

Senate Council

Monday, January 9, 2023

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3:00 PM on Monday, January 9, 2023, 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 3:03 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 asked SC members and guests to introduce themselves, as there were more people attending the meeting than usual.

1. [Minutes from December 5, 2022 and Announcements](#)

The Chair informed SC members that no edits were received to the December 5, 2022 minutes. There being **no objections**, the minutes from December 5, 2022 were **approved as distributed by unanimous consent**.

The Chair reminded SC members that the March 13 SC meeting would fall during Spring Break and asked SC members to let the SC office know their availability for that meeting. The Chair also asked SC members to indicate their availability for the April 3 SC meeting, noting that Fayette County's spring break occurred during this week. The Chair reminded SC members that the March Senate meeting would take place on March 20.

The Chair note that the SC office was constantly working to improve office processes to ensure Senate processes were as clear as possible. The Chair informed SC members that one area of confusion the SC office had noticed related to terms describing program changes in the *Senate Rules (SR)*. Currently, there were "minor" program changes, "major" program changes, and "significant" program changes. The Chair explained significant and minor program changes to SC members and noted that removing the word "major" would provide a far more logical taxonomy. The Chair explained the SC office was planning to propose a modification of terminology to simplify nomenclature that would not change any policies or procedures. The Chair noted the office would send forward a recommendation for this change in the coming weeks.

The Chair thanked everyone for their work on the badge proposal. The Chair noted she was pleased that SC and Senate were able to: create a new credential that some students and employers would highly value; work jointly with administrative leadership on the proposal to ensure the University is ready to implement what Senate has established; and ensure the Senate is well positioned to maintain faculty oversight of curricular content in all its shapes and forms. The Chair informed SC members that the SC office staff worked on updated the *SRs* over the break and ran into some areas in the proposal which were a little difficult to codify, related to the approval process steps for badges homed outside a college. After discussions with members of the Senate Rules and Elections and Committees (SREC) and others involved with the proposal, it was agreed that academic council oversight would be necessary for every badge proposal (credit-bearing and non-credit bearing, and homed within and outside a college), to ensure broad University vetting. The Chair described the approval process for

badge proposals and noted badges would be put on a 10-day post (web transmittal) for final approval to ensure broadest vetting possible. Given that this was a new credential, the Chair noted that issues should be expected. The Chair explained she would inform SC members of any issues the SC office noticed.

The Chair informed SC members that new forms had been created – one a new badge, as well as a form to create a faculty body. The Chair noted that once the forms were working as intended, they would be brought to SC for review and approval.

The Chair announced that she approved the temporary addition of online delivery for CS 628, noting that the temporary addition of distance learning (DL) would allow the eight enrolled students to take the course.

2. Consent Agenda

The Chair informed SC members that the SAPC had reviewed a number of University Scholars Program (USP) proposals that were all positively recommended. The Chair noted all proposals were compliant with the *SRs* and placed on a consent agenda at SAPC Chair Sandra Bastin's request.

The Chair asked SC members if anyone would like to remove something the consent agenda. There being **no objections**, the consent agenda for January 9 was adopted.

- a. Proposed New USP between BS Agricultural and Medical Biotechnology and MS Integrated Plant and Soil Sciences
- b. Proposed New USP between BS Agricultural and Medical Biotechnology and PhD Integrated Plant and Soil Sciences
- c. Proposed New USP between BS Natural Resources and Environmental Science and MS Integrated Plant and Soil Sciences
- d. Proposed New USP between BS Natural Resources and Environmental Science and PhD Integrated Plant and Soil Sciences
- e. Proposed New USP between BS Aerospace Engineering and MS Mechanical Engineering
- f. Proposed New USP between BS Aerospace Engineering and PhD Mechanical Engineering
- g. Proposed New USP between BA International Studies and MA Diplomacy and International Commerce

The Chair noted that the SAPC had discussed whether or not the Senate needed to approve every USP proposal if the guidelines and requirements were well-established. The Chair informed SC members that it was likely a proposal would come forward to modify the *SRs* slightly to indicate that if the requirements for USP proposals in the *SRs* were met, representatives of both degree programs would just need to request the Graduate School create the USP. The Chair noted the Senate already had the framework for USPs in the *SRs*. The Chair asked SC members to share any thoughts with Bastin as soon as possible.

