

Senate Council
April 24, 2017

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, April 24, 2017 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 2:58 pm. Due to the number of invited guests, the Chair suggested that everyone present introduce themselves, which was done.

1. Minutes from April 10, 2017 and Announcements

The Chair said there was one suggestion for the minutes that as accepted. There being **no objections** the minutes from April 10 were **approved** as amended by **unanimous consent**. The Chair announced that Greg Heileman from the University of New Mexico was selected to serve as UK's associate provost for student and academic life. In terms of organization, the offices of strategic planning and institutional effectiveness were reorganized and the positions of the two directors were eliminated.

2. Digitized Workflow for Distribution of Effort (DOE) Forms – Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement G. T. Lineberry and Project Manager Diane Gagel

The Chair introduced the guests for the discussion - Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement G. T. Lineberry and Project Manager Diane Gagel. Lineberry began by offering some background history of UK's distribution of effort (DOE) forms and the recent work done to digitize the forms. Lineberry indicated that there were three primary outcomes of the new, digitized workflow: 1. the DOE planning system has been disassociated from cost distributions; 2. a faculty member will now receive their DOE via myUK instead of it being available on a piece of paper; and 3. there will be increased reporting capabilities which will allow chairs, division chiefs, deans, and the Provost to look at DOE information in composite format, or ordered/ranked by department, title series, faculty rank, etc. Gagel offered additional information about the roll-out process to colleges.

There were a number of questions from SC members; it was quickly determined that the time allotted to discussion was insufficient. The Chair said she would invite Lineberry and Gagel to return to SC at a later date, perhaps for the summer retreat, when a more in-depth discussion could be conducted. There were no objections.

3. Degree Recipients

a. December 2017 Honorary Degree Nominee(s)

The Chair welcomed the next guest, Graduate School Assistant Dean for Graduate Student Development Morris Grubbs, who gave SC members a presentation on the two honorary degree nominees for December 2017. There were no questions from SC members.

Bailey **moved** that the elected faculty senators approve LSP as the recipient of an Honorary Doctorate in Humane Letters, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees and Cross **seconded**. There was no discussion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair noted that only elected faculty senators on SC should be voting on the honorary degree recipients.

Cross **moved** that the elected faculty senators approve JDE as the recipient of an Honorary Doctorate in Humane Letters, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees and Bailey **seconded**. There was no discussion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair reminded SC members to not share the names of the honorary degree candidates, which was to be kept confidential.

b. May 2017 Degree List

Grossman **moved** that the elected faculty senators approve UK's May 2017 list of candidates for credentials, for submission to the President to the Board of Trustees and Schroeder **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

c. Early August 2017 Degree List

Grossman **moved** that the elected faculty senators approve UK's early August 2017 list of candidates for credentials, for submission to the President to the Board of Trustees and Schroeder **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Proposed Changes to 2017-18 University Calendar

Guest Cleo Price, assistant dean for graduate academic services, explained the Graduate School-related changes needed for the 2017-18 University calendar. Bailey **moved** to approve the proposed changes as distributed and Schroeder **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) – Ernie Bailey, Chair

i. Proposed Name Change of Department of Forestry to Department of Forestry and Natural Resources

Bailey, chair of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC), explained the proposal. He said that the SAOSC discussed the proposal via email and that the issue that warranted attention pertained to a letter from the steering committee for interdisciplinary degree in Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences (NRES), written two years ago, in which the NRES steering committee had no objections to changing the MS Forestry degree name to add "and Environmental Sciences" after "Forestry." The letter, however, expressed concern about negative impact on the NRES program if "Environmental Sciences" was added to more than the MS Forestry. Bailey opined that what was missing from the Department of Forestry's name change proposal was a current response from NRES on this issue. He indicated that two guests, Jeff Stringer (AG/Forestry, department chair) and David McNear (AG/Plant and Soil Sciences, DUS for NRES and steering committee member), were present to answer questions.

Bailey solicited questions about the name change in general. Bird-Pollan asked for more information about what "natural resources" entailed – as a lawyer, she understood that phrase to encompass oil and gas and wondered if there was a common usage of "natural resources." Stringer explained that faculty in Forestry had expertise in many issues other than Forestry; included in "natural resources" is water resources. The name of "Forestry" did not fit the unit well, Springer stated, and said that the unit's work was best encompassed by the addition of "and Natural Resources." He said that the departmental faculty reviewed a variety of alternate names, including "wildlife," but none fit the department's activities better than "and Natural Resources." He noted that from the standpoint of Forestry faculty, it excluded oil and gas.

