

Senate Council
April 2, 2018

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, April 2, 2018 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Katherine M. McCormick called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:00 pm. The Chair suggested that the agenda be reordered and a new item be added [discussing the wording of an email passage]. There were no objections.

The Chair thanked Blonder, Cross, and Schroeder for keeping SC members up to date on the state budget actions being undertaken by the state legislature, particularly the wording that would allow tenured faculty to be dismissed if a program were to be closed. Cross said that after the discussion on the wording in the campuswide email, he would like to discuss a request from SC to leadership that it lobby against the tenure language in future state budget legislation.

Discussion on Wording for All-Campus Email Regarding Kentucky's Biennial Budget

The Chair thanked SC members for their responsiveness during the day to the emails she sent regarding wording of a campuswide email from President Eli Capilouto. She said that there were two paragraphs that could be edited, but when she sent the email to SC members shortly after midnight, she had opted to ask SC to focus on the first paragraph, as that pertained explicitly to the tenure issue. During the discussion, SC members expressed a desire to modify the language in both paragraphs and they offered possible wording changes for both paragraphs as well as appropriate phrasing to describe SC's input.

After about 30 minutes, the Chair asked if SC members wanted to make a motion regarding the language. Brion **moved** that the SC move forward with the proposed language as amended for the joint campuswide email release and Grossman **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Cross proposed a resolution that the SC ask the administration to actively lobby against the inclusion of tenure language in future budget because such language is not in the best interests of faculty, staff, students, or higher education in Kentucky. Cross presented this resolution as a **motion**. Schroeder **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Wood **offered a substitute motion** to replace the earlier motion about the proposed language for the joint campuswide email release, so that the SC would **move** to direct the Chair to transmit the version approved by the SC with the note that any revisions need to be reapproved by the SC in order to retain the SC as a signatory to the email. Cross **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair left to share the proposed wording with the President's office. Because Bird-Pollan, the vice chair, was absent, the Chair asked Cross to take over as chair in her absence.

1. Minutes from March 26, 2018 and Announcements

Cross, the acting chair, solicited a motion for approval of the minutes. Wood **moved** to approve the minutes from March 26 and Brion **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. Acting Chair Cross suggested that announcements wait until the Chair returned.

2. Old Business

a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) – Margaret Schroeder, Chair

i. Proposed New MAT in Secondary STEM Education

Schroeder, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained that Brett Criswell (ED/STEM Education) was again present and that Guest Allison Soult (AS/Chemistry, SAPC member) would present the proposal on her [Schroeder's] behalf. Acting Chair Cross said that unless anyone objected, presenters would serve as acting chair for purposes of answering questions of fact only. There were no objections from SC members. Schroeder clarified that she wanted to pass that authority on to Soult, who would present the proposal.

Soult reviewed with SC members the **motion** from the SAPC, which was a recommendation that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new MAT in Secondary STEM Education, in the Department of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics Education within the College of Education. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. Guests Brett Criswell (ED/STEM Education, proposer), Jared Stallones (ED/Curriculum and Instruction, department chair), and Jennifer Wilhelm (ED/STEM Education, department chair) all participated in the discussion. There were expressions of concern regarding a perceived duplication of effort and the non-renewal of graduate status by the Department of Curriculum and Instruction for faculty from the Department of STEM Education.

Acting Chair Cross noted that hard copies of the SC's proposed changes to the draft all-campus email were now available and he suggested that SC members take a brief break from their current discussion to review the language.

Discussion on Wording for All-Campus Email Regarding Kentucky's Biennial Budget

Grossman **moved** to approve the language in the track changes-version of the two paragraphs and Schroeder **seconded**. SC members noted that "statutes" was misspelled as "statues" and asked that the signature line be revised to reflect that the Chair's "signature" documented approval of the SC on behalf of the University Senate. When there was no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the wording as revised and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

SC members returned to the discussion regarding the MAT in Secondary STEM Education.

