

Senate Council

Monday, December 5, 2022

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3:00 PM on Monday, December 5, 2022, in 103 Main Building, although a video conference link was also available for members. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken electronically otherwise specified. Specific voting information can be requested from the Office of the Senate Council (SC).

Senate Council Chair DeShana Collett (HS) called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:00 PM. The Chair welcomed those present. She informed everyone that the session was being recorded for notetaking purposes and noted that it was an open meeting. She asked that all attendees, online and in person, state their name and affiliation prior to speaking, to ensure everyone knew who was speaking. The Chair asked SC members to be ready to vote via Poll Everywhere. The Chair reminded SC members that regarding the ability to speak, members must raise their hand to be called upon. The Chair also reminded everyone that SC members would have priority speaking, noting that others may be called upon as needed and given a chance to speak only if there were no additional comments from SC members.

The Chair informed SC members that there were a number of agenda items to get through and asked to limit discussion on the agenda items for the Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules (SR) 1.3 ("Councils of the Senate")* and *SR 1.4.1 ("Structure of University Senate Committees")* and *SR 3.1.3 ("Procedures for Processing Academic Programs and Changes")*, the Discussion on Teacher Course Evaluations (TCEs), and Proposed New Badge Credential.

SC Vice Chair Leslie Vincent (BE) **moved** to limit the discussion on the three agenda items to 10 minutes. Marilyn Duncan **seconded**. A **vote** was taken, and the motion passed with none opposed and one abstained.

1. Minutes from November 28, 2022 and Announcements

The Chair informed SC members that no edits were received to the November 28, 2022 minutes. There being **no objections**, the minutes from November 28, 2022 were **approved as distributed by unanimous consent**.

The Chair announced that Undergraduate Council (UC) Chair Kristine Urschel sent forward the results of the UC's survey of time spent on UC-related activities. The Chair explained that the amount of time their members spent on providing service to the University was wildly different from the Distribution of Effort (DOE) percentages they were provided with. The Chair noted that one UC member had no DOE assigned for service. The Chair informed SC members that she had not met with Urschel yet but was appreciative of the UC's work. The Chair opined that it may be a good idea to ask all active Senate committees and the other two academic councils to undertake a similar exercise.

The Chair informed SC members that this would be the last meeting for SC members Susan Cantrell (ED) and Richard Charnigo (PbH) as their terms were ending. The Chair thanked both Cantrell and Charnigo for their service.

2. Old Business

- a. Proposed Changes to Senate Rules 1.3 ("Councils of the Senate") and SR 1.4.1 ("Structure of University Senate Committees") and SR 3.1.3 ("Procedures for Processing Academic Programs and Changes")

The Chair explained that there not enough time at the last meeting to finish the discussion on the proposed changes to the *Senate Rules (SR)*. The Chair thanked members for staying late last meeting and provided a

brief recap of what was discussed. The Chair noted that because the edits discussed at the prior meeting were clerical in nature, Sheila Brothers (SC) office would post an updated version tomorrow for the Senate meeting.

The Chair remarked that Kaveh Tagavi (EN) had additional comments about ex officio membership and voting status that were not resolved. The Chair explained that ex officio members could be voting or nonvoting; while the *SRs* did not have a standardized way to refer to ex officio members, they were generally clear about who could and could not vote. The Chair noted that the current activity was not intended to change voting rights but explained that explicit voting rights would be included for each academic council and committee. The Chair explained that Tagavi had additional suggestions, which would be reviewed carefully by the SC office and two members of the Senate Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), to ensure suggestions that were within the activity's scope were included.

Sandra Bastin (AG) **moved** to recommend Senate approve the proposed changes to *SR 1.3 ("Councils of the Senate")* and *SR 1.4.1 ("Structure of University Senate Committees")* and *SR 3.1.3 ("Procedures for Processing Academic Programs and Changes")*. Akiko Takenaka (AS) **seconded**. The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate. Tagavi mentioned more substantive suggestions that he sent via email and asked they could be discussed, including terms for ex officio members and faculty members on academic councils and committees, and the style of the composition for the Health Care Colleges Council (HCCC). Katie Silver (SC office) clarified that for each primary HCCC member, there was one corresponding alternate member, whose terms were staggered. Tagavi suggested adding "staggered terms" to the language in the *SRs* describing HCCC members. The Chair noted that she would provide the non-substantive sections back to the SREC chair. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

b. Senate Nominating Committee (SNC) - Bob Grossman, Chair

i. Nominees for Area Committees (Physical Sciences and Engineering, Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts)

The Chair explained the area committees listed had vacancies and needed additional members for January. SNC Chair Bob Grossman (AS) provided four nominees for the Area Committee for Physical Sciences and Engineering, four nominees for the Area Committee for Social Sciences, and five nominees for the Area Committee for Humanities and Arts.

