

Senate Council
February 27, 2017

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, February 20, 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 was absent due to illness and Vice Chair Ernie Bailey was out of town. Senate Council member and faculty trustee Lee Blonder chaired the meeting at the request of the Chair. Blonder called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:02 pm. She suggested that those present introduce themselves, guests and members alike.

1. Minutes from February 20, 2017 and Announcements

Blonder said that no changes to the minutes had been received. There being **no objections**, the minutes from February 20, 2017 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

Blonder said she had a couple announcements to share. First, the Chair wished to convey her appreciation to the SC members who were able to attend the visits with candidates for the position of associate provost for student and academic life. If members had not already done so, she passed along the request to submit feedback on the candidates. Also, there will be an open forum for the preferred candidate for vice president for institutional diversity on Thursday from 2 pm – 3 pm in 321 Don & Cathy Jacobs Science Building.

2. Proposed Calendar Change to College of Medicine 2016-17 Calendar

Blonder explained that there was an error in the calendar sent and posted but the correct version was now posted. Although the correct supporting documentation was received earlier in the day, there were no objections from SC members about hearing the request.

Guest Chris Feddock (ME/Internal Medicine, assistant dean for medical education) explained the proposed change. He said that a change to their calendar and curriculum was made about a year and a half prior, but no one notified the Registrar's office. The mismatch between dates on the College of Medicine's site and the Registrar's site was brought to their attention by a parent.

McGillis **moved** to approve the proposed change of the 2017 spring break for first-year students from March 4 – 12 to March 27 – April 2. Schroeder **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Old Business

a. Senate Meeting Roundtable

SC members discussed the February University Senate (Senate) meeting. SC members thought the meeting went well, although there were some questions about the purpose of the presentation on the redevelopment of south campus. Grossman explained that it was an informational presentation, not a solicitation of input, in large part because there were no faculty-related matters or concerns involved. There were additional comments.

4. Committee Reports

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

i. Two Proposed University Scholars Program: BA Linguistics to MA Linguistics & BS Linguistics to MA Linguistics

Schroeder explained that although there was one file to review, there were two separate motions that would need to be made, one for the BA-MA and one for the BS-MA. Schroeder explained the proposal for a BA – MA Linguistics University Scholars Program.

The **motion** from the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) was a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new University Scholars Program of a BA Linguistics and MA Linguistic Theory and Typology within the Department of Linguistics within the College of Arts and Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. Guest Anna Bosch (AS/Linguistics, associate dean for academic programs) was present to answer SC members' questions.

When there were no further questions or comments, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Schroeder then explained the proposal for a BS – MA Linguistics University Scholars Program. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new University Scholars Program of a BS Linguistics and MA Linguistic Theory and Typology within the Department of Linguistics within the College of Arts and Sciences. 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.

After the vote, SC members discussed whether or not SACS (Southern Association for Colleges and Schools) still required the University to actively offer differentiated expectations/requirements for graduate students who enroll in a 400G- or 500-level course. After brief discussion, it was decided that UK's liaison to SACS should be queried. If SACS no longer required the differentiation, it was the sentiment of the SC that the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) should be asked to review whether or not the requirement should remain in the *Senate Rules*.

ii. Proposed Suspension of MS in Clinical Research Design

Schroeder explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the University Senate approve the suspension of admission into an existing master's graduate program in Clinical Research Design in the Department of Preventative Medicine and Environmental Health within the College of Public Health. 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. Proposed Suspension of Graduate Certificate in Clinical Research Skills

Schroeder explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the suspension of admission into an existing graduate certificate program in Clinical Research Skills in the Department of Preventative Medicine and Environmental Health within the College of Public Health. There were a couple questions from SC members. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iv. Proposed Suspension of BS Philosophy

Schroeder explained the proposed suspension. The motion from the SAPC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the suspension of admission into the existing undergraduate program of a BS in Philosophy in the Department of Philosophy within the College and Arts & Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions about the proposal.

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

b. Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) - Joan Mazur and Davy Jones, Chair

i. Student Free Speech and the Classroom

Mazur explained that there had been an unfortunate incident in which a student used an online forum for a class assignment that included inappropriate language. The issue evolved into a free speech discussion and the extent to which students can and cannot make those sorts of statements. A clause in the Code of Student Conduct about "Instructional Setting Behavior" states that "[t]he primary responsibility for managing the instructional setting rests with the instructor. Students who engage in conduct that results in disruption of an instructional setting may be directed by the instructor to leave the class for the remainder of the instructional setting period."

The Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) noted that *Senate Rules 10.3* contemplates a wide variety of instructional settings for University classes. The SREC voted unanimously to recommend that the SC refer the matter to the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC). The SREC further suggested that the SC encourage the SAASC to consult with the UK Legal Office and Office of the Dean of Students in developing educational policy recommendations to the Senate that will guide distinctions between the academic free speech of the student and student conduct warranting disciplinary action by the instructor.

