

Senate Council
February 26, 2018

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, February 26, 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 3:04 pm.

1. Minutes from February 19, 2018 and Announcements

The Chair reported that there was one clerical edit to the minutes. There being **no objections**, the minutes from February 19 were **approved** as amended by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair asked Provost's Liaison Turner for an update on the "Our Path Forward" initiative, which Turner did.

The Chair asked Cross for an update on the recent meeting of the Coalition of Senate and Faculty Leadership (COSFL) and Cross did so.

The Chair asked SC members to send her or Ms. Brothers an email if there was something on the SC office's "to do" list that had yet to be completed or if an SC member wanted an update on a particular initiative. She added that it had come to her attention that when the University Senate (Senate) reviewed the proposed new John. H. Schnatter Institute for the Study of Free Enterprise [October 10, 2016], the Senate's motion included a review by the Senate and Provost's office at the midpoint of the grant. The Chair said she would work to move that mid-grant review forward.

The Chair noted that she had a short item to discuss regarding meeting procedures, but that she intended to share it at the end of the meeting.

2. Old Business

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

i. Proposed New BA in US Culture and Business Practices [revised proposal] [newly revised file]
Schroeder, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), presented background information on the proposal and explained that two editorial changes were submitted over the weekend. (Spelling out the major name in questions 2a and 2o.) She said that the SAPC agreed that spelling out the acronym and changing an erroneous reference to a department chair were minor changes. The Chair noted that this followed the SC's recent discussion about how to accommodate revised proposals. There were no objections from SC members in regards to discussing the editorially revised proposal.

Guests Rich Schein (AS/Geography, associate dean of faculty) and Jeff Clymer (AS/English, department chair) answered a variety of questions from SC members. The Chair clarified that Schroeder was the correct individual to answer questions about the proposal until the motion from the SAPC was placed on the floor by the Chair. During discussion, SC members noted some language in question 2O, pertaining to the faculty of record. Schein and Clymer clarified that it referred to departments, not individual faculty and both agreed it was acceptable to slightly revise the language to make that clear. Some SC members expressed concern that the few required courses and the many electives might not offer a student a coherent course of study. There was also some discussion about adding a business ethics course from the Department of Philosophy – it became clear that the course was inadvertently omitted.

Schein and Clymer indicated that the director of undergraduate studies would certainly allow students to substitute the business ethics course for another course in the list of electives.

When discussion wound down, the Chair asked if there were any further questions for Schroeder. Hearing none, the Chair explained that the **motion** from the SAPC, including the two editorial changes shared with SC members and the clarifying language about the role of departments in the faculty of record, was a recommendation that the Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new BA degree in US Culture and Business Practices, an interdisciplinary degree program between College of Arts and Sciences and Gatton College of Business and Economics; the home educational unit will be the College of Arts and Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. Proposal from Student Government Association (SGA) on Proposed New Fall Break – Ben Childress, SGA President

Childress, President of the Student Government Association (SGA), explained the proposal. Guest Greg Heileman, associate provost for student and academic life, was present and spoke in favor of the proposal. SC members discussed the proposal and asked a variety of questions. SC members were largely supportive of the proposal, but had detailed questions about how implementation could affect other aspects of University life. During discussion, it was clarified that the proposed fall break would become part of the main University calendar but that the colleges with independent, specific calendars colleges (Dentistry, Law, Medicine, and Pharmacy) would not change. Schroeder suggested that Childress revise the proposal to make it clear that the student holiday on the day before Thanksgiving would remain as a holiday. She said it could be confusing because the Wednesday before Thanksgiving was currently described as “fall break” on the University calendar. Provost’s Liaison Turner explained that there is an entire initiative underway to redesign K Week and the entire first-year experience. She and Heileman agreed with Childress’ assertion that starting classes in the fall semester on a Monday would be academically beneficial to students.

The Chair explained that the **motion** from the SGA was a request to change the University calendar to implement a fall break on the Thursday and Friday of the 8th week of the fall semester. Childress **moved** that motion and noted that it included Schroeder’s friendly amendment to clarify that the holiday on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving would remain. Marr **seconded**. Bird-Pollan asked if the proposal could include details about how the proposal would change the number of each instructional day. Tagavi suggested that Childress add an FAQ to the proposal to add some more details. Childress agreed to both changes. A **vote** was taken on the motion (and the three revisions) and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstained. The Chair clarified for Ms. Brothers that the revised proposal would go directly to Senate and not return to SC.

3. University Calendars

a. Proposed Change to College of Pharmacy 2018-19 Calendar

b. Proposed Change to 2017-18 University Calendar

c. Proposed Change to 2018-19 University Calendar

The Chair explained the proposed changes to the calendars. Schroeder **moved** that the SC approve the proposed changes to the College of Pharmacy 2018-19 Calendar, 2017-18 University Calendar, and 2018-19 University Calendar. Grossman **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair suggested that SC move to the curricular proposals on the agenda and there were no objections.

