

CRAMER:

Hello, everyone. Welcome to the December 13th, the University Senate Meeting, the last Senate Meeting of the fall 2021 semester. Let's go ahead and get started.

Attendance will be captured via a Zoom reporting feature. We're no longer using the chat to record attendance at this meeting. Chat's not generally enabled based on discussion from the Senate Council on how to facilitate these meetings moving smoothly. Any chat sync will only be received by Senate Council Office personnel. Office staff can put motion language into the chatter or similar functions when it -- when that's helpful or appropriate.

Please mute yourself when you're not speaking. Katie's empowered to help mute if you forget. The meeting is being recorded for note-taking purposes. If any member of the Senate is disconnected and cannot reconnect at all, please send an email to Sheila at sbrothers@uky.edu, so we're aware of the situation.

Senate meetings are open meetings. We follow Robert's Rules of Order, newly revised. No voting by proxy, which means if you're not the member you can't vote. Be civil, be a good citizen. Here that specifically means make sure that your colleagues are aware of the activities in

the Senate and participate. If you want to ask a question about something we're considering or want to make some observation during discussion of an item, please use the "raise-hand" feature to seek the floor.

As we've done for about a year and a half now, Zoom participants are divided into two categories, panelists and attendees. Both can participate in the meeting. Attendees can raise their hand also. And if I see them, I can also allow them to speak. Voting senators are panelists, panelists receive a unique link via email from Katie Silver. There should have been, I think, some automated reminder emails that have gone out including one about an hour ago with the Zoom information. For the panelists in there are eligible to vote in Senate elections, or in Senate -- on Senate motions.

Non-voting senators and guests or attendees -- attendees get the Zoom link from the Senate site and do not vote.

To speak for any reason or otherwise be recognized, including making parliamentary motions or seconds or voting, use the "raise-hand" feature within Zoom. The manner in which we'll conduct our votes, when there's a question before the body,

I'll call for votes in favor, then those opposed, and then those wishing formally to abstain, voting members, the panelist in the Zoom webinar will register their vote by clicking on the Zoom feature, "raise-hand".

After each vote, the counts will be recorded and hands will be cleared. We'll clear the hands, leave your hands up until we've been able to clear the hands, which will indicate that we've recorded the vote. We'll document the members of the body that are in the minority and those abstaining, because these are smaller numbers and easier to record. If the votes proceed to be close, we'll use a roll call vote to ensure that we get an accurate vote.

This is a reminder, before speaking, please remember to state your name and college affiliation, so that we all know who were listening to.

The first item on the agenda are the minutes from November 8th, 2021. No edits to these minutes have been received in the Senate Council Office. So unless objections are heard now, the minutes from November 8th, 2021 will stand approved as distributed by unanimous consent.

Those minutes are approved.

In terms of announcements, we've talked about the vacant position in the Senate Council Office, we've made an offer to a great candidate last week. This person will start in the office in early January. We've appreciated the robust pool of candidates and look forward to being back at full strength in the new year.

Senate Councils had some discussions about how to improve interactivity and community within the Senate meetings, given that we're going to continue at least, for the foreseeable future in this format. And one explanation or one suggestion was to ask senators to turn cameras on, especially while speaking. Of course, if you have some reason why you can't - no explanations needed if you cannot turn on your camera - but this was something Senate Council members thought might help improve sort of the atmosphere, the collegiality in the Senate meetings.

The first Senate meeting of the new year will be on January 24th, so make sure that you have that in mind. Also, the final grading window is now open for this semester. The deadline for submission of grades online in the grading portal is 5:00 PM on Monday, December 20th. That is

the final deadline for submitting grades. For fall '21 courses, please ensure that you have your grades submitted in that time. That's part of the responsibility of being faculty members - to enter grades in a timely fashion. And please make sure your colleagues are aware also of the importance of meeting this deadline.

You've seen that we've had officer elections for the Senate Council. You've seen emails that DeShana Collett in Health Sciences has been elected to serve as chair for the term June 1st, 2022. Now, so starting in June to May 31st a year from then. Also, Leslie Vincent in the Gatton College of Business and Economics has been elected to serve as Vice-Chair for the term, June 1st -- the same term, June 1st to May 3rd.

One other observation. The March Senate meeting was originally scheduled for Spring Break. Senate Council has decided to move the March Senate meeting date back a week to March 21st. And that'll be the Monday after Spring Break, but at least it won't be during the Spring Break time. We'll update the website to show the new date for the March Senate meeting.

This is a slide. We show you every month, but there are curricular deadline

proposals - or curricular proposal deadlines - for proposals that the proposer would like to see effective for the '21-'22 academic year. If you're seeking a fall 2022 effective date, these are the dates by which the proposals should be received in the Senate Council Office, in order to have a reasonable chance of being approved by the -- in time for the fall start date.

Note that we've passed the deadline for new degree program proposals. Of course, we continue to get items. We continue to process them as efficiently as possible, but because of some external constraints, it may not be possible for a new degree program proposal that's received in the Senate Council Office now to be approved in time for a fall start date.

March 1st is the deadline for other proposals that require Senate Committee Review. And then April 12th is the deadline for courses, other program changes, and minors things that don't require a review by Senate Committees. Please make sure that these deadlines are in your mind and in the minds of any of your colleagues that are working on curricular proposals.

The second item on the agenda today is a

consent agenda. The Senate hasn't regularly used a consent agenda, and so I want to describe how this will work. Proposals on the consent agenda are proposals for which the Senate Council does not anticipate discussion on the items. Today, these are all proposals to seek to suspend or close a particular program.

None of these have students enrolled in them, all have been dormant for years, this represents a cleanup action where some long-dormant programs are being closed to make sure that our records are up to date. So Senate Council, because these are suspension enclosure items which would fall under the Senate Rules definition of a significant reduction, these typically would require an open hearing under Senate Rule 3.3.2.2.2. Senate Council recommends that in adopting the -- approving the consent agenda, waiving Senate Rule 3.3.2.2.2 for these items.

All right. So -- sorry, making sure I'm saying -- all right. And then, that recommendation to waive the open hearing requirement for this was also submitted or supported by the committee chairs of the two committees that were bringing these proposals forward to the Senate.

Generally, this question of how to handle these open hearings, especially for long-dormant programs is one that's been difficult to put into practice. So Senate Council has asked that the Academic Organizations and Structures Committee to consider whether changes to Senate Rule 3.3.2.2.2 would be advisable. So if we get a proposal from the committee along those lines it'll level come to Senate.

So we have these items on the consent agenda, any Senator can request that an item be removed from the consent agenda by objecting now. That will move the item off of the consent agenda, and the item will be discussed during this meeting at a time that I decide is reasonable. Otherwise, approval of the consent agenda will result in two things: a waiver of Senate Rule 3.3.2.2.2 for the programs listed, and then approval of suspension and closure for the programs listed. And these programs are listed on the following two slides.

