

Senate Council
February 19, 2018

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, February 19, 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 2:59 pm. Given the number of guests, the Chair invited all those present to introduce themselves.

1. Minutes from February 5, 2018 and Announcements

The Chair welcomed Associate Provost for Academic Excellence Operations Kirsten Turner, who will be serving as the Provost's liaison to the SC.

The Chair asked SC member about rearranging the agenda. She noted that the Randa Remer-Eskridge (assistant dean of student affairs in the College of Health Sciences) was again present for SC discussion and that Remer-Eskridge had rearranged her schedule multiple times to accommodate SC and Senate meeting schedules. The Chair suggested that SC members might be amenable to moving Remer-Eskridge's agenda item forward, as well as the discussion of the prior week's Senate meeting. There were no objections from SC members.

The Chair said that editorial changes had been received for the minutes from February 5. Hearing **no objections**, the minutes from February 5 were **approved** as amended by **unanimous consent**.

There were a few announcements.

- The Chair reported that the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) directed the SC office staff to remove *Senate Rules (SR) 5.4.1* and to return it to the version approved by Senate in March 2013. Per the SREC, the SREC has the authority to make clarifying editorial changes to the *SRs*. The SREC acts directly to make clarifying edits. The SREC has editorially directed in a memorandum to the Chair dated February 9, 2018 and in its minutes from February 8, 2018, that the previous, post-March 2013 edits be removed and the rule from March 2013 be reinstated. The Chair added that the SREC has determined that no SC approval was needed for this change.
- The Office of Legal Counsel is undergoing some changes, which will affect the activities of the Regulation Review Committee.
- The Blue Ribbon Committee on Graduate Education will hold two forums – one on Wednesday, February 28 from 3 – 5 pm (Lexmark Public Room, Main Building) and one on Thursday, March 1 from 9 – 11 am (Chandler Hospital, Pavilion A, Karpf Auditorium). She said she would send an email to all faculty to remind them of the forums. In response to questions about live streaming, Liaison Turner said the forums would be live streamed and that the intent of the forums was to gather information to be used by SC and Provost David Blackwell. Turner added that the Blue Ribbon Committee's work would be done after the forums.
- Kentucky's Coalition of Senate and Faculty Leadership (COSFL) will be holding a meeting in Frankfort on February 23. The Chair said that she was unable to attend due to UK's meeting of the Board of Trustees. After a few comments, Cross indicated he would try to attend.

4. Degree Recipient

a. Request for Waiver of Senate Rules for College of Health Sciences Student PM-01

Ms. Brothers shared supporting documentation for the agenda item. Tagavi asked that it be shown on-screen but the Chair reminded him that the document was FERPA-protected and could not be shown on-screen due to the presence of non-members. Guest Remer-Eskridge (assistant dean of student affairs in the College of Health Sciences) came forward and reminded SC members that she had attended a previous SC meeting to request the addition of student PM-01 to the December degree list, which SC approved, as did the University Senate. She was in attendance to ask the SC to waive *SR 5.4.1*, specifically the requirement that at least 25% of the minimum credit hours required for the degree be earned from UK.

SC members discussed the authority to waive rules and was eventually satisfied that the SC had the authority to waive the *SR* and to report its action to the Senate at the Senate's next meeting.

There was extensive discussion regarding the wording of the motion to waive the pertinent *SR*. There was some sentiment to include in the motion a description of the series of errors that had occurred throughout the process pertaining to student PM-01. By the end of the discussion of the motion, however, the SC members offering an opinion believed that a number of errors had occurred in a variety of areas and a descriptive listing of errors would not be useful. Grossman **moved** that due to exigent circumstances caused by University errors, the SC waive *SR 5.4.1.B* for student PM-01 with no intent of establishing a precedent. Bird-Pollan **seconded**. There was no further discussion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with two opposed and none abstained.

2. Proposed Revision to Minutes from January 22, 2018

Schroeder **moved** to amend the previously adopted minutes from January 22, 2018 as distributed. Bird-Pollan **seconded**. Tagavi vehemently objected to revising the minutes. After discussion, a compromise was reached whereby the revised minutes would be posted in "track changes" with a footnote indicating the date of the change. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

7. Senate Meeting Roundtable

The Chair invited SC members to offer their thoughts about the February Senate meeting. Brion suggested that SC be more careful about the version of a committee's report that is presented to Senate. She said it was unnecessarily confusing. Bird-Pollan said that she was confused about Tagavi's objection to Schroeder's responses to questions when Schroeder was presenting a report from the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC). Tagavi responded that once a motion was on the floor, debate had started and it was the Chair's responsibility to call on people in the exact order in which hands were raised. He stated that the Chair did not have the authority to allow a presenter to respond to a question or comment from a senator if the presenter had not raised their hand and waited their turn; he stated that Schroeder had repeatedly talked without getting permission to do so. Cross explained that the motion was technically not on the floor for debate until the Chair said it was ready for debate, but that some bodies, including Senate, traditionally allow a presenter to act as chair and preside over discussion. He indicated that the decision to do so was in the purview of the Chair. Schroeder wondered how her presentation of the SAPC's work differed from Tagavi's presentation of SREC work, when both she and Tagavi acted similarly in answering questions from senators.

