Senate Council

Monday, April 25, 2022

The Senate Council met in regular session at 2:00 PM on Monday, April 25, 2022, in 103 Main Building, although a video conference link was also available. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken electronically using Poll Everywhere unless otherwise specified. Specific voting information can be requested from the Office of the Senate Council (SC).

Senate Council Chair Aaron Cramer (EN) called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 2:02 PM. The Chair welcomed those present. He informed everyone that the session was being recorded for notetaking purposes and noted that it was an open meeting. He asked that all attendees, online and in person, state their name and affiliation prior to speaking, to ensure everyone knew who was speaking. He suggested that anyone attending via phone use a headset, as using speakerphone made it difficult for audio to be captured and others to hear.

1. Minutes from April 18 and Announcements

The Chair reported that no edits were received for the minutes from the April 18 SC meeting. There being **no objections**, the minutes from April 18 were **approved as distributed by unanimous consent**.

The Chair announced that the reappointment of Academic Ombudsman Alice Turkington had been finalized.

The Chair informed SC members that activity regarding campus-wide committees would be conducted via listserv.

The Chair informed SC members on behalf of SC and Senate, he approved temporary online delivery for ME 325 and ME 440. The Chair noted that course proposals to permanently add DL to ME 325 and ME 440 were in Curriculog awaiting Undergraduate Council review.

2. Old Business

a. Final Report from Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Policies for Unscheduled Closings

The Chair introduced Akiko Takenaka (AS) to provide a final report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Policies for Unscheduled Closings. Takenaka shared the report with SC members and the proposed *Senate Rule* change. The Chair noted there was a **motion** from committee was for SC to recommend Senate approved the proposed Senate Rule change, effective immediately. The Chair asked if there were any questions of fact.

Bob Grossman (AS) asked if the cancellation of in-person activities were intended for the type of closure mentioned in the proposal. Takenaka confirmed this was the intention. Grossman noted clarification would be helpful, as the rule could be interpreted as "all in-person activities during the closure time." The Chair asked if there were any objections to amending the proposed rule change with clarification by way of friendly amendment. There were **no objections**. Faculty Trustee Lee Blonder (ME) asked if the rule change pertained to the health care colleges as well. Vice Chair and Chair-elect DeShana Collett (HS) confirmed that the health care colleges closed when the President announced campus closure, noting that clinical rotations and internships were not impacted by unscheduled closings.

The Chair stated the amended **motion** from committee was for SC to recommend Senate approved the proposed Senate Rule change, effective immediately. Because the **motion** came from committee, no second was required. The Chair asked if there was any debate. Grossman asked if University administration had been consulted, noting that Executive Vice President for Financial Administration Eric Monday had oversight regarding unscheduled University closures. Takenaka confirmed that UK Spokesperson Jay Blanton was part

of the committee to represent University administration and noted Blanton's approval of the proposal. Leslie Vincent (BE) expressed her favor for requiring instructors to provide an asynchronous learning opportunity because it would eliminate inconsistency, noting that some courses only met once a week. Vincent commented that this allowed the University to continue to provide the education and learning opportunities that students deserved. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with two opposed and none abstained.

3. Degree Recipients

a. May 2022 In Memoriam Honorary Degree Recipients

The Chair reminded senators that per Kentucky law and *Senate Rules*, only the senators elected by college faculty members may vote on degree lists. Collett **moved** for elected faculty SC members, on behalf of the elected faculty senators of the University Senate, to approve the May 2022 In Memoriam degree list, for submission through the President, to the Board of Trustees. Takenaka **second**. The Chair asked if there was any debate and there was none. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. May 2022 Degree List

The Chair noted the May 2022 Degree List included names of students who were added by Senate members over the last week. Vincent **moved** for elected faculty of SC to approve, on behalf of the elected faculty senators of the University Senate, the revised UK May 2022 degree list, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Cantrell **seconded**. The Chair asked if there was any debate and there was none. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

c. August 2022 Degree List

The Chair asked for SC members to recall that the Board of Trustees approved the August 2022 Degree List, as Senate did not meet again until September 2022. Cantrell **moved** for elected faculty of SC to approve, on behalf of the elected faculty senators of the University Senate, the August 2022 Degree List, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Takenaka **seconded**. The Chair asked if there was any debate and there was none. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

