

Senate Council  
May 8, 2019

The Senate Council met in special session at 9:30 am on Wednesday, May 8, 2019 in room E on the 18<sup>th</sup> floor of Patterson Office Tower. 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 9:28 am.

1. Arrivals/Continental Breakfast (9:00 – 9:30 am)

2. Minutes and Announcements (9:30 – 9:35 am)

The Chair noted that all pending sets of minutes would be on the SC's agenda for approval in the fall. The Chair offered a few announcements.

- There are many dean-related changes coming. UK has named its new Libraries dean, Doug Way. The search committee for a new dean of the College of Communication and Information is hosting its preferred candidate soon. The search committee for a new dean of the College of Education will be meeting with the Provost soon to discuss the candidates. The search committee for a new dean of the College of Social Work will be meeting later in the week to discuss the results of their internal candidate search.
- Provost David Blackwell has offered to hold an informational session for senators on online course tuition pricing and will also offer some comments on the new iPad initiative. The Chair noted that a request to live stream the session was received and the SC office was working on that request.
- The Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee (SRWAC) is holding its last meeting of the semester later in the day. Due to concerns that SRWAC might lose quorum before all appeals are heard, the Chair said she reviewed the information about SRWAC's composition and realized that SC could name alternates that would have full voting rights. The Chair said that she was volunteering to be named an alternate so she could help avoid a loss of quorum. The Chair added that if anyone else was interested, she would be happy to step aside. After a few comments, Brion **moved** to name the Chair [Bird-Pollan] as an alternate to the SRWAC and Collett **seconded**. There were additional comments but no debate. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. James Lincoln and Graduate Student Congress (9:35 – 9:50 am)

The Chair welcomed Guest James Lincoln (outgoing president of the Graduate Student Congress (GSC)). Lincoln, with some comments from Guest Joel Klipfel (incoming president), gave a presentation on the wide-ranging activities and initiatives of the Graduate Student Congress. Lincoln ended by adding that the GSC was UK's student organization of the year last year and he thanked SC members for supporting graduate students. SC members offered some comments, listed below.

- The presentation should be given to the full Senate, so that senators are made aware of the GSC's work.
- Effort should be made to allow the GSC to choose their own representative on the Graduate Council [one of Senate's three academic councils].

- GSC should continue its significant mental health initiatives. It is troubling if a graduate student cannot continue work on a grant due to mental health absences. On the one hand, faculty have a moral responsibility to students, but on the other hand, faculty still have the fiduciary responsibility to the agencies providing the grants.

Noting the time, the Chair suggested that further questions could be sent directly to Lincoln or Klipfel.

Because the meeting was running a bit behind schedule, the Chair suggested moving on to the item on off-campus speakers, as those guests were present. There were no objections from SC members.

5. Proposed Changes to Administrative Regulations 9:9 ("Policy of the University of Kentucky Governing Speakers From Off Campus (Approved By the Board of Trustees)") (10:00 – 10:25 am)

Guests Marcy Deaton (Legal Counsel, senior associate general counsel) and Terri Crocker (Legal Counsel, senior paralegal) described the proposed changes to AR 9:9. Deaton explained that there was no intent to make any substantive changes, but rather that the regulation's language and formatting needed to be updated.

Grossman suggested adding information about the locations of events and Deaton said that a reference to the AR [9:1] regarding the time, place, and manner of meetings, etc. could be added. There was a brief discussion about rules about inviting political candidates to campus; Deaton said she could also include a reference to the AR that governs the invitation of political candidates. There were additional comments about this particular aspect of off-campus speakers. Guest Bill Swinford (President's office, chief of staff), commented on the distinction between a student organization inviting a specific political speaker, versus "the University" inviting all qualified political candidates to an event. Deaton said she would clarify that in the regulation, too.

There was a brief discussion on UK's change from a specific free speech zone to opening up the entire campus, subject to exceptions such as academic learning spaces and patient care areas.

Deaton thanked SC members for their comments and added that she would be happy to take additional suggestions via email.

6. Impact of SB 17 (2017) on Faculty Promotion and Tenure (10:25 - 11:00 am)

The Chair suggested that Brion, who raised the issue, could describe the problem to SC members. The Chair also noted that Guest Bill Swinford (President's office, chief of staff) was also present to answer questions. Brion described a past situation in which a UK faculty member was awarded a grant but the awarding agency could not finalize the agreement because of prohibitions against contracting with institutions in a state without LGBTQ\* anti-discrimination laws. The discussion focused on an incident involving San Francisco and California, although those present recognized that other cities and states might have similar restrictions against dealing with institutions in a state without inclusive anti-discrimination practices.

