2.1. 23 MR. KORNBLUH: Yeah. 24 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: You want to add 25 language that explicitly references back 4.2.1 to

1	define nondegree students?
2	MR. GIANCARLO: Yeah.
3	CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. Can I have your
4	paper one more time? I've got to keep this because
5	
6	MR. GIANCARLO: I mean
7	CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: So
8	MR. GIANCARLO: it sounds like we're
9	in agreement. I was did not understand earlier
10	which version on there. And I what we were
11	looking for is clarity on the proposed new
12	proposal that it referred back to the standards
13	within the proposal.
14	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Could you
15	CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. So
16	MR. GIANCARLO: restate
17	CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: we're still on the
18	fact the the fact portion of this. We've not
19	risen to the level of debate.
20	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yeah. Can I
21	ask a question of the chair of our SREC?
22	CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Yes.
23	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: The lack of a
24	reference in the proposed rule to this previously
25	enacted rule, can you tell me whether that in any

```
way invalidates the earlier rule?
 1
 2.
               MR. JONES:
                           The -- the more --
 3
               CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: And -- and your name?
 4
               MR. JONES:
                          -- the places these --
 5
               CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                   Your name?
 6
               MR. JONES: Davey Jones, college of
 7
    medicine. There -- there's a possibility that, you
 8
     know, the -- the more recent legislation overrides
 9
     the contradictory existing legislation. So I -- can
10
    we put back up the --
11
               CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Put the new rule back
12
     up, the one from today.
                              Nope.
1.3
               MS. ETTMIMS:
                             I'm lost.
14
               CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                   That one.
     Uh-huh.
15
                             They -- I -- I've had -- I
16
                 MR. JONES:
17
    think what he is concerned with -- his question here
18
     is "The faculty of record of the undergraduate
19
     certificate may establish policies." Now, see, does
20
     this authorize them -- even more reasons in the
21
     language does that authorize them to establish
2.2
    policies that would otherwise be in contradiction
23
    with last December's action? I think he was wanting
24
    to cite last December's action here so that this
     will consonant the lack of senate rules.
25
```

1 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. 2 MR. CRAMER: I don't see a downside to 3 that. 4 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: 5 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. Again, just 6 factual for now. 7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yeah, I think 8 we can accept this as a friendly amendment. 9 was what was intended here. I mean, what's intended 10 here -- so currently all the undergraduate 11 certificates echo the old rules. 12 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Uh-huh. 13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: So every 14 existing undergraduate certificate limits it to 15 degree-seeking students. So the reason this lang --16 on -- on each one that was passed by the senate, 17 limited degree-seeking students. So this language 18 would allow those certificates to agree with or --19 with the nondegree rules. 20 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. 2.1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: But it wasn't 2.2 intended to go beyond that. So, you know, we've 23 accepted as a friendly amendment that it referred 24 back to --25 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: I don't know if you can

```
accept this as a friendly --
 1
               UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Well --
 2
 3
               CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: -- amendment.
 4
               UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: You're
 5
    probably --
 6
               CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                   Can -- can --
 7
               UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yes, we would
 8
     and -- and I'll note that in the initial proposal
 9
     that was sent to us from the Acrof board --
10
              CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Yeah.
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- committee.
11
12
              CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: So right --
13
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- the
    possibility.
14
              CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: -- now the --
15
16
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:
                                          So is it --
17
              CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: -- the -- right now --
18
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: So I don't --
19
              CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: -- the motion is from
20
    the senate --
               UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: That --
21
2.2
               CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: -- council.
23
               UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- it -- he
24
     referenced back to -- to the -- 4.2.1 --
25
              CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Yeah.
```

1	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: rule that
2	had been just recently changed. We got it like a
3	few weeks after
4	PARLIAMENTARIAN BRENNEN: Right.
5	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: that was
6	passed.
7	CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Right.
8	PARLIAMENTARIAN BRENNEN: Something that the
9	whole senate council agrees.
10	CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: It can't be a friendly
11	amendment
12	PARLIAMENTARIAN BRENNEN: Uh-huh.
13	CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: unless the senate
14	council agrees. It's a motion from the senate
15	council right now. So I it's the senate council
16	who has to accept the friendly amendment. Yes.
17	TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: May I propose a sub a
18	shorter substitute that I think will address your
19	concern? The substitute is just to add CSR
20	4.2.1.3.1 at the end of the sentence here.
21	MR. GIANCARLO: That works. If that would
22	you think that that particular reference would be
23	
24	TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: I I
2.5	CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Do you accept that as

```
a -- as a -- as an amendment to your motion?
 1
 2
     And, Abigail --
 3
                MR. GIANCARLO: Yeah.
 4
                CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: -- do you accept that
 5
     as an amendment to the motion?
 6
                MS. ABIGAIL: Another thing is to be
 7
     amended.
                MR. GIANCARLO:
                                She's still taking fact.
 8
 9
                UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:
10
                CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                    I'm still taking
11
     questions of fact. We haven't risen to the level of
12
     debate. So if you -- so the proposer would like to
1.3
     amend the motion to say just what Bob Grossman said.
                UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Who is --
14
                CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: But there's a second.
15
16
            So -- so the proposer -- the -- the motion
17
    maker and the second accept the change that in --
18
    that instead of this new language, we would add a
19
     reference here to --
20
                TRUSTEE GROSSMAN:
                                   Let's see.
                                               4.2.1.3.1.
2.1
                CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Got that?
2.2
                TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Which is the rules for
23
     governing --
24
                 MR. GIANCARLO: For governing --
25
               TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: -- admission of
```

```
nondegree-seeking students.
 1
 2
               MR. GIANCARLO: -- admission of
 3
    nondegree-seeking students.
                                   Okay. All right.
 4
               CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
 5
     Okay. So questions of fact on that motion?
 6
     So the motion is just to add a citation at the end
 7
     of this language rather than the extended sentence.
 8
     Questions of facts?
 9
                MR. GIANCARLO:
                               You --
                MS. DUNCAN: Yeah. I guess that would
10
11
    mean --
                                   And your name?
12
                CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
13
                 MS. DUNCAN: Marilyn Duncan, college of
                I guess I'm still confused whether the
14
    medicine.
     earlier slides that you showed us was exactly what
15
                The -- I just didn't see any of them.
16
    you said.
17
                MR. GIANCARLO: I guess, could we put it
18
    up? Is that good?
19
                MS. DUNCAN: Would you? Do you -- I
20
    thought --
21
               UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: In the 100's
22
    they are.
23
                MS. DUNCAN:
                             I didn't think we -- the
24
     other one was with
25
                UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:
                                              I'm not --
```

1	MS. DUNCAN: On nondegree-seeking
2	students and what they're college admissions bring.
3	CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Well, the other one
4	is
5	MS. DUNCAN: And does
6	CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: the rule
7	regarding who can enroll right now as a nondegree
8	student.
9	MS. DUNCAN: And does it say that they
10	have they need a
11	CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: It says they have to
12	self-certify that they have obtained a high school
13	diploma, a GED, or that they need the council on
14	the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education
15	college readiness indicators.
16	MS. DUNCAN: Well, what does self-certify
17	mean? I mean, if a student were applying to be an
18	an undergraduate, I think we're going to see
19	MR. GIANCARLO: No.
20	MS. DUNCAN: self-certifying be
21	adequate?
22	CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: No.
23	MS. DUNCAN: Or do they have to provide
24	MR. GIANCARLO: If
2.5	MS. DUNCAN: documentation?