4. Proposed Changes to Administrative Regulations and Governing Regulations – Marcy Deaton (Senior Associate General Counsel) and Katherine McCormick (Acting Associate Provost for Planning and Assessment)

a. Proposed Change to Governing Regulations I ("The University of Kentucky (Definition)")
b. Proposed Change to Governing Regulations II ("Governance of the University of Kentucky")
c. Proposed Change to Governing Regulations IV ("The University Senate")
d. Proposed Change to Governing Regulations XI ("Student Affairs")

The Chair invited Marcy Deaton (senior associate general counsel) and Katherine McCormick (acting associate provost for planning and assessment) to present the proposed changes to the Governing Regulations (GR). The Chair explained that the proposed changes to GR I, II, IV, and XI were similar in nature and largely replaced outdated position titles. The Chair asked if there were any objections to considering the items as single action. There were **no objections.**

Deaton asked SC members if there were any questions. SC members discussed the following:

- Why the section of the solicitation of funds was being removed (Deaton responded that the Office of Legal Counsel could not find a reason for it to exist, noting that portions of the section were outdated)
- A clerical error placing an accent mark over the "e" in CAFE (Deaton noted this would be corrected)

- If the proposed changes had gone through the Regulations Review Committee (Deaton explained the committee had not met yet to review the proposed changes, but would review the changes before the second reading of the changes by the Board of Trustees)

The Chair noted that the proposed changes would be sent to the Board of Trustees, noting that the Senate would also have opportunity to review and provide feedback. The Chair explained the first reading of the proposed changes would take place by the Board of Trustees on Friday, and that the second reading would take place in June. Grossman **moved** for SC members to recommend Senate endorse the proposed changes to GR I, II, IV, and XI. Collett **seconded**. The Chair asked if there was any debate and there was none. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

5. Committee Reports

a. Senate Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) - Leslie Vincent, Chair
The Chair invited SAPC Chair Leslie Vincent (BE) to provide a report from the SAPC.

i. *Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Integrated Strategic Communications*
Vincent explained the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Integrated Strategic Communications. The Chair asked if there were any questions and there were none. The Chair stated the **motion** from committee was for SC to recommend Senate approve the establishment of the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Integrated Strategic Communications with the Department of Integrated Strategic Communications and in the College of Communication and Information and approve for online delivery. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair asked if there was any debate and there was none. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

ii. *Proposed New Graduate Certificate in DeafBlind*
Vincent explained the proposed new Graduate Certificate in DeafBlind. The Chair informed SC members that proposer Jennifer Grisham (ED) was also attending. The Chair noted that proposers also intended to seek approval for online delivery, so the proposal was held to receive a recommendation from the Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLeL). SCDLeL Chair Roger Brown (AG) noted there were no concerns from the SCDLeL. The Chair asked if there were any questions. Takenaka noted there were still some clerical errors where DeafBlind still contained a hyphen. The Chair explained to Grisham, who was not present at the last SC meeting, that an amendment was accepted on the floor at the previous SC meeting to represent the correct spelling as DeafBlind. Grossman asked if DeafBlind was an adjective or a noun and commented that the certificate left an adjective without a noun. The Chair reminded SC members that they were still asking questions of fact and that debate should be reserved for when debate was requested.

The Chair stated that the **motion** from committee was for SC to recommend Senate approve the proposed new Graduate Certificate in DeafBlind within the Department of Early Childhood, Special Education, and Rehabilitation Counseling in the College of Education for online delivery. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with one opposed and none abstained.

b. Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) - Michelle Sizemore, Chair
The Chair invited SAASC Chair Michelle Sizemore (AS) to provide a committee report from the SAASC.

The Chair explained that the agenda item for the proposed changes to *Senate Rules Section 4 ("Rules and Relating to Admission to the University")* had been removed at the request of the proposer, Christine Harper (associate vice president for enrollment management).

ii. *Proposed Change to Senate Rules 5.3.2.1 ("Repeat Option," Undergraduate Students")*

Sizemore explained the proposed change to *Senate Rules 5.3.2.1 ("Repeat Option," Undergraduate Students").* Sizemore noted that the recommendation was to change the rule regarding the use of the repeat option for only students who are enrolled in the University. Sizemore explained the SAASC recommendation to strike the particular language "and must be enrolled at UK" in the repeat option was part of a larger proposal for the repeat option. The Chair asked if there were any questions.

Collett asked if the word "student" implied enrollment and if other adjacent *Senate Rules* had been reviewed. Sizemore explained the committee discussed a host of related and adjacent issues from the proposal but not that aspect.