After Brion's description, there was lengthy discussion. Comments focused primarily on possible ways to mitigate any negative effects felt by faculty who might be penalized for being at an institution in a state that does not have LGBTQ\* anti-discrimination policies. It was noted that UK's anti-discrimination policy was far broader than that of the state. Those offering opinions, though, suggested that UK's policy might not be enough to ensure a grant would be awarded to a faculty member who earned it if the awarding

agency was subject to laws prohibiting contracting with entities from a state that did not have inclusive anti-discrimination policies. Swinford suggested that an affected faculty member could ask the President's office or Provost's office to supply documentation of UK's non-discrimination policies, which might alleviate some concerns. He noted that first, however, other decision-makers would need to be involved to develop a way to manage such requests.

Brion suggested partnering with other Kentucky institutions and Cross commented that the issue could be something for discussion at the national Association of Attorneys General. Soult suggested that a faculty member going up for promotion could note in their dossier if a grant was not awarded solely due to the state's lack of LGBTQ\* anti-discrimination laws.

#### 4. Policy on Advocacy Groups and Interactions with SC & Senate (9:50 – 10:00 am)

The Chair asked SC members for guidance that she could refer to if a group advocating for a particular cause requests the ability to present to the SC or Senate. She added that she was seeking advice for any advocacy group, whether it is a student group or community endeavor. Below are comments and suggestions that were offered.

- If the advocacy group's issue affects academic policy, the Chair should strongly consider adding them to a SC agenda.
- The Chair has authority over the SC agenda, so no guidance is needed. Because the SC has authority over the Senate agenda, no guidance for the SC is needed, either.
- Due to the language in the *Senate Rules* about senators being able to add an agenda item to the Senate agenda even if the SC declines to put it on a Senate agenda ["10 senators' rule," *SR 1.2.3.3*], it is not difficult for any group to be included on a Senate agenda.
- Student advocacy groups can contact a student senator about being added to a Senate agenda.
- If a group approaches the Chair about being on an agenda, the Chair can let the SC know about the request (via an email or as an announcement in a meeting) and SC can decide if it wants to hear the request.
- If an advocacy group is turned away from being on a SC agenda, the Chair should inform the group about the "10 senator rule."
- If an advocacy group wants to address the SC, the Chair could ask them to prepare a one-page memo with information about the issue and the group's specific position.
- Only registered student groups or official campus entities should be allowed to address the Senate. Other groups should not be added to a SC or Senate agenda, but they could use the "10 senator rule" to be added to a Senate agenda.

The Chair thanked SC members for their input. She commented that while the next agenda item might be construed as a request from an advocacy group, President Eli Capilouto had asked the SC to provide its input. There were chuckles all around.

7. Fair Trade Campaign Resolution (11:00 – 11:30 am)

The Chair welcomed the invited guests presenting the resolution: Shane Tedder (UK's sustainability coordinator), Sarah Lyons (AS/Anthropology), Carolyn Goins (Aramark's' sustainability coordinator), Megan Van Son (graduating undergraduate student, president of UK's Fair Trade Campaign), and Krista Jacobsen (AG/Horticulture). Those present discussed the Fair-Trade Campaign resolution, with the guests answering a multitude of questions from SC members.

After discussion, which included comments on the appropriate motion to make, Tagavi **moved** that the SC support and endorse the fifth resolution in the UK Fair Trade Resolution ("Education: The college/university will support students, staff, and faculty working to increase on-campus awareness of Fair Trade through events, the incorporation of Fair Trade into curricula, and other efforts."). Cross **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair added that she would share the results of the discussion with the President, but that Tedder was also welcome to share it. Tedder replied that he would also inform the Chair regarding next steps from the President's office so the Chair could share it with the SC.

8. LUNCH (11:45 – 12:45 pm)

SC members adjourned for lunch early, around 11:20 am. Guests Jon Gent (Internal Medicine, chair of the Staff Senate) and Annie Weber (assistant provost for strategic planning and institutional effectiveness)) joined SC members for lunch. The meeting began again at 12:46 pm.

