Senate Council
April 25, 2016

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, April 25, 2016 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 Andrew Hippisley called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:01 pm.

1. Minutes from April 18, 2016 and Announcements
There were no changes requested for the minutes. There being **no objections**, the minutes from April 18, 2016 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair offered a couple of announcements.

In February, the Chair neglected to report that after he queried SC members via the listserv, he received no suggestions or comments regarding the proposed changes to *Administrative Regulations 2:4* ("Special Title Series"), *Administrative Regulations 2:3* ("Extension Title Series"), *Administrative Regulations 2:2-1* ("Regular Title Series after 1-2-2000"), and *Administrative Regulations 2:2-2* ("Regular Title Series prior to 2000").

The Chair asked Kraemer for information on the recent Saturday brainstorming meeting regarding the recently announced reorganization of units in Provost Tim Tracy's area, specifically Undergraduate Education, and Kraemer did so. There was brief discussion among SC members about the reorganization.

2. Degree Recipients
a. May 2016 In Memoriam Honorary Degree List
i. College of Communication and Information Student
The Chair invited Guest Alyssa Eckman (CI/Integrated Strategic Communications, department chair), to share some comments regarding Mr. Jonathan Krueger, a student in Integrated Strategic Communications, who passed away during the course of his studies at UK. Grossman **moved** that Mr. Krueger be added to the May 2016 In Memoriam Posthumous Degree List and that the elected faculty senators approve UK's May 2016 In Memoriam list of candidates for credentials, for submission to the Senate and then through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. May 2016 Degree List
The Chair said he would entertain a motion to approve the May 2016 degree list. Wood **moved** that the elected faculty senators approve UK's May 2016 list of candidates for credentials, for submission to the Senate and then through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Schroeder **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

c. Early August 2016 Degree List
Schroeder **moved** that the elected faculty senators approve UK's Early August 2016 list of candidates for credentials, for submission to the Senate and then through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Wood **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

d. Late Addition to the Degree List (per *Senate Rules 5.4.1.1.D.1-2*)
i. College of Agriculture Student SN-53

Guest Larry Grabau (AG/Plant and Soil Sciences, associate dean for academic programs) explained that someone in his officer erroneously entered the degree application for December 2016 instead of December 2015.

Brown **moved** that student SN-53 be added to the December 2015 degree list and Wilson **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Committee Reports
a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) - Margaret Schroeder, Chair
i. Proposed BLS Bachelor of Liberal Studies
Schroeder, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal. Guests Anna Bosch (AS/English, associate dean for undergraduate programs) and Christia Spears-Brown (AS/Psychology) answered questions from SC members. There were a number of questions from SC members about the purpose, rigor, and target audience for the proposed degree. The Chair said that the **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new BLS degree with a major in Liberal Studies, in the College of Arts and Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

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

ii. Proposed BS Digital Media and Design
Schroeder explained the proposal; College of Fine Arts Dean Michael Tick, guest, and Guest Rob Jensen (FA/Art and Visual Studies) answered questions. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new BS degree in Digital Media and Design, in the School of Art and Visual Studies within the College of Fine Arts. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iii. Proposed New Undergraduate Certificate in Universal Design
Schroeder explained the proposal. Guest Harold Kleinert, former director of the Human Development Institute, and Guest Ben Withers (associate provost for undergraduate education) answered questions from SC members. All the questions pertained to the proposed home academic unit, Undergraduate Education, which was part of the recently announced, Provost-led structural reorganization. (McCormick suggested that the SAOSC be tasked with reviewing the reorganization.)

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

SC members again discussed the reorganization in the Provost's area [Undergraduate Education, Enrollment Management, Student Affairs, the International Center, and the Center for Learning and Teaching]. Some SC members expressed concern about the reorganization in general, as well as with the Provost's lack of explicit consultation with SC. Discussion turned to having a SC-named liaison between the SC and the Provost's reorganization committee. Although a couple of SC members had attended the first meeting, they had not attended as SC representatives. Wood **moved** to ask the Provost to appoint chair-elect McCormick as a liaison from the SC to the committee considering the reorganizations in the Provost's area. Mazur **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

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

Bailey, chair of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC), commented that in discussions with the contact persons for the two items on the day's agenda, both groups commented that while they followed the procedures set out in *Administrative Regulations 1:3* ("Policies and Guidelines Related To Multidisciplinary Centers and Institutes") and thought their proposals were complete, they found out very late in the process that such proposals also need to be routed through the Senate – *AR 1:3* is silent on the role that Senate plays. Bailey said that there should be a clear process outline in the *AR*. The Chair said that particular regulation has now been revised and would be sent to Senate for endorsement in the near future so that it matched the language in the *SR*. Bailey noted that the SAOSC has different requirements for information, in addition to what is included in *AR 1:3*, but noted that the contact persons for today's items were very nice about the need for additional paperwork and related documentation.