The **motion** from committee was for SC to recommend Senate approve proposed changes to *SR 5.3.1.2*, effective July 1. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair asked if there was any debate. Collett requested clarification on what it meant for someone who was a student but not enrolled. Sizemore noted the committee did not land on the issue of the term "enrolled," and that scenarios could be further considered. Sizemore explained the intention of the proposed change was to avoid preventing students from being able to use to the repeat option who may be awaiting a transcript or studying abroad. Kaveh Tagavi (EN) asked what the difference was between a student who was enrolled and a student who was registered. Grossman commented that he was not as concerned with the language as others, noting that he believed the language to be clear and was not intended to be technical. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with one opposed and three abstained.

c. Senate UK Core Education Committee (SUKCEC) – Keiko Tanaka, Chair

i. *Proposed Change to Senate Rules 1.4.3.3*

The Chair invited SUKCEC Chair Keiko Tanaka (AS) to provide a report from the SUKCEC. Tanaka explained the proposed change to *Senate Rules 1.4.3.3*. The Chair asked if there were any questions. Tagavi noted the language stated that five ex-officio nonvoting members were to be identified by the Chair. The Chair explained that it had been operationalized throughout his term for the SUKCEC chair to select the ex-officio nonvoting members. Tagavi asked if the language intended to use the word "approve" for courses recommended to the Undergraduate Council by the SUKCEC. Tanaka clarified that the courses were approved and recommended by SUKCEC to the Undergraduate Council for final approval. The Chair noted the issue regarding unclear verbiage in Senate committee charges was a known issue. Shannon Oltmann (CI) asked about the language regarding the policies by which a course could be designated as Core. Tanaka explained the committee had been debating the language, noting that SUKCEC could not currently recommend a policy without the language.

The **motion** from committee was for SC to recommend Senate approve proposed change to *SR 1.4.3.3*, effective immediately. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair asked if there was any debate.

Grossman **moved** that SC amend the language to specify that the Chair of SUKCEC would be the actor that invites five ex-officio nonvoting members from the listed areas to join the committee. Collett **seconded**. The Chair noted that this would The Chair asked if there was any debate. Tagavi commented

that the practice of chairs having the final say of membership of a committee seemed appropriate. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with two opposed and none abstained.

Tagavi commented that he did not believe the committee should be responsible for communicating something that would be presumably recommended to SC. Oltmann **moved** to amend the language under the second function to state the committee "shall recommend policies by which courses may receive UK Core designation to the Senate." Collett **seconded**. The Chair noted that this motion would be described as "motion from the floor #1."

The Chair asked if there was any debate. Grossman noted he supported the amendment but asked about the language after the proposed new language. Oltmann clarified her motion removed the language regarding communicating. Grossman asked who would inform the colleges. The Chair observed that when the Senate took action, it was disseminated broadly across campus and the Chair was free to delegate the dissemination such information. Sheila Brothers (SC office) explained that she routinely communicated Senate actions broadly to the colleges after each Senate meeting. Charnigo (PbH) then suggested to add the language, "If called upon by Senate to do so, it shall also broadly communicate approved policies to all undergraduate colleges, the University Registrar, and other appropriate parties." The Chair asked if there were any objections to the amendment to the motion being categorized as a friendly amendment. There were **no objections**. The Chair then asked if there were any objections to the motion from Oltmann as amended by Charnigo. There were **no objections**.

The Chair stated that SC members were now debating the amended proposal. Grossman commented that the language under the third function still stated that the SUKCEC would approve and recommend all courses. The Chair commented that this was a known issue with committee charges and ruled the debate of order since it was beyond the scope of the proposal. Tagavi suggested to drop the word "approve" from the language mentioned by Grossman. The Chair stated that Tagavi could appeal the ruling that he had just made that the debate was out of order. The Chair asked if there was any further debate on the motion as amended and there was none. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

The Chair thanked Tanaka.

d. Graduate Council - Martha Peterson, Chair

i. *Proposals Regarding Duolingo and TOEFL Essentials*

The Chair informed SC members that Acting Dean of the Graduate School Martha Peterson was unable to join SC members today. The Chair noted that Angela Garner (AS) and Suzanne McGinnis (GS) were in attendance. McGinnis explained the proposals regarding Duolingo and TOEFL Essentials, to extend the acceptance of Duolingo for the 2022-23 and 2023-24 academic years as the language test requirements for Graduate School admissions for non-native English-speaking applicants. McGinnis explained TOEFL Essential was a new test that they were reviewing to establish a minimum score. McGinnis noted the Graduate School wished to accept these scores in the same manner as Duolingo with a follow-up interview by Center for English as a Second Language (CESL) faculty.