9. Draft for Phased Retirement Survey (12:45 – 1:30 pm)

The Chair reminded SC members that the issue of faculty serving as an elected faculty senator or faculty trustee during phased retirement was brought up at last year's retreat; currently employees who go into phased retirement, or who are already on phased retirement, cannot serve in either of those two positions. The issue stems, at least in part, from an *Administrative Regulation [AR 3:2]*, which defines faculty as not being full-time when on phased retirement. The SC had asked the Chair to discuss the matter with President Capilouto; the President asked for more information about broader faculty opinions, as well as comments from staff, specifically from the Staff Senate. A survey sent out to both Senates was discussed as a viable way to seek input, although by the time the survey was about ready, both the University Senate and the Staff Senate were conducting trustee elections. A decision was made to delay a survey of Senate members until the elections were over, which meant the survey would go out in fall 2020.

The Chair noted that Guest Jon Gent (Internal Medicine, chair of the Staff Senate) was present to participate in the discussion. The Chair added that she was interested in input from SC about the contents of the survey, noting that she already planned to add information that explains which regulations are involved or would be affected, as well as including the regulations with the survey.

Below are representative comments from those present.

- The question asking if someone is a staff employee or faculty employee should be nearer to the beginning of the survey.
- The open-ended questions will be hard to analyze; the questions using a [Likert] scale are sufficient.

- The survey could be sent to both Senates, but the results could be separated by employee type. The survey can be designed to force a user to identify their employment type before they are allowed to proceed to additional questions.
- If the survey was developed carefully, both employee types can be asked questions that are specific to their type.
- Change the question about “advantages” to provide one question about advantages and one about disadvantages. Put these at the beginning of the survey, to force users to think about the issue before asking them other questions.
- The demographic information must come first.
- The only faculty who should be affected by any change should be faculty who are already eligible to serve (by virtue of regulations/rules), but who would not be eligible if they were on phased retirement. A change in the phased retirement policy should not open the doors to allowing new groups of faculty into the University Senate.
- *AR 3:2* does not have any effect on membership in the University Senate. If the University Senate wishes to allow phased retirement faculty to serve on Senate, then only the *SRs* need to be changed, not the *AR*.
- The survey should be announced in both Senates prior to the survey going out, so senators will be more likely to fill out the survey when it comes to them. Also, senators can be asked to discuss the issues with constituents prior to filling out the survey. The survey can be sent out after each Senate announces it, in September.
- If the demographic information is asked first, bridge logic can be used in the survey to adjust the narratives for staff (i.e. drop references to faculty) and for faculty (i.e. drop references to staff).
- Once the survey is sent out, respondents should have about two weeks to fill it out.

The Chair thanked Gent for attending and participating in the discussion and noted that the intent would be to incorporate the day’s ideas in time for a survey to be sent out in September.

#### 10. Curricular Considerations (1:30 – 2:30 pm)

##### a. Request for Consideration from Senate’s Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) – Programmatic Duplication, Naming (1:30 – 2:15 pm)

The Chair asked Cramer to explain the issues that the Senate’s Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) discussed. Cramer, chair of the SAPC, explained that the SAPC was troubled over what it saw as a lack of ability to collaborate, as well as increasing concerns that some proposals were treading on disciplinary areas that had long been held for other departments. He added that the SAPC supported some method of notifying the entire campus when new programs were being proposed. Also, units should be consulting with a wide variety of areas on campus before submitting proposals with names that are all-encompassing. The SAPC discussed the issue and supported the idea of adding a short comment period (30 days or so) within the approval process to promote conversations among individuals who wanted to

provide input on a proposal. The intent was not to slow down the process, but rather help issues come to light sooner rather than later. By the time a proposal gets to the SAPC, there should not be any complications regarding units not having been consulted or proposals that were vehemently opposed by another area. The academic councils are more broadly representative of the campus and its various units, so the councils are the best places for these sorts of discussion to take place. Below are representative thoughts and comments. Guest Annie Davis Weber (assistant provost for strategic planning and institutional effectiveness) also participated in the discussion.