The Chair explained the **motion** was a recommendation from the committee for the SC to approve the proposed nominees for vacancies on the requested Area committees. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair opened the floor to questions of fact and debate for members. It was noted that one of the four nominees provided for Physical Sciences and Engineering was a department chair and therefore ineligible to serve on an area committee. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

ii. Nominees for University Appeals Board

Grossman explained that a current UAB member was willing to continue serving and nominated that member.

The Chair explained the **motion** was a recommendation from the committee for the SC to approve the proposed nominees for the UAB. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions of fact or debate. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

c. Senate Meeting Modality Poll Results

The Chair explained that there were 93 responses for the Senate Meeting Modality Poll. The results indicated hybrid as the most favorable modality, followed by Zoom, followed by in-person. The Chair stated that Senate meetings would continue in a hybrid fashion so long as in-person attendance justified holding hybrid meetings.

d. Discussion on Teacher-Course Evaluations

The Chair explained that she thought SC members were generally aware of the many concerns about Teacher-Course Evaluations (TCEs). The Chair explained University administration had authority over the teacher evaluation component of a TCE, but the Senate oversaw the pieces related to course evaluations. The Chair suggested a proposed charge and composition for an ad hoc committee to consider TCEs as a starting point of discussion for SC members. The Chair suggested that the ad hoc committee should be as follows.

Review UK's teacher-course evaluations, including but not limited to the following: past relevant faculty reports on teacher-course evaluations; the current TCE survey instrument; potential new software for survey distribution; and appropriate use of TCE results. The ad hoc committee shall then review national standards and provide recommendations based on best practices to improve UK's teacher-course evaluation process broadly, including suggestions to decrease bias.

The Chair noted that the goal was to provide a clear charge, but not limit the committee as they consider the issue broadly.

SC members discussed the following:

- Incorporating distance learning (DL) questions throughout the TCE, rather than having standalone DL questions
- Changing the way DL questions were asked to avoid implying that DL course delivery was inferior to in-person course delivery
- Looking at reports from prior TCE ad hoc committees
- The time frame for students to complete TCEs
- Adding questions to TCEs regarding UK Core

The Chair observed that there seemed to be a general consensus around the charge. The Chair explained the draft composition of the ad hoc committee to SC members and explained the representation for each member. Grossman commented that it should be clarified that all members would be voting members, including ex officio members on the ad hoc committee.

Bastin **moved** to approve the proposed charge and composition of the ad hoc committee where all members would be voting members. Duncan **seconded**. A **vote** was taken by show of hands, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

3. Officer Elections

The Chair introduced Senate Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) Chair Roger Brown to facilitate the process of SC officer elections. The Chair also expressed her appreciation for Brown's work and offered praise for the work he does conducting different types of elections for the Senate.

Brown explained the circumstances of both the SC Chair and SC Vice Chair election. Brown explained that the outcome of the election for SC Chair had been determined by willingness of only one candidate to serve. Brown

announced that the current SC Chair DeShana Collett would continue and begin her second term on June 1, 2023.

Brown continued to explain the SC Vice Chair election, noting that there were six eligible candidates and 13 eligible voters (elected faculty members, the SC Chair, and students). Brown informed SC members of the eligible candidates: Sandra Bastin (AG), Olivia Davis (BE), Marilyn Duncan (ME), Robert Grossman (AS), Kaveh Tagavi (EN), and Akiko Takenaka (AS).

Duncan nominated Takenaka, Charnigo nominated Grossman, and Bastin self-nominated. Brown confirmed willingness to serve from Takenaka and Bastin. Grossman declined. Both Takenaka and Bastin were allotted time to speak to SC members.

