

Senate Council  
November 27, 2017

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, November 27, 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 called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:00 pm.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair reported that the minutes were not yet ready for approval. She made a few announcements.

- SC members will again be meeting at Pazzo's after the last SC meeting of the semester on December 4, to celebrate the contributions of the three SC members whose terms will end December 31 (Bailey, Lauersdorf, and Mazur).
- The Provost Search Committee will meet this week with the candidates and President Capilouto.
- The Connect Blue Reception will take place on Tuesday, December 12, immediately following adjournment of the 2 pm Board of Trustees meeting.
- UK has "Alumni Professorship" awards, which were last reviewed in 2002. The Chair described the professorships and stated that there were four available Alumni Professorships. The Chair explained that there is one available professorship so she received a request from Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement G. T. Lineberry to ask SC to identify three or four nominees to serve on an advisory committee to review faculty for Alumni Professorship(s). SC members identified four faculty to be asked to serve.

There was a sidebar discussion regarding securing any SC-nominated faculty member's availability and willingness to serve on the committee for which they were nominated. SC members were not supportive of asking the SC office to ascertain availability and willingness of nominees to serve on a given committee, primarily because in most situations, the SC is asked to identify a handful of nominees, from which a member of University leadership would pick one or two nominees to invite to serve. It would be awkward for the SC office to verify a nominee's willingness to serve if they were subsequently not chosen to serve.

2. Old Business

a. Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) – Joan Mazur and Davy Jones, Co-Chairs

i. Proposed Interpretation to *Senate Rules 6.1.3.A* ("Academic Evaluation")

Mazur, co-chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), explained the proposal. She said it was in response to the prior year's change to when midterm grades were due and that it pertained to what date would be used for "midterm" when a course was offered via a compressed calendar. There was minimal discussion about the change as presented and there was some discussion about what "midterm" meant in regards to the impending change from two summer terms to a single, more flexible summer term.

Wood asserted that the interpretation being shared with SC members did not need a vote for approval, as it was an informational announcement. The Chair suggested that the SC charge the SREC to consider changes needed for a single summer term and there were no objections.

Grossman suggested there was a related discussion from SREC that needed to be presented to the SC, in regards to what, exactly, “evaluation” meant in the context of SR 6.1.3.A. He noted that it was generally understood to encompass grades, but that it was not explicitly stated as such.

#### 4. Determination of Voting Process, etc. for SC Chair and Vice Chair Elections

The Chair explained that she was unable to find any record of having three candidates for the SC chair position. Therefore, there were two issues to discuss – the voting process and the opportunity for candidates to make statements during the meeting on December 4.

Guest Roger Brown (AG/Agricultural Economics), chair of the Elections Subcommittee of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), explained that although a proposed process was shared via the agenda, the Chair was somewhat indifferent to the method ultimately chosen and would defer to SC's preference(s). Brown explained that the preferred method of voting per Roberts Rules of Order (Newly Revised) (RONR) was rounds of balloting and reballoting until a single candidate with a majority of support from members was identified. If that process was not considered feasible, there was another acceptable method where candidates are ranked and a clear winner was usually identified easily.

There was extensive discussion among SC members, who asked many questions about both processes, as well as detailed queries about determining the second place and third place candidate in the process of candidate ranking [also referred to as “preferential voting”]. As discussion wound down, Cross [parliamentarian] and Brown volunteered to determine a process while the SC members conducted business, with the understanding that SC members would vote on it prior to the end of the day's meeting.

#### 5. Committee Reports

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

##### i. Proposed New USP between the BS Computer Engineering and MS Computer Science

Schroeder, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was to approve the establishment of a new University Scholars Program between BS Computer Engineering and MS Computer Science within the College of Engineering. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There was one question asked to clarify an acronym. There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. [Cross was involved in the election process deliberation and did not participate in the vote.]

##### ii. Proposed Suspension of Graduate Certificate in Pharmaceutical Sciences

Schroeder explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was to approve the suspension of admission into the existing Graduate Certificate in Pharmaceutical Sciences, in the College of Pharmacy. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There was brief discussion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. [Cross was involved in the election process deliberation and did not participate in the vote.]

##### iii. Proposed New Dual Degree Program: BA/BS in a STEM Major in A&S and MBA

Schroeder explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was to approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new Dual Degree Program: BA/BS in a STEM major (i.e., Biology, Chemistry, Geology, Mathematics, Mathematical Economics, Neuroscience, and Physics and Astronomy) within the College of Arts and Sciences and MBA in the Gatton College of Business and Economics. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

Tagavi objected to the use of the term “invited,” commenting that all qualified students should be able to apply, regardless of an invitation. Schroeder noted that the language in the proposal was the same language as the MBA-related dual degree program with the College of Engineering. Guests Anna Bosch (AS/Linguistics, associate dean for undergraduate programs), Ken Troske (BE/Economics, associate dean for graduate programs and outreach), and Harvie Wilkinson (BE/Marketing, MBA Center Director) all indicated that students did not need to be invited to be accepted. Tagavi asked that the proposal be changed and the wording was changed to reflect Wood’s suggested change to “all students who are eligible for admission to the Graduate School may apply.”

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the amended proposal and the motion **passed** with none opposed. [Cross was involved in the election process deliberation and did not participate in the vote.]

iv. SAPC Recommendation on Degree Designations

Schroeder explained the SAPC’s recommendations on degree designations. Guest Annie David Weber, assistant provost for strategic planning and institutional effectiveness, also participated in the discussion.