The Chair asked if the Graduate Council would propose to use the tests permanently if data showed that they were appropriate for Graduate School admissions for non-native English-speaking applicants. McGinnis responded that they would. The Chair asked if there were any questions of fact. Tagavi asked if this was intended for English-speaking applicants. The Chair explained the modifier clarified that this was intended for non-native English-speaking applications. Tagavi commented that they were still English-speaking applicants. The Chair noted that these proposals provided different means of satisfying

the existing language admission requirement for the Graduate School for non-native English-speaking applicants.

The **motion** from the Graduate Council was for SC to recommend Senate approve the use of TOEFL Essentials and extend acceptance of Duolingo (with a 115 minimum), for the 2022-23 and 2023-24 academic years, with possible interview by faculty from the Center for English as a Second Language (CESL). Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair asked if there was any debate and there was none. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

6. Proposed Extension of Badge Pilot through Summer 2022

The Chair explained the Senate Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) was still reviewing the proposal associated with the extension of the badge pilot through Summer 2022. The Chair noted that since the SAPC was not yet ready to make a recommendation, the request was to extend the pilot until a recommendation from SAPC was received. SAPC Chair Vincent explained some of the work that the committee had done regarding the proposal, including the addition of Senate language to provide definitions.

Cantrell **moved** for SC to recommend Senate extend the digital badge pilot through the end of the 2022-23 academic year. Duncan **seconded.** The Chair asked if there was any debate. SC members discussed the following: if there was a successor to replace Kathi Kern (AS); who facilitated the badge working group; how successful the badge pilot had been to date; and if the committee felt it had been successful. Vincent noted that evaluation of success of the badge pilot would be similar to the evaluation of success of other programs. Tagavi suggested adding semester or term to the date to make the language clearer. The Chair asked if there were objections to a friendly amendment to change the language to the "end of the Spring 2023 semester" and there were none. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with one opposed and none abstained.

7. Proposed Establishment of Comprehensive Transition and Postsecondary Program - Johnny Collett

The Chair reminded SC members that they had previously discussed the Comprehensive Transition and Postsecondary (CTP) program. The Chair welcomed Johnny Collett (Human Development Institute) , who gave a brief, high-level overview of the program to SC members. The Chair explained the proposal was from the Human Development Institute (HDI) and explained to SC members that three items were being considered, per SC's previous review: the name of the credential, the program requirements, and the admissions requirements. The Chair asked if there were any questions of fact.

Tagavi asked what a credential was and what the University of Kentucky College and Career Studies was. J. Collett explained that the "meaningful credential" often showed up in federal law and noted that the HDI was asked by SC how to name the meaningful credential. Tagavi asked how students would benefit from the program. J. Collett explained proposal program was a non-degree program and that students on the non-degree program would be responsible for tuition like any other student at the University. Tagavi asked if the program was a "non-degree degree." Collett noted that the term "degree" was not identified in the proposal.

Cantrell **moved** to recommend Senate approve the name of credential, "College and Career Studies." Vincent **seconded**. The Chair asked if there was any debate. Oltmann noted that she was supportive of the proposal but asked if Senate should approve the proposal before the application sent by HDI to the Department of Education (DOE) had been approved. Tagavi asked about the credit mentioned in the proposal, asking what the credit was for and if it was educational credit. Oltmann commented that she felt the language in the proposal was clear that the credential was not a degree. Duncan commented there were other non-degree programs at the

University for which students went through requirements and earned credit, noting she saw no concerns with calling the CTP program a program. A robust discussion took place and SC members discussed the following:

- If the coursework in the proposal was undergraduate or graduate coursework (J. Collett clarified it was undergraduate coursework)
- Whether students who received Es in coursework would still receive the credential (J. Collett responded that They would not, and that measuring progress in the program would be aligned satisfactory progress for any student in the University)
- If the second item being considered would need to include requirements of satisfactory progress (J. Collett commented that he could send the application from the DOE to the SC to clarify)
- Whether a new type of degree should be created to replace the credential
- If the internship mentioned in the program proposal was more career-focused
- If the credential would appear on a student's transcript

A **vote** was taken on the name of the credential and the motion **passed** with two opposed and one abstained.