The first are certificate programs, which are listed here. And so, we would be approving the suspension of admissions and closure to these three certificate programs. And then for the degree programs listed here, approval of the consent agenda would approve the

suspension of admissions and also approve for submission to the Board of Trustees, the closure of these degrees. And so, these are shown here. Does any Senator want to have an item removed from the consent agenda?

Then the consent agenda is approved by unanimous consent.

The next item on our agenda is the Chair's Report. Recall that the Senate Rules give the chair authority to take some actions on behalf of the Senate as long as they're reported. I've approved a few one-time non-COVID-related requests for DL delivery for spring 2022. Specifically, the course ICT 695 is part of an online program, but the unit inadvertently, when it created the online program, did not include this course. They've now got a curricular proposal for this course moving forward, but they requested that that course be allowed for DL in the Spring because the students in that course are remote students, because it's an online program.

ICT 410 is a course that's generally taught in person - and the intention is to continue to teach that course in person - but the usual faculty member is on sabbatical. There's a need to find a part-time instructor, and the available part-

time instructor that they were able to locate is not local, and so, their request was made to allow this course to be taught DL for the semester to cover the sabbatical leave.

And then also MSC 402G is a similar situation. The regular instructor was not available. The available instructor was only available remotely, and so they requested the ability, one time, for this course to be offered via Distance Learning. And so those were approved on your behalf.

Also, on behalf of Senate Council and Senate, the chair approved clerical change to the SRs related to probation and suspension rules within the Rosenberg College of Law sought to add the term "fall" or "spring" to modify the word "semester." Previously, there was no modifier there. This request was run by the Rules and Elections Committee Chair, and also the Admissions Academic Standards Chair to determine that there was a wide agreement this was a clerical change and just clarifying the existing policy. And so, this change will be codified in the next round of Senate Rule updates.

We've also discussed polling and voting options, for the Senate, going forward.

Senate Council is planning to purchase a one-month trial subscription in early January of the software Poll Everywhere - the service Pole Everywhere. We'll test this within -- in a couple of Senate Council meetings. Ideally, we'll try it in one Senate meeting, maybe the January Senate meeting, if all goes well, before deciding whether or not to purchase a year-long subscription. But this software seems to support voting in an in-person format, in a hybrid format, in a completely remote format, and seems like it'll be a good replacement for our clunky calling for hands of people that vote "yes" and so forth. So, obviously, you'll hear more about that if that gets going, and goes well.

The next item on the agenda is the Vice Chair's report.

CRAMER: DeShana, are you on and have a report today?

COLLETT: I do not have a report today. Thank you.

CRAMER: Thank you, Deshana. Clayton, do you have a parliamentarian's report today?

THYNE: No, sir.

CRAMER:

And then today's the start of the December

board meeting, so our trustees are participating in that today and tomorrow, so they don't have a report for us today.

The next item on the agenda are degree recipients. The first is the in-memorial degree list for December 2021. Remember that degree list are voted on only by elected faculty senators. And so, make sure if when we're voting on this, if you're a student or administrator not to vote on this item. But the motion from the committee for the in-memorial degree list for December 2021, it's that the elected faculty senators approve the December 2021 in memorial degree list for submission through the president to the Board of Trustees. That motion comes from the committee, so it requires no second. Is there any debate on this motion?

Okay. Seeing none, if you'd like to vote yes on this motion, and you're an elected faculty Senator, please raise your hand now.

If you'd like to vote no on the motion, please raise your hand now.

If you'd like to abstain on the motion, please raise your hand now.

That motion passes.

The next item on the agenda is the December 2021 degree list. Again, remember that under Kentucky Law and the Senate Rules, only the elected faculty senators vote on degree list. Since the degree list was distributed, two undergraduate students were added - one from the College of Arts and Sciences, and one from the College of Education.

I think Sheila sent that -- those names out to you earlier today. So the motion from the committee is for the elected faculty senators to approve the revised December, 2021 degree list for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Is there any debate on this motion?

Sandra? Maybe Sandra was voting. Alright. Seeing no debate, if you'd like to vote yes on this motion to approve the revised degree list, please raise your hand now.

If you'd like to vote no, please raise your hand now.

If you'd like to abstain, please raise your hand now.

Okay. That motion passes.

The next item on our agenda is some update on the activities within the Vice President for Research's Office. We have the Vice President for Research Lisa Cassis with us today. And she'll discuss these items. Lisa, are you ready? We have you set up as a --

CASSIS: I am. And if I could share my screen if I try my best here. Oops. It says I'm disabled.

CRAMER: All right, one second more and we'll get you a set.

CASSIS: If it doesn't work, Aaron, then I think Sheila has the slides. If she'd like to just pull them up.

CRAMER: I think we're pretty close. Give me one more second. And otherwise, I'll pull the slides up for you.

CASSIS: Okay. Well, I'll begin by thanking Chair Cramer for giving me time. And fir-- thanking all of the faculty senators today, for allowing me to come in and talk to you. And I think I'm supposed to identify myself. So I'm a professor in the Department of Pharmacology and Nutritional Sciences in the College of Medicine and currently serve as your Vice President for Research. It's still not

letting me. Sorry.

CRAMER: Sorry about that. Yeah, I'll advance.
Just let me know when you want to advance.

CASSIS: I will, Aaron. Thank you so much. I'm only going to talk about two topics - I think you had a third. The first is a plea for you to help me in having all of our faculty complete the required responsible conduct of research training, and I call that RCR for short.

And the second is to introduce to you a new program that we are developing to offer in next fiscal year. I think it's an exciting program to help our research mission, and we look forward to your feedback. You can do that either today or with limited time, send me an email or set up a meeting. Aaron, next slide, please.

So, for some time now, because of various issues, we've had across the campus, unfortunately, in areas related to research misconduct. We put together a task force who deliberated on how we might help our faculty, staff, and students, prevent these sorts of issues in the future. And the results of that task force was -- one of them is the requirement for online training, through

CITI, which has an online service. There are currently six modules that we ask all faculty, staff, and students who touch research to complete. They deal with the topics that are listed here. These topics are generally applicable to your research no matter what the examples they give based on -- we understand research and creative work are different, but things like plagiarism and other issues relate to us no matter how we do our research mission. There is an annual refresher course as well. Next slide Aaron.

So who is required to complete this training? While really all faculty come onto our list, but especially, of course, today, for the purposes of this group, faculty who have research effort on their DOE. Anyone who's on a sponsored project has an active IRB or ICAP protocol. This applies to students, whether they be graduate or undergraduate students, and it really doesn't matter what title series the faculty are in. If they come up under any one of these areas, they are on our list to complete the training. Next slide.

So I'm here today because we are still struggling to adhere to this requirement. This is a tracking and summary spreadsheet it's sent to each college, I think on a

monthly basis. This is the one that was presented to me in December. This is a lot of people. If you look under the column, "Total Required," 14,000 people, we've asked to take this training based on those criteria I introduced to you. This is the data per college. We've had 8,952 completions. Unfortunately, 4,991 who are on our lists have not completed the training. We really asked your help to get the message out to your faculty to please complete the training. If I could have the next slide.