Bailey asked McNeal about any overlaps, noting that NRES was an interdisciplinary program, without a department chair to go to bat for them, so it was important that SC be sensitive to their issues. He added that there were some members of NRES whose appointment was in Forestry. McNear said that the NRES program was consulted a couple of years ago about the name change to the MS Forestry [to

add “and Natural Resources” to that degree name] and that the sentiment of the NRES steering committee was that the name change to the master’s degree was fine, but there were concerns about “and Natural Resources” creeping into the department name and other places. The NRES steering committee thought that any additional use would involve more discussion. There were also concerns from NRES that having two undergraduate degrees with “and Natural Resources” would be confusing to students. Bailey commented that the undergraduate degree in NRES was heavier in science than the undergraduate degree in Forestry. Bailey summarized by saying that the two programs did appear to be different and fulfilled different niches. The question he still had pertained to not knowing the extent to which Forestry will evolve and overlap into NRES.

SC members and guests discussed the concerns raised by NRES about the proposal. McNear indicated that he understood that Forestry faculty wanted a name change for their department and he did not want the NRES placed in a position to have to oppose it, but rather that he would like a discussion first, and a commitment from Forestry to be supportive of NRES. He said NRES was not actively consulted on Forestry’s name change and that his desire at this point was begin from a new slate, without any animosity, and simply find some middle ground from which both parties can work. In response to a question from Schroeder, Bailey explained that there was some awareness within the College about NRES’ concerns, but there was also a reluctance for the NRES steering committee to get in the way of the proposed name change. The undergraduate curriculum committee in the College discussed it at length and concluded it would not adversely affect NRES but that attention should be paid to the name overlap in the future. Some SC members expressed concern about the lack of resolution regarding NRES’s concerns and wondered about the feasibility of delaying the Senate’s vote until it was resolved.

Cross **moved** to endorse the proposed name change to the Department of Forestry with the caveat that Stringer and McNear draft a letter, which could be read to Senate, to ensure that the issues discussed will be resolved. Grossman **seconded**. There was additional discussion. Bird-Pollan asked if Cross’s motion was intended to require an agreement to be in place for the May 1 Senate meeting. Cross clarified that his intent was to require a letter indicating a willingness to work together on the issues discussed. Ms. Brothers stated that the letter would need to be received by the Chair no later than 3 pm on Friday, April 28. There was no additional discussion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with a majority in favor and one opposed.

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

i. Proposed New Undergraduate Certificate in Sexuality Studies

Schroeder, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new Undergraduate Certificate in Sexuality Studies, within the Department of Gender and Women's Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were a couple questions. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed New Undergraduate Certificate in Baroque Trumpet

Schroeder explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the establishment of a new Undergraduate Certificate in Baroque Trumpet, in the School of Music in the College of Fine Arts. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions from SC members. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iii. Recommendations for Professional Degree Definitions and Approval Processes

Schroeder explained the recommendations from the SAPC regarding professional degrees. SC members discussed the recommendations; guest Davy Jones, co-chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), also participated in the discussion. SC members offered a variety of suggestions.

- Incorporate examples of each type of professional degree to better distinguish among the similar definitions.
- Remove references to “professional college” in the *Senate Rules* because it is an outdated term and confuses the issue of professional degrees.
- Clarify if the intent that the definition of a professional master’s degree program specifically excludes programs that are shorter than two years’ duration.
- Determine if the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) will accept UK’s utilization of a fourth defined type of professional degree if the CPE only has three types.
- UK’s current degree categories are predicated on their use of certain number series of courses – with the new language on professional degrees, determine which course number series will be used.

The Chair noted that there were a number of remaining agenda items and wondered aloud if consensus on the recommendations would be reached. She acknowledged that the SAPC had done a great deal of work on the matter and that it warranted a thorough discussion. Bird-Pollan asked about the consequences of having a degree in one category instead of another and Schroeder responded that it pertained to differential tuition. Schroeder explained to Grossman that SAPC did not recommend removal of references to “professional colleges” because of the many references in the *Senate Rules* to professional colleges and the sheer amount of work that would need to be undertaken if that terminology was removed.

Given the massive revisions to the SRs that the recommendations entail, there was wide support for the proposal to be vetted by the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), also. Grossman **moved** to table the discussion on the SAPC’s recommendations on professional programs until the SC retreat. McGillis **seconded**. After additional discussion, Grossman **amended** his motion so that SC instead postponed review of the SAPC’s recommendations, to give the SREC time to review the changes. McGillis **agreed** to the changed motion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iv. Recommendations for Program Changes Involving New Emphases (Tracks, Concentrations, and Specializations)

Schroeder **moved** to table the recommendations for program changes involving new emphases until the next regular SC meeting. Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

v. Recommendations for University Scholars Programs Not Approved by Senate

Schroeder explained the SAPC’s recommendations. She noted that the third option was for the two units which were thought to have a University Scholars Program (USP), but for which no evidence was found – the process will allow them to make their USPs official, too. In response to a question from Bird-Pollan about students currently enrolled in some of the USPs that were not approved by Senate, Schroeder noted that there was an inherent, underlying premise to the recommendations that each will be approved. The SAPC’s job will be to ensure that a USP is able to be approved by Senate.