i. Proposed New Sports Medicine Research Institute
The Chair said that College of Health Sciences Dean Scott Lephart and John Abt (HS/Rehabilitation Science) were present as guests and prepared to answer questions from SC. Bailey explained the proposal for a new Sports Medicine Research Institute (SMRI) and noted that he intended to remove the "draft" language in the SAOSC's support letter. Bailey said that a faculty member, Davy Jones (ME), had contacted him over the weekend to let him know that while the SAOSC did a good job reviewing the academic aspects of the proposal, it had not reviewed aspects such as infrastructure and resources. Furthermore, according to Jones, the SAOSC needed to provide two motions, one to approve based on academic merits and a second motion to endorse, based on nonacademic merits. Bailey noted that Jones had also submitted suggestions for changes to wording, although one of the suggestions was not in compliance with *AR 1:3*, which requires that centers comprised of faculty from multiple colleges should report to the Vice President for Research, not the college dean. Bailey added that Jones made additional suggestions regarding specific wording within the proposal, which he shared with the contact person. There was much discussion regarding who the center would and should report to.

There was discussion among SC members and guests regarding who the center should report to. Bailey noted that the SAOSC had only put forward one motion so he was not comfortable assuming that the SAOSC supported using both motions. Therefore, Bailey said he would move the motion and not bring it forth from committee. Bailey **moved** to approve the proposed new Sports Medicine Research Institute based on its academic merits. He added that it had unanimous approval from the SAOSC. McCormick **seconded**. Wood **moved to amend** the motion such that approval was contingent upon a revision of the proposal to include clarification on the voting faculty of the educational unit and time equivalence assigned to SRMI-affiliated faculty. Brown **seconded**. There was additional discussion and a little confusion among SC members about needing to take two votes. Dean Lephart said he was happy to make the suggested revisions. A **vote** was taken on the motion to amend the motion and the motion to amend **passed** with none opposed. A **vote** was taken on the motion to approve (based on academic merits) the proposal for a new Sports Medicine Research Institute if it is revised to include clarification on the voting faculty of the educational unit and time equivalence assigned to SRMI-affiliated faculty. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

Bailey said that the second motion pertained to endorsement of the proposal based on non-academic merits. SC members continued the discussion on whether the SRMI should officially report to the College of Health Sciences Dean, to the Provost, or to the Vice President for Research. McCormick **moved** to recommend that Senate endorse the proposed Sports Medicine Research Institute based on its non-academic merits, with the SMRI director reporting to the College of Health Sciences dean. Porter **seconded**. Discussion about the appropriate reporting structure continued, with Bailey noting that while

the AR does not allow a center with multiple colleges involved to report to a college dean, it made sense in this case because the Health Sciences dean was providing all the funding for the institute in question. SC members noted other existing centers/institutes (Sanders-Brown Center on Aging and Spinal Cord and Brain Injury Research Center) included faculty from multiple colleges yet reported to a college dean. Questions about why two motions were necessary continued to be raised. Bailey suggested leaving the reporting structure as is [reporting to the Health Sciences dean] and that Provost Tim Tracy would need to straighten out the matter and make reporting relationships consistent. There was brief, additional discussion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. Dean Lephart thanked SC and noted he would be happy to talk with Bailey in the future about how to make the center/institute proposal process more transparent and simple to navigate.

ii. Proposed New Institute for Biomedical Informatics
Bailey explained the proposal, noting that it had enthusiastic support from the SAOSC. He said that this proposal would also need to have a motion to approve and a motion to endorse. Bailey noted that a faculty member, Davy Jones (ME), had also submitted suggestions for changes to wording in this proposal (clarification of the voting faculty of the educational unit, time equivalence assigned to IBI-affiliated faculty, and where the IBI would report). SC members and Guests GQ Zhang (ME/Internal Medicine) and Jeffrey Talbert (PH/Pharmacy Practice and Science) at length the issue of where the proposed Institute for Biomedical Informatics (IBI) should be housed. Wood **moved** to approve the proposed Institute for Biomedical Informatics based on its academic merits and subject to a revision to include the suggested changes and Bailey **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Wilson **moved** to endorse the proposed Institute for Biomedical Informatics based on its non-academic merits and Porter **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. Bailey suggested he and Zhang meet in the near future to discuss how to improve the approval process and Zhang was amenable to that.

c. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) - Scott Yost, Chair
i. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 4.2.3.3* ("College of Medicine")
Guest Scott Yost, chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), explained the proposal, noting that it was similar to what the College of Pharmacy did a few years back – changing to a more holistic admissions process and moving required coursework information to the Bulletin. Grossman said that he made a similar comment when Pharmacy proposed their change – admissions requirements are traditionally included in the *SR* because the Senate has to approve admissions policies. He said that he wanted SC members to recognize that they would be giving up oversight of those admissions policies in Medicine by approving the proposal. There was extensive discussion among SC members and Guest Chris Feddock (ME/Internal Medicine, assistant dean for medical education) about what the proposed change would mean in terms of Senate oversight and the *SR*. Ms. Brothers commented that if SC approved the change, it would not be clear if Senate would need to be involved in changes to admissions requirements that were not in the *SR* – the charge to the SAASC gives them purview over Sections IV and V of the *SR*, but it would not be clear if the part of the admission policy removed from the *SR* (specific course requirements) would still be under Senate authority. Ms. Brothers added that the Senate did not have purview over the Graduate School Bulletin so it would be unlikely to have purview over whatever document the course-specific admissions policy was in.

SC members discussed whether it was appropriate to allow a program to make admissions-related changes, particularly if the purpose of removing the language from the *SR* was to make it easier to change such requirements. Yost commented that the only aspect of admissions that was being removed was the pre-med coursework, not the entire admissions policy. Some SC members thought the proposed change was acceptable while others were concerned about removing pre-med coursework from the *SR*, even if such changes were considered to be minor by the MD program faculty. In response to a question from Brown about who makes decisions on pre-med coursework, Feddock replied that a committee of faculty (the curriculum committee) makes a recommendation to the faculty-led admissions committee, after which the recommendation is heard by the College of Medicine faculty council. The proposal was a combined recommendation from the curriculum committee and the admissions committee. After a few additional comments, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with five in favor and two abstained.

ii. Update on Review of GCCR's Proposed Assessment Plan and Substitution Policy
Yost explained the SAASC's review of the Graduation Composition and Communication requirement (GCCR) that would be inserted into the *SR*. He noted that SC had already approved the policies in principle. The SAASC recommended the addition of one paragraph from the policy into the *SR*, along with a few changes to clarify intent, but there were no substantive changes. The Chair said that the **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation to approve the proposed changes to *SR 5.4.3.1* ("Composition and Communication"). 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 and one abstaining.

d. Senate's Research and Graduate Education Committee - Mark Lauersdorf, Chair
i. Report on Graduate School
The Chair welcomed Guest Mark Lauersdorf, chair of the Senate's Research and Graduate Education Committee (SRGEC), who reported on the SRGEC's report on proposed decentralization of some aspects of the Graduate School. The concerns raised by SRGEC in the report regarding proposed decentralization of Graduate School responsibilities were largely echoed by SC members.

As discussion was winding down, Mazur suggested that it would be helpful to know what problem had instigated the conversation about decentralization of Graduate School responsibilities. The Chair said it was within the purview of the SC to charge the SRGEC to look into the matter further. Wood suggested that the SRGEC report back to the SC on the underlying motivations for any proposed change in the structure and function of the Graduate School. Wood added that she would forward a previous report on the Graduate School, conducted during the tenure of then-provost Christine Riordan, to Lauersdorf for him and his committee to review. No vote was taken on the proposed SRGEC charge but no SC members spoke against it. Wood concurred with Porter's assertion that the gist of the charge was essentially for the SRGEC to sit down and talk to Provost Tim Tracy or with his designee. Lauersdorf noted that he would not be on Senate after the end of the spring semester but the Chair said the *Senate Rules* would permit a non-senator to chair the SRGEC.

4. Tentative Senate Agenda for May 2, 2016
SC members discussed the proposed tentative University Senate (Senate) agenda. There were no objections to the Chair's suggestion that the meeting start at 2 pm instead of the typical 3 pm start time. McCormick suggested having the Provost attend to talk about his proposed restructuring.

Grossman **moved** to approve the tentative Senate agenda for May 2, 2016 as an ordered list, with the understanding that items may be rearranged to accommodate guests' schedules and Porter **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstaining.

Due to the time, the meeting was adjourned at 5:27 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Hippisley,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bailey, Blonder, Brown, Grossman, Hippisley, Kraemer, McCormick, Mazur, Porter, Schroeder, Wilson, and Wood.

Invited guests present: John Abt, Anna Bosch, Christia Spears-Brown, Alyssa Eckman, Chris Feddock, Larry Grabau, Jane Jensen, Rob Jensen, Harold Kleinert, Mark Lauersdorf, Scott Lephart, Jeffrey Talbert, Michael Tick, Ben Withers, and GQ Zhang.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, May 4, 2016.