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: They provide documentation.

2.

2.1

2.2

MS. DUNCAN: And, then, so what -- what -- what are amendments? Do you want documentation or do you want to self-certify?

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: So -- so let me remind you. This -- this is not on the table. This is what we voted on in December. What we're talking about is enrollment in certificates specifically.

MS. DUNCAN: Which was fine --

MR. GIANCARLO: What --

MS. DUNCAN: -- and decided.

MR. GIANCARLO: What page --

MS. DUNCAN: The amendment, as you're saying, is what's already here. Then we need to understand that. Don't we?

MR. GIANCARLO: What I was looking for in the proposal was simply the reference to the existing rules to clarify that there would be minimal admission standards for the certificate that were consonant with the minimum admission standards for the University. I have to say the questions of whether self-certification or University certification, I think, are kind of beyond the purview of what I've proposed.

```
CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
 1
                                    Yeah.
 2
                MS. DUNCAN: Well --
 3
                MR. CROSS: Al Cross, communications and
 4
     information.
                   Ouestion for Herman: Could the
 5
     faculty of record of the certificate program
 6
     require, for example, a high school transcript if we
 7
     wanted to?
 8
               MR. FARRELL: Yep.
                                   But --
 9
               MS. DUNCAN: We want to.
10
               MR. FARRELL: -- can -- can we go back to
11
    the --
                                   Well, they can operate
12
               CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
1.3
           I mean, they can require any number of things.
     Undergraduate certificates have admission
14
15
     requirements.
16
              MR. GIANCARLO: Right.
17
              CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: You can require that
18
     someone be in a particular degree program.
19
               UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:
                                           Uh-huh.
20
               CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                   You can require that
21
     they have a certain status. There are all sorts of
2.2
     things you can require. Can you go back --
               MR. GIANCARLO: And that's --
23
24
               CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                   -- to --
25
               MR. GIANCARLO: -- part of the --
```

1 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: -- the new language? 2 MR. GIANCARLO: -- reason why we add that 3 part within the --4 MR. CROSS: Thank you. CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Any other factual 5 6 questions on the newly amended motion? Yes. 7 MR. POOL: Chris Pool, arts and sciences. 8 So in the initial wording of the amendment that you 9 proposed, you referred to 4.2.1 and the subsection? 10 MR. GIANCARLO: Yeah. 11 MR. POOL: Are there other subsections 12 that are required? CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: 13 This is the 14 subsection on nondegree students. But, I mean, if we 15 MR. POOL: Yeah. 16 restrict it to -- just to that subsection -- I mean, 17 I'm -- I'm just wondering what the rationale for the 18 broader language was? 19 MR. GIANCARLO: Broader one, the 20 rationale initially was to include the subsection --2.1 MR. POOL: I got it. 2.2 MR. GIANCARLO: -- and then I go -- and 23 I'm looking for it -- subsection on 4.2.1.1.3, high 24 school nongraduates where it is, in fact, quoted, 25 made clear that the condition of graduation from

```
high school was a basic condition.
 1
 2.
              MR. POOL:
                         Yeah.
 3
              CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: For enrollment in the
 4
     University.
 5
              MR. GIANCARLO: For enrollment in the
 6
     University.
               MR. POOL: So I would suggest, perhaps
 7
 8
     that the -- the wording B and C --
 9
               CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                   But -- but --
10
               MR. POOL: -- Section 4.2.1 and
11
     subsections rather than just directing it to that
           There's another subsection there.
12
13
                CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: But -- but the high
14
     school non-graduation deals with enrollment in a
15
     degree program in the University, not to nondegree
16
     students.
17
               MR. ALLEN BROWN: Allen Brown, arts and
18
     sciences. So my question, the -- so I know you said
19
     the self-certifications are beyond your purview, but
20
     that seems like a big difference. Does that address
21
     the issue that you originally --
2.2
                 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Uh-huh.
23
                  MR. ALLEN BROWN: -- wanted to address
24
     or raise with this amendment that for a
25
     nondegree-seeking student, they can self-certify?
```

1 MR. GIANCARLO: Speaking person? 2 MR. ALLEN BROWN: That enroll --3 -- that --TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: 4 Probably not, but 5 speaking in terms of establishing a precedent for 6 addressing concerns like this and making the 7 explicit new rules that for certificates, minimum 8 standards apply and are -- are referenced in the 9 rule, then I think it probably does. 10 MR. GIANCARLO: As a point of information, 11 can we go back to the nondegree-seeking student --12 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. We need to move 1.3 on. 14 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Right. 15 MR. GIANCARLO: -- rules that we passed 16 because I hear everybody's concerns. And let's just 17 remember that there are a couple stopgaps that we 18 put in to ensure that a student did self-certify, 19 falsified, was problematic, was tanking in their 20 class as a result of being not as prepared as the 21 degree-seeking students are. We put in -- if you 2.2 can scroll up. 23 MS. ETTMIMS: Uh-huh. CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: You want further down 24 25

1 MR. GIANCARLO: Yes. 2. CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: -- in the language? 3 MR. GIANCARLO: Yeah, further down. 4 Remember, that sentence about the nine credit hours? 5 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: A little down 6 further. 7 MR. GIANCARLO: Right there -- well, the 8 This is our kind of a stopgap. It is a 9 rules governing 4.2.1.3.3, nondegree-seeking 10 students except Donavon Scholars who complete nine 11 credit hours or more with less than 2.0 GP -- GPA 12 will not be allowed to continue enrollment. 1.3 that's our kind of stopgap for those students who 14 are coming in that way. What we were convinced of from the perspective 15 16 of this proposal is that with regard to these 17 certificates making this available to nontraditional 18 students mostly people who are out in the field, 19 they will probably more often than not be 20 overqualified rather than underqualified --2.1 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Uh-huh. 2.2 MR. GIANCARLO: -- and that was part of 23 the reason for this here. 24 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. So what we 25 have on the table right now -- well, actually, we

```
are still doing facts. So I'll put on the table a
 1
 2
    motion and a second to add, I'm sorry. Joanie, one
 3
    more time go back to the new language.
 4
                MS. ETTMIMS:
                              Uh-huh.
 5
                CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: -- to add a citation
    to today's proposal with a cross reference to 4.2.1
 6
 7
                MR. GIANCARLO: .1 --
 8
 9
                CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: -- .3 --
10
                MR. GIANCARLO: -- .1.1.
                CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: -- .1. Okay.
11
                                                   Is
12
    there debate on that motion? Any debate on that
    motion? Okay. So our problem is -- debate on that
1.3
14
    motion? Uh-huh.
                UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:
15
16
                CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Uh-huh. Your name?
17
                UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I just wanted
    to remind our friends that --
18
19
                CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: This is specifically
20
     on the motion to add a citation.
21
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:
                                          It's an
2.2
     amendment.
23
              CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                  It's an amendment.
24
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:
                                          It is --
25
               UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:
                                           Oh, well,
```

that's -- well, I'm coming late to the meeting. So, no.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. Okay. So the

1.3

2.2

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. Okay. So the problem is that we don't have a way to create a slide. So we're going to have to vote on this amendment by hand. And so my sergeant in arms is going to help me, and we're going to count.

So is there any further debate on the motion to amend this language to add the citation? Yeah.

MR. ALLEN BROWN: One quick -- Allen

Brown, arts and sciences. Quick question: Is that

the same like -- he's saying to say "see," whatever

section it was. I don't --

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Yeah.

