

Senate Council
November 5, 2018

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, November 5, 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 Jennifer Bird-Pollan called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:02 pm. Given the number of guests, the Chair suggested that those present introduce themselves.

1. Minutes from October 29, 2018 and Announcements

The Chair said that no comments had been received for the minutes from October 29. There being **no objections**, the minutes from October 29, 2018 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair offered a few announcements.

The chair of the Senate's Institutional Finance and Resource Allocation Committee (SIFRAC) asked the Chair to pass on to the SC a request that the SC let SIFRAC know if there is any particular issue that SC would like SIFRAC to review. Items mentioned were: ensuring resources to replace research equipment after an initial round of funding ends; suggesting that SIFRAC meet with Vice President for Facilities Mary Vosevich and Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration Eric Monday; and finding a process to streamline the process for funding student organizations – currently there are a lot of administrative roadblocks to access such funding.

The Chair reported the names of the co-chairs for each of the three recently composed dean search committees.

President Eli Capilouto could not attend the November Senate meeting as planned, but he is now scheduled to attend the December Senate meeting.

Regarding the expected influx of program proposals related to the *Our Path Forward* and the online degree/certificate initiative, Aaron Cramer (EN/Electrical and Computer Engineering, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC)) spoke with the Chair about the possibility of adding additional members to the SAPC. SC members engaged Guest Cramer in a brief discussion; there was a sense that SC members supported a proactive approach and while SC would normally prefer that added members also be members of the University Senate, such a practice may not be feasible or even efficient, given that Senate committees had already been composed.

The Chair asked if SC members were amenable to temporarily postponing discussion on agenda item 2a. Vice Provost Larry Holloway had asked the Chair if he could attend and to participate in the discussion but he had not yet arrived from another meeting. There were no objections from SC members.

2. Old Business

b. Results of 2017-18 Faculty Evaluation of the President

The Chair presented the results of the 2017-18 evaluation to SC members. There were a variety of comments from SC members.

a. Proposed Change to *Senate Rules 4.2.5* ("Graduate School")

The Chair reminded SC members that after the SC discussed the proposal on October 29 and voted on it, there was a suggestion that the language be further modified, to include endorsement of cooperative agreements by the faculty of record. She asked Farrell to address the proposed revision. Guest Herman

Senate Council
November 5, 2018

Farrell (FA/Theatre and Dance, chair of Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC)) commented that some of the language that SC added the prior week to *Senate Rules 4.2.5* was unnecessary, specifically the phrase “per the cooperative agreement.” Cross **moved** to remove that phrase and Brion **seconded**. SC members discussed the motion at length; Holloway also participated in the discussion. Holloway noted that there were existing cooperative agreements that did not include language related to “12 months”; he wondered aloud if, the language remained as is, if UK would be obligated to renegotiate all the existing cooperative agreements that did not include a waiver of 12 months.

Grossman **moved** to amend Cross’s motion by changing the language to “...waived for up to 12 months or the number of months as stated in the cooperative agreement.” Cross **seconded**. SC members discussed the amendment. Wood stated that her opposition to removing “per the cooperative agreement” was due to her concern that without that language, it could be misinterpreted in the future to allow such a temporary waiver for something other than the cooperative agreements currently under discussion. A **vote** was taken on the motion to amend Cross’s motion and the motion **passed** with six in favor and three opposed.

SC members then debated the amended motion. Firey **moved** to further amend the motion by changing the pertinent language to “...waived for up to 12 months from the date of enrollment or the number of months stated in the cooperative agreement.” Cross **seconded**. After additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstained.

SC members **voted** on the amended motion [to change the pertinent language to “...waived for up to 12 months from the date of enrollment or the number of months stated in the cooperative agreement....” and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair suggested that SC members then turn to the yellow language in the proposal [“...including endorsement by the faculty of the affected degree program,”]. Farrell commented that he supported the phrasing in general, but that it was not well worded. There were a few additional comments. Using the discussion from October 29 as a guide, Tagavi **moved** to add “, including approval by the faculty of the affected degree program.” Grossman **seconded**. SC members discussed the motion. Holloway noted that admissions decisions would still lie with the graduate faculty of the program; if a student was found to be unacceptable, the faculty simply would not admit the student. Grossman said that when SC discussed this issue the prior week, there was a sense that it was reasonable to give faculty advance notice of such an agreement, as opposed to faculty just not admitting students. He opined that the faculty’s approval could easily be conveyed to Holloway by the department chair when those interactions occur. Holloway noted that it would be relatively simple to determine the responsible faculty for certain degree programs, but some cooperative agreements covered the entire campus – he was not sure how he would carry out the requirement that it be approved by all involved faculty.

Wood **moved** to amend Tagavi’s motion by adding “graduate” to modify the faculty body that would offer approval. Blonder **seconded**. SC members discussed the amendment. A **vote** was taken and the motion **failed** with five opposed and four in favor.