The Chair noted that she had received at least four different interpretations about what Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised said regarding permission to speak. She suggested that this particular discussion be postponed, noting the day's full agenda and the invited guests waiting for review of their particular

agenda items. Tagavi said that two wrongs did not make a right and that no debate should be had until the Chair puts a motion on the floor. He said it was fine if it was implied that the motion was on the floor but once the motion was on the floor, the presenter does not have the floor and the Chair must call on those asking questions. He said that Schroeder did not raise her hand and so Schroeder therefore could not speak. Wood suggested that the subject be the topic of discussion at the SC's summer retreat and there were no objections.

Cross said that he had asked that the roundtable item be moved up on the agenda. He said he wanted to be sure that the minutes reflected Provost Blackwell explicit recognition of the valuable role that faculty play as senators, in addition to their roles as teachers and researchers.

3. Old Business

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

i. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Professional and Technical Writing

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 not approve, based on its academic excellence, the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Professional and Technical Writing, in the Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies within the College of Arts and Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. Schroeder said that among the SAPC's concerns was that the proposed certificate was nine hours, while most benchmark offerings were 12 credit hours and that the UK certificate was the only one that would be offered asynchronously online and possibly completed on a part-time basis in one year. She suggested that Rice be invited to comment and offer his thoughts about his department's proposal.

Guest Jeff Rice (AS/Writing, Rhetoric and Digital Studies, department chair) stated that the faculty of record identified three primary audiences for the proposal: members of the military, members of the legal profession, and scientific researchers. He said having fewer numbers of required credits would allow a potential student to complete the certificate more quickly than the student could do with another institution. He asserted that the SAPC did not engage in any conversation with him about their deliberations. The Department of Writing, Rhetoric and Digital Studies was more than qualified to perform the type of instruction required for the certificate and he did not understand why UK would not advance the certificate.

There was extensive discussion among SC members and with Rice and Guest Mark Kornbluh, College of Arts and Sciences dean. During the discussion Tagavi complained multiple times that Schroeder did not have the right to speak about the proposal unless she raised her hand and was called on; he did not believe she had the right to respond to questions and comments. Cross indicated again that the Chair retained the prerogative to recognize whomever she felt would help facilitate an effective discussion. For the remainder of the discussion, SC members who wished Schroeder to respond to queries asked their questions directly of Schroeder, or the Chair explicitly stated that Schroeder was welcome to respond. The discussion pertaining to the proposal primarily focused on the number of credit hours required for the certificate, the credentials of faculty charged with instructing students on legal writing, and how the proposed certificate would fill a need for members of the military who would have likely already gone through officer training.

Grossman **moved** to offer a substitute motion, to approve the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Professional and Technical Writing. Tagavi **seconded**. In response to questions from Bird-Pollan, Schroeder stated that all SAPC members were present for the vote on the proposal and seven were in

favor of the motion to not approve and one abstained; Schroeder stated that she did not typically vote. Schroeder explained that the SAPC's concerns were not limited to the number of credit hours, but that SAPC did review similar offerings at benchmark institutions; the SAPC noted that the proposed certificate did not match the certificates offered by benchmark institutions. She noted that the SAPC specifically asked Rice for information about how the proposed certificate differed from those of benchmark institutions but that Rice did not respond. Instead, the College's administrative assistant replied by indicating that the issue was moot and irrelevant. In response to a question from Brion, Rice explained that the proposed new certificate would offer continuing education instruction to students already employed in the workforce with information about appropriate content and style that the students did not receive at the undergraduate level. Blonder stated that if the SC was not comfortable with nine credit hours as the minimum number of credit hours for a graduate certificate, then a rule change could be discussed at a future date. She asserted that nine credit hours seemed reasonable for the proposed certificate. Schroeder commented that the request from the SAPC to Rice was that if the program faculty intended to keep the certificate at nine hours, then he should submit a rationale for keeping the proposal at nine credit hours. She said that the SAPC asked for that information four times and thought throughout the process that having that information would be instrumental in approving the proposed new certificate.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to allow a substitute motion and the motion **passed** with none opposed. Grossman then **moved** that the University Senate approve, based on its academic excellence, the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Professional and Technical Writing, in the Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies within the College of Arts and Science. Tagavi **seconded**. Schroeder suggested a **friendly amendment** that the motion include a clause requiring Rice to submit a rationale for keeping the certificate at nine credit hours. Grossman **did not accept** that as a friendly amendment, but Kornbluh and Rice both stated that the rationale would be forthcoming. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Recommendations for Significant Changes [to be discussed pending receipt of SAPC recommendation]
Schroeder explained the proposal and reviewed the changes made by the SAPC (in yellow) since the SC last discussed it. There was lengthy discussion about the proposal. There were a few concerns raised by SC members, described below.