So what are our next steps? Certainly, if you are faculty with research effort on your DOE, no matter what your research or creative activity are, we ask you to complete the training or penalties, unfortunately - they're actually on this slide - will have to be enacted in the near future. And we really don't want to have to go there, so please help us to avoid having this happen. We do have an exemption process, it's on our online, under our Office of Research Integrity. If you believe, or you know faculty who believe they should be exempted, please have them go through the exemption request. It's not onerous, it's actually fairly simple to do.

Unfortunately, if the training

requirements are not met, we will need to enact penalties and they would include things like a new or competing renewal grant account set up would be put on hold until the training is completed by anyone on the grant or contract. Same thing for IRB or human subjects or animal IACUC protocols.

New protocols would be returned to the principal investigator until the training requirement is met, or the people are removed from the protocol or on sponsored projects. And obviously, another thing that we would also look at is suspending access to institutional funds, and that would include things like startup funds, pilot projects support, creative activities, et cetera.

We really don't want to go there, ask you to please complete the training requirements and to do the refresher, I've heard from so many people that they've learned something. I've also heard where it may not relate as much, but in general, I feel like the overwhelming input is that the training will help us achieve the mission of not having as many difficulties here in the future, in our research mission. Next slide.

So I'm going to turn to the positive, and

that is the development of a new program. It's called the University of Kentucky Research Leadership Academy. It is being led by Linda Dwoskin, in my office, as well as Kathy Grzech and myself and others. I hope you will enjoy this program, and I hope you get the word out to faculty to please apply when we send out notices for the different parts of the program. If I could have the next slide, Aaron.

So why are we developing a leadership academy? Well, we've been strategic planning, as we have with Provost DiPaola. We've been doing it in the research realm for over a year now. And as we looked at how to continue to improve the research infrastructure, and support the development of our faculty in research, we asked, "What other things could we do to facilitate their advancement?"

One is to align our infrastructure better with the missions of research in each of your colleges. Another is to develop future research leadership within the colleges, and even at the institutional level. Train the next generation of Associate Deans for research, people in the Office of the Vice President for Research, et cetera, help our faculty and staff to compete for large programmatic

grant opportunities, and seed and support emerging areas of research and creative work. So these are the reasons why we're doing this. If I could have the next slide, Aaron.

What we have developed is three independent program tracks. These will be offered - we will be sending out the call in the spring for applications. And they will go into place, hopefully, that's our plan, July 1st, 2022. The three tracks are a Research Leadership Career Development program, has a series of opportunities for up to six faculty - if that can apply - with the support from their college leadership and research, they will develop a project that relates to research within their discipline or their college. And they will have the opportunity to interface with us in all of our different grants administration, and all of the things we do in the Office of Research. The second program track is a Complex Programmatic Grant Development program. This will give specialized help to a named grant opportunity that is complex in its development and crosses domains and requires specialized assistance in the form of grant administration, budget development, but travel to other institutions that might have this type of grant, external review

consultants, et cetera. The third track is the Emerging Themes for Research and Creative Work program, to seed new areas of research across the institution.

All of these tracks will have separate applications and you can apply to more than one track. We're working on how we will review these applications and how we will evaluate them for long-term sustainability of these programs. But we're really excited about these program offerings. We seek your input. Like I said, either today, or send me an email, or set up a meeting and we can go into further detail on each of these activities as I've described. So thank you very much. I'm happy to take questions, comments, or whatever you'd like me to do.
Chair Cramer.

CRAMER:

Sure. Thank you, Vice President Cassis. So, yeah. Getting an echo here.

Thank you, Vice President Cassis, both for this today, but also, I -- we've intentionally tried to find ways to productively improve the interaction and the productivity of the interaction between the University Senate and the VCRs office. Certainly, any questions or feedback you have for the Vice president today. But also, if you have ideas on how

to increase that relationship or engagement along those lines, you can let the vice president know, you can let me know, you can let Senate Council know, and we'll try to work on those. Gail?

BRION: Sorry. I have two questions. Number one, how can we access what the status is, as faculty?

CASSIS: I'm sorry. I think you broke up a little. How can we access what, Dr. Brion?

BRION: Our training statuses?

CRAMER: Yes, I think you can -- your Associate Dean for Research in your college should have a detailed report that will go down to the faculty level, all the way to the person. So my advice to you is to start with your Associate Dean for Research in your college. If you don't get the needed information, please feel free to contact me and I'll get it to you right away.

BRION: So there's no websites set up that we could just sign in to?

CASSIS: No, there is an Excel spreadsheet and tracking that we have that is sent out to college leadership. And they are then asked, of course, to try to share that however, they see fit. So, but we'd be happy if you can't get the information there, please come straight to us; okay?

BRION: My second question is, as someone who has been director - past director - of a research center that served multiple colleges, I do not see that your Research Leadership Academy is really sponsoring this. Especially, what I find troubling and -- is that there's a lot of accountability for faculty. But what is your mechanism for dealing with accountability for the administrative promises that are made to support facilities?

CASSIS: Okay. Well, the Leadership Academy, I think the track that's most applicable to your comments is probably the Emerging Themes. And please correct me if I'm not correct -- if I'm not right there. We have nothing preconceived. So, anyone that has an emerging theme that they'd like to put forward for support can come through that mechanism. We do ask that there is, hopefully, some buy-in from unit leaderships of units that might participate, but we would be providing seed funding. And that would be, you know -- it would basically go across whatever the participants in that program are. And we would ask for information on the participants and who they are and about the theme, but our accountability will really relate to, "How do we make sure that if we give seed support, that there's long-term sustainability?" That's really what we would be looking for.

And because unfortunately we just don't have

the funds to support these programs for very long. So it's really to seed them and then find ways, whether it be through philanthropy, external support, whatever mechanisms we can, to get them up and off the ground, and helping our faculty do their research mission.

Thank you, Lisa. I just do want to make you aware of a problem that not just I, but other faculty have encountered where the pledged support or grants from the sustaining programs has not materialized after the grant was given. And I really think this is a big blindside in our process. That there needs to be accountability, not just from the faculty, but from the administrative people, who may have made a pledge that then another administrator moved in and decided they were not going to, you know, --

BRION: I'd be happy to talk with you, Dr. Brion. I do not know this, so I would like to know more specifics. I think all I can speak on behalf of is the Office of the Vice President for Research and UKRF support. For that --

CRAMER: Molly?

BLASING: I am Molly Blasing, College of Arts and Sciences. Dr. Cassis, thanks so much for presenting on this Leadership Academy. It looks really exciting. I represent the humanities division of Arts and Sciences. And

humanities researchers have very different needs, and humanities research leadership would have different needs. I wonder to what extent the program is envisioning different cohorts and what could I tell my humanities colleagues about this leadership academy and how it might serve the particular needs of humanities researchers and leaders, and humanities research?