The Chair informed SC members that the second item regarding the requirements of the program was now being considered. Grossman expressed concern that the credential could be completed with audited coursework and that there was no faculty body overseeing curriculum proposed in the program. The Chair stated there was not yet a motion on the floor. Cagle (AS) **moved** to recommend Senate approved the proposed program requirements for the College and Career Studies CTP program. Vincent **seconded.** The Chair asked if there was any debate. A robust discussion took place, and SC discussed the following:

- Whether HDI had faculty (the Chair clarified they did not)
- If the intention of the coordinator for the program was to know if audited coursework was serving the student (J. Collett clarified it was intentional)
- Who was responsible for identifying internships (J. Collett explained that unlike other similar programs, a full time CTP coordinator was in place to help students meet requirements)
- If the portfolio went through assessment (J. Collett explained portfolios would be reviewed)
- What would happen if funding did not come through from the DOE (J. Collett noted that HDI was committed to keeping the program active and informed SC members that funding was already available for the next two years)
- If the faculty members associated with the program had the distribution of effort time in their workload dedicated to the institute

Grossman suggested to add a sentence that would indicate the instructor would work with the student for audited coursework. The Chair observed that this was already a condition of the Senate policy regarding auditing. Grossman **moved** to add a sentence to specify that the student's coordinator would work with the student and instructor to successfully achieve student goals. Charnigo **seconded**. The Chair noted that this motion would be described as "motion from the floor #2."

Tagavi asked how resolution would be achieved if there was disagreement between the student (and coordinator), and the instructor. Grossman noted the instructor was in charge of the course. Tagavi asked what the effect of failing to satisfy the requirements for the audit of a course was. University Registrar Kim Taylor explained the grade for an audited course was "AU" and that there was no alternative, noting that she had not observed a situation where a student failed to satisfy the requirements for an audited course. Charnigo commented that the student could be assigned a "W" by the Dean if they did not attend an audited course but noted this was outside the scope of the discussion. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with one opposed and two abstained.

The Chair asked if there was any further debate on the motion to recommend Senate approve the proposed program requirements as amended, to require the collaboration of the instructor and HDI coordinator. A **vote** was taken, and then motion **passed** with one opposed and none abstained.

The Chair informed SC members that the third item regarding admissions processes was now being considered. Grossman **moved** to recommend Senate approve the proposed changes to *SR 4.2.1.3.1* and *SR 4.2.1.3.1.3* as outlined in the request from HDI. Vincent **seconded.** The Chair asked if there was any debate. Tagavi asked Kim Taylor if there was someone in UK Admissions who could manually enter the information to enroll the applicant as a non-degree seeking UK student. Taylor stated that this was generally how admissions worked, but that she preferred not to answer since she did not work in admissions. J. Collett noted that the HDI would be meeting soon with Student Financial Services, the University Registrar, and University Admissions to have conversations of a similar nature. Tagavi asked if J. Collett knew who granted admissions. J. Collett noted that the body that would admit the students of the CTP program is the body that admits other students to the University. Tagavi asked who would be in charge of granting admissions. The Chair suggested that Admissions, within Enrollment Management, usually granted admission to the University. J. Collett noted the program would have a process in place to determine eligibility and ensure the University was a good fit for the student. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with one opposed and none abstained.

The Chair asked J. Collett to provide the CTP application submitted to the Department of Education to the Senate Council office, to post for the Senate meeting on Monday.

8. Tentative Senate Agenda for May 2, 2022

a. Graduate Council item on Duolingo and TOEFL Essentials

The Chair noted one missing item from the tentative Senate agenda for May 2, 2022, was the Graduate Council item on Duolingo and TOEFL Essentials.

Vincent asked if the item removed from the SC's agenda (from the SAASC) needed to be removed. The Chair confirmed that was correct. Vincent **moved** to approve the amended Senate agenda for May 2, 2022. Oltmann **seconded**. The Chair asked if there was any debate and there was none. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstained.

9. Items from the Floor (Time Permitting)

Time did not permit for items from the floor.

The Chair noted that this was his last regular SC meeting and told SC members it had been a pleasure to serve them. The Chair said it had been a pleasure to work with everyone over the last two years. SC members expressed their appreciation for the Chair with a round of applause.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:22 PM with no objections.

Respectfully submitted by,
Aaron Cramer

SC members present: Blonder, Cagle, Cantrell, Charnigo, Collett, Cramer, DeCorte, Duncan, Grossman, Hawse, Oltmann, Swanson, Tagavi, Takenaka, Vincent

Invited guests present: Sheila Brothers, Johnny Collett, Marcy Deaton, Katherine McCormick, Suzanne McGinnis, Michelle Sizemore, Keiko Tanaka

Prepared by Katie Silver on May 5, 2022