- If the standard is a 25% change in curriculum, a certificate comprised of nine credit hours could trigger the significant change rule by changing just one course.
- The Office of Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (OSPIE) has the authority to determine if a proposal meets the definition of "substantive change" as promulgated by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) per the language in the new subsection (5) [within *SR 3.2.3.C.2.(a)*], but it was not acceptable for OSPIE to be able to determine if a proposal reached any of the standards in (1), (2), (3), or (4), which would essentially trigger Senate action.
- It was not explicitly clear as to which entity would serve as final arbiter in a disagreement about whether or not a change triggered the significant change process.

SC members then discussed the possibility of returning the proposal to the SAPC for further deliberation. Schroeder indicated that due to the SAPC's current workload, she was not sure if the SAPC could return to it during the current academic year. There was brief discussion about who could revise

Senate Council
February 19, 2018

the proposal. Cross **moved** that the SC defer action on the proposed changes until the SC Chair deems the proposal has been sufficiently revised to discuss again. Brion **seconded**. When there was no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstained. Wood offered to begin work on this revision.

iii. Recommendation for Professional Degree Programs [to be discussed pending receipt of SAPC recommendation]

Schroeder explained the proposal and said that she had met with a number of individuals, including the chair of the Graduate Council, the Assistant Provost for Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness, and the current and past chairs of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC). SC members discussed the proposal. Guest Annie Davis Weber, assistant provost for strategic planning and institutional effectiveness, confirmed for Bird-Pollan that the JD degree was universally recognized as a professional degree. Schroeder noted that the approval process for programs from the College of Law would continue to be processed in the same manner – that process was not changed during the SAPC's deliberations. Tagavi pointed out the use of "doctor's degree" in the proposed revision to SR 9.14.2 and Schroeder indicated she would revise that language to instead use "doctoral degree."

The Chair stated that the **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation to approve the proposed changes to the *SR* related to professional degree programs. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair noted that it was after five o'clock and asked SC members about what agenda items they thought they might be able to review quickly. Schroeder asked that the proposed new BA in US Culture and Business Practices be reviewed, but Tagavi indicated that he had significant concerns with the proposal. The Chair then asked if the SC was willing to review the proposal from the Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLeL) and there were no objections.

b. Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLeL) - Roger Brown, Chair

i. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rule 5.1.8.1* ("Unilateral Removal for Failure to Attend First Two Class Periods")

Guest Roger Brown, (AG/Agricultural Economics, chair of the Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLeL), explained the proposal and said that it had already been approved by the SC in November, but that Katherine suggested it return to SC. The Chair confirmed for Brown that she had sent on to SC members the comments that Tagavi had made regarding the proposal. There was general discussion about the proposed changes, with the Chair noting that the rule specifically related to a previous conversation at SC involving Registrar Kim Taylor about financial aid disbursement and class rolls. Discussion continued.

Blonder **moved** that the SC postpone discussion on the proposed changes to *SR 5.1.8.1* ("Unilateral Removal for Failure to Attend First Two Class Periods") until such time as the Registrar presents a proposal to address complying with federal financial aid rules and class rolls. Guest Taylor indicated that she would try to bring a proposal to SC within the next couple weeks. Tagavi **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstained.

There was no formal motion made, but the meeting was adjourned by general consensus at 5:27 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine M. McCormick,
Senate Council Chair

Senate Council
February 19, 2018

SC members present: Bird-Pollan, Blonder, Brion, Childress, Cross, Grossman, Marr, McCormick, Osterhage, Schroeder, Tagavi, and Wood.

Provost's liaison present: Kirsten Turner.

Invited guests present: Ruth Beattie, Nick Kehrwald, Mark Kornbluh, Randa Remer-Eskridge, Jeff Rice, Rich Schein, Kim Taylor, Annie Davis Weber.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, February 20, 2018.