3. Old Business

- a. Subcommittee on Programs without Faculty Oversight - Update on Activities

The Chair asked SC Vice Chair Leslie Vincent (BE) to provide an update on activities from the subcommittee of Programs without Faculty Oversight. Vincent provided an update to SC members including information about the subcommittee's activities, goals, timeline, evaluation, and development recommendations.

The Chair thanked Vincent for her report.

4. Committee Reports

a. Senate Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) – Sandra Bastin, Chair

The Chair invited SAPC Chair Sandra Bastin (AG) to provide a committee report.

i. Proposed New MS Criminal Justice (online)

Bastin explained the proposed new MS in Criminal Justice, to be offered online. The Chair explained the proposal also involved online delivery and was reviewed by the Senate Committee for Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLeL), as well, and invited SCDLeL Chair Sara Police (ME) to provide information from the SCDLeL review. Police noted that one point of discussion among committee members was if there was a sufficient number of faculty to teach in the program. The proposer made it clear that the college could not advertise new faculty postings until the program was approved. Police explained the SCDLeL made a unanimous recommendation to approve.

The Chair explained there was a recommendation from the SAPC that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new MS Criminal Justice in the College of Social Work, contingent upon SW 510 being approved, and be offered online. Because the **motion** came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair asked if there were any questions of fact or debate and there were none. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

The Chair noted that SW 510 was on the consent agenda for the next Undergraduate Council (UC) meeting and required Graduate Council (GC) review after. Bob Grossman (AS) **moved** to send the proposed new MS Criminal Justice (online) to the January 23 Senate meeting. Elizabeth Salt (NU) **seconded**. The Chair opened the floor to questions of fact and debate. Vincent noted that SC had never moved a program forward without all courses approved, noting such an action may set a precedent. Bastin agreed with Vincent but noted that for this particular instance it would be okay to move it forward to Senate without all courses having been approved. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

ii. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Trauma-Responsive Practice (online)

Bastin explained the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Trauma-Responsive Practice, to be offered online. The Chair explained the proposal also involved online delivery and was reviewed by the Senate Committee for Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLeL), as well, and invited SCDLeL Chair Sara Police (ME) to provide information from the SCDLeL review.

The Chair explained there was a recommendation from SAPC that the University Senate approve a new Graduate Certificate in Trauma-Responsive Practice, in the College of Social Work, and be offered online. Because the **motion** came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair asked if there were any questions of fact or debate. Faculty Trustee Aaron Cramer asked if this proposed new graduate certificate also had a course pending approval. The Chair explained that it initially did, but that the course was at the Registrar's level in the curricular approval process. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

iii. Proposed Change to BSFOS Food Science

Bastin explained the proposed change to the BSFOS Food Science. The Chair explained there was a recommendation from the SAPC that the University Senate approve a change to the BSFOS Food Sciences. Because the **motion** came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair asked members if there were any questions of fact or debate and there were none. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

b. Senate Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) – Gregg Hall, Chair
i. Proposed Name Change from College of Education to College of Education, Sport, and Human Sciences

The Chair provided background for the proposed name change from the College of Education to the College of Education, Sport, and Human Sciences. The Chair invited SAOSC Chair Gregg Hall (GS) to provide information from the SAOSC about the proposal. Hall noted two issues that the SAOSC had: letters from colleges and who was qualified to determine where terms such as “human science” and “sports” should be housed. Hall noted that as of November 4, 2022, the SAOSC did not have letters from three colleges (CI, AS, and BE), and that such letters were requested after the November 4 SAOSC meeting. Hall suggested that the Provost’s office should have better managed the discussion about renaming a college. The Chair explained that the Office of the Provost was involved former College of Education Dean Julian Heilig-Vasquez long before her time as SC Chair. The Chair recognized there were former SC chairs present at the meeting and asked former SC Chair Aaron Cramer (EN) if he had any comments. Cramer noted that while the proposal had been under development for some time, no guidance was sought from the SC Chair. Cramer commented that the Senate should be responsible for requesting what was needed to endorse a proposal, noting that this was not the responsibility of the Provost.