MR. ALLEN BROWN: -- even remember. Is that the same as saying as defined by and then that section?

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: I -- I would think so.

MR. ALLEN BROWN: Does "defined by" give us a little more better than "see"? I don't know that it does. I just wanted to get that out there before we voted.

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: I think it's -- I said

"see" because that's what all the other hyper -hyperlinks and references in the rules say. They

```
all say "see".
 1
 2
             MR. ALLEN BROWN:
                               Is there a semantic
 3
     difference that I don't know?
 4
            TRUSTEE GROSSMAN:
                               Yeah.
 5
            MR. GIANCARLO:
                            There is.
 6
            MR. ALLEN BROWN:
                              Okay.
 7
            TRUSTEE GROSSMAN:
                               Yeah.
            MR. CROSS: Cross communication information.
 8
 9
     There is a semantic difference.
                                          You -- if we add
10
     that clause, you're limiting the policies to
11
     anything that is described in that rule.
12
     it's sort of a shorthand reference, I think it makes
1.3
     clear that if you're trying to admit someone to one
     of these programs, you have to make reference to the
14
15
     other rules too. So I agree with Bob.
16
               MR. MADISON JONES:
                                   Yeah.
                                           I think that
17
     was --
18
               CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                    Jones --
19
               MR. MADISON JONES:
                                    Oh.
20
               CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                   -- Madison.
2.1
               MR. MADISON JONES:
                                   Yeah, elsewhere in the
2.2
     senate rules -- well, for example, where higher
23
     governing regulations are -- are putting limits on
24
     them, we -- we put the cite and their government
25
     grant this and we --
```

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: 1 2 MR. MADISON JONES: -- we always interpreted 3 it to mean subservient to that. 4 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Yeah. 5 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. Any further debate 6 on the amendment in the motion? Okay. So we'll 7 have to vote by hand. And so please raise your 8 hands and raise them high. All those in favor of 9 the amendment. Voting. 10 MS. ETTMIMS: Faculty only. Say it again? 11 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: 12 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Faculty --13 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Oh, no. No. No. 14 Everybody. Everybody who's a voting member of the 15 senate. Okay. 16 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Why don't we 17 18 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: -- just say 19 the opposite. 20 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Oh, okay. Shall we do 21 the opposite? Because maybe it's a general 2.2 consensus and we operate and the number. All those 23 opposed to the amendment? Any abstentions from the 24 voting on the amendment? Okay. And all those in 25 favor of the amendment?

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: General 2 consensus --3 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. So we'll say 4 general consensus. Okay. All right. 5 So now we have a motion on the table that is amended 6 with a "see" the reference we've mentioned many 7 times already. Is there further debate on that 8 motion? 9 Tagavi, did you want to make a comment on the 10 underlying motion? 11 Yes. Why the -- in all the BS, MR. TAGAVI: BA degrees "see" under -- under, because by 12 1.3 definition we need a passing grade, but over the 14 years this has happened in certain programs and now 15 this is a University-wide program saying that the 16 certificate, which is not at -- at the level as a BS 17 degree, if you have a D, you cannot even advance --18 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: This is not the 19 proposal. This language has been here and continues 20 to --2.1 MR. TAGAVI: I see that. 2.2 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: -- be there. 23 MR. TAGAVI: I don't have --24 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Oh, okay. 25 MR. TAGAVI: -- a problem with this

condition on my college that this seems to be unnecessarily high and unwarranted.

2.1

2.2

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. So as I mentioned in the last senate meeting about this, I think there is — there are multiple items in the undergraduate certificate rules that are ripe for reconsideration, and that might be one we add to the list, but others have — from the admissions and academic standards committees and others have brought other things I think in here about the level at which the credits have to be offered and things like that.

So I expect you will see a larger proposal about undergraduate certificates sometime early next year. We can add that to the list. Are you making a motion today?

MR. TAGAVI: Me?

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Uh-huh.

MR. TAGAVI: No, I'm not.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. Any other

debate on this -- the amendments? I'm sorry. Not

the amendment. On the motion with the amendment

included. Any further debate? Okay. All right.

So we have -- we have a slide. I lost my clicker.

Here it is. Okay. Okay. So now we have to reopen

the Power Point. Okay. All right. Any remaining debate? All right.

So all voting members of the senate -- oh,
yeah. Yes? Oh, are you voting? Are you -- oh, not
a comment. Okay. All right. So now we'll open
voting, and -- and this is open to all voting
members of the senate. Any final votes?
Okay. The motion passes. Okay. Thanks for that
good debate, everyone. All right. Now, you get to
see Aaron Cramer for a while here.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: For a long

MR. CRAMER: So we've got 14 programs.

14 So --

2.

2.2

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: -- big enough?

MR. CRAMER: Yeah, big enough. The first one is a proposed new MS in data science.

This is a recommendation that the University senate approved for submission for the board of trustees to establish kind of a new BS — or MS degree, data science in the department of computer science within the college of engineering.

In many areas of study, vast amounts of heterogeneous data are being continuously generated

what we think of as big data. There's a nationwide shortage of data scientists who are able to analyze and make use of such data. The proposed program leverages UK's strengths in these areas to meet regional and national workforce demand. The proposed two-year interdisciplinary program features core coursework in computer science and statistics in biostatistics.

2.1

2.2

The program is proposed to launch with a single concentration in biomedical and pharmatics with future plans to develop concentrations in other application areas. The MS is being proposed as a non-thesis Plan B program with each student completing and defending a project in data science. Initial enrollment of four students growing to, you know, 25 or 26 students is anticipated.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. So questions of fact. I think we have some members of the proposing

MR. CRAMER: Is Saul here?

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: -- group --

MR. CRAMER: Yeah.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: -- here. Yes. Okay.

So are there any questions of fact regarding this proposal? Yeah.

```
MR. SHEATHER:
                              Simon Sheather.
 1
                                               I'm the
 2
     dean of the college of business and economics.
 3
     would it -- be approved? If somebody came along and
 4
     said they wanted to do it in the arts department, is
 5
     that your college, you know?
 6
               CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Well, should we let
 7
    the proposer take the --
 8
                            I mean, it's --
               MR. CRAMER:
 9
               CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. Well, actually,
10
     it's sort of a senate process. I mean, do you want
11
     to talk about how your group would respond to
12
     expressions --
1.3
               MR. SHEATHER: Yeah, I can, and --
               CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: -- of interest?
14
15
               MR. SHEATHER: -- as I do it (1:08:18.7).
16
               CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                   Yeah.
17
               MR. SHEATHER: Will there be any
18
     distraction?
19
                TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Will you repeat that
20
     question?
                I couldn't hear it.
2.1
                MR. SHEATHER:
                               Sorry. Amending this
2.2
    thing where all the concentrations in various spots.
23
     Let's -- let's take selfie pics and put on the --
24
     it's unambiguous.
25
                              Kevin Lafferty, in -- in
               MR. LAFFERTY:
```

accounting. Would you or your colleague oppose or would you encourage those in --

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: College.

2.2

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: And in terms of the -- the mechanics?

MR. ROGER BROWN: I mean, to add to that

-- to that section, we asked them to sort of
establish it in this sort of hub, spoke model where
there will be room for additional spokes in
different application areas with your college
specifically in mind as -- as one that propose
additional concentration areas. It would be
approved just as -- as a program change to add a

new -- new concentration area.

