

Senate Council  
December 3, 2018

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, December 3, 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 Jennifer Bird-Pollan called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:05 pm.

1. Minutes from November 19, 2018 and November 26, 2018 and Announcements

The Chair said that no comments had been received for either the minutes from November 19 or the minutes from November 26. There being **no objections**, the minutes from November 19, 2018 and November 26, 2018 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair offered a series of announcements.

Earlier in November, the SC reviewed a proposal for a Task Force for Online Program Guidelines. The proposal was tabled and expected to return to SC on November 26, but due to the Thanksgiving holiday, an error was made and the item was not placed on that agenda. After additional discussions, the proposers have opted to change the nature of the task force and instead provide input and guidance directly to the Chair regarding items brought to the SC office related to distance learning. The Chair said she intended to utilize the group if an issue arose that crossed many committees' charges, or if the issue should be sent to SC. She said that instead of asking SC to approve the group, the group will serve as an advisory body to the Chair. The group will not make any final decisions, but will help the Chair in determining next steps in how to move something forward.

The previous week, SC did not have the time to review the proposal from Firey regarding a possible ad hoc Committee on Title IV. The Chair explained that Firey was unable to attend the day's meeting, so it will be placed on the next SC agenda as "Old Business," when SC reconvenes in January and Firey can attend.

The Chair met with Staff Senate Chair Jon Gent (Internal Medicine) regarding the issue of phased retirement and University service. She said that she and Gent met and discussed President Eli Capilouto's request that any discussions regarding phased retirement be informed by broad feedback from staff and faculty employees. The Chair explained that she and Gent decided to develop a list of major issues regarding having phased retiree employees serving on a senate or as a trustee and once that list was finalized, both chairs will solicit input on the list of issues from their respective executive bodies. The next step will be a survey of each body's senators and after that, the survey results will be shared with both senate's executive committees. A proposal to the President can then be developed, based on the feedback from the Staff Senate and University Senate. The Chair indicated that the list of major issues should be ready for SC's review in January.

A member of senior leadership contacted Ms. Brothers about the possibility of allowing non-degree seeking students to earn an undergraduate certificate. The Chair explained that Ms. Brothers and Herman Farrell (FA/Theatre and Dance, chair of Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC)) were working with the individual so that their request dovetails with the SAASC's current review of the issue.

The Chair met with the President about the membership of the Work Group on Policies Regarding Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment. She said that the composition was almost finalized, but the President wanted to confirm the willingness of the last few members prior to any announcement.

Moving to the agenda, the Chair said that she and Ms. Brothers realized earlier in the morning that the wrong agenda item had been posted for the day's meeting. The Lewis Honors College (LHC) rules needed to be returned to SC for further deliberation, but the LHC proposal regarding changes to the *Senate Rules (SRs)* was inadvertently included on the agenda, instead of the LHC rules. The Chair asked that SC review the LHC rules instead of the LHC's proposed changes to the *SRs*. There were no objections to the change.

The Chair suggested that all those present introduce themselves.

## 2. Old Business

### a. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 4.2.1.3* ("Non-Degree Students")

Guest Farrell, chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), explained the changes since the last SC meeting. When Farrell was finished, the Chair solicited questions of fact from SC members. Guest Christine Harper, associate provost for enrollment management, also participated in the discussion. When questions of fact slid into debate, the Chair noted that the **motion** on the floor was a recommendation from the SAASC to approve the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 4.2.1.3* ("Non-Degree Students"). Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

SC members debated aspects of the proposal, but there was a sense that the SC was supportive of the proposed changes. When discussion wound down, the Chair suggested that it was time for a vote. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstained.

### ~~b. Proposed New *Senate Rules 5.3.2.8* ("Undergraduate Colleges Probation and Suspension Policies," "Lewis Honors College")~~

### b. Proposed Changes to Lewis Honors College Rules

Guest Czar Crofcheck (AG/Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering, Lewis Honors College associate dean of academic affairs) explained the changes that had been made since the SC last saw the most recent draft of the Lewis Honors College (LHC) rules.