Wood was opposed to the proposal and spoke multiple times against it, saying that the list of degree designations from the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) was not an exhaustive list and it did not include every appropriate graduate degree that could be offered. Wood also objected to the proposal’s language that degree designations that were not on the CPE list were “out of compliance” and expressed deep concern that having to provide a rationale for use of a degree designation not on the CPE list was akin to having to ask permission to use a degree designation not on the CPE list. Grossman opined that the proposal was clear in that it was an attempt to encourage compliance with the CPE’s list of degree designations, not an attempt to prohibit a degree designation not on the CPE list.

Mazur also spoke against the proposal, stating that she did not understand the rationale for the proposal and it was not necessary to comply with the CPE list of degree designations. Weber explained that the intent was, in the long-term, to reduce the duplicate program information kept in SAP so that one degree designation could be used both internally and externally. Currently, the 78 degree programs not included on CPE’s list of degree designations had two separate fields in SAP to describe the program – one used for internal purposes and one used for external reporting to the CPE. She said the existing 78 degree programs could stay as is, but she believed that adding some guidance for faculty proposers could make the program-related data cleaner, over time.

Mazur and Wood expressed concern that to encourage faculty to use a degree designation from the CPE’s list would stifle creativity and innovation. Wood also objected to the proposed program change form to be used by any of the 78 degree programs using degree designations not on the CPE list, stating that it was inappropriate to force anyone to change their degree designation. Schroeder clarified that the degree designation change form could be used by any one of the 78 programs, but there was no requirement that anyone change their degree designation. Bailey suggested that changing “require” to “encourage” would be more appropriate since further down it was clear that making such a change would be a matter of choice by those responsible for the program and not a requirement. Tagavi suggested changing language about “out of compliance” to “a degree designation not on the CPE’s list.” Schroeder, on behalf of the SAPC, was amenable to Bailey’s and Tagavi’s suggestions, as well as the suggestion to modify language on new program form, to remove a “rationale field” for a proposer to use

if the proposer wanted a degree designation not on the CPE's list of degree designations. In this case, a proposer would be asked instead to provide an "explanation" if using a degree designation not on the CPE's list of degree designations.

There was additional and lengthy discussion. Wood and Mazur asked if Weber could propose to the CPE that it identify a process to add a degree designation to their list. Weber said she would be happy to do that, but did not think such a process would be created in the short run. Discussion continued. Mazur suggested that Weber contact the 78 degree programs using degree designations not on the CPE list to let them know if there was an equivalent degree designation from the CPE list. Schroeder clarified that the proposed form to change degree designations would require approval by the department, college, and then be sent to the SC office, after it would be placed on a Senate web transmittal for final approval.

Noting the time, the Chair suggested that because there had been extensive discussion, it might make sense to move towards a vote. She noted that the SAPC's recommendations dealt with two primary issues: revising new programs forms to recommend that faculty use a degree designation from the CPE's list (first two bullets of the proposal's recommendations) and approval of a new form to allow a change to a degree designation not on the CPE list one that was on the CPE list (third bullet of the proposal's recommendations).

The Chair called for a **vote** on the SAPC's first two recommendations (with revised, softened language) and the motion **passed** with four in favor and three opposed. The Chair then called for a **vote** on the SAPC's third recommendation (with revised, softened language) and the motion **passed** with four in favor and three opposed.

SC members then returned to the matter of a voting process for the position of SC chair, to be used at the SC meeting on December 4.

#### Determination of Voting Process, etc. for SC Chair and Vice Chair Elections, continued

Cross and Brown explained the revised election process and Ms. Brothers put their proposal on-screen so it could be read by those present. There was lengthy discussion and a few editorial changes were made. Below is the final version of the language.

A secret paper ballot will be conducted among the members, who will write on their ballot the name of the person they want as Senate Council chair.

If none of the three candidates receives a majority of the vote, a second ballot will be conducted. If a candidate withdraws, the original procedure will be repeated. If no candidate withdraws, the second ballot will be conducted through preferential voting. The council members will write the names of all the candidates on their ballots, along with a numeral 1, 2 or 3 indicating their ranked preference (forced ranking), otherwise their ballot will not be counted.

If no candidate receives a majority of first-rank votes, the second-rank votes on the ballots of those preferring the third-place candidate will be redesignated as first-rank votes for their second-choice candidate(s). If there is an initial tie for second place, that place will be awarded to the candidate with the most second-rank votes. If the two have the same number of second-rank votes, second place will go to the candidate with the fewest third-place votes. If a tie remains, second place will be determined by lot.

Senate Council  
November 27, 2017

The final ballot will be a non-ranked choice between the top two candidates.

If there are more than two nominees for vice chair, the same procedure will be followed.

Cross **moved** that the SC approve the process described on the screen and Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair noted that she had overlooked the Old Business agenda item of "Senate Meeting Roundtable." She asked if any SC members wanted that item to be returned to the agenda for December 4. No SC members indicated a desire to discuss that agenda item on December 4.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine M. McCormick,  
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bailey, Bird-Pollan, Blonder, Cross, Grossman, Mazur, McCormick, Schroeder, Tagavi, and Wood.

Invited guests present: Anna Bosch, Roger Brown, Catina Rossoll, Ken Troske, Mirek Truszczynski, Annie Davis Weber, and Harvie Wilkinson.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, November 29, 2017.