The Chair stated that there was a recommendation from the SAOSC that the Senate endorse the proposed change of the name of the College of Education to the College of Education, Sport, and Human Sciences. Because the **motion** came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate.

SC members discussed the following:

- Whether input from other units was required
- Whether the motion was to endorse or approve
- If it would be premature for SC to make a recommendation, given that Senate would be discussing the proposal at the next Senate meeting
- The proposal was not clear whether other colleges were in favor of or opposed to the name change
- Clerical notes about the proposals where an ampersand was used in place of an Oxford comma in some instances of the name change
- What would happen with a negative recommendation

Doug Michael (LA) **moved** to amend the motion from committee to change the word “endorse” to the phrase “submit to Senate for discussion.” Bob Grossman (AS) **seconded**. The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate.

SC Vice Chair Leslie Vincent (BE) asked what was sought by a discussion at the Senate level without a recommendation. The Chair explained that similar to other complex proposals, two readings were generally conducted; the first for discussion only, in case any additional information came from the first discussion, and the second so that Senate could vote after having sufficient time to digest the proposal. The Chair noted that following a first discussion at the Senate level, the proposal would return to SC for a recommendation. Molly Blasing (AS) asked if there was a procedure by which a change to the proposal could be made if brought before the Senate for discussion. The Chair noted that there could be an amendment, but such an amendment would be contingent upon the college accepting said amendment. The Chair commented that the procedure would be for the proposer to take the suggested amendment

back to the college. Proposer Molly Fisher (ED) asked what the college's action would be with such an amendment. The Chair noted a letter of amendment, rather than starting over on the proposal, would be appropriate at Senate. The Chair asked if there were any other questions of fact or debate from members or guests regarding the amended motion. SC members and guests discussed the following:

- How the end of discussion would be determined for an item without parliamentary action
- The SAOSC's endorsement of the proposal prior to the receipt of letters from other colleges
- Whether SC would continue to accept letters from colleges that were not aware of the proposal
- If the Chair would consider allowing representatives from colleges who had not submitted letters be allowed to speak first before opening the floor for discussion at Senate
- The rationale for the proposal

Michael **moved** to call the question. Vincent **seconded**. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

The Chair reminded SC members that they were now voting on the motion to amend the previous motion from committee, to recommend that SC submit the proposal to Senate for discussion. A **vote** was taken, and the motion to amend the original motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

The Chair announced that SC members were now voting on the amended motion. A **vote** was taken, and the amended motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

ii. Proposed Suspension and Closure of Graduate Certificate in Environmental Systems

Hall explained the proposed suspension and closure of the Graduate Certificate in Environmental Systems, noting that the certificate was never implemented. The Chair stated there was a recommendation from the committee for the Senate to suspend admissions and close the Graduate Certificate in Environmental Systems. Because the **motion** came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate.

Grossman asked for clarification about lack of implementation. The Chair explained no one ever enrolled in the certificate, noting this was a clean-up item for UK's degree inventory. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

iii. Proposed Suspension of PhD Gerontology

Hall explained the proposed suspension of the PhD Gerontology. The Chair stated there was a recommendation from the committee for the Senate to suspend admissions into the PhD Gerontology. Because the **motion** came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate.

Blasing asked would happen to the pre-tenured faculty member in the program. Proposer John Watkins (PbH) explained the faculty member was still in another department. Marilyn Duncan (ME) asked if the program was closing. Watkins explained there were still active students, and that the program could not be closed until the students were finished. Grossman asked if the pre-tenured faculty member had access to graduate students in the college. Watkins explained they did, and that they were still actively researching. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

The Chair thanked Hall for his report.