2. Old Business

a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) – Margaret Schroeder, Chair

i. Proposed New MAT in Secondary STEM Education (continued)

As discussion continued, Wood suggested that Curriculum and Instruction affirm via a written memo that it would not enroll students into the math or science areas of Curriculum and Instruction's MAEDU Education-Secondary Education degree program. Grossman **moved** to amend the motion to approve the proposed new MAT in Secondary STEM Education conditionally upon receipt of a memo from Curriculum and Instruction declaring that Curriculum and Instruction would not admit any students into a math or science track in the MA in Education. Wood **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion to amend **passed** with none opposed. Discussion continued on the amended motion, specifically on the CIP code for the proposed new MAT in Secondary STEM Education. Wood remained concerned that the proposed CIP code could open the door to allowing STEM Education to offer the program to more levels than just the secondary level. Schroeder explained that after doing additional research into CIPs with Assistant Provost for Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Annie Weber, they had learned that all STEM-related CIPs available to UK were multi-level – there was no CIP available that could restrict instruction to a single level.

As there was no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion recommending that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new MAT in Secondary STEM Education, in the Department of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics Education within the College of Education, conditional upon receipt of a memo from the Department of Curriculum and Instruction declaring that Curriculum and Instruction would not admit any students into a math or science track in the MA in Education. The motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstained.

ii. Recommendations for Significant Changes

Schroeder explained the proposal and the changes that had been made since the last time it was presented to SC. (The proposal had been reviewed by Tagavi and Wood, as members of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), due to Wood's concerns regarding language consistency.) Wood explained that the prior version had five phrases that described what constituted a "significant change." That prior list of five descriptions was simplified so there were now two overarching descriptions of what would constitute a "significant change."

In response to a question from Blonder, Wood indicated that the "Senate Council office" was included as having the authority to declare a proposal as constituting a "significant change" in order to ensure the SC chair had the authority to determine if a proposal constituted a "significant change." Grossman opined that it was appropriate for SC staff to bring something to the attention of the chair, but that the SC office could not determine if a proposal was a significant change. Schroeder added that "Senate Council office" was used repeatedly throughout the *Senate Rules (SRs)* and changing it to "Senate Council chair" would require changes throughout the *SRs*.

Schroeder then drew SC members' attention to the language on letters of administrative feasibility. She explained that the requirement for letters of administrative feasibility from the provost and dean were different for graduate and for undergraduate programs. She noted that the current *SR* language required letters of administrative feasibility from the provost and dean for program changes, too. She said the SAPC believed that letters of administrative feasibility from the dean and provost should be required only for any new degree programs, new certificate or for degree programs or certificates undergoing a significant change. Wood opined that for undergraduate programs and certificates, a letter of administrative feasibility from the provost should only be required if the new program or new certificate was to be homed outside a college. Only graduate degrees and certificates (new or significantly changed) should require a letter of administrative feasibility from the provost, which would simplify the process for faculty.

Wood **moved** to amend the significant changes proposal, specifically to change the (single sentence, beginning with "The Office of the Provost shall provide a statement...") of the middle paragraph of *SR 3.2.3.A.2* to: "For degree programs and certificates that report to an office outside of a college, the Office of the Provost shall provide a statement of administrative feasibility for new degree programs, for degree programs with a significant change, or concerning for new certificates or certificates with a significant change." Ms. Brothers commented that she was under the impression that Provost David Blackwell welcomed the opportunity to review such proposals as they were being developed. Wood explained that the Provost's office could be involved in some other way, without forcing the provost to write a letter. Blonder **seconded**.

Schroeder said that she was not sure if SAPC would agree with the change, noting that the changed sentence was radically different from the sentiment that SAPC vetted, proposed, and sought feedback on. She said that in conversations with Assistant Provost for Strategic Planning and Institutional

Effectiveness Annie Davis Weber and with the Provost's office, it was her understanding that the Provost's office wanted to be integrally involved in program proposals from the very start, in part of have an understanding of what resources might be needed and to clarify if a proposal would bring in new students or cause existing UK students to transfer into the program. Wood stated that the Senate should be involved in assessing new degree programs and certificates in terms of quality and standards, not on bringing new students to UK and budget dollars. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion to amend the significant changes language from the SAPC and the motion passed with four in favor, two opposed, and one abstained.

b. Nominees for Area and Advisory Committees

Ms. Brothers explained the layout of the files describing committee compositions and eligible faculty. The first group of committees and nominees that SC discussed was comprised of the Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure and the seven academic area advisory committees.

The Chair (McCormick) returned to the meeting and gave SC members a brief update on the email language deliberations, but indicated that Acting Chair Cross should continue in the role of Chair for the time being.

SC members returned to, and completed, their deliberations on committee nominees for the SACPT and academic area advisory committees.

Given the presence of a remaining guest, SC members suggested that the degree list item be discussed prior to beginning the next set of committee nominees.