CASSIS: Well, those are great comments and, and I think we need to hear from you to help us guide how the Emerging Themes goes forward. As I mentioned, we have no preconceived ideas of what themes we would ever support. So we're really looking for a grassroots effort that is supported by a faculty, maybe, across units or that relates to something that's happening in this country or the world. So I would just tell them it's pretty open. I think we need to hear from all of you and things like how we review, which will be hard, as you might imagine, to see what we can support. And that's what we're thinking through now. So, really Dr. Blasing, if you'd like to set up a meeting to talk to our team on this, we'd be thrilled to talk to you; okay? Because we want to make sure that it is for all types of research and creative work; okay?

BLASING: Thanks very much. I'll do that.

CRAMER: Marilyn?

DUNCAN: Thank you. I'm excited to see these programs that you're developing. I think this is great. My question is how does this interact with a recent announcement about funds being available for centers? So about a month ago, at least some of us received news that if we were working on cross-programmatic research areas involving multiple departments and multiple colleges on a particular theme that was fairly broad in its impact, that there would be funds available for centers. And we were encouraged to apply for those. So, does that interrelate to this in any way? It seems like it might overlap with two and three or something.

CASSIS: Dr. Duncan, would you mind sending it to me? Because I don't really know. I don't know that that came from my office, but I'd be happy to take a look and see if there's any relationship. We do obviously support some centers that are across boundaries that are under the Vice President for Research. We have not added, or put out a call for that. We envisioned doing it through this program that we're creating. So please, please, if you don't mind, Dr. Duncan. Send me an email with what you have.

DUNCAN: Okay. A couple of us are working on this, so let me try to find the announcement.

CASSIS: Okay. Thank you.

DUNCAN: Thank you.

CRAMER: Cagle?

CAGLE: This is Lauren Cagle, College of Arts and Sciences. Thank you, Dr. Cassis, for presenting on this. It is very exciting. I have a follow-up question to Dr. Blasing's question, which is, you spoke to the Emerging Themes track as it relates to humanities. And that is really still to be envisioned. But the former two, the Research Leadership Career Development and the Complex Programmatic Grant Development programs seem to be a little more gelled. Can you speak to how those will be relevant to humanities researcher?

CASSIS: Oh, I think they will because they're really going to be almost college-based. So, for example, if you apply for the first track, the Career Development, if you are in the humanities and you have -- you want to apply for that, you would have a project that we would work with you on, as would your college leadership, and that is a big part of it. So it's going to be more tailored to the area. We're not driving that conversation. What we would do is put you in situations where you would learn about research leadership. Meaning, research administration, the vision piece, how do you communicate and interact with all of you incredible faculty - which is why Chair Cramer's said that I need to come here

more often. Things like that. So, those are the kinds of leadership opportunities I think we're looking for. The second track, we have some ideas on what defines a "programmatic complex grant" but I think we're still working on that. And now and again, it can't just be by dollars. It might be, obviously, something that's very prestigious in your area, that is crossing different boundaries and things, and requires more help - specialized help. So I think we're so -- that's why I'm here today. Because we're still working on these things, all of the tracks, and how we define them.

CRAMER: Provost DiPaola, did you have your hand up?

DIPAOLA: Yeah, I was just going to make a comment, but I was hoping it didn't use up my chances to make a comment. It was responding to both Molly and Lauren in regard to what Lisa was saying if that's okay. I just think that if we broaden what we think about in terms of research opportunities and programs, I think humanities are going to serve a more and more important role when we think about thinking creatively - as part of a team. And so, I would just -- I applaud the questions and I would encourage you to have discussion on how that could be a significant part of a team, both on the programmatic or complex programmatic opportunities, as well as the one that Dr. Cassis pointed out about creative works. And I'd be happy to talk about it. I feel pretty

passionate about it. I think it's going to be very important going forward. Anyway, just --

CASSIS: Yeah, we did this -- thank you, Provost DiPaola. We did this because we listened to people telling us they struggle and there was not an avenue for research leadership career development here. And we're also hoping, of course, for the first track, that it'll help us not just recruit, but retain talent here at the university by giving them ways to advance in their research careers. So all good. I'm happy to talk to any of you as are Dr. Dwoskin and Kathy Grzech. My suggestion is if you'd like to set up something maybe along specific to the creative or humanities, we could, where we go over the programs in more detail, and can get your input; okay? That would be great.

CRAMER: Thank you so much. Vice President Cassis. I think that this -- I have encouraged you. I think this is a good opportunity for us to increase -- a lot of what faculty do is on the research side, and yet a lot of what the Senate does tends to be on the curricular side. But I think that that understanding our educational activities across the spectrum is very important. And so, I'm very thankful for you spending this time with us. If you -- it sounds like if you have specific feedback or comments, you might be able to direct them to the vice president via email. If you're not sure how to do that, feel free to send me an

email, I'll make sure it gets passed along in a good direction. Shannon, do you have one last --? Sorry, I saw your hand late.

OLTMANN: I just raised it. Very quick, Dr. Cassis, would you be willing to come and do like a college-by-college introduction of this and walk through with us?

CASSIS: As, as best I can. Dr. Oltmann, I'll do -- we'll try. It might be part of our team, it might not be me, because really, Dr. Dwoskin has been leading this effort. One of us, we can try to do that, however, you might need. Because we want to get it right, we're moving along, and we really are intending to send out the calls in the spring and have a start in June and July. So we need to probably do it quick. In other words, Dr. Oltmann; okay?

CRAMER: And Dr. Cassis, so you have no objections to senators, for example, distributing the slides that you've provided?

CASSIS: No, and as you know, Aaron, I have slides with more detail. I'd be happy to provide those so they could get a more intense look at what --

CRAMER: I meant those slides, actually. They're posted with the agenda, and I think they were in the email that was distributed to Senate members. It's only -- it's with the agenda. So if you go to the agenda for today's page, they're

linked there. They're not the slides we went through today. They're more detailed and might give a better picture for your colleagues.

CASSIS: Thank you.

CRAMER: Thank you. Alright. The next item on the agenda is a discussion with the acting Dean of the Graduate School, Martha Peterson, on the question of honorary degrees. Recall that there was some issue before the Senate, recently on honorary degrees, and Dr. Peterson's come here today to provide some insight on ways to address this situation going forward and to seek your feedback on how to do that. So, I think I'm running your slides today, too --

PETERSON: Got them there, Aaron?

CRAMER: Yep.

PETERSON: Alright. Thank you. So I'm Martha Peterson. So the Acting Dean of the Graduate School. This is a really long title. Acting Associate Provost for Graduate Professional Education, but really, I'm a faculty -- I'm a professor in the College of Medicine - Microbiology, Immunology, and Molecular Genetics. So what I want -- I've put a few things, a few slides, together that provide the guidance for the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees. I've excerpted some pieces from the AR-11.4,

which establishes this committee. I've got some information that comes from some Senate rules that refer to this committee, and also some -- a few things from the graduate school website. And so, I wanted to go through, briefly, an overview of the committee, what is codified as to its role. And then I can tell you, based on having gone through one cycle of this, what the committee did or does on -- in their process. And then, like Aaron mentioned, make some suggestions and, get your reactions to some additional processes that we might do.