- It would be useful to inform various colleges' representatives about a proposal at the time that the proposal leaves the college, or just before the proposal moves to an academic council.
- Once programs are included in Curriculog, proposals will be available for anyone to review, at any time.
- Canvas would be a good platform to use to announce newly submitted proposals. That system might facilitate discussions in real time.
- Significant concerns are unlikely to be resolved via Canvas discussions.
- Simply announcing newly submitted proposals would be helpful.
- If comments on proposals are solicited, it is not clear who would be responsible for responding to the comment.
- If there is a 30-day comment period just prior to review by an academic council, would an academic council have to wait to review it until the 30 days were over?
- Having a waiting period after college-level approval is not ideal, given that the proposal will be in its final format. Having a comment period immediately after college-level reviews makes it less likely that any collaborations or revisions would occur, as most of the work will already have been done.
- Because it generally takes about 30 days for a proposal to be reviewed by the Undergraduate Council, having a 30-day comment period during the UC's review would not cause much of a delay.
- The people who should be informed about pending proposals for new degrees and certificates are the deans and associate deans. They can, in turn, ask their representatives on the academic councils to carry a college's concerns.
- Problems caused by "turf wars" that are addressed by the SAPC require at least two or three back-and-forth discussions with a proposer. A proposal without that sort of concern usually requires one iteration with a proposer.
- If the point is to ensure other units know about a proposal, a flag can be raised when the proposal is first created. The drawback to that is that there will not be any proposal, as such, to

comment on. The earlier that people are informed, however, the better the chance that changes could be made, i.e. a course has not been (unnecessarily) already created.

- Comments do not have to stay with the proposal itself – associate deans, etc. could send comments directly to the proposal’s contact person.
- Because different colleges have different approval structures, it might make the most sense to send notices of new degrees and certificates to the individuals who sign off on proposals at the college level.
- The SC office has a formal list of contact persons; the information could be sent to them.
- New program proposals are large documents and it would be a big request to ask associate deans to review all the pages submitted for every new degree and certificate proposal. If the intent is to simply raise awareness about a new proposal, providing associate deans with a paragraph-long description, program name, and college name would be enough to understand the gist of a proposal.
- A survey could be used to solicit input and comments, but it is not clear who would be responsible for addressing them.
- Alerting leadership in the colleges about proposals for new degrees and certificates will provide proposers with opportunities for collaboration.

The Chair thanked SC members for a productive discussion and comments were offered about the curricular process in general. The Chair noted that Senate approved 36 new programs over the past academic year, while only 11 were reviewed in the prior year. Grossman suggested allowing proposals to have a spring effective date. The Chair explained that she has solicited such a change from the Registrar’s office, but the real problem is that UK’s undergraduate Bulletin is only published in the fall. Senior officials from the Provost’s office and the Registrar’s office are supportive of making such a change, but it is an administrative issue for the Registrar’s office to figure out.

**b. Expedited Review Process for Undergrad Certs Opening Admissions to Non-Degree Students (2:15 – 2:30 pm)**

The Chair reminded SC members that because the Senate approved the idea of admitting non-degree students into undergraduate certificates, there was a need to allow existing certificates and newly approved undergraduate certificates to choose to admit such students. The Chair explained that there are fewer than 20 existing undergraduate certificates and it would be relatively easy to contact the certificate directors. The Chair asked for SC members to discuss the possibility of expedited reviews to allow undergraduate certificates to enroll non-degree seeking students in fall 2019.

After some discussion, Grossman **moved** that the SC establish a one-time process for reviewing changes in existing undergraduate certificate admissions policies for non-degree students, such that if the certificate program wishes to admit non-degree students under the same criteria (with the exception of them being non-degree students) as degree-seeking students, the certificate’s program faculty should notify the SC office, adhering to a deadline established by the SC office, and that the SC office can approve the requests on behalf of SC and Senate and the change can be made effective immediately.

Brion **seconded**. There were additional comments. SC members indicated that a unit that wished to make any other changes to their undergraduate certificate (or wished to do it later) could submit a program change form, which would be routed through the usual approval process. Those expressing opinions firmly stated that the faculty of record needed to be involved in the decision and that the proposal would need to be approved by a college's regular approval process. After college approval, however, the proposal would come directly to the SC office for final approval. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. SC members briefly discussed a deadline and no one objected to a deadline of receipt in the SC office by December 2019.

c. Plan A Master's (2:30 – 2:45 pm)

Guest Weber explained to SC members that regulations promulgated by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools – Commission on Colleges (SACS) mandates that all post-baccalaureate degrees (masters and doctorates) require a minimum of 30 credit hours. Plan A master's degrees require 24 hours of coursework but some programs have not been consistently requiring additional courses for the remaining six hours of thesis work. Some units use courses with the "748" number to allow maintenance of full-time status, but that practice is not consistent across programs and that course carries no credit. The thesis for a Plan A master's degree is the equivalent of six hours of course work, but that effort needs to be documented via a credit-bearing course prefix and number. Weber closed by stating that there was no intent to require programs to change their curriculum, other than to ensure students are enrolled in at least thirty hours of credit-bearing courses if they are in a Plan A masters, which will require, in some instances, adding six hours of thesis writing credit to the existing curriculum.