The motion from the SAPC was a recommendation that the SC approve the SAPC's proposed actions to formalize the USPs not approved by Senate:

1. Contact all USPs not approved by the senate. Ask them to submit the USP paperwork by August 31, 2017 to the Senate Council office. Proof of college level review/minutes, will not be required.
2. They will then be forwarded together to SAPC to be reviewed and approved no later than September 30, 2017. They will then be forwarded to Senate Council and Senate for approval.
3. For USPs that colleges think they have, but there is no record for: Dean of the Graduate School will contact the DGSs who have inquired and ask them to also submit their program paperwork, with proof of College level review, no later than August 31, 2017. It will then be reviewed by the Graduate Council and proceed through the normal approval processes.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

vi. Year-end Report

Schroeder **moved** to table the year-end report until the May 8 SC meeting. Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

c. Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SERC) - Joan Mazur and Davy Jones, Co-Chairs

a. Update on Activities

Mazur, co-chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), provided SC members with an update on the SREC's recent activities, which included college elections and associated certifications of the results and the creation of an appeals process for a faculty member to use if they would like to challenge an assertion that the faculty member is ineligible to vote in the trustee election.

Mazur also stated that many of the SREC members were contacted by other faculty members regarding concerns about the new excused absences policy in *Senate Rules 5.2.4.2* ("Excused Absences"). As a result, the SREC has begun drafting an interpretation that adds text about the type of documentation an instructor may request if a student has a professional interview. The SREC left for another day the issue of documentation for post-graduation employment. Mazur added that she would like Reid or Childress to attend the next SREC meeting when the excused absences policy was discussed. There were a few comments from SC members. Reid expressed opposition to the draft form, stating that it was an odd requirement that the person interviewing the student would need to sign the form. She stated that having that sort of odd requirement was not the best way to begin an interview. Reid was amenable to working with the SREC to identify some sort of way to verify the need for an interview at a particular time, commenting that a form was not the only way to document an interview. Reid asserted that the simplest way to offer proof of an interview was for a student to provide a copy of the email they received about the interview from the prospective interviewer.

6. Proposed Changes to Administrative Regulations

a. Background Information and Partial Summary of Changes

The Chair welcomed the guests in attendance for the discussion: Marcy Deaton (senior associate general counsel), Nick Kehrwald (interim dean of students), and Terri Crocker (senior paralegal). Kehrwald

presented SC members with background information about the Community of Concern and the philosophies driving the efforts regarding students who may be a risk to themselves and/or others.

b. Proposed Changes to *Administrative Regulations 4:11* (“Community of Concern Team”)

c. Proposed Changes to *Administrative Regulations 4:12* (“Student Involuntary Medical Withdrawal Policy and Procedures”)

The Chair reminded SC members that the role SC played in changes to *Administrative Regulations* was one of endorsement, not approval. SC members expressed appreciation for the changes made to the policies since the last time SC reviewed them. Deaton noted that the very last line of *AR 4:12* (section *VI.E*) had been modified slightly to state that a student could still appeal to the University Appeals Board in the cases of alleged violations of student rights.

Cross **moved** to endorse the proposed changes to both *Administrative Regulations 4:11* (“Community of Concern Team”) and *Administrative Regulations 4:12* (“Student Involuntary Medical Withdrawal Policy and Procedures”) [including inclusion of the reference to the University Appeals Board]. Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Given the time, the Chair suggested the SC discuss the Senate’s tentative agenda and there were no objections.

8. Tentative Senate Agenda for May 1, 2017

SC members discussed the proposed agenda, removing a couple of the items. After discussion, Mazur **moved** to approve the tentative Senate agenda for May 1 and Schroeder **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

10. SC Retreat Planning

SC members discussed possible dates for the retreat. Cross suggested that SC members send their “cannot attend” dates in May to Ms. Brothers, who could use that information as the basis for a poll to identify a date when the majority of SC members could attend.

Bird-Pollan **moved** to adjourn and Grossman **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine M. McCormick,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bailey, Bird-Pollan, Blonder, Cross, Grossman, Lauersdorf, Mills, McCormick, McGillis, Mazur, Reid, and Schroeder.

Invited guests present: Terri Crocker, Diane Gagel, Morris Grubbs, John Lhotka, GT Lineberry, David McNear, Carol Mason, Cleo Price, and Jeff Stringer.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, May 4, 2017.