Brown instructed SC members attending in-person to indicate their own name and their vote by way of paper ballot and asked those attending online to email him using their UKY email. The Chair concurred with his suggestion for the meeting to proceed while he counted votes.

4. Degree Recipients

a. December 2022 In Memoriam Degree List

Vincent **moved** that the elected faculty members of SC recommend Senate approve UK's December 2022 In Memoriam degree list, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Bastin **seconded**. The Chair reminded SC members that only elected faculty members were permitted to vote on degree lists. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

b. December 2022 Degree List

Grossman **moved** that the elected faculty members of SC recommend Senate approve UK's December 2022 degree list, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Davis **seconded**. The Chair opened the floor for questions of fact and debate. Faculty Trustee Aaron Cramer (EN) noted that the Board of Trustees Academic and Student Affairs Committee meeting would occur before the Senate meeting. Cramer explained that the parliamentary action on the degree list at that meeting should be contingent upon the action of the Senate afterwards and the Provost concurred. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

c. Honorary Degree Recipient(s)

The Chair noted that SC members already voted on the honorary degree recipient(s) at the prior SC meeting, and that this item was added to the agenda in error.

d. Late Addition to May 2022 Degree List (per Senate Rules 5.5.1.1.4 ("Late Addition to Degree List"))

i. *College of Engineering Student WB-95*

Grossman **moved** the elected faculty members recommend the Senate amend the May 2022 degree list by adding the BSME Mechanical Engineering for student WB-95 and recommend through the President to the Board of Trustees that the degree be awarded effective May 2022. Vincent **seconded**. The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate. Grossman commented that the confusion surrounding the difference between a double major and a double degree was likely the cause of the student being omitted from the degree list. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

3. Officer Elections (*continued*)

Brown explained that he had the results of the SC Officer elections. Brown thanked everyone and thanked Davy Jones (ME, emeritus) for assisting in certifying the results. Brown announced that Takenaka received five votes and Bastin received seven votes. Brown explained that Bastin's term as SC Vice Chair would begin on June 1, 2023. The Chair congratulated Bastin and said she looked forward to working together.

5. Committee Reports

a. Senate Nominating Committee (SNC) - Bob Grossman, Chair

The Chair explained the Office of the Provost requested nominees with a short turnaround, noting that she requested at least two weeks' notice for future requests to give the committee time to deliberate.

i. Advisory Committee to Provide Recommendations for the Acting Dean Appointment

The Chair explained the request was to identify nominees from the College of Education to serve on an advisory committee that will provide recommendations regarding the acting dean appointment for the College of Education. Grossman explained that two to three nominees were needed and provided six nominees.

The Chair stated the **motion** was a recommendation from the committee for the SC to approve the proposed nominees for the Acting Dean of Education advisory committee. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** is required. The Chair opened the floor for questions of fact and debate. Provost Bob DiPaola thanked Grossman for the nominees. Bastin asked if the number of nominees was sufficient and the Provost clarified that it was. Faculty Trustee Aaron Cramer (EN) noted that this was an area where the Provost was not necessarily obligated to consult the SC and expressed his gratitude for the Provost's consultation of the SC. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

ii. College of Medicine Dean Search Committee

The Chair explained the request pertained to nominees for members of the Dean of Medicine search committee. Grossman explained that three to four nominees were needed and provided five nominees.

The Chair stated the **motion** was a recommendation from the committee for the SC to approve the proposed nominees for vacancies on the College of Medicine dean search committee. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair opened the floor for questions of fact and debate. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. Senate Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) - Sandra Bastin, Chair

i. Proposed New Badge Credential

Bastin explained the proposed new Badge Credential. The Chair stated the **motion** was a recommendation from the committee for the Senate to approve the proposed credential and associated SR language. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair opened the floor for questions of fact and debate.

Tagavi **moved** to amend the proposal to explicitly state that non-credit bearing badges would not be on the transcript. Vincent **seconded**. A **vote** was taken by show of hands, and the motion to amend the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

SC members discussed the following:

- The relationship between the badge credential and the University's QEP (quality enhancement program)

- Use of badges at other institutions
- Badges were considered a stackable credential that could lead to a certificate, therefore awarded badges did not need to be considered by the Board of Trustees

Cantrell noted that the badge credential was a solid evaluation component for reaffirmation when it came to the QEP.

