

Senate Council
March 26, 2018

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, March 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 3:00 pm.

The Chair said there were two issues to mention prior to moving to agenda items. She explained that Provost David Blackwell was in attendance to discuss a variety of issues with SC members. Given his tight schedule, she hoped SC members would be amenable to moving up the discussion on the Graduate Education Implementation Committee. Also, the Chair said that the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) had asked that SC add an item to the agenda, to approve an editorial change to the *Senate Rules* on behalf of the SREC. There were no objections from SC members.

The Chair welcomed Provost David Blackwell. He thanked SC members for adjusting the agenda to accommodate his schedule. He gave SC members an update on the five-year financial stability plan, information available regarding the ongoing state budget process and possible effects to UK, and [in relation to state legislative language regarding dismissal of tenured faculty] the importance of protecting tenure and ensuring a good due process. There were a number of questions and comments from SC members.

5. Review of Charge to the Graduate Education Implementation Committee

Noting the time, the Chair reminded SC members that the prior evening she had emailed them a draft charge for the Graduate Education Implementation Committee, which she and Provost Blackwell had worked on jointly. The Chair noted that the Provost had accepted the SC's nominees and invited them to participate, but not all of the Implementation Committee's possible members had confirmed their ability to serve. She noted that there had been hopes for a more aggressive timeline such that the Implementation Committee could have a report to Senate at its May meeting, but it seemed more likely that the report would be available for SC to review at its May 18 retreat, instead.

SC members offered their comments about the proposed charge. The majority of concerns pertained to a sense among some SC members that the charge did not seem to build upon the work already completed by the Blue Ribbon Committee on Graduate Education (Blue Ribbon Committee), but rather seemed to suggest that the Implementation Committee would be repeating some of the work done by the Blue Ribbon Committee. Spear said he shared that concern and also asked that the Implementation Committee look at the issue of teaching assistant (TA) positions. When queried by Provost Blackwell, Spear explained it was his understanding that the former provost had put together a group of deans and associate deans to discuss the issue and that the Blue Ribbon Committee was told not to review TA-related issues. Schroeder added that she had also heard of this other group's work and that it pertained to TA allocations across colleges. Provost Blackwell said he would look into it.

Wood suggested that the proposed charge pertaining to professional degree programs be removed from the proposed list of charges to the Implementation Committee, noting that the University Senate had just recently approved a policy that outlined specifics pertaining to professional degrees.

Provost Blackwell commented that it was his intent that the Implementation Committee dig into the details of the report and highlight priorities. He said that it would be difficult to implement ideas based on a long narrative and he wanted the Implementation Committee to distill the Blue Ribbon

Committee's report into more immediately actionable items for the short run. The Implementation Committee could align the Blue Ribbon Committee's recommendations with resource availability and pertinent, relevant aspects of UK's current Strategic Plan in order to suggest and inform next steps. Tagavi opined that because Provost Blackwell did not participate in drafting the charge to the Blue Ribbon Committee, the charge to the Implementation Committee might need to incorporate some issues heretofore unaddressed, but that Provost Blackwell saw as important.

As discussion continued, Provost Blackwell reiterated that he would like a deliverable from the Implementation Committee by May, which could be reviewed over the summer with work starting in the fall. He said that he would not be surprised if some graduate education-related conversations were had at the October retreat of the Board of Trustees. Provost Blackwell commented that he needed to leave for another meeting and thanked SC members for their comments and for reordering the agenda. The Chair confirmed for Wood that a revised charge would return to the SC for additional review.

1. Minutes from March 5, 2018 and Announcements

The Chair reported that there were no edits to the minutes. There being **no objections**, the minutes from March 5 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair explained that given Ernie Bailey's departure on sabbatical, the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) needed a new chair. She asked Cross, a current SAOSC member to serve as chair and he was willing. Cross said he was aware that there were two proposals pending and Ms. Brothers added that they had not yet been received in the Senate Council office.

The Chair noted there had been a brief discussion about reviewing the John. H. Schnatter Institute for the Study of Free Enterprise. She noted that the review was scheduled to take place in September 2019, so there was time available to deal with that issue. The Chair announced that the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) identified some issues with the rules for Honors College and their work was progressing.

The Chair thanked Schroeder and Cross for keeping the SC abreast of what has been happening in Frankfort and with the Coalition of Senate and Faculty Leadership (COSFL). The Chair added that President Eli Capilouto was scheduled to attend the April Senate meeting; the hope was that the state budget would be ironed out by then.

The Chair said that Joan Mazur (ED/Curriculum and Instruction), a member of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), was present on behalf of the committee chair. The SC could review the SREC's proposed editorial changes (mentioned at the beginning of the meeting) immediately following.

2. Old Business

a. Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) – Davy Jones, Chair

i. Proposed Change to *Senate Rules 1.2.3* ("Meetings")

Guest Joan Mazur (ED/Curriculum and Instruction, member of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC)), explained the proposal. She said that the primary issue with the language suggested by the SC was that there were a variety of dates that might be considered the "first day of the fall semester." SC members engaged in a robust discussion regarding the proposed change. It was readily acknowledged that the SC will play an important role in ensuring that an effective date was included with any proposal regarding the *Senate Rules*. Ms. Brothers asked for and received confirmation that the

proposed new rule would not change the standard practice of having program changes effective for the following fall semester.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** from the SREC to approve the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 1.2.3* (“Meetings”). (Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary.) The motion **passed** with none opposed. Grossman asked about the effective date for the proposal and those present agreed that it would be effective immediately upon Senate approval. Schroeder suggested that the file be slightly revised so that the effective date was added to the proposal, to set a good example and Mazur agreed to do so.