MR. LAFFERTY: Thank you.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Any other factual questions regarding the proposal? Okay. So we have a motion that the senate approved for the submission of the board of trustees the establishment of a new MS in data science housed in the department of computer science within the college of engineering. Any debate on that motion? Debate?

Okay. We'll open that for voting, then. Any last votes on the new MS in data science? Okay. The motion passes.

MR. ROGER BROWN: All right. The next one is a recommendation that the University senate approved for submission to the board of trustees, the establishment of a new MS degree in science translation and outreach in the college of agriculture, food, and environment.

1.3

2.1

2.2

The cooperative extension service has been engaged in science translation for more than 100 years. Extension agents work directly with local leaders in the public to address diverse public needs in different communities.

Rapid scientific progress and increasing complexity have created a need for transdisciplinary education in science translation. The proposal program addresses this need through a set of required courses focusing on program development and evaluation science, literacy, and translation and research methods.

Selective courses allowing specialization and the capstone of course. While not exclusively targeted to such individuals, the proposal notes that nearly 100 college employees are enrolled in master's programs at other institutions. Many of these individuals are extension agents, the population for whom earning their master's degree

opens up career advancement possibilities. The proposed online degree program will address the needs of such extension agents. A cohort of ten students per year is anticipated.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

Some of the proposers here. Yes, excellent. Okay. Great. So any questions of fact regarding this master's? Any questions of fact on the proposal? All right. So we have, then, a motion on the floor that the University senate approved for submission to the board of trustees the establishment of the new MS in science translation and outreach inside the college of agriculture, food, and the environment. Is there debate on that motion? Any debate?

Okay. So we'll open that for voting, then. Any last votes? Okay. The motion passes.

MR. ROGER BROWN: All right. The next item is a recommendation that the University senate approve the establishment of a new 3+3 program.

It's a BS human health sciences in the doctor, physical therapy program within the college of health sciences. The proposed accelerated degree program resulted in the awarding of BS in PT degrees is a combined effort between the division of health

sciences, education and research and the division of physical therapy.

1.3

2.1

2.2

The program would allow high achievement and strongly motivated students to earn both degrees in six years, reducing the customary time date of completion by one year of the two degrees.

Human health sciences students apply for admission to the physical therapy program in their third year, and admitted students would begin DPT coursework in their fourth year. The BS requirements in the admission standards are unchanged, but accept this to the DPT program could be confirmed sooner and purviewing the retention of highly qualified students.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. And we have some of the proposers here today?

MR. ROGER BROWN: Yes.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Great. Yeah. Okay.

Any questions of fact regarding this proposal 3+3

proposal? Any questions of fact?

All right. Then we have a motion on the floor to establish a new 3+3 program, a BS in human health sciences in the DPT in physical therapy. Any debate on that motion? Any debate?

Okay. So we'll open up for voting, then. Go ahead

```
and vote now. Any final votes?
 1
 2
     Okay.
            The motion passes.
 3
              MR. ROGER BROWN: All right.
                                            The next item
 4
     is a graduate certificate.
                                 This is a recommendation
 5
     that the University senate approved the
 6
     establishment of a new graduate certificate in
 7
     fundraising and development --
 8
               CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                   Oops.
                                           Sorry.
               UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:
                                           Back online?
 9
10
               CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                   No.
                                         You can ahead.
11
                UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:
                                            All right.
12
     We're good.
13
                MR. ROGER BROWN: -- in the department of
14
     arts administration within the college of fine arts.
15
     Nonprofit organizations, including educational
16
     institutions, health human services, relief
17
     agencies, and arts and religious organizations
18
     depend on educated and skilled fundraisers.
19
     There's a natural interest from students in the EMAN
20
     arts administration program.
2.1
         Furthermore, there's been large demand for
2.2
     courses in these areas for nonmajor,
23
     nondegree-seeking students, a student population who
24
     would also be served by this program.
25
          Many nonprofit administration degree programs
```

offer a course in fundraising, but few offer the breadth and depth of the proposed online 18-credit certificate program -- the 18 hours that are available online.

This will have courses in a variety of areas associated with fundraising principles and practice. The department will also apply to become an approved provider of continuing education credit, making it the only arts administration department offering such a credit and one of the only providers of that credit online.

The initial anticipated enrollment's eight has grown to nearly 30 projection.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. And we have proposer --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I can answer --

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: -- here with us --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- any

19 questions.

1.3

2.2

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: -- for questioning.

Any questions of fact regarding this proposal?

Okay. So, then, we have a motion on the floor to establish a new graduate certificate in fundraising and development in the department of arts administration within the college of fine arts. Any

debate on that motion? Any debate? Okay. So then we'll open up for voting. Any final votes on the fundraising and development certificate? Any last votes?

1.3

2.2

Somebody is not voting. Okay. It's okay. We can't force you. All right. Motion passes.

Okay. Well, I mean, it's a -- sorry. I --

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: There

MR. ROGER BROWN: The next two are graduate certificates that are proposed also out of the college of agriculture, food, and environment that are meant to be complementary with the master's in science translation and outreach that we just — that we just voted on. They're certificates that can be used to specialize that degree, and — and so that's the context in which these are offered.

This is a recommendation that the University senate approve the establishment of a new graduate certificate positive youth development in the college of agriculture, food, and environment.

The proposed 12-hour graduate certificate will provide students with a theoretical applied and experiential knowledge base related to positive youth development.

Positive youth development is an intentional

pro-social approach that engages youth within their communities, schools, organizations, peer groups, and families in a manner that is productive and constructive.

1.3

2.1

2.2

The program will provide students with information on current research in this field and teach them how to create programming for youth audiences and encourage them to identify and analyze current trends impacting youth and youth-serving organizations.

A primary audience for this program is extension agents. And the program's designed to complement the proposed MS in science translation and outreach. The program's projected to have ten students following the first year.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. And we have some of the proposers here?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Excellent. So any questions of fact for this proposal — this new grad certificate? Okay. So then we have a motion on the floor that the senate approve the establishment of this new graduate certificate in positive youth development inside the college of ag, food, and the environment. Any debate on that motion? Debate?

Okay. We'll vote on that one, then. Any last votes? Okay. Motion passes.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

MR. ROGER BROWN: This is a recommendation that the University senate approve the establishment of the new graduate certificate in family and consumer sciences in the college of agriculture, food, and environment.

The proposed 12-hour graduate certificate will provide students will knowledge and skills to positively effect the quality of individual and family life. The course work will focus on providing critical thinking skills to address problems in diverse family, community, and work environments, and enhancing capacity of building skills that can empower individuals and — and families.

The program includes coursework in the foundations of the area, the intersection of technology with families and society, and cultural sensitivity in the context of working with diverse families. A primary audience for this program is also extension agents and the program's designed to complement the proposed MS in science translation and outreach. This program's predicted to also have ten students following the first year.

Okay. 1 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: And we have a 2 proposer here for that one. Any questions of fact 3 regarding this proposal? Questions of fact? 4 So we have a motion that the senate approve 5 the establishment of a new grad certificate in 6 family consumer sciences inside the college of ag, 7 food, and the environment. Any debate on that motion? Debate? Okay. We'll open that up to vote. 8 9 Any last votes? Okay. Motion passes. 10 MR. CRAMER: This is a recommendation that 11 the University senate approve the establishment of a 12 new graduate certificate in advanced materials 13 characterization. 14 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Hold on a second. 15 MR. CRAMER: Might want to finish. 16 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Yeah. You're right. 17 MR. CRAMER: We're good. 18 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: You're right. Okay. 19 MR. CRAMER: I said this is in advanced 20 material characterization in the department of 2.1 chemical and materials engineering within the 2.2 college of engineering. 23 The proposed graduate certificate's built on 24 existing courses in the materials engineering

graduate programs. The program will teach students

25

fundamental principles and limitations of a range of techniques, sample preparation, and the operation of state of the art equipment in the UK Electron
Microscopy Center.