SC members discussed the proposal. Grossman opined that making the change in the *SRs* was more appropriate than adding it to the Code of Student Conduct regulation because changing the Code would require Board of Trustees approval and could open up that Code to additional revisions. There were no objections from SC members about having the language reside in the *SRs*. There was additional discussion among SC members. Blonder noted that the **motion** on the floor was the SREC's recommendation that the issue of free speech and the classroom be referred to the SAASC with the further suggestion that the SAASC consult with the Legal Office and Office of the Dean of Students to develop educational policy recommendations for the Senate to help guide distinctions between the academic free speech of the student and student conduct warranting disciplinary action by the instructor. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Brian Nichols, Chief Information Officer (4 pm)

Blonder welcomed Guest Brian Nichols, chief information officer, who offered a presentation to SC members about recent changes in Information Technology Services (ITS), formerly known as Analytics & Technologies (UKAT). Nichols discussed his view of the role of ITS and engaged in a friendly conversation with SC members about current ITS activities. SC members offered some comments about areas for improvement, including last summer's sudden shift to require email users on the MC domain to use a particular app on phones to access email; the centralized nature of IT support on the medical center side and the lack of departmental-based IT support; better support for MC-related login issues with Canvas; and balancing healthcare-related IT needs with employees on the healthcare side who were not involved in patient care but still subject to all healthcare-related IT policies. Nichols noted that he oversaw ITS on campus, but that UK HealthCare had its own CIO. He said he would bring these issues up with the Healthcare CIO to try to make things a little easier.

Mazur said that there was one particular problem that spanned the entirety of UK, that of data integrity. She offered one example – if a student had two separate UK-owned email addresses, a report that shows the number of students in a given program will count the number of email addresses, not the number of students. This results in wildly inflated numbers that, in turn, affected external reporting.

Grossman noted that those reports were submitted to the federal government and to the KY Council on Postsecondary Education. Given the time, Blonder indicated that SC needed to move to its last agenda item. She and other SC members thanked Nichols for attending and for sharing information.

6. Block Grants for Graduate Education – Provost Tim Tracy (4:30 – 5 pm)

Guests Brian Jackson (interim dean of the Graduate School) and Provost Tim Tracy shared information about the Graduate School's block funding grants for graduate education. Jackson explained the prior process(es) that were used and the current process. He explained that the changes were due to the desire to think about new ways to improve the graduate student recruitment process. One particular issue was the time-consuming nature of coordinating the varied admissions cycles on campus and how no single time works for all programs to submit and receive notification about funding in a timely manner. The intent was to develop a new process with the fundamental goal of providing flexible funds to graduate programs to allow them to recruit the best and brightest students.

Jackson continued that a pilot program was developed for the incoming class of fall 2016, with five programs in three colleges. These programs were each provided with a pool of funds that were relatively unrestricted, other than to require them to be spent on recruitment, stipends, and scholarships. Feedback from the programs was unanimous in terms of it having been a successful approach, but the question arose as to how to expand it for subsequent years. The proposal as put forward was to expand by distributing funds now to colleges and allow colleges to disburse the funds to their programs. The monies used came from eight separate funding sources (Dissertation Year Fellowship; Graduate School Academic Year Fellowship; Kentucky Opportunities Fellowship; Multiyear Fellowship; Reedy; Gillis Award; Travel Awards; and Dissertation Enhancement Award) that were consolidated into a pool of about \$2 million, plus tuition scholarships.

The Graduate School's initial allocation model was based on the percentage of total disbursed funds previously awarded to each college (prior two-year average). After discussions with the deans' council and DGSs, the model was modified so that 50% of the allocation was based on the percentage of total disbursed funds awarded to each college (prior three-year average) and the remaining 50% was based on the percentage of total doctoral enrollment per college. Jackson noted that all colleges received substantially more than they had received in the past two years. Provost Tracy commented that there had been delays and inefficiencies in the past, but funds were now pushed out in total, not piecemeal.

Jackson added that there were four strong recommendations regarding the use of the funds, specifically that the funds be used for: stipends for graduate students enrolled in a UK graduate program; tuition payments (via SAG form) for graduate students enrolled in a UK graduate program; costs for UK graduate students to attend meetings in their field, including costs related to travel, lodging, and meeting registration; and costs for UK graduate students to travel to sites needed for research or training deemed necessary for the student's thesis/dissertation work. Jackson said that the Graduate School would be expecting expenditure reports on an annual basis.

There were a variety of questions and comments from SC members. Provost Tracy opined that the Blue-Ribbon Panel on Graduate Education should consider graduate student funding during its deliberations. During discussion, the Provost clarified that the diversity awards were separate from the block funding pool.

Senate Council
February 27, 2017

Blonder noted the time and indicated it was time for the discussion to end. Grossman **moved** to adjourn and Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 5 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Lee X. Blonder,
Acting Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bird-Pollan, Blonder, Botts, Cross, Grossman, Lauersdorf, McGillis, Mazur, and Schroeder.

Invited guests present: Margaret Bausch, Anna Bosch, Chris Feddock, Brian Jackson, Beth Kraemer, Brian Nichols, and Tim Tracy.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, March 2, 2017.