SC members discussed the motion from Tagavi [to add “, including approval by the faculty of the affected degree program.”]. Holloway again raised the issue of logistics. Wood stated that if UK was going to sign an agreement which faculty must implement, then the faculty needed to approve the

agreement up front. Grossman suggested that if a college were to make an agreement as a whole, the entire faculty could vote on it. If it was a campuswide agreement, it could just be run through Senate.

Noting the time and the remaining agenda items, the Chair asked if there were any additional comments that had not already been made and there were none.

A **vote** was taken and the motion to add “, including approval by the faculty of the affected degree program.” The motion **passed** with none opposed. After a question from the Chair, there were no objections to the changes being made effective immediately upon Senate approval.

3. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) – Aaron Cramer, Chair

i. Proposed New USP between the BSCHE Chemical Engineering and PhD Chemical Engineering

Guest Aaron Cramer (EN/Electrical and Computer Engineering, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC)) explained the proposal. The Chair solicited questions of fact from SC members and there were a couple.

The Chair stated that the **motion** on the floor was a recommendation from the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) to approve the establishment of a new University Scholars Program between the BS Chemical Engineering and PhD Chemical Engineering, in the Department of Chemical and Materials Engineering within the College of Engineering. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair asked if there was any debate and Grossman noted that he supported the proposal. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstained.

ii. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Executive Educational Leadership

Cramer explained the proposal. The Chair solicited questions of fact from SC members but there were none.

The Chair stated that the **motion** on the floor was a recommendation from the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) to approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Executive Educational Leadership, in the Department of Educational Leadership Studies within the College of Education. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There was no debate. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iii. [significant change] Reopening of Master of Science of Nursing (and Changes to Requirements)

Cramer described the proposal. The Chair solicited questions of fact from SC members. Wood asked if the cross-listed NUR courses had already been approved and the Chair asked Guest Karen Butler (NU, assistant dean of academic operations) to respond. Butler stated that some courses had already been approved and were being taught, but others had already been cross-listed. There were no further questions of fact.

The Chair stated that the **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation to approve the significant change to the MS in Nursing, in the College of Nursing. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair called for debate. Wood asked a series of questions about the 900-level NUR courses being cross-listed with 600-level NUR courses and stated that she was deeply concerned about cross-listing a 600-level course with a 900-level course. She said that a professional course could not carry 600-level credit. Butler noted that the course proposals were all approved by the Graduate

Council prior to moving on to the SC office and that the courses would have differentiated grading scales, as well as differentiated assignments. Ms. Brothers noted that the SC office had discussed the matter internally and solicited input from the Registrar's office and the final determination was that while it was not an ideal situation, it would be a reasonable solution and would be the same reasonable solution that had been applied in similar situations in the past. After additional discussion, the Chair asked Wood to clarify if her [Wood's] concerns pertained to the degree program or to the courses and Wood said that she had no problem with the program, but rather was concerned with the courses. She suggested that the use of cross-listed 600/900-level courses might not be a legal degree at the master's level, which required one-half of the master's courses to be at the 600- and 700-level. At the Chair's request, Butler explained that no one had ever objected to similar arrangements in Nursing, which had often been done for resource-related reasons. Brion said that she was aware of this having been done in other colleges, but would like to see a memo from Graduate School Dean Brian Jackson that indicated the Graduate School's approval of this arrangement. The Chair noted that the program proposal and all the courses had already been approved by the Graduate Council (GC).

After additional brief discussion, Grossman **moved** to postpone the discussion until the next SC meeting in two weeks, so the SAPC can further investigate. Brion **seconded**. Firey referred to language in the Graduate School Bulletin that explicitly stated that the GC could grant permission for a program to include specific professional courses as part of its curriculum. Cramer asked for a description of exactly what SC wanted to see. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. Wood said that Cramer should solicit a letter from the Graduate School explaining approval for cross-listings between 600-level and 900-level courses. Grossman suggested that Assistant Provost for Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Annie Davis Weber could be asked for email confirmation that the arrangement would not cause any problems with the Council on Postsecondary Education or the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools – Commission on Colleges (SACS). The Chair asked if there were any other issues that needed to be addressed for SC members to feel comfortable with the proposal but there were no further comments.

b. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) – Herman Farrell, Chair

i. Proposed Change to PhD Gerontology (total required credits)

At the Chair's request, Guest Herman Farrell (FA/Theatre and Dance, chair of Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC)) explained the proposal.

The Chair solicited questions of fact. Wood asked what the proposed change involved and Farrell replied that it involved a reduction in credit hours. Wood asserted that the proposal did not require approval by the GC, let alone the SC, opining that such a change was in the purview of graduate faculty – there was nothing that required the coursework required to be approved by anyone other than the graduate faculty associated with the degree program. There were no additional questions of fact.