Acting Chair Cross stepped down as acting chair and the Chair was again responsible for the meeting.

3. Degree Recipient

a. College of Arts and Sciences Student KD-06

Guest Ruth Beattie (AS/Biology, associate dean for advising) explained the request, indicating that it involved similar circumstances to another situation that the SC reviewed earlier in the semester. Brion **moved** that the elected faculty members of SC amend the **December 2017** degree list by adding the BA Economics for student **KD-06** and recommend through the President to the Board of Trustees that the degree be awarded effective **December 2017**. Grossman **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. Nominees for Area and Advisory Committees

SC members began deliberating on the nominees for the remaining committee compositions: Senate Hearing Panel (Privilege & Tenure); Senate Advisory Faculty Code Committee; University Joint Cmte on Honorary Degrees; Advisory Committee on Naming University Property; Intellectual Property; Research Conflict of Interest Committee; Residency Status Review Committee; University Appeals Board; Academic Computing Committee; University IT Coordinating Committee; and UK Core Education Committee.

There were no vacancies on a few of the committees, but Ms. Brothers explained that she included them on the master list so they would not be forgotten in future deliberations. The nominees for the UK Core Education Committee were not discussed; Ms. Brothers indicated that the UK Core Education Committee chair intended to work closely with the SC on reviewing nominees.

e. Discussion on Documentation Required for Borrowed Courses

The Chair explained that program proposers are currently required to receive permission from an outside department to include the outside department's courses in a program proposal ("borrowed course"). She explained that Schroeder, Ms. Brothers, and colleagues from the College of Arts and Sciences had been discussing ways to improve the curricular process. The Chair read for SC members the current standard ("Any use of courses from outside the department must be approved by the faculty of the offering unit."), as well as the proposed standard ("If a student must take a specific course, or must take a course (or courses) from a list of five or fewer courses, there must be evidence that every offering unit has granted permission for its course(s) to be used. If a student is allowed to (1) choose any course with a specific prefix (with or without a restriction on which hundred series the course must be in) or (2) choose from a list of six or more courses (regardless of prefix), no permission is required.").

Osterhage expressed concern that if the proposed standard was accepted, units from which courses were borrowed might not know how many students would be enrolling in those borrowed courses. The Chair commented that faculty also might not be aware of course prerequisites if borrowed courses could be used without formal permission. Ms. Brothers explained that the proposal's documentation neglected to include an explanation that if the proposed standard was accepted, faculty members would continue to be encouraged to discuss use of borrowed courses with colleagues; Ms. Brothers noted that in addition to the concerns already noted, collaborative conversations would also indicate if a course were to be dropped or offered less frequently, as well as if there were other, perhaps better courses to include in a program proposal.

Wood stated that some units offered a tremendous number of service courses and that forcing departmental faculty to vote on approvals for use of those courses was an intolerable burden on their faculty. She spoke in favor of an exception to the requirement (for permission to use borrowed courses) for courses that are offered specifically for University-wide service. Grossman said that because different departments used courses differently for their own majors, it would be difficult to create a list that was correct. Wood suggested the creation of an opt-out list, for which departmental faculty do not have to vote to approve their use as borrowed courses. Brion supported consulting departmental faculty for use of borrowed courses, noting that sometimes if a faculty member retired a course would no longer be offered. Also, if a department did not know that others were using its course(s), the department might not think to offer the course. Ms. Brothers indicated that a campuswide opt-out list was a feasible option that should be discussed further, but suggested that could be investigated in addition to making a change to the standard on borrowed courses.

During discussion, the Chair updated SC members on the status of the language for the campuswide email to campus regarding the biennial budget.

SC members were satisfied with changing the proposed standard so that inclusion of a specific borrowed prefix and course number in a proposal would require approval by the department chair, director of graduate studies, or the director of undergraduate studies (no vote by the faculty would be necessary). For lists of prefixes (not a specific course prefix and number), no consultation or approval would be required.

In response to a question from Brion, regarding the campuswide email the Chair indicated that it might be necessary to send additional changes to the email language to SC members via email, later in the evening.

Senate Council
April 2, 2018

Blonder **moved** to adjourn and Wood **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 5:19 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine M. McCormick,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Blonder, Brion, Cross, Grossman, McCormick, Osterhage, Schroeder, Spear, Tagavi, and Wood.

Invited guests present: Margaret Bausch, Jared Stallones, Annie Davis Weber, and Jennifer Wilhelm.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, April 5, 2018.