2.

1.3

2.2

The program's correctly aligned with recent efforts to promote manufacturing and high tech and high impact job readiness in Kentucky. And the proposers have identified a clear need by employers for current and future employees to have a deeper understanding of modern materials characterization techniques.

The proposed program composed of online courses is initially anticipating the enrollment of five students with growth to ten students projected.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. We have a

proposer here in the back. Any questions of fact on this new grad certificate? Okay. So then we'll put the motion on the floor that the senate approve the establishment of a new grad certificate in advance materials characterization in the department of chemical materials engineering within the college of engineering. Any debate on that motion? Debate? Okay. We'll open up for voting. Any last votes? Okay. That motion passes.

MR. CRAMER: This is a recommendation that

the University senate approve the establishment of a new graduate certificate in clinical social work in the college of social work.

2.

2.1

2.2

The proposed graduate certificate prepares students for advance practice in clinical social work. It will move students from the broad foundation of generalist social work practice to an advance level of clinical knowledge and skills, including application of social work practice in clinical settings.

This certificate will complement the master's of social work program, and may be pursued with the MSW or after the completion of the MSW. Completion of the certificate program will prepare students for clinical practice and subsequent clinical licensure. An initial enrollment of 30 students (coughing) 60 students is anticipated.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. We have the proposers over here. Any questions of fact regarding this new grad certificate? Yeah.

MR. ENGLISH: I'm just curious about something. Tony English, health sciences. I'm -- I went through all the things that -- that Aaron's talking about now, but some of the proposals say this is 12 credit hours, and some of them don't say

anything on them. 1 Is that -- is that a different -- like this one 2. 3 doesn't have the credit hours in here. I assume 4 it's probably a nine, but I just wanted to know 5 whether that was legitimate. 6 MR. CRAMER: So I write these little 7 rationales --MR. ENGLISH: 8 Yeah. 9 MR. CRAMER: -- sort of ad hoc in. 10 MR. ENGLISH: Okay. And just sometimes there's --11 MR. CRAMER: 12 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: It's in the proposal. 13 MR. CRAMER: Sometimes on a Friday night I 14 was sitting there typing this out (laughter). CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: (Laughing) sometimes like 15 16 ten o'clock on a Friday. 17 MR. ENGLISH: This is true. Thank you very 18 much. 19 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. Any other 20 factual questions? Okay. So then we have a motion 21 that the University senate approve the new grad 2.2 certificate in clinical social work in the college 23 of social work. 24 Any debate on that motion? Any debate? 25 Okay. We'll open that for voting. Any last votes

on that? Okay. That motion passes.

2.1

2.2

MR. CRAMER: All right. The next item is a recommendation that the University senate approve the establishment of a new graduate certificate in applied nutrition and culinary medicine in the department of pharmacology and nutritional sciences within the college of medicine.

The proposed 12-hour program is designed for health and med — medical professionals, including those in postgraduate training. It is designed to meet the nutrition education needs of such individuals with core coursework in principles of mechanism of nutritional strategies, practical culinary approaches to bridge evidence-based nutrition recommendations with food selection, cooking, and preparation.

Double digit percentage growth in related occupations is projected by 2026. The proposed program is a collaboration among the colleges of agriculture, food, and environment, health science and medicine. An initial enrollment of 20 students growing to 40 or 50 students is anticipated.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. And we have the proposers here? Yes, excellent.

AN/DOR REPORTING& VIDEO TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

MR. CRAMER: Okay.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Any questions of fact regarding this proposal? Okay. So we have a motion that the University senate approve the establishment of this new graduate certificate in applied nutrition and culinary medicine in the department of pharmacology and nutritional sciences within the college of medicine. Any debate on that motion? Okay. Then we'll open voting. Any final votes?

2.2

MR. CRAMER: The next item for recommendation is that the University senate approve the establishment of a new graduate certificate in structural engineering in the department of civil engineering within the college of engineering.

The proposed certificate program will provide students with the necessary background and skills of structural engineers.

There's an increase in workforce need for well-prepared civil engineers to develop more sustainable and resilient structure to replace the nation's aging infrastructure. Demand for civil engineers is projected to grow by eight per -- by 8 percent by 2024. And the National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying has approved a model licensure law requiring a BS plus additional

graduate credit in order to complete professional licensure.

2.

2.1

2.2

The proposed program would serve as a starting point toward those -- those seeking these increased licensure requirements. Enrollment of five students growing to 15 students is projected.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. Do we have a -- a proposer here?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yeah

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: No. Okay. Oh, you know what? I just got an email that he was unavailable. So Aaron can answer questions of fact if there are any. Any questions of fact?

Okay. Then we'll put the motion on the floor that the senate approve the establishment of the new grad certificate in structural engineering in the department of civil engineering in the college of engineering. Okay. Debate on that motion? Any debate. Okay. (Coughing) vote. We got none.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: No.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Anyone --

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Any final votes on this one? Grad certificate in structural engineering, any remaining votes? Okay. Motion passes.

MR. CRAMER: The next item for recommendation is that the University senate approve the establishment of a new graduate certificate in tobacco truth and specialist training in the college

1.3

2.1

2.2

of nursing.

The proposed program's designed to provide students with the knowledge and skills needed to meet the core competencies established for tobacco treatment providers by the Association for the Treatment of Tobacco Use and Dependance. These competencies are organized in domains including tobacco dependence knowledge, counseling skills, assessment, treatment pharmaco therapy, relapse prevention, diversity in specific health issues, documentation and evaluation, professional resources, law and ethics, and professional development.

Completion of the program is the first step
to obtain a national certificate in tobacco
treatment practice. The proposed program builds
upon the bridging research efforts and advocacy for
healthy environments trending program which is
accredited by the Council for Tobacco Treatment
training programs, but the proposers have identified
a specific interest in a graduate certificate in

this area.

1.3

2.2

Enrollment of five to ten students growing to 20 to 25 students is anticipated.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. And we have the proposer here. Thank you. Any questions of fact regarding this new grad certificate in tobacco treatment specialist training?

Okay. Hearing none, we have a motion from the committee that the University senate approve the establishment of a new grad certificate. Any debate? Okay. We'll open it up for voting. Any last votes? Okay. Motion passes.

MR. CRAMER: The next item is a recommendation now for an undergraduate certificate that the University senate establish — approve the establishment of a new undergraduate certificate in aerospace engineering in the college of engineering. Aerospace engineering careers are typically developed in graduate school or through career experience. The proposed undergraduate certificate program introduces students to the multidisciplinary aspects of aerospace engineering while preparing them for either a graduate education or their careers.