5. Committee Reports

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

i. Proposed Change to Required Credit Hours for BSME in Mechanical Engineering

Guest Herman Farrell, chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), explained the proposed change. Guest Kim Anderson (EN/Chemical and Materials Engineering, associate dean for administrative and academic affairs) was present to answer questions. There were no questions. Ms. Brothers asked Farrell if the motion could be changed to refer to a BSME instead of a BS and he was amenable to that change.

The Chair stated that the **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation to approve the proposal from the College of Engineering involving a change in the BSME in Mechanical Engineering. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed Changes to Engineering Standing and Academic Standards for Eight Engineering Undergraduate Degree Programs (Biosystems Engineering, Chemical Engineering, Computer Engineering, Computer Science, Electrical Engineering, Materials Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, and Mining Engineering)

Farrell explained the proposed changes. There were a few comments from SC members. The Chair stated that the **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation to approve the eight proposals from the College of Engineering involving changes to the Engineering Standing Admission (from pre-major to major) policy for the entire college and specific changes to the course requirements, GPA calculation and the over all GPA requirement for the following undergraduate engineering programs: Biosystems Engineering; Chemical Engineering; Computer Engineering; Computer Science; Electrical Engineering; Materials Engineering; Mechanical Engineering; and Mining Engineering. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iii. Proposed Change to MSW (Change in Concentrations)

Farrell explained the proposal. Grossman asked if the course-related changes were also approved. He wondered why the proposal had not gone to the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) for review by virtue of the recently discussed proposal on "significant changes." Schroeder explained that the proposal was not yet approved by SC so the process remained as it had been. There were no other comments or questions from SC members. The Chair stated that the **motion** from the SAASC was to approve the proposal from the College of Social Work involving changes to the Master of Social Work. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Tagavi asserted that Robert's Rules of Order (Newly Revised) did not allow the SC to vote on more than one proposal at once. He suggested that the SC vote on items individually. Cross, the Senate parliamentarian, said there was no need to separate the votes. If anyone objected to multiple items being included in one motion, the concerned individual could just make a motion to separate the items.

iv. Proposed Change to MS Athletic Training

Farrell explained the proposal. Guests Phillip Gribble (HS/Rehabilitation Science) and Hanna Hoch (HS/Rehabilitation Science) were present to answer questions. The Chair said that the **motion** from the

Senate Council
February 26, 2018

SAASC was to approve the proposal from the College of Health Sciences, Department of Rehabilitation Science, involving changes to the Master of Science in Athletic Training. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

v. Proposed Change to MS Medical Sciences

Farrell explained the proposal. There were no questions from SC members. The **motion** from the SAASC was to approve the proposal from the College of Medicine involving a change in the MS Medical Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. Blue-Ribbon Committee for Graduate Education– Carl Mattacola and Brett Spear, Co-Chairs

i. Committee's Recommendations

Spear and Guest Carl Mattacola (HS/Rehabilitation Science, associate dean for academic and faculty affairs), the two co-chairs of the Blue-Ribbon Committee for Graduate Education, presented to the SC the executive summary of the Committee's recommendations. There were a number of questions from SC members. As discussion wound down, the Chair reminded SC members of the two town hall events scheduled for later in the week, during which Spear and Mattacola would present the Committee's recommendations; Spear noted that the events would be live streamed. The Chair added that the Provost's office would be taking notes and the SC could review the notes and have further discussion in the near future. She thanked Mattacola and Spears for the report.

4. Committee Nominees

a. Academic Area Advisory Committee for the Biological Sciences

SC members deliberated on possible nominees and suggested 10 faculty as possible nominees.

The Chair said that as a result of recent discussion about parliamentary procedures for SC and Senate meetings, she wanted to propose a procedural standard for SC and Senate meetings, based on a proposal from Tagavi. Cross added that as this request was a recommendation from him and the Chair, SC did not need to vote on it. The Chair explained that when a presenter/committee chair presented a proposal, the Chair would consider it to be a report. After the presenter/committee chair finished, the Chair would then invite and entertain questions of factual nature from the audience. At that time, since the presenter/committee chair would still be at the podium and technically had the floor, that person could answer audience questions pertaining to the facts of the proposal. The Chair would then present the motion for debate to the assembly. After the motion is put to the assembly, it would become a motion under Robert's Rule of Order (Newly Revised). The Chair would then call on members to speak. During that time if a question of a factual nature arose, the Chair could ask the presenter/committee chair to respond to the query. Discussion/debate would continue, with the Chair handling the discussion until the vote on the motion. There were no objections from those present.

6. SC Retreat Planning (Scheduling)

Ms. Brothers asked if any SC members would be travelling over the summer. Bird-Pollan said she would leave campus on May 21. Wood indicated that she would return to Lexington on May 16. Ms. Brothers indicated that given the available information about schedules, May 18 might be the best date for the retreat.

The meeting was adjourned by general consensus (and departures) at 5:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine M. McCormick,

Senate Council
February 26, 2018

Senate Council Chair

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

Provost's Liaison present: Kirsten Turner.

Invited guests present: Kim Anderson, B. J. Brandenburg, Jeff Clymer, Janet Ford, Phillip Gribble, Hanna Hoch, Hannah Knudsen, Carl Mattacola, and Richard Schein.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, February 28, 2018.