The Chair reminded SC members that there were no objections to the addition of an agenda item from the SREC; the Chair suggested that item be discussed, next.

Proposed Changes to Senate Rules 3.4.2 (“Procedures Governing Creation, Consolidation, Transfer, Closure, or Significant Reduction of an Academic Program or Educational Unit”) and Senate Rules 3.4.3 (“Procedures Governing Creation, Consolidation, Transfer, Discontinuation, or Significant Reduction of Other Educational Units (e.g. multidisciplinary research centers or institutes; interdisciplinary instructional programs)”)

The Chair explained that the changes involved a series of numbering changes and one clarification. Mazur explained the changes, noting that the revisions were made necessary out of concern that there might be a need to use the rule in the future.

The Chair said that unless anyone objected, Mazur would serve as acting chair for purposes of answering questions of fact only. There were no objections. There were a variety of questions from SC members. During discussion, Bird-Pollan noticed that there was a *Senate Rules (SR)* reference in Section 3.4.2.A.4 that was still an old reference and should be changed from “SR 3.3.2.1.A.5” to “SR 3.4.2.A.5.” On behalf of the SREC, Mazur accepted that edit as a **friendly amendment**. Cross suggested that the second-to-last sentence in the Section 3.4.3 paragraph be reworded so that “Example” was made plural and the first instance of “programs” was removed. Mazur said she could accept that change as a **friendly amendment**, on behalf of the SREC. There was no further discussion.

The motion from the SREC was a request that the SC approve the changes to *Senate Rules 3.4.2* (“Procedures Governing Creation, Consolidation, Transfer, Closure, or Significant Reduction of an Academic Program or Educational Unit”) and *Senate Rules 3.4.3* (“Procedures Governing Creation, Consolidation, Transfer, Discontinuation, or Significant Reduction of Other Educational Units (e.g. multidisciplinary research centers or institutes; interdisciplinary instructional programs)”) on behalf of the SREC. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. In response to a question from Ms. Brothers, it was stated that the SC’s action on behalf of the SREC did not need to go to the Senate for final approval.

Given the number of guests present, the Chair suggested that those present introduce themselves.

b. Reaction to Recommendations from Blue Ribbon Committee on Graduate Education

Schroeder **moved** to postpone discussion on the agenda item until the next SC meeting and Bird-Pollan **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion passed with none opposed.

3. Request for Rule Waiver for College of Education Student CP-73

Guest Donna Lee Brostek (ED/Early Childhood, Special Education, and Rehabilitation Counseling) explained her request for a rule waiver for student CP-73. Grossman **moved** to approve the rule waiver regarding enrollment as a condition for credit by special examination, as explained by Brostek, and Schroeder **seconded**. The Chair added that Registrar Kim Taylor had sent an email documenting her support of the rule waiver. SC members discussed the request. When there was no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. Brostek thanked SC members for their support of the student.

The Chair said that unless anyone **objected**, Schroeder would serve as acting chair for purposes of answering questions of fact only. Tagavi **objected**. Cross **moved** that Schroeder be allowed to serve as acting chair for purposes of answering questions of fact only and Grossman **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with two opposed and one abstained. Tagavi asserted that the motion was not appropriate and the Chair ruled that the comment was out of order.

4. Committee Reports

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

i. Proposed New MAT in Secondary STEM Education

Schroeder, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained that the proposal came from her department so she asked another SAPC member, Kristen Mark (ED/Kinesiology and Health Promotion) to present the report on Schroeder's behalf. Guest Mark explained the proposal. There was lengthy discussion that included guests who attended to speak for and against the proposal: Brett Criswell (ED/STEM Education, proposer), Jared Stallones (ED/Curriculum and Instruction, department chair), and Jennifer Wilhelm (ED/STEM Education, department chair). Another guest who participated was Annie Davis Weber, assistant provost for strategic planning and institutional effectiveness.

It became clear during the lengthy discussion that there were a handful of outstanding issues from within the College of Education that had not been resolved between the departments of STEM Education and Curriculum and Instruction, many of which focused on the CIP of the proposed new degree. Cross **moved** to stop debate and Grossman **seconded**. Cross explained that a vote to stop debate takes precedence and required a two-thirds vote in favor to pass. A **vote** was taken and the motion **failed** with four in favor and four opposed. There were a few additional comments.

Grossman **moved** to table discussion on the proposal until the next SC meeting, with the hopes that the two departments could develop language or an agreement that would address issues to everyone's mutual satisfaction. Cross **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with two opposed.

Bird-Pollan asked if the workgroup could be composed prior to adjournment and there were no objections.

8. Naming of Outstanding Senator Award Workgroup

The Chair asked if anyone was willing to volunteer to serve on the Outstanding Senator Award workgroup, along with Bird-Pollan. Schroeder and Wood agreed to serve.

Wood **moved** to adjourn and Brion **seconded**. Those present indicated support for the motion by departing.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine M. McCormick,

Senate Council
March 26, 2018

Senate Council Chair

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

Provost's liaison present: Turner.

Invited guests present: Donna Brostek Lee, Kristen Mark, Jared Stallins, Annie Davis Weber, and Jennifer Wilhelm.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, March 29, 2018.