So the committee is charged with identifying the candidates for honorary degrees through a broadcast solicitation. Committee members are not able to nominate candidates, but a call goes out in the fall or in the spring. Actually, this year it was picked up by the Lane Report in the fall, so, calling for nominations. The committee meets to -- or is to evaluate the qualifications of candidates and compile a list of recommended nominees and then transmit that to the University Senate, through the Office of Senate Council chair those nominees that are endorsed by a majority vote of the committee. Next slide, please.

And to let you know the membership, because this is a joint committee - and it is - it was jointly appointed through the president and Senate Council president -- Senate Council chair, sorry. So it'll be seven appointed

members and four ex-officio members. And the appointed members are listed here. Four members selected by the Senate Council from the university faculty as a whole, and all those four members of voting. There are two members selected by the president, also from university faculty as a whole, that are also voting members. And we have one member of the Board of Trustees that is appointed as a non-voting member to the committee. The next slide.

The ex-officio members, one is the provost or the provost designee, is ex-officio with voting rights. The Dean of the Graduate School is also ex-officio, also voting, and also serves as the committee chair, which is why I'm here today to talk about it. That is one of the things that the Dean of the Graduate School, one of the roles I perform. The Senate Council chair is ex-officio non-voting. And the president appoints one member of senior administration to serve on the committee also as non-voting. And the president and Senate Council chair confer each year before finalizing the faculty membership to ensure that the list of faculty appointees is broadly representative of university faculty. The next slide.

So the role of the University Senate then is to transmit names of nominees that are favorably recommended along with supporting documentation through the president in his role as chair of

the University Senate to the board for its approval. And then the president transmits those names to the board, and then the board votes to approve the honorary degrees. The next slide.

This takes some information from the Senate rules. And the Senate rules talk about the role of the joint degrees in con -- consistent with the previous ARREST. The role of elected faculty senators in the university -- in the University Senate in approving the honorary degrees. The circumstances for the award of an honorary degree. For example, the person has to be present to win, it designates the number of honorary degrees that can be awarded each year, and then provides a list of, titles for honorary degrees, so that when a nomination is put forth, the committee is also to recommend what title of honorary degree that nominee would be honored with. And then, the Senate rules also contain a list of conditions of merit for honorary degrees. Let's go on to the next slide.

Now the graduate school website on honorary degrees reiterates the University Senate criteria and eligibility guidelines with links to the relevant AR and Senate rules. So the criteria for honorifics. It specifies the nomination package requirements and the due date, and like I said, we have two due dates per year. So we have a cover letter, a letter

of nomination in which the nominee expands on the qualifications relative to the criteria of the person who's being nominated. We ask for a CV or bio or a professional resume from -- on the nominee. And then a minimum of two additional letters of support, and any optional information. Is that my last slide? Maybe. Yep, it is. Okay. So, those are the official guidance that we have around the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees.

So what happens then, as far as process goes is that the graduate school, on their website, has a place where the nomination packages can be submitted. The graduate school ensures that they're complete, that they contain the necessary pieces, and then they're placed on a shared site, so -- and reviewers are given access. So that means the committee members. A rubric is included, and the reviewers are asked to share their scores in advance of the meeting so that the -- when the committee meets, the scores have been compiled, shared with the committee before the meeting, so that helps to facilitate the discussion. The committee meets to rank -- discuss rank and vote on the nominees.

And then these are then passed along to Senate Council, senate, and president. In the past, the committee has evaluated the nominees based on trusting the nomination packages that they receive. However, due to the discussions at

the October Senate meeting regarding the nominee presented, which I, unfortunately, was not present for - I was teaching during that meeting - but have heard the discuss -- of the discussions that occurred, I'm here to propose that the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees add a few additional steps to the evaluation process. And these are some -- I'm going to make a couple of proposals, I'd love to hear feedback, or if you think it's a good idea, any other ideas that you have.

So all committees -- all committee members will be asked to use any resources available to them to evaluate the nominee in addition to the nomination packet. And we will add an additional item to the rubric to represent for this task. And then, if any items of concern regarding the suitability of the nominee for an honorary degree are discovered, the committee member will bring that information for discussion at the committee meeting.

And to be sure there is time for this additional work request, we'll be sure to allow at least three weeks between receiving the nomination or the nominee names and the committee meeting. In the past, this has been a pretty short turnaround of only two weeks, but I think three or four is reasonable, and will still allow the nomination and pass through to the various levels of approval to occur.

And then if any items of concern are discovered and discussed in the committee, the committee would have the option of inviting the nominator to meet with the committee at a future meeting to discuss their concerns and then have a conversation about that with them before making a final, vote to approve or not that nomination.

And so, the committee met the day after the Senate's meeting at which the prior nominee had been discussed. And so, we discussed this a little bit, but there wasn't really time to do any additional due diligence on the nominees. But what I would propose is that if you think that these additional steps that I'm proposing are reasonable, that I would ask the current committee to do this extra due diligence step on the two nominees that actually rose to the top after our discussion and determine whether or not there are any items of concern that would require the committee to, reconvene and discuss. And if not, then when I come next month to actually present the nominees, then I would be able to tell you that, in fact, we did do extra work to ensure that the nominees we are bringing forth, there was no public information that would raise concern in honoring them. So I'd like to hear any thoughts, concerns. Are we on the right track with this?

CRAMER: Alright. Thank you, Dr. Peterson. Right. This

process is built on trust. It almost always works. But I think that the -- this is a good step to try to develop a shared sense of what it will take for us to fully trust the process. But I think it's a wise move for Dr. Peterson to bring this to the Senate to get the Senate's input on this so that the next time that the committee proposes nominees, the Senate can have the same trust that it ordinarily has in the committee's work. So, any feedback or comments you want to provide to Dr. Peterson about her suggestions? Rae?

GOODWIN: Rae Goodwin, College of Fine Arts. Thank you, Dr. Peterson, for being here today and bringing this to our attention. And, for this discussion, a point of information, as a new Senator, I'm not aware, is there anything on your rubric that -- where the committee looks at whether the person who's been nominated, whether they are in line with the values of the university or the mission of the university? Is that something that's considered?

PETERSON: Well, not currently. We are -- the rubric goes along with the criteria on the Senate's rules. But what I was proposing to add to the rubric was - this is proposed language - "is based on due diligence searches and publicly available sources. The candidate's record is consistent with UK's institutional values."

GOODWIN: Thank you. It's not on the screen, so I

couldn't see that, and I'm a visual learner. So thank you so much.

PETERSON: It isn't on the screen because this is our informal rubric that -- but that was what I was proposing to add to ensure that the committee has done some extra thinking along those lines.

CRAMER: Ken?

CALVERT: Ken Calvert, College of Engineering. Having been involved in this process in the past, if I recall correctly, secrecy about who's being nominated was a primary consideration during the whole process. And I didn't hear anything about that. So I was -- wanted to ask how that would interact with these additions.

PETERSON: Well, since I've only been through this one cycle, I don't know that -- I mean, certainly the nominator is aware. I don't know if the nominator is specifically asked to keep it secret from the nominee, but --. Yeah, I'm not sure how to answer that.