Technical electives in mathematical

coursework are paired with an aerospace engineering 1 2 educational experience to provide context. 3 Aerospace is a growth sector in Kentucky's economy 4 requiring engineering expertise in the workforce. 5 An initial 15 students growing to 35 students are 6 anticipated. 7 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: (Coughing) proposers 8 here, or no? Oh, yes. 9 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yeah. There's 10 11 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. 12 Okay. Any questions of fact regarding the new 1.3 undergraduate certificate? Okay. So then we have a 14 motion that the University senate approve the establishment of a new undergraduate certificate in 15 16 aerospace engineering in the college of engineering. 17 Any debate on that motion? Debate? 18 Okay. We'll open up for voting. Any last 19 votes? Okay. Motion passes. 20 MR. CRAMER: All right. This is a 21 recommendation that the University senate approve 2.2 the establishment of a new undergraduate certificate 23 in historic preservation in the department of 24 historic preservation within the college of design.

The proposed interdisciplinary program focuses on an

25

understanding, protecting, and interpreting buildings and landscapes considered historically valuable and caring for such resources with sustainable practices.

1.3

2.1

2.2

The proposed undergraduate certificate is affiliated with the master's of historic preservation program and will introduce students to the history, theory, and practice of historic preservation, introduce related (coughing)

Practices in a rich undergraduate curricula in a variety of disciplines.

The department of historic preservation first offered an introductory undergraduate course in 2015 and strong student demand has been observed ever since. An initial enrollment of 10 students doubling to 20 students is anticipated.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: And we have the proposer here in the back. So any questions of fact regarding the undergraduate certificate in historic preservation? Okay. So we have a motion to approve the establishment of the new undergraduate certificate in historic preservation in the department of historic preservation in the college of design. Any debate on that motion?

Okay. So we'll open the voting. Any last votes?

Okay. Motion passes.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

MR. CRAMER: Last one.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Last one.

MR. CRAMER: This is a recommendation that the University senate approve the establishment of a new undergraduate certificate in financial planning in the department of finance and quantitative methods within the Gatton College of Business and Economics.

The proposed undergraduate certificate is a collaboration between the Von Allmen School of Accountancy and the department of finance and quantitative methods. The program would be the first such program offered in the Lexington area and is the first step for those intending to complete the certified financial planning exam.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics projects a

15 percent increase in personal financial advisors

by 2026 and a large fraction of the current labor

force is expected to retire in the next decade. The

curriculum is comprised of required courses in

accounting and finance. Initial enrollment of 45

students growing to 98 students to almost 100

students is --

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: 98.

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Any one --2 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. I think we have 3 -- the proposer's here in the back. Any questions 4 of fact regarding this proposal? 5 Yeah. 6 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, trustee. 7 Will they have to, like, go to a restaurant to hear 8 a two-hour pitch? 9 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Proposer? 10 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Any other questions of 11 12 fact? Okay. So then we have a motion that the 1.3 senate approve --UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: You know 14 I got to get out of here. 15 what? 16 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: -- senate approve the 17 establishment of an undergraduate certificate in 18 financial planning in the department of finance and 19 quantitative methods within the Gatton College of 20 Business and Economics. Any debate on that motion? 2.1 Yes. 2.2 MR. CROSS: Al Cross, communications. 23 Will they be instructed how to do a two-hour pitch? 24 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Part of the training. 25 Any other debate on this motion? Okay. We'll open

up for voting. Any final votes on this motion? Any last votes? Okay. The motion passes.

So I just wanted to take a minute. As you can see, this is not the end. This committee's going to bring several more recommendations to you in two weeks.

1.3

2.2

Actually, can the senate academic programs committee members who are here just stand for a minute. They've done so much. They — they have — they had a meeting every other week. They agreed to meet weekly. Each of them has taken on many more proposals than they, I think, agreed to when they signed up. I don't know how many of them are coming back next year. But I just want us to express our gratitude because they do a lot of hard work on our behalf and we're very grateful.

So thank you. Okay. Next is a proposal that comes to us through the senate academic organization and structure committee, chair Al Cross.

MR. CROSS: Our committee has not been quite as busy, but we did have --

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: You're still very important.

MR. CROSS: -- difficulty scheduling meetings on this proposal, but finally it is before

you. The academic organization and structure committee recommends that the senate endorse the proposed academic organization of the center for equality and social justice in the college of arts and sciences.

2.2

This center is already operating as an administrative unit. Under this proposal, it doesn't meet the definition of educational unit that requires senate action on its academic content resources or reporting. However, the center and the college do seek senate endorsements of the academic organization saying they are following the example holcot disciplinary research centers.

The center does not appear to be an NDRC because it doesn't have at least one FTE of faculty assigned other than the director assigned to his activities.

However, its interim director, Dr. Christy
Brown, calls the senate endorsement the most prudent
path and says, "There is clearly a lot of faculty,
student, communities, staff, and administrators
support and encouragement for the center."
The proposal says the center's overarching mission
is to promote equality and social justice through
collaborative scholarship and education and to help
highlight the importance of social justice with our

communities' disciplines -- I'm sorry -- communities' public policies and laws.

2.

1.3

2.2

It says there is an urgent need for high quality scholarship from a diverse set of disciplines and viewpoints addressing the policies, consequences, and possible solutions to continued social inequality.

A scholarship, then, needs to be translated toward decision-makers and the public so the research can more effectively inform discussions of justice and equality. The center aspires to be a prominent voice both to the Commonwealth and to the nation in offering research-based recommendations for socially just public policies. It says this can only be done as a formalized research center with full university credentials behind it.

Among other relevant points, the center says it will offer fellowships for graduate and undergraduate students to expand their education and training, offer workshops for faculty hoping to engage in public policy or advocacy work. And although we're not offering classes per se, we'll contribute to both the research and educational admissions of the University.

Committee members made several comments and

suggestions about the original proposal. It was revised as a result, was endorsed by the committee and the senate council, and I'm prepared to ask — answer any questions you may have.

2.1

2.2

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: So we have both Al as the chair of the committee and Christy here -- here as the proposer. So are other members of the committee and those in the body.

Are there questions of fact regarding this proposal?

Any questions of fact?

Okay. So then we have a motion on the floor that the senate endorse this proposed academic organization, the center for quality and social justice in the college of arts and sciences.

Any debate on that motion. Yes.

MR. KORNBLUH: I'd just like to say that the --

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Your name?

MR. KORNBLUH: Mark Kornbluh, college of arts and sciences. This has been a faculty-led event from the start. This is spearing committee of faculty from across main colleges and letters of endorsement from most of those — from all of those colleges, and I think this is a really important thing that the faculty have done. And I just wanted

to --

1.3

2.1

2.2

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Any other debate on that motion?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I would just add one point.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Uh-huh.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: There was some concern that the center might engage in advocacy. I think that its mission could be quickly described as helping others engage in advocacy, and that I think there's plenty of room for University faculty to —to do that. And I — I'm happy to endorse it myself.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Any other debate on the motion to endorse the proposed center for equality and social justice?

Okay. So then we'll open that motion for voting. Any remaining votes on the center for equality and social justice? Okay. The motion passes. All right. Next, Herman Farrell, The other hardest working committee chair in the senate.