SC members discussed the proposed change and the Chair commented that every master's degree program also has a 768-numbered course, which was credit bearing. There were concerns about the additional tuition that a student might be required to take, but Weber noted that a 768 course could be taken while the student was enrolled in other courses. If the student opted to take the 768 class as part of the student's full-time course load, the tuition cost would not increase. The Chair explained that Graduate School Dean Brian Jackson asked the SC for help in resolving this issue in an expedited fashion. Weber added that there were about 30 – 35 master's degree programs that needed to change. SC members discussed the issue and the request.

In response to a question from Grossman about a graduate program's requirements and increased costs for existing students in the affected Plan A master's degrees, Weber explained that UK was obligated to let current students finish under the Bulletin under which they entered, so no changes could be made that affected current students. It was too late to make these changes for fall 2019, which meant that entering graduate students for fall 2020 would be the first ones affected. During discussion, both the Chair and Weber commented that there was no wriggle room for this issue – either a program faculty made the change to ensure 30 credits of work, or the degree would no longer be offered.

The Chair said that Jackson's intent was to reach out to the directors of graduate studies (DGSs) for the Plan A master's degrees that had less than 30 credits and if SC approved, he could provide them with an abbreviated path to approval. Grossman **moved** that the SC establish a one-time process regarding Plan A master's degree programs that require fewer than 30 hours, to ask if they would like to make up enough hours to get to 30 credit hours with a XXX 768 course, or if they would like to pursue a different path to get to 30 credit hours; if the former they should send in an email indicating the faculty of record's approval to the SC office by September 30, 2019, but if the latter, they should prepare a program change form and follow the regular processes so that the proposed change(s) will have a fall



2020 effective date. Cross **seconded**. Grossman added that the SC office could approve the proposal. SC members discussed the issue and the motion.

Grossman suggested that as a corollary, the SC ask Jackson to make sure this change and the reason for it are explained and further that Jackson consult with UK's Graduate Student Congress on any hardship that graduate students may have due to this change and to take steps to address the hardship. There was no further discussion so a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

11. Request from Student PM-03 (per Senate Rules 5.4.1.2.4.3 ("Application for Degrees," "Demonstration of Extraordinary Hardship")) (2:45 pm – 3:00 pm)

The Chair explained the request from College of Arts and Sciences student PM-03. The student explained their situation and provided the SC with details about their experience when trying to apply to graduate with two degrees.

SC members discussed the student's request. No SC member suggested that the student had not experienced an extraordinary hardship, although there were differing opinions about what the hardship was – inadequate advising when filling out the paperwork, having only one degree when two were earned, etc. Blonder **moved** that the elected faculty members of SC amend the December 2017 degree list for College of Arts and Sciences student PM-03 by rescinding the BA in History and Political Science, Minor in Music Performance, and Minor in German and instead conferring a BA History, BA Political Science, Minor in Music Performance, and Minor in German. Brion **seconded**. SC members discussed the issue. The student noted that he would prefer not having to submit their request to the entire Senate; the SC was a smaller, more intimate group. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Blonder **moved** that the SC's action be done on behalf of the Senate and Osterhage **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

12. Closing Remarks (time permitting) (3:00 – 3:15 pm)

The Chair thanked SC members for their thoughtfulness and valuable discussions, over the past year and all day long. She said her first year as chair had been a productive one, but it also was a learning process; she expressed appreciation for everyone's patience and support. She said that over the summer, the SC office would work on compositions for Senate's committees and efforts would be made to try to have chairs for all committees and councils when school started again in August.

The meeting was adjourned by unanimous consent at 3:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Jennifer Bird-Pollan,  
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bird-Pollan, Blonder, Brion, Collett, Cramer, Cross, Grossman, Hall, Hamilton, Osterhage, Soult, and Tagavi.

Invited guests present: Terri Crocker, Marcy Deaton, Jon Gent, Carolyn Goins, Morris Grubbs, Krista Jacobsen, Joel Klipfel, James Lincoln, Sarah Lyons, Bill Swinford, Shane Tedder, Megan Van Son, and Annie Davis Weber.

Senate Council  
May 8, 2019

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Monday, June 3, 2019.