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

i. Proposed Changes to Senate Rules 4 (“Rules Relating to Admission to the University”)

The Chair noted that the proposer, Christine Harper (associate vice provost for enrollment management and chief enrollment office), was unable to attend today but that colleague Adam Bohland (executive director of admissions) was attending to answer any questions. The Chair asked SC members to note that the entirety of the section was not being changed, just the sections that related to undergraduate admissions. The Chair noted that due to the scope of the proposed changes, and in part to give the SREC time to evaluate how the changes may affect other areas of the SRs, the proposal would be given two readings at Senate. The Chair explained that senators would have a chance to review the proposed changes and ask questions at the January Senate meeting, and that a vote on the proposal itself would not be held until the February Senate meeting. The Chair asked SC members to think about the entirety of the proposal and how best to ensure that senators have what they need to both be informed themselves and so they could inform their constituents about the changes. The Chair noted that SREC Chair Roger Brown (AG) could not attend today but was aware of these changes and knows that SREC needs to review the proposed changes and provide guidance to SC about what other SRs may need to change as well.

Vincent described the proposal to SC members. The Chair stated that there was a recommendation from the committee for the Senate to approve the proposed changes to SR 4. Because the **motion** came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate.

SC members discussed the following:

- The process that was used by the committee to remove instances that dated the SR
- The language used in the SR describing the consideration of potential students
- How student applicants were considered holistically if not admitted automatically to the University
- Admission standards for dual admissions for high school students

The Chair asked SC members to send any changes or comments to the SC office.

Faculty Trustee Aaron Cramer (EN) **moved** to amend the committee’s recommendation for approval to state that “SC send the proposal to Senate for discussion.” Grossman **seconded**. The Chair asked if there were any objections and there were none. There being **no objections**, the motion was **amended**.

The Chair asked if there were any objections to the amended motion and there were none. There being **no objections**, the amended motion was approved by **lack of objection**.

d. Senate Calendar Committee (SCC) – Richard Charnigo, Chair

i. Proposed Nonstandard Calendar for NRE 320

The Chair invited SCC Chair Richard Charnigo (PbH) to provide a report to SC members. Charnigo explained the proposed nonstandard calendar for NRE 320. Charnigo noted that while the request was in perpetuity, the form for calendar requests did not allow for requests in perpetuity. Charnigo clarified this request would be from 2023 to 2026. The Chair stated there was a recommendation from the committee for the SC to approve the proposed nonstandard calendar for NRE 320, from 2023 to 2026. Because the **motion** came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate.

SC members briefly discussed nonstandard calendar requests. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

5. Tentative Senate Agenda for January 23, 2023

The Chair explained the tentative Senate agenda for January 23, 2023. The Chair noted that due to the length of the agenda, the UK Invest presentation would be rescheduled. Vincent suggested that some of the SAOSC items be placed on the consent agenda, in the interest of time.

Vincent **moved** to approve the tentative Senate agenda for January 23, 2023, as amended as an ordered list, unless it needed to be rearranged to accommodate a guest's schedule. Olivia Davis (BE) **seconded**. There was no discussion or debate. The Chair asked if there were any objections and there were none. There being **no objections**, the agenda was approved **as amended**.

6. Update on QEP Process – Co-Chair Susan Cantrell

The Chair invited Susan Cantrell (ED) to provide an update on the QEP process. Cantrell provided an update to SC members about the QEP process.

The Chair thanked Cantrell for her update.

7. Items from the Floor (Time Permitting)

Time did not permit for items from the floor.

The meeting adjourned at 5:16 PM with **no objections**.

Respectfully submitted by,
DeShana Collett

Prepared by Katie Silver on Sunday, January 22, 2023

SC Members Present: Bastin, Blasing, Collett, Cramer, Davis, Duncan, Grossman, Laws, Michael, Raglin, Salt, Swanson, Tagavi, Takenaka, Vincent, York

Invited Guests Present: Sheila Brothers, Susan Cantrell, Katie Cardarelli, Robert DiPaola, Gregg Hall, Gregg Rentfrow