MR. FARRELL: The senate admissions and academic standards committee recommends that the senate approve the proposed changes to the MA in philosophy. We're also going to have --

subsequently have to the PhD program. 1 2 In this proposal, the only changes that are being 3 requested is to move away from the comprehensive 4 Instead, students will complete two pro 5 seminars in their first year. There's no change in 6 the total credit hours. It was noted that this 7 action is in keeping with comparable benchmark 8 degree programs, notably -- noting that only 2 of 11 9 benchmarks that require comp exams. 10 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. So any 11 questions about that proposal? Questions of fact? 12 Yes. 13 MR. GIANCARLO: Matt Giancarlo, arts and 14 sciences. Does this mean that there won't be any equivalent to comprehensive exam, comprehensive 15 16 discussion? It will be absorbed into the 17 coursework? 18 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: And is there --19 Is our proposer here? CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: MS. ETTMIMS: No, he's not. 20 2.1 MR. GIANCARLO: Okay. 2.2 MR. KORNBLUH: So Mark Kornbluh, arts and 23 sciences. Yes, I believe that's the case. 24 also came out of the external review of the

department last year, which strongly recommended

25

doing away with our comprehensive exam (1:40:31.4). 1 2. CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Any other questions of 3 fact? Okay. So then we have a motion that the 4 senate approve the proposed changes to the MA in 5 philosophy. 6 Any debate on that motion? Any debate. 7 Okay. We'll open that for voting. Any remaining 8 votes on the changes to the MA in philosophy? 9 Okay. That motion passes. Okav. 10 MR. FARRELL: So this is the comparable 11 change in the -- to the PhD in philosophy. 12 as is saying -- it doesn't say much. 13 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Same thing. But also 14 for the PhD. Okay. Any questions of fact regarding 15 that change? Okay. Yes. 16 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, trustee. 17 So does this replace the qualifying exams -- the 18 oral and written qualifying exams? I mean, that's not the case for the master's but --19 20 MR. FARRELL: No. 21 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: -- PhD. So the 2.2 comprehensive exams are different from the --23 MR. FARRELL: Yes. 24 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: -- written qualifying 25 exams?

1	CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Uh-huh.
2	TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Okay. Thanks.
3	CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Any other factual
4	questions?
5	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: What was
6	the answer to the question?
7	CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: The answer is yes,
8	it is different. And it's a
9	MR. KORNBLUH: Yeah. Mark Kornbluh,
10	arts and sciences. Yes, this is different than the
11	external reviews that allow you doing both of
12	these. So this was this was mostly in
13	literature.
14	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: So they
15	they retain the comp the oral or, sorry the
16	written qualifying exam?
17	MR. KORNBLUH: Yeah, not the
18	comprehensive.
19	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Not the
20	comprehensives. Okay.
21	CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: They retain the
22	written qualifying exams, but not the comprehensive
23	exams. Any other factual questions?
24	MR. TAGAVI: Kavel Tagavi, engineering.
25	What is motivating these changes? What's the

driving force for getting rid of comprehensive 1 2. exams? MR. KORNBLUH: Mark Kornbluh, arts and 3 4 sciences. We take the external review seriously. 5 The department chose people from the outside. 6 came in. They suggested that this was an older 7 style of comprehensive exam which is different than 8 the PhD qualifying exams and it was duplicative and 9 it made some -- too long for students to finish the 10 program. 11 The department then got the review and did 12 their evaluation, and the external review committee 1.3 and we looked forward to changing, and what they're 14 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Any other questions? 15 16 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: 17 record -- major. 18 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. Well, I'll put 19 it up for -- for debate now. There's a 20 recommendation to approve the proposed changes to 21 the PhD. Any debate on that motion. 2.2 Okay. Then, we'll open that for voting. Any last 23 votes for the changes to the PhD in philosophy? 24 Okay. Motion passes. Okay.

MR. FARRELL: Next up, the senate

25

admissions and academic standards committee recommends that the senate approve the proposed changes to the PhD in epidemiology and biostatistics as noted in the proposal the change here includes simply a reduction in credit hours and the course CPH663 from three to one credit hour.

1.3

2.1

2.2

That reduces the total required credit hours for the PhD program from 58 to 56. As noted, the outcomes of CPH60 -- 63 course will no longer require program competency to be available to all departments in the college of public health.

As this was going through the senate council, we realized that there was actually a -- a proposal behind it that is also coming from the college of public health. It will actually be reducing the standards down even further, ending the total credit hours for the PhD program even further down into the 30s if I remember correctly.

And -- but that proposal is not before us.

It's -- it's still coming out of graduate council.

So that's under review right now. All that's under review is this one particular course change and program change.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Okay. Any questions of fact regarding that proposal?

Uh-huh. 1 2 MR. GIANCARLO: Matt Giancarlo, arts and 3 sciences. Would you or the proposers care to 4 comment on the motivations for the reduction in --5 in credit hours? Again, the results of an external 6 review or is it because of time degree concerns? 7 MR. FARRELL: I can't speak to why there's 8 a -- that -- that bigger change because, again, it 9 hasn't been totally -- we haven't even seen it yet. 10 MR. GIANCARLO: Yeah. 11 MR. FARRELL: But is Steve Browning here? Maybe he could respond. 12 13 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: This is the results of 14 a credit change in one of the courses that's a 15 required course from a -- from a --16 MR. FARRELL: Three to one. 17 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: -- three credit to a 18 one credit requirement. So the -- as a result, the 19 course is still required and the number of credits 20 required for the degree has reduced by two. 21 when we see the larger program change, which will 2.2 likely be in fall. Yeah? 23 MR. FARRELL: Yeah. 24 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: I mean -- and not

just likely be in the fall. I was about to say

25

```
likely, and the answer's just it will be in the
 1
 2.
            That one we'll have a larger conversation
 3
     about why they're making the jump.
 4
              MR. FARRELL: And I'm sure that there will
 5
    be more of an -- an explanation as to what is the
 6
    motivation for that larger --
 7
               MR. GIANCARLO: Well --
 8
                MR. FARRELL: Again, all of that was
 9
     stated at the senate --
10
               MR. GIANCARLO: Right.
11
               MR. FARRELL: -- council meeting and I
12
    haven't seen any of the paperwork.
13
               CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Any other questions of
14
     fact on this change and the number of credits
15
     required for this degree? Okay. So then we have a
16
    motion to approve the proposed changes to the PhD in
17
     epidemiology and biostatistics. Any debate on that
18
    motion. All right. We'll open that one for voting.
19
    Any last votes? No. That motion passes.
20
                          And our last proposal today
            MR. FARRELL:
2.1
     the senate admissions and --
2.2
             CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: I don't have any others.
23
              MR. FARRELL: -- academic --
24
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: No.
25
             CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                 Okay. Well, I --
```

MR. FARRELL: (Indiscernible) Sorry. Oh, I'm sorry. I turned the page. The -- the senate admissions and academic standards committee recognized that the senate approved the proposed changes to the BAEDU early elementary education program.

2.1

2.2

In here it's a name change from early elementary education to elementary education because the old name suggests a focus on primary age children when the program involves the entire scope of elementary education.

The proposal also involves a change to the grade standards and requires students to maintain a minimal of 2.75 GPA average to opt the teacher education program, and the program faculty has voted to approve a letter of C or better in content courses that are found — foundational for teaching elementary school.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Do we have a proposer for that change here? Great. Any questions of fact regarding those changes? Any questions of fact?

Yeah.

MR. ALLEN BROWN: Allen Brown, arts and sciences. What is considered content courses? Are those core courses? Or what is that?