Tagavi asked if the LHC III.C was intended to exclude other lecturers. After a lengthy discussion, Crofcheck agreed to a change. Tagavi **moved** to change the sentence in C, as described below\*.

In accordance with (the controlling) GR VII.E.2.a, Associate members of the Honors College Faculty are ~~those~~ tenure and tenure-eligible faculty with primary appointments in another college who have an occasional assignment to provide instruction in the Honors curriculum; and lecturers ~~with a primary appointment in the Honors College~~ who teach Honors courses on an occasional or recurring basis.

Brion **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. Discussion continued.

Tagavi **moved** to add ", for consistency with University Governing Regulations" to the third sentence of LHC VIII, as described below.\*

The University Senate delegates its authority to approve amendments to these rules to the Provost and Dean of the Lewis Honors College, for consistency with University Governing Regulations.

---

\* Strikethrough indicates deleted text and underlining indicates added text.

Wood **seconded**. Discussion followed, with the bulk of the discussion centered on what exact language should be added and where it should be added. Guest Douglas Michael, parliamentarian, said that because the Chair had not formally put the motion on the floor, Tagavi could modify his motion without the need for additional parliamentary action.

Tagavi then **moved** to add the phrase “for consistency with higher University rules and regulations” to the sentence in LHC VIII, as described below\*.

These rules do not become effective until and unless approved by the Dean of the Honors College and Provost for consistency with higher University rules and regulations as indicated by their signatures below, and by the University Senate.

Wood **seconded**. Discussion continued. Brion suggested putting the same language in the sentence below about amendments but Grossman disagreed, saying that the “next sentence” pertained to delegating authority so it did not belong there. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Brion then **moved** to add the same language to the LHC Preamble, as described below\*.

These rules may be amended by a majority of the total voting membership of the Honors College Faculty (GR VII.E.2.c), and the approval of the Dean of the College and the Provost that the rules are consistent with higher University rules and regulations.

Tagavi **seconded**. Cross reminded SC members that the correct word to use would be “certify,” not “approve.” Brion **accepted as a friendly amendment** Cross’s suggestion, as did Tagavi, to the language as described below.

These rules may be amended by a majority of the total voting membership of the Honors College Faculty (GR VII.E.2.c), and the ~~approval~~ certification of the Dean of the College and the Provost that the rules are consistent with higher University rules and regulations.

There were a few additional comments, after which a **vote** was taken. The motion **passed** with none opposed. There were a few additional comments.

A **vote** was taken on the changes to the proposed changes to the LHC rules and the motion **passed** with none opposed. Crofcheck said that she would solicit approval from the LHC faculty on the revised language. The Chair said that if there was faculty debate about the changes to the LHC rules, the rules would need to return to SC. Otherwise, there was no need for the LHC rules to return to SC prior to being reviewed by the Senate.

### 3. Committee Reports

#### a. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) – Herman Farrell

##### i. Proposed Change to Master of Health Administration

Farrell, chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), described the proposed changes. The Chair called for questions of fact.

Tagavi asked if the phrase “Electives (5 total)” meant five credit hours or five courses. He also asked if there was a list that had been approved by program faculty. Guest Martha Riddell (PbH/Health Management and Policy) clarified that the language referred to “five credit hours.” At Tagavi’s request, Riddell agreed to make that change. There was little debate about the merits of the proposal. The Chair stated that the **motion** on the floor was a recommendation from the SAASC to approve the proposed changes to the Master of Health Administration. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

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

#### 4. Degree Recipients

##### a. In Memoriam Degree Recipient

##### i. College of Social Work Student PJ-37

Guest Kalea Benner (SW) explained the request from the College of Social Work. Grossman **moved** that the elected faculty members of SC approve **College of Social Work student PJ-37** as the recipient of an In Memoriam honorary degree, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Cross **seconded**. After brief discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

##### b. Honorary Degree Recipient(s)

The Chair invited Guest Morris Grubbs (Graduate School assistant dean for graduate student professional development) presented four honorary degree nominees put forward by the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees (UJCHD). SC members voted on the nominees in the order in which they were presented in Grubbs’ PowerPoint.

