Senate Council
November 21, 2016

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm in 103 Main Building on Monday, November 21, 2016. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hand unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Katherine M. McCormick called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:05 pm.

1. Minutes from November 7, 2016 and Announcements
Brown offered an update regarding the ongoing elections for SC members whose terms will begin January 1, 2017.

The Chair said that no changes were received for the minutes. There being **no objections**, the SC minutes from November 7 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**. The Chair offered a few announcements.

- The Chair noted that there were a few incidents on campus where students were attacked verbally or physically, as well as altercations among students. There were also instances of graffiti and other forms of protest regarding the outcome of the recent presidential election. She said she would try to send a note to all faculty, and encouraged SC members to remind their colleagues, that providing opportunities for students to engage in discussions was appropriate, but political statements were not appropriate.

- The members of the UK Core Education Committee, as well as its chair Eric Sanday, were continuing to work on responding to issues regarding the intersections of race, diversity, difference, etc. The Chair said she would keep SC members up to date as discussions move forward.

- On Thursday there was a meeting of academic administrators and the focus was on diversity and graduate education. The Chair said that it appeared to be more of an opportunity for Provost Tim Tracy to receive information, rather than an event in which information was pushed out. She said that the University had contracted with Stamats, a higher education marketing consultant company from the Midwest. The Chair explained that she and Lauersdorf, in his role as chair of the Senate's Graduate Education and Research Committee, met with representatives from Stamats. The Chair explained some of the topics of the meeting they had. She said it was her understanding that the consultants will conduct interviews with campus individuals and others and draft a written report early in the spring 2017 semester. Shortly thereafter the Provost will convene with the Graduate School a blue ribbon committee on graduate education (five members each from administration, Senate Council, and the Graduate School), which will use the Stamats report as a starting point. The blue ribbon committee hopefully will have its report completed by May 2017; a campus conversation will take place in fall 2017 with an eye toward having final recommendations made and actions taken by the end of the fall 2017 semester.

  There were a number of comments and questions from SC members about this announcement, particularly the use of an outside consultant. More than one SC member asked for more information about why exactly the Graduate School was being discussed and if there was a particular issue or problem that needed to be addressed. There was general confusion about what the goal of the entire exercise was intended to be, as well as the amount of effort being

put into an investigation of the Graduate School when there were so many recent reports regarding the Graduate School submitted by campus committees. After additional discussion, Mazur **moved** that the SC review to the agenda item for which guests were present. Porter **seconded**. There being no discussion, **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Committee Reports
a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) – Margaret Schroeder, Chair
i. Proposed New Undergraduate Certificate in Film Studies
Guest Matthew Giancarlo (AS/English) attended the meeting and presented the proposal on behalf of Schroeder, who was not able to attend due to illness. Giancarlo explained the proposal and noted that there was one change that needed to be made to the form. The proposal indicated that the certificate director would report to the college dean, but that needed to change to reporting to the department chair because the certificate will be homed in a department. There was brief discussion. Grossman asked about references to the advisory board. Guest Pearl James (AS/English) explained that the intent was for the advisory board to be the executive committee of the faculty of record. After additional discussion, James said she would resubmit the proposal with changed language about the responsibilities of an executive committee, not an advisory board.

The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new Undergraduate Certificate in International Film Studies (as amended), in the Department of Modern and Classical Languages, Literatures, and Cultures in the College of Arts and Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

2. Old Business
a. Committee Nominees for External Review Committees
The Chair explained that the SC needed to identify faculty to serve on a chief academic officer summative review for Dean Terry Birdwhistell in Libraries. SC members identified three faculty nominees.

SC members identified 14 faculty nominees to serve on a variety of external review committees. It was not clear which colleges would be reviewed and when, so SC made an effort to identify faculty from a variety of colleges.

4. Senate Meeting Roundtable
SC members discussed a variety of aspects of two issues: program review, evaluation, and sunsetting; and the review of the Graduate School. Below are representative comments.

- Does Provost Tracy have concerns about the existing Senate processes to review, evaluate, and close programs?

- Is the problem that there are no standards or rubrics by which to identify programs that should be evaluated? For example, does the Provost want Senate to promulgate a standard that, for example, programs with fewer than four graduates in 10 years should be evaluated?

- Senate is typically in a responsive mode – it does not solicit changes, but rather responds to proposals that are submitted.

- Senate's responsive mode supports a bottom-up process but if there are efforts to suggest that some programs be closed, that would be a top-down process.

- This exercise could be driven by the prospect of UK's next accreditation visit. It could be awkward to discover that UK has a number of programs with very few or no enrolled students.

- A unique program might graduate a handful of students, but they might be the only graduates in the entire country.

- How can someone tell if a small number of enrolled students is due to lack of student interest or is due to lack of appropriate funding, resulting in insufficient numbers of faculty to teach all interested students?

- If UK just wants to close programs to save money, it should be shared from the outset.

- Graduate programs should be measured in many dimension beyond enrollment.

- Senate may not have the resources (time, money, personnel) to actively participate in program reviews. It may be hard for faculty to have a dispassionate view of another program.

- The unit responsible for assessment is much, much smaller than it was about five years ago, which may hamper their ability to conduct program reviews.

- What is the problem that needs to be solved? What is the goal and what is the concern?

- (Review of the Graduate School) It would be nice to see a copy of the contract that was signed with Stamats, to better understand the purpose of the review.

- Is the program review issue and the review of the Graduate School about centralization/decentralization? Will administration's activities regarding either of these types of activities circumvent existing Senate processes?

- Until the conversation is framed, it is difficult to offer input.

5. Rationales for Senate Agenda Items

The Chair noted that one outcome of the recent Senate meeting was a request by a senator that SC provide a rationale for motions that come to the Senate. The Chair said that a rationale is often given orally during the meeting, but it may help some senators to have the rationale when the agenda is sent out, as opposed to receiving it just before holding the vote.

There were no objections from SC members about presenters at Senate being asked to provide a rationale for their agenda item (and/or the specific motion) to Ms. Brothers for posting with the entire agenda.

6. Items from the Floor (Time Permitting)

Grossman said that it was relatively common to hear complaints about the length of time it took for the then-proposed new BS Neuroscience degree to be reviewed and approved by the University Senate apparatus. Grossman asked if there was a timeline of the approvals for that proposal. The Chair said she would ask Ms. Brothers to gather the requested information and share it with SC members.

The Chair then said Ms. Brothers had an item for discussion. Ms. Brothers noted that while the SC had recently empowered the Registrar to make editorial changes to department and program classifications as requested by educational units to maintain consistency with University academic organization, no guidelines had been given. After brief discussion, Ms. Brothers said that she understood there was one general standard to keep in mind (consider who might be harmed as a result of the change) and one technical standard (approval from the department chair where the program currently resides and approval from the department chair where the program will reside).

There being no additional business to attend to, Mazur **moved** to adjourn and Lauersdorf **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 4:57 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine M. McCormick,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bailey, Blonder, Brown, Lauersdorf, McCormick, Mazur, and Porter.

Invited guests present: Matthew Giancarlo and Pearl James.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, November 29, 2016.