CALVERT: I would like to ask, so you said the committee would use all available resources. So one might imagine that they would talk to colleagues and things like that. I think one reason for that rule is to prevent damage to someone's reputation if they're nominated and they don't end up getting the degree. So, I would like to encourage the committee to consider that aspect

of these changes.

PETERSON: Okay Ken. I see what you're saying, Ken. Yes. And actually, perhaps, what I just read to Dr. Goodwin, as far as what we -- how we would reword this new rubric would be "due diligence searches and publicly available sources." So we aren't meaning to go try to get hearsay stories from people who might know this person, but I -- but, thank you, your point is well taken. That we would ask the committee to make available public -- look at publicly available sources, which for most of us would probably be a Google search, but perhaps other folks would have access to other sorts of public databases. But, you're right. Thank you for that point.

CRAMER: Kaveh?

TAGAVI: Yes. Can you guys hear me?

PETERSON: Yes, I can hear you.

TAGAVI: Perfect. Kaveh Tagavi, College of Engineering. I hope the comment that I'm going to make is not irrelevant and it's related to what you are asking. I recall some time in the past, the committee asked for a waiver of how many nominees could be presented. Senate has a rule that the number of nominees should be four, or five, or three - I don't remember. What was awkward, at that time, was that the committee revealed the name of all the nominees,

including the ones that they wanted to do - the extra ones - and then asked the Senate Council to waive. I thought it would have been better if a request for waiver would be given as generically as possible. So, for example, "This person is a head of a state and he can only come during this year and blah, blah, blah. We are asking you to increase the allotted number." And after they get the waiver, reveal the name of the nominees to the Senate Council. Not in the other order.

PETERSON: Yeah, I fully agree that that doesn't sound like a process that would be able to -- I appreciate, I think that the same point that Dr. Calvert was trying to make about the privacy of the individuals so as to not publicly reveal them only to say, "Oh no, we're not going to award that." So that -- yeah, that I'm not asking for additional waivers. But you're right that the Senate rules limit it to five - up to five - per year. So --

TAGAVI: So, yeah. But my anger is a bit different from my colleague Dr. Calvert. It's not the privacy, but the bias and the awkwardness. That once you know who is going to be nominated, then you want to agree to the waiver or not. And I'm asking that if this -- I appreciate that you are telling me verbally that you agree with me, but I appreciate if I see this somewhat in writing, perhaps in your procedure, perhaps in future rules, that waivers for this - the

numbers - should be presented before the names are revealed or made public.

CRAMER: Kaveh, the last time that such a waiver was requested the candidates' name wasn't first. We can go back and look at the minutes.

TAGAVI: Maybe not the last time, but I was involved personally when after the name of the five or five plus one was revealed to Senate Council, then we were asked to waive the rule and allow five plus one to be presented. All I'm asking is, let's do it the reverse order.

PETERSON: Well, that's -- if you want to put it into the rules, that's not -- that's up to you to, Aaron, but right. Okay.

CRAMER: Shannon?

OLTMANN: Shannon Oltmann, College of Communication and Information. I also have a question that may involve the rules. I brought this up in Senate Council, but I think to me it's important enough to reiterate. I'd like to see either criteria that addresses diversity concerns or a member of the committee that is focused on diversity, maybe from the Office of Institutional Diversity. There could be a member on the committee. I understand that's not the way the committee is composed currently. So I guess I'm asking what are my -- what are the Senate's options to ensure that

diversity concerns are forefront of people's minds when they're reviewing potential candidates.

PETERSON: So thank you for that. Like I said, I didn't distribute or pub -- or put on slides the rubric that has been used. And I said that this is just a process that has been used by the committee. But one of the rubrics that is listed is called "Other Attributes, for example, meaningfulness to graduates as a role model, recognition for diversity, et cetera." So at it's mentioned, it's not called out separate. But also, as we mentioned at the Senate Council meeting, we really would like to have a much broader and diverse range of nominees that are put forward. And that's where we're going to -- I'll give a shout out to the whole Senate here. I told you that none of the members of this committee can nominate individuals for these honorary degrees. But other than that, it's open to every everybody. So when the call comes out, please give careful consideration to people you know in your field who might be deserving of this award so that we can -- and especially if those with diverse -- that come under the umbrella of diverse candidates. So thank you, Dr. Oltmann.

OLTMANN: I thank you for that, but that's actually not quite what I meant. I'm more concerned if a nominee say has some untoward inappropriate tweets in their past or something like that.

Some folks may not recognize that certain tweets, to continue with my example, are inappropriate. But if you had somebody - if there was somebody on the committee who explicitly had diversity concerns as part of their focus, that person might recognize, "Oh, wait, these tweets are questionable. We need to talk about this in more detail." So that's my concern with respect to diversity.

CRAMER: Christian?

BRADY: Thank you, Christian Brady, Arts, and Sciences. In a similar vein, I guess I'm wondering, it's all publicly available, but with social media today, often social media comments and things out there, we can't always trust the veracity. So while I'm supportive of the efforts, Dr. Peterson, I'm just wondering what assessment of the veracity and reliability of sources will be taken into account.

PETERSON: Well, that was a concern that was actually discussed at the committee. It's -- we just have to do our best effort in discussing amongst the committee, hopefully, which has -- covers a wide area, supposedly diverse among the faculty. And, I think it was discussed as to what would disqualify somebody for being considered. And we didn't know what that was. And that's where, I think, at least, discussing potential concerns that what -- if the committee decided that if there were some

things that were, maybe, not -- of a little bit of concern, but in fact that the accomplishments of the nominee were -- outweighed that, that we could still put that name forward, and then if questions came up about something that raised concern, we could report that "Yes, we were aware of that, we discussed it thoroughly, and on the basis of our opinion, we think that this person is still deserving." So I don't think that anybody on that committee would feel comfortable saying what would be a disqualifying event. I think the idea would be to give it a discussion in the committee so that when it actually comes forward, that we can tell you what sort of due diligence the committee did and how they came to their decision.

Cramer: Okay. Akiko and then Julianne, and then, we should move on, probably.

TAKENAKA: Akiko Takenaka, Arts and Sciences. And I do second Dr. Oltmann's concern about having somebody who is very attuned to issues of diversity. Okay. Having somebody attuned to diversity on the committee. And I suppose that is the role of the Senate to nominate those -- the Senate Council to nominate such people. But while I was listening to that conversation, I thought about perhaps also including in the nomination package requirements something that addresses, or an option of something that addresses the - what's the word - contribution

for diversity of the nominee. I'm thinking about job application packages these days; right? Applicants always need to address diversity issues in their applications. And I would like to see something that invites diversity issues in the nomination requirements. Thank you.

PETERSON: Thank you. You know, that a nice idea. Like I said, we have provided in the nomination packet, we asked them to address the conditions which are enumerated in the Senate rules. And I wonder if that would be a place to be able to add an additional point as conditions for the honorary degree.

CRAMER: Julianne?