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

c. Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) - Leslie Vincent, Chair

i. Proposed Change to BPH Public Health

Vincent explained the proposed change to BPH Public Health. The Chair stated the **motion** was a recommendation from the committee for the Senate to approve the proposed changes to the BPH Public Health. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** is required. The Chair opened the floor for questions of fact and debate. Grossman asked a clarifying question about the proposal's GPA requirements. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstained.

d. Senate Committee on Distance and e-Learning (SCDLeL) - Sara Police, Chair

i. Proposed Online Delivery of Graduate Certificate in School Social Work

Police explained the proposed online delivery of the Graduate Certificate in School Social Work. The Chair stated the **motion** was a recommendation from the committee for the Senate to approve online delivery of the Graduate Certificate in School Social Work. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** is required. There were no questions of fact or debate. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

e. SC Subcommittee on the Faculty's Evaluation of the President

i. Follow-Up Report

The Chair provided a follow-up report from the SC subcommittee on the Faculty's Evaluation of the President. The Chair explained that during her presentation to the Board of Trustees, it was noted that no qualitative analysis had been performed. The Chair informed SC members that President Capilouto had subsequently posed questions to her about the survey's methodology and qualitative results, so the qualitative analysis was performed post-hoc.

The Chair noted the post-hoc qualitative analysis was consistent with the sentiments expressed to the Board of Trustees during the presentation. The Chair explained that this qualitative analysis was limited to content analysis only and that sentiment analysis was not performed. Faculty Trustee Aaron Cramer (EN) commented that he found the report to the Board to be quite ordinary and was surprised for the need for the subcommittee to be engaged in such an exercise given the ordinary nature of that report.

SC members discussed the following:

- Whether the coded themes identified by the content analysis needed sentiment analysis for context
- Reservations about publicizing qualitative data
- Publicizing free-text responses would be inappropriate and not generally useful to the public
- The qualitative analysis performed was not intended to be conclusive research, but was helpful when combined with the quantitative analysis

Grossman **moved** that SC only publish the quantitative data that was typically published in prior years. Bastin **seconded**. The Chair asked if there was any discussion and there was none. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstained.

Davy Jones (emeritus faculty) asked a clarifying question about what was received by the Board. The Chair clarified the quantitative results of the survey were summarized in the report to the Board, and that the President received that report as a courtesy. Vincent asked if she envisioned the qualitative effort becoming a part of the report to the Board. The Chair stated that it would be beneficial for SC to ensure this component was considered, based on the President's interest and the Board's interest. Other points of clarification were discussed, including how the free text responses from the survey were distributed to the President (for the question pertaining to comments for the President only) and SC members (for the question pertaining to comments to help the SC evaluation of the President), and whether that data was sanitized. The Chair stated that she would bring the topic up again with SC before deploying the next survey for the faculty evaluation of the President.

f. Subcommittee on Programs without Faculty Oversight - Leslie Vincent, Chair

i. Update on Activities

In the interest of time, the Chair asked SC members to consider the Tentative Senate Agenda for December 12, 2022 and save the committee report from the Subcommittee on Programs without Faculty Oversight for old business at the next SC meeting. There were **no objections**.

6. Tentative Senate Agenda for December 12, 2022

The Chair explained that Faculty Trustee Aaron Cramer (EN) had pointed out that the degree lists were accidentally omitted from the tentative Senate agenda. A few other clerical errors were pointed out, including an edit to the Senate meeting date.

Vincent **moved** to approve the tentative Senate agenda as amended, with the ability to rearrange agenda items if needed. Duncan **seconded**. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:01 PM with **no objections**.

Respectfully submitted by,
DeShana Collett

Prepared by Katie Silver on Tuesday, December 6, 2022

SC Members Present: Sandra Bastin, Susan Cantrell, Richard Charnigo, DeShana Collett, Aaron Cramer, Olivia Davis, Marilyn Duncan, Bob Grossman, Andrew Laws, Kiarah Raglin, Hollie Swanson, Kaveh Tagavi, Akiko Takenaka, Leslie Vincent

Invited Guests Present: Kalea Benner, Sheila Brothers, Roger Brown, Katie Cardarelli, Sarah Cprek, Robert DiPaola, Sara Police, Gregg Rentfrow