Cross **moved** that the elected faculty members of SC approve SBB as the recipient of an Honorary Doctor of Laws, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Walker **seconded**. There was brief discussion about the type of honorary degree chosen by the UJCHD. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Grubbs described the next nominee. Brion **moved** that the elected faculty members of SC approve YG as the recipient of an Honorary Doctor of Humane Letters, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Grossman **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Grubbs moved to the third nominee. Grossman **moved** that the elected faculty members of SC approve JH as the recipient of an Honorary Doctor of Humane Letters, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Cross **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Grubbs described the fourth nominee. Grossman **moved** that the elected faculty members of SC approve HLL as the recipient of an Honorary Doctor of Humane Letters, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Walker **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

##### c. Request for Waiver of *Senate Rules 5.4.2.3.C.1* (“Circumstances for Award of Honorary Degrees”)

At the Chair’s request, Grubbs explained the request from the UJCHD for a sixth awardee this academic year. Grubbs explained that the UJCHD requested the waiver to allow five honorary degrees to be awarded during the May Commencement ceremonies, bringing the total number awarded in 2018-19 to six; the *SRs* limit the number of nominees to five in any one academic year. Grubbs explained that there

was a strong field of nominees and that it was possible that one of the four already approved by SC might not be able to attend due to scheduling conflicts.

Grossman **moved** to waive *SR 5.4.2.3.C.1* (“Conditions of Circumstance for Honorary Degrees,” Circumstances for Award of Honorary Degrees”). Cross **seconded**. There was lengthy debate about the rule waiver. During debate, the Chair announced that she and Parliamentarian Michael reviewed the *SRs* quickly and *SR 1.1.0.C* (“Authority to Waive Senate Rules”) granted the SC the ability to waive *SRs*, but not the Senate. Therefore, there was no need to ask Senate to waive the rule and the fifth nominee, if approved by SC, would be sent forward to the Senate. A **vote** was taken and because it was a tie, the Chair cast the deciding vote; the motion **passed** with four in favor, three opposed, and one abstained.

d. Honorary Degree Recipient(s) [Pending Approval of SR Waiver]

Grubbs described the fifth nominee. Spear **moved** that the elected faculty members of SC approve RST as the recipient of an Honorary Doctor of Engineering, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Walker **seconded**. Discussion continued, although it focused primarily on the nominee’s status as a possible sixth awardee during the academic year, not on the credentials of the nominee. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair reminded SC members and those present to not share the discussion – the nominees were considered private and secret until the President has a chance to contact each nominee.

e. December 2018 Degree Recipients

Grossman **moved** that the elected faculty members of SC approve UK’s December 2018 list of candidates for credentials, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees and Brion **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Request from Student Regarding Senate Rules 5.4.1.1 (“Application for Degrees,” “Demonstration of Extraordinary Hardship”)

The Chair reported that the student in question had failed to send in the required documentation. After additional comments from the Chair, Brion **moved** to postpone discussion until the student submits the required documentation and Walker **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. Officer Elections

a. Vice Chair

The Chair invited Guest Roger Brown (AG/Agricultural Economics, chair of the Elections Subcommittee of the Senate’s Rules and Elections Committee (SREC)) to the table to oversee the election process. The Chair commented that Osterhage was absent due to illness, but that she had expressed to the Chair a willingness to stand for the position of vice chair. Brown thanked the Chair for that information, noting that he had wanted to know if she was willing.

Brown began the election process by saying that the election could be done by secret ballot if anyone requested it; Blonder asked for a secret ballot.

Brown listed the nominees who were eligible to serve and passed out small pieces of paper. He asked SC members to first write down nominations for the vice chair; nominations could be made for more than one eligible SC member. After the nominations were written down and collected, Brown said that those nominated were Brion, Cross, Osterhage, Spear, and Tagavi.

Brown suggested that those nominated indicate their willingness to serve. Both Brion and Spear expressed gratitude for the nomination, but for a variety of reasons neither was able to serve if elected. Brown noted that the list of nominees was now at three: Cross, Osterhage, and Tagavi.