OSSEGE: Yes. Julianne Ossege, College of Nursing. I wanted to say, I appreciate these, points that you've brought up. Dr. Peterson. I especially like the part about inviting the nominator to discuss if there are questions. Obviously, the process is not going to be perfect, but I think this is a step in the right direction, and I appreciate that.

PETERSON: Thank you.

CRAMER: Thank you, Dr. Peterson, for sharing this. I think that this is the point; right? This is a process built on trust and we have to articulate what it will mean for us to trust

the process. I think this is -- has been a good exercise and we look forward to seeing how the committee can do its work and what that means --

PETERSON: Thank you. I definitely appreciate the feedback that you all provided. Thank you.

CRAMER: All right. The next item on the agenda is a committee report from the Academic Organization and Structure Committee. Greg Hall is the chair and he'll present this item now. Greg, are you ready?

HALL: All set. Great. Hi, Aaron and colleagues Greg Hall, Graduate School. This is a proposal to close the Center for Interprofessional Health Education, CIHE, as an educational unit and to continue the center as an administrative center, taking on new responsibilities involving the Area Health Education Center, or AHEC program, an administrative unit. By way of a little bit of background, in 2014, a review found that the center was not addressing research or practice. So a proposal was made at that time to change the name of the center to reflect the shift in focus to only Interprofessional education or instruction about instruction. In 2020, a task force impaneled by then Provost Blackwell proposed to close the CIHE as an education unit and recreate it as an administrative center. This proposed change -- its closure will not cause a

change to current -- any faculty's current DOE assignment. And staff positions may be impacted, but they will receive some lead time over several months to apply for updated positions. And then, the SAOC, which endorsed the proposal unanimously recommended that the Senate approve the proposal in regard to its programmatic aspects and endorsed the proposal in regard to its unit structural aspects.

CRAMER: All right. So we have a motion from the committee. Are there any questions about this motion? This is one of these SAOC-type areas where the Senate has authority over the approval of its educational content, or its academic program merits, and it has an endorsement role in terms of the structural aspects of the proposal. Sarah?

POLICE: Hi, I'm Sarah Police, College of Medicine. I've read the PDF and thank the organizers and proposers for all the details I was looking for -- so here's my question. Does this impact students in any way or the academic programs that they would apply and then progress through completion with? I saw a little bit about educational experiences for students and professionals in question three, page five on the proposal, but I'm wondering are students affected and how, if so?

CRAMER: Greg, do you have an answer? Or one of the proposers?

- HALL: No, I don't. I'm looking back for that, but I don't, at the moment.
- HEATH: Aaron, I'm glad to answer it.
- CRAMER: Dean Heath, please.
- HEATH: This is Janie Heath, Dean of Nursing. I'm also the Chair of the Board of Directors for the Center of Inter-professional Health Education as well as a college that has been engaged with AHEC for a number of years. So to answer your question, Sara, if anything, it's going to enhance it. It is not going to take anything away from students. Collectively, we're looking at about 2000 students continuing to be engaged in a lot of the important work we do here at the university and in the community, and throughout the state. So if anything, it's enhancing, not taking away.
- POLICE: Thank you, Dean Heath.
- CRAMER: Are there any other questions? If not, we have a motion from the committee. Is there any debate on this motion? Bob?
- GROSSMAN: Yeah, I don't have any problem with the merits. I was just wondering, are we approving and endorsing in a single vote, or are those two separate votes? And if so, which are we doing first?
- CRAMER: The motion is a compound motion as proposed

from the committee, but, yes, we're approving where it's our job to approve and we're endorsing where it's our job to endorse.

GROSSMAN: Okay. Thanks. So one vote?

CRAMER: One vote. In terms of education for the senators. There's an academic program aspect to the center's activities where we're approving that the closure of the center as an educational unit, with respect to those academic program issues. And in terms of the unit structures, its organizational structural merits, the Senate has an advisory role where we would endorse this proposal to reorganize the center as an administrative unit in this way. Seeing no debate, all in favor of the motion, please raise your hand now.

All opposed, raise your hand now.

Any abstaining, raise your hand now.

That motion passes. Thank you, Greg.

All right. The next item on the agenda is a report from the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee. Michelle Sizemore is here to present the proposal. You ready, Michelle?

SIZEMORE: Ready. Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Michelle Sizemore, College of Arts and Sciences. Our first proposal is a change to the Doctor of

Nursing Practice degree. DNP is proposing a more holistic admissions policy that weighs the life experiences and personal qualities of the applicants alongside traditional measures of academic achievement, which is grades and test scores. Specifically, they wish to lower the minimum GPA from 3.3 to 3.0. The proposal notes that this adjustment is consistent with the metrics of the top 25 BSN to DNP degree programs. All required 3.0 minimums, except one - Penn State. The committee agreed with our proposal's rationale that a broad range of factors should be used to gauge academic readiness, and we're persuaded that the 3.0 GPA met admission standards.

CRAMER:

All right. So we have a motion from the committee. Are there any questions about the motion from the committee?

Okay. Well, we have the motion from the committee. Is there any debate on this motion?

Seeing none, if you'd like to vote in favor of the motion, please raise your hand now.

If you'd like to vote against the motion, please raise your hand now.

If you'd like to abstain, please raise your hand now.

That motion passes.

The next two items are related. For background information on Senate Rule 5.5.2.2. This is conditions of merit and circumstance for degree honors for Law, J.D., students and pharmacy, Pharm D, students. Last spring, the chair, me, I gave one-time approval on behalf of the Senate for application of the standards that are in the proposals before you now to the spring 2021 graduates of each program and encouraged the two programs to develop a rule change to codify what it was that they were trying to do with these students. Presuming that the Senate approves of this today, Senate Council has asked the Rules and Elections Committee to, instead of codifying that the change is exactly as described in the proposal, to codify the changes in a new section of the Senate rules that's not a subset of the language on the undergraduate programs. In the new section that the Rules and Elections Committee will also specify that the honors are applicable to the specific program, not the entire college. These are specifically rules that apply to J.D. and Pharm D students, not to -- if there were other programs within those colleges. And the two programs are each requesting that these changes become effective for Pharm D and law cohorts graduating in spring 2022. So Michelle, do you want to talk about the first -- the proposals marry each other. The pharmacy and law proposals are essentially identical. Michelle?

SIZEMORE: Thank you for the additional background, Chair Cramer. The first one, the college -- the proposed change to the conditions of merit and circumstance for degree honors for the Rosenberg College of Law. The College of Law faculty request an amendment of Senate Rule 5.5.2.2 related to the conditions of merit and circumstances for degree honors. Because of the evolving nature of legal education, and the growing number of experiential courses graded on a pass/fail basis, as well as the growing number of students who participate in dual degree programs, the law faculty voted to eliminate the minimum number of graded credits required to earn Latin honors. This change would allow for the possibility of additional deserving students to earn these honors. The committee approved the proposal in a 7-2 vote.

CRAMER: Are there any, questions of fact about the proposal before you? Bob?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A&S. Michelle, what were the reasons for the (indecipherable).