1	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yes.
2	MS. WHITE: The content for the are
3	considered
4	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: For?
5	MS. WHITE: content courses and they
6	have the the core at the end of the program when
7	they
8	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: We were clearly
9	
10	MS. WHITE: And the reason we have that is
11	because for certification they have to stay
12	nationally
13	CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Right.
14	MS. WHITE: in these content areas.
15	THE COURT REPORTER: What was your name?
16	CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Sorry. Can you tell
17	us your name one more time?
18	MS. WHITE: Oh. Kim White, elementary
19	ed.
20	CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Kim Wright,
21	elementary ed.
22	UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Kim White.
23	White.
24	MS. WHITE: White.
2.5	CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Oh. sorry. Any other

```
questions of fact? Yes.
 1
 2
                MR. JONES: I think I may have missed
 3
     something.
 4
                CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                   Davey Jones.
 5
                 MR. JONES: So -- yeah.
                                          I think maybe
 6
     that the motion's to change so the word early is not
 7
     there?
 8
                MS. WHITE:
                            Yes.
 9
                UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:
10
     correct.
11
                CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: That's correct.
12
                 MR. JONES: Okay.
                                    I -- I --
1.3
                 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Changes to the
14
     current degree, which include --
                 MR. JONES: Yeah.
15
16
                 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: -- those --
17
                  MR. JONES: You're not changing to
18
     early ed?
19
                  CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                      No.
20
                  MR. JONES: All right.
21
                  UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:
                                              Yeah.
2.2
                  CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Any other factual
23
     questions?
                 Yeah.
24
                 MS. DUNCAN: Marilyn Duncan, college of
25
    medicine.
                How did they determine to keep on instead
```

of their GPA or --

2.

2.2

MS. WHITE: That's a common mistake.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Any other factual questions? Okay. So then you have a motion to approve the proposed changes for the BA in education — early elementary education degree, including the change to the name. Any debate on that motion. Okay. So we'll open voting on that. Any last votes on this proposal? Okay. Motion passes.

Okay. What -- can I say something before you talk about this one? So -- so on this one, we're going to talk about submission of admissions again. And the first thing you're going to hear about is a waiver, which we've talked about over the last couple of meetings.

One of the conversations that we had at the senate council on Monday was whether we could find a way not to have to waive this all the time even in these instances where it seems like no one would come to an open hearing, but we thought about a possibility of making a meeting of the admissions and academic committee the hearing and that the colleges that are under consideration would have responsibility for some sort of notice about the

meeting happening. 1 2 And so we are going to ask for your waiver one 3 more time here, but hopefully come the fall we will 4 not need to be asking this anymore since the 5 meetings themselves will be the hearings that are 6 required under the rules. 7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: And what I 8 would just ask of this is we have a proposal that's 9 coming to us from the same college who's been 10 mindful of this -- of this problem, and so it's 11 coming to us on Thursday and we've already done the 12 open notice -- the notice of an open hearing --1.3 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Oh. UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- that will 14 be held at our meeting on --15 16 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Oh, good. 17 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- Thursday. 18 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: So even at the next --19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: So we're --20 we're already --2.1 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: -- senate meeting 2.2 we're already --23 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- getting it 24 together. 25 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: We're going to --

```
we're not going to need to waive it anymore.
 1
 2
     Anyway, so I -- many of you are brave and taken
 3
     seriously and so we will ask for you to do this one
 4
     more time today, but hopefully this will be the last
 5
     one.
 6
                UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:
                                             Sorry.
 7
     Celeste?
 8
                CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                    Yeah.
 9
                 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:
                                              Just for
10
     clarification, we -- we did have an open forum for
11
     this, but it wasn't University. It was within
12
     our --
1.3
                 CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                     So the senate -- the
14
    problem is the senate rules require the senate
     committee on admissions and academic standards to
15
16
     have an open hearing.
17
                UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: All right.
18
                CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Not the college
19
     itself. So -- so we have continued to fail in that
20
     obligation, but we will not fail in it going
2.1
     forward.
2.2
                UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:
                                             Yeah.
23
                CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                    So you -- I'm sorry.
24
                 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:
25
                CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN:
                                    I just jumped all
```

over your.

2.1

2.2

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: No. No.

That's fine. So the senate admissions and academic standards committee recommends that the senate waive the open hearings and disclosure requirements that are set forth in 3.4.2.2.2 for the proposed suspension of admissions and closure of the BACH-AH program that comes to us from the college of health sciences, department of political sciences.

In this case, it's -- just so I understand what's going on here, admission has been suspended for more than five years. Students have not been enrolled for more than five years in this program. Suspension or deletion as they use that determines closure of this program is a result of an SAP audit review.

This action resulted in a more accurate depiction of the programmatic offerings in the college and UK at large. Results are noted in the meeting that was held by Associate Dean Matt Decola. He just spoke that there have been no students actually in the program for at least 15 years.

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: Any questions of fact regarding this proposal? Okay. So, again, what we're asking is for the waiver of the open hearings

and disclosure requirements.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

So the motion on the table that the senate waive the open hearings and disclosure requirements set forth in the rules or the proposed suspension of closure of this degree. Any debate on that motion.

Okay. We'll open that up for voting, then. Any last votes on this motion?

Okay. That motion passes.

I just — stay for a minute before we vote on this. That's just a good rule itself. College of health sciences has done a lot of this this semester. You notice they've really paid attention to what their outstanding degree program offerings are that aren't currently in use. I would encourage you—all to go back to your own colleges and figure out the same thing if you have programs on your books that aren't being offered. We have now a lot of experience in program closure and suspension of admissions, and so next year we happily help your colleges walk through this process. Oh, sorry. I forget one more time.

MR. FARRELL: So the senate admissions and academic standards committee recommends that the senate approve the proposed suspension of admissions and closure of the BACH-AH program that comes from

the college of health sciences, department of political sciences. And again the rationale's already --

2.

2.1

2.2

CHAIR BIRD-POLLEN: If there's any questions of fact on that motion? Okay. So then we have a motion that the senate approve the proposed suspension of admissions enclosure of the BACH-AH degree. Any debate on that motion.

Okay. We'll open that for voting. Any last votes on that motion? All right. That motion passes.

Okay. Thanks.

And I think as you see here as well, the admissions and academic standards committee has been working hard. The members of that committee who are here, would you mind standing? I'm wanting to acknowledge you. They've got more to come to us in May — in May as well.

Okay. So, my goodness, you've been so efficient and look at that. We -- we are on the last item. Are there any items from the floor today?

Okay. A reminder that I have -- senate council has decided to start this May meeting at two o'clock as well. If you are just as efficient, then you will get out very early in May, but we hope to see

```
you then. So if you would like to vote to adjourn,
 1
    we can do that here. Otherwise, communicate your
 2
 3
     intentions by leaving. Thank you all very much.
     Hopefully next month we will -- no, it will be two
 4
    weeks. We'll be upstairs because the lights will be
 5
 6
     -- thank you all.
 7
       (WHEREUPON, the Senate Council Meeting concludes
 8
     at 4:15 p.m.)
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	
2	CERTIFICATE
3	STATE OF KENTUCKY )
4	COUNTY OF OLDHAM )
5	
6	I, BRENDA YANKEY, the undersigned Court Reporter and
7	Notary Public in and for the State of Kentucky At
8	Large, certify that the facts stated in the caption
9	hereto are true, that at the time and place stated
10	in said caption, that said proceedings were taken
11	down in stenotype by me and later reduced to type
12	writing, and the foregoing is a true record of the
13	proceedings given by said parties hereto and that I
14	have no interest in the outcome of the captioned
15	matter.
16	My commission expires: January 31, 2020.
17	IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I hereunto set my hand and
18	seal of office on this day March 21, 2019
19	Crestwood, Oldham County, Kentucky.
20	
21	
22	
23	BRENDA YANKEY, NOTARY PUBLIC STATE AT LARGE, KENTUCKY
24	NOTARY ID #546481
25	