Brown handed out additional pieces of paper on which SC members could write the name of the person they were voting for, for the position of vice chair. He said that the individual who won a majority of the votes would be declared the winner. Brown collected the ballots and counted them and announced that Osterhage had won a majority; Brown said that Osterhage received four votes, so she had received a majority of the votes.

Cross **moved** to declare Osterhage as the winner and Grossman **seconded**. Tagavi objected, saying that four votes out of eight votes did not constitute a majority and another vote would need to be held. Roger then agreed with Blonder, explaining that Osterhage received four votes, Tagavi received three votes, and Cross had received one vote. Roger concurred that an additional vote would be required. Cross withdrew his name from the field, explaining that he had received the fewest votes in the first round of voting.

SC members voted again and Brown announced the results: Osterhage with four votes and Tagavi with four votes. Brown indicated that another vote would be needed and Tagavi asked why Brown thought that a different outcome would occur. Brown explained that it was expected that at this point, SC members would discuss the candidates and advocate for one over the other. Brown asked if there were any SC members who wanted to offer a comment. Bird-Pollan (chair) noted that Osterhage was absent due to illness, but regularly attended SC meetings. Tagavi interrupted Bird-Pollan and said she could not speak on behalf of Osterhage. Bird-Pollan corrected him, noting that she had the right to participate in officer elections. Tagavi said that she did not have the right to speak, but that she could vote. Brown disagreed, saying that Bird-Pollan was not administering the election and that in her role as a voter, Bird-Pollan had a right to participate. Blonder and Brion spoke in favor of Tagavi. Cross commented that if Osterhage had been present, she would have already won the election, but due to others' expressed concerns about an assistant professor serving as vice chair, he would vote for Tagavi.

Brown again handed out pieces of paper for voting. After counting the ballots, he announced that Tagavi won the election and would take office on June 1; Tagavi received five votes and Osterhage received three.

#### 7. Nominees for Ombud Search Committee

SC members deliberated on the nominees. The Chair indicated that the SC office had only received two nominations, so she put her name forward to serve as a possible (third) faculty member on the Ombud Search Committee. SC members were not comfortable putting forward the name of the faculty administrator who self-nominated and settled on the Chair and the nominee from the College of Medicine. The Chair said she was willing to serve, but that she did not teach undergraduate students and it was possible that the other nominee also did not teach undergraduate students. During discussion, McCormick indicated that she could serve as one of the faculty nominees. SC members thanked McCormick. Grossman **moved** to send forward McCormick's name, as well as the name of the College of Medicine nominee. Cross **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 8. Tentative Senate Agenda for December 10, 2018

Senate Council  
December 3, 2018

9. Tentative Senate Agenda for January 14, 2018 - Discussion Only

The Chair explained that the *Senate Rules* provide for a Senate meeting on the second Monday of the month when classes are in session. Although there had not been a regular January Senate meeting for quite some time, she said that she thought it was needed. As evidence, she noted the current time and commented that the SC had been unable to get through its agenda for the day, which was substantially shorter than the anticipated December Senate meeting agenda, if no January Senate meeting was to be held. The Chair said that the January Senate meeting agenda could be approved at the SC meeting on January 7, but she was sharing it ahead of time to demonstrate the need for a January Senate meeting.

There was extensive discussion among SC members about the placement of the agenda items, but there were no objections to the idea of a January Senate meeting. After a number of suggestions to reorder and move agenda items, Cross **moved** to approve the tentative Senate agenda for December 10, as revised. Grossman **seconded**. SC members discussed the anticipated length of the December Senate agenda, but noted that if not all proposals could be reviewed, some proposals could easily be moved to January. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Due to a mass exit, the meeting was adjourned at 5:28 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Jennifer Bird-Pollan,  
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bird-Pollan, Blonder, Brion, Grossman, McCormick, Spear, Tagavi, Walker, and Wood.

Invited guests present: Kalea Benner, Roger Brown, Czar Crofcheck, Herman Farrell, Morris Grubbs, Christine Harper, Douglas Michael, Martha Riddell, and Annie Davis Weber.

Provost's Liaison present: Turner.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, December 5, 2018.