SIZEMORE: So, we all agreed to the request for more flexibility in the Latin honors calculation. The elimination of the rule for a minimum 90 quality or graded hours seemed reasonable to everyone. The committee was less comfortable with dropping the minimum hour requirements. So the minimum numbers of hour -- the number of hours earned at UK -- and Dean Bird-Pollan

attended our November 18th committee meeting to address our concerns. And then the majority of the committee was comfortable with her response to our questions. And we approved the proposal. I can go into more detail or perhaps Dean Bird-Pollan can if you'd like further explanation of that visits and the discussion there.

GROSSMAN: Oh, that's fine. I understand. Thanks.

CRAMER: Any other questions of fact about the proposal? We have a motion from the committee. Is there debate on this motion? Scott?

YOST: Yeah. Scott Yost, Engineering. I was to address Bob's comment. I was one of two people who voted against this proposal for one, I guess, factor, which I can now put into the record of the University Senate. And that is not having a minimum number of hours. If you fast forward five years down the road, and another program says, "Well, the College of --" Sorry, "For pharmacy or law, they didn't need a minimum number of hours for honors.

And so, they could have a person show up and take one class and get honors in that class. And they graduate because there's also no requirements for how many hours they need to take at UK. Now, having said that, of course, for law, as it was explained to us, is that their accrediting agency doesn't allow more

than, I think, the first year to be transferred in.

So there's -- by default, there's going to be several years -- a year or several years of classes at UK. I just would like that, the record to reflect for a historic or institutional knowledge that they happen to have an external checks and balances at how many hours are taken at UK because you can't transfer in a bunch. They don't have that 30 of the last 36-hour requirement that we have in the Senate rules, if I understand correctly. And so, it's just there's a uniqueness about it, and I don't want, in the future, some program to site the law program or pharmacy program that, "Hey, they didn't need a minimum. So we don't either." Because again, there was some external things in that that made a minimum by default.

CRAMER: Any other debate on the motion?

Okay. Then if you'd like to vote yes, please raise your hand now.

If you'd like to vote no, please raise your hand now.

If you'd like to abstain, please raise your hand.

And that motion passes.

All right. Michelle, do you want to say anything more about the pharmacy one? I think it's the same proposal; right?

SIZEMORE: It's the same, and the vote was the same. The -- this proposal, in case we need a refresher, is about the Latin honors status within the Pharm D program. The majority of pharm D graduates don't qualify for Latin honors due to the Senate Rule 5.5.2.2. So similar to the J.D. Degree, this real stipulates for Pharm D students, to take a minimum of 90 quality hours to qualify. Since implementing a 2015 curricular revision, several courses that are now designated as pass/fail, and that reduces the minimum number of quality hours that can be used toward, the Latin honors calculation. So the proposal is also to amend the Senate rule to eliminate the 90 quality hour requirement. And that the committee approved this proposal in a 7-2 vote for the same reasons that you've heard for and against.

CRAMER: Are there any questions about this proposal?

All right, then we have a motion from the committee. Is there debate on this motion?

Okay, then all in favor, please raise your hand now.

If you'd like to vote against the motion,

please raise your hand now.

If you'd like to abstain, raise your hand now.

And that motion passes. Thank you, Michelle.

The next item is a proposal, from the Senate's distance learning and e-learning committee. The proposal was modified somewhat by the Senate Council last week. But I understand that Roger has spoken with his committee about it and that they're generally supportive, but perhaps Roger, you can describe some of that as you describe the proposal.

BROWN: Roger Brown, College of Ag. This proposal came in an original form from the committee to the Senate Council. There was some additional discussion before and during the Senate Council meeting. A contingent motion was approved by Senate Council, contingent on approval by the DL Committee, with further review. And the DL Committee voted or signaled unanimously that they support the proposal that you see here. And this is a proposal from the -- to codify into the Senate rules some new language around a topic called, "Regular and Substantive Interaction." This is a clarity that's been provided by the Department of Education, about this subject, and in keeping with the

sentence requirement under GR 4C1, it's Senate's responsibility to codify policy from the Department of Ed. So, Regular and Substantive Interaction, generally, if you read about this, is related to distance learning. However, distance learning, to the Department of Ed is supposed to have the same level of rigor and same standards as a traditional or in-person education. And so, by implication, those regular and traditional courses are also supposed to have regular and substantive interaction.

So, you see here the language we would propose to put into the Senate rule, subject to codification by the SREC. As part of this proposal, we would also require that instructors, like they do for other similar kinds of policies, make reference to this either with a link, or if they prefer, to copy and paste the entire thing into their syllabus.

We would also ask Senate Council to work with us to revise the forms for new courses and major course changes to capture how these new courses and course change proposals would satisfy this new requirement. And then for existing courses, we would notify the deans that they have a responsibility to ensure the quality of the curriculum through the faculty. And so, to work with their faculty to make sure that this requirement is met.

CRAMER: Are there any questions about this proposal from the Distance Learning and e-Learning committee and then modified, but concurred by the Distance Learning and e-Learning committee? Ken?

CALVERT: Ken Calvert, College of Engineering. I have a question whether having a scheduled meeting time in the schedule of classes constitutes participant -- course participants meet regularly as prescribed in Senate Rule 10.6. Or is there something more than that that is required? i.e., taking attendance, in particular.

BROWN: Yeah. That's a great question, Ken. The answer is, it's assumed that regular and substantive interaction occurs in, let's call it a traditional face-to-face, Monday, Wednesday, Friday, 10:00 to 10:50 class. That would meet the standard for a regular interaction. And then, assuming that, during that time, the instructor and the students are engaging in that list of other things there, including having discussions, doing lectures, being two examples, then that would meet the standard for regular and substantive interaction for that type of course.

CALVERT: Okay, thanks. That answers my question.

CRAMER: Are there other questions about the proposal from the committee?

Well, we have a motion from the committee.
Is there a debate on this motion?

Okay. If you'd like to vote yes, on this
motion, please raise your hands.

If you'd like to vote no on the motion,
please raise your hand now.

If you'd like to abstain, please raise your
hand now.

That motion passes. Thank you, Roger.

BROWN: Thank you.

CRAMER: Now we're at a point in the agenda where
senators can raise issues that are not on the
agenda. Items from the floor. I guess I
would raise one, which is of course there
were obviously very severe storms in Western
Kentucky, even parts of central Kentucky over
the weekend. You would have seen the message
that the Provost and I sent out on Saturday
evening pre -- reminding instructors of some
of the options that they have in terms of
accommodating the students that need it due
to those storms. So I just wanted to make
sure you are aware of that. Are there other
items from the floor?

All right. Not seeing any, I absolutely wish
you the best end of the semester possible.
Please submit your grades on time. Encourage

your colleagues to submit your grades on time. This is very important. The registrar's office needs faculty to enter their grades on time to run a number of important post-term processes that help our students understand their situation or standing within the university. And so, it's very important that you do this on time and that you encourage your students to do this on time. Otherwise, unless, there are objections now, we will adjourn.

All right, then, we're adjourned. Have a good break guys.