The Chair said that the **motion** on the floor was a recommendation from the SAASC to approve the proposal from the College of Public Health, Department of Gerontology to change the total credit hours for the Ph.D. in Gerontology from 44 plus residency to 41 plus residency. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There was no debate.

The Chair called for a **vote** and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed Change to PhD Chemistry (qualifying exam requirements)

Farrell explained the proposal, noting it was unanimously approved by the SAASC, and the Chair solicited questions of fact. There were no questions of fact.

The Chair said that the **motion** on the floor for discussion was a recommendation from the SAASC to approve the proposal to change the qualifying examination requirements for the Ph.D. in Chemistry. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

Spear suggested to Guest Christopher Richards (AS/Chemistry) that the program faculty consider strengthening the proposal requirements. Grossman spoke in favor of the proposal, explaining that the cumulative nature of the qualifying exams had been long disliked within the Department of Chemistry, but that until the proposal under discussion, there had never been a proposed change that the Department agreed on. Wood said that changes to the PhD qualifying exam structure should not be reviewed by the Senate, but should rather that the Graduate Council should be the final body approving those types of changes; she said that the basic structure of two years pre-qualifying and one year post-qualifying was in the purview of the Senate, but that beyond that, Senate should not have any role. She expressed concern that any approval by SC might set a precedent requiring similar approvals through Senate in the future. Ms. Brothers commented that the *Senate Rules (SRs)* state that changes to a program are considered “program changes” and are therefore under Senate’s purview; she asserted that similar changes to PhD programs were regularly reviewed and approved at SC and Senate meetings. Ms. Brothers said that SC would need to provide her with additional guidance regarding review of program change proposals if the SC intended to deviate from the broad description of “program change” as outlined in the *SRs*.

Tagavi and Brion supported Wood’s assertion. Brion said that she had been operating for years under the assumption that the structure of the preliminary exam was under the purview of only the major advisor and the committee. Tagavi noted that in the Department of Mechanical Engineering, the graduate faculty had changed the qualifying exam requirements many times without seeking Senate approval. He said that if the proposal before SC was determined to need SC and Senate review, then all the changes his unit had made might be considered illegal, which made him uncomfortable. The Chair noted that multiple entities, including the GC, SC office, and SAASC had believed there was an obligation documented in the *SRs* to review the proposal through Senate. Bird-Pollan said that a future change could be discussed in the future, but there was a proposal currently before SC that had moved through the curricular review process and was now at SC for review. Blonder opined that neither the Gerontology change nor the Chemistry change should be forwarded to the Senate. The Chair noted that the Senate had approved multiple proposals recently that included a change to the total credit hours.

Firey asked if the SC had the authority to decline to review the proposal. Ms. Brothers suggested that the SC could make changes to the process in the future, but that it would make a lot of sense to simply approve the proposal under discussion without tying it to a policy discussion. Wood disagreed and asserted that the SC office had created a situation whereby there was a very big change in process – she said that the Department of Statistics changed its qualifying exam structure many times and it was never sent to Senate. Wood wanted to approve the change, but not put it on the Senate’s agenda. Farrell pointed out that the information about qualifying exam requirements was a standard field on the SC’s form.

The Chair commented that the Department of Chemistry believed that submission of the “PhD change” form was necessary, the form itself provides fields in which to describe the current qualifying exam requirements and the proposed changes to it, so even if the SC opted not to review it, the Department,

GC, and SAASC had all believed that the review was necessary and appropriate. After a brief sidebar with the Chair, Parliamentarian Douglas Michael asserted that the *SRs* [1.2.3] require that a recommendation by a committee be placed on the Senate agenda unless both the committee and the Senate Council determine otherwise. Farrell said that he could support not sending the PhD Chemistry proposal to the Senate as long as the proposal was approved in some way. Grossman asked that the SC vote on the proposal and send it to the Senate, after which there can be a proposal to change the specifics regarding what types of program changes do and do not need SAASC and/or Senate review. Grossman **called the question**. Parliamentarian Michael asserted that such a motion would require a two-thirds vote of those present [six votes in favor] and therefore no second was required. The Chair reminded SC members that the motion on the table was to cease discussion and hold an immediate vote on the motion from the SAASC. A **vote** was taken and the motion **failed** with five in favor and four opposed.

Guest Chris Richards (AS/Chemistry) said that it was okay if he did not need to attend the next Senate meeting, but that he had hoped the proposal was fairly straightforward. Brion asserted that once the faculty voted on the change, it became effective immediately and the Senate's approval process was unnecessary. Richards noted that the director of graduate studies in Chemistry also believed that approval was required. The Chair recognized Guest Annie Davis Weber, assistant provost for strategic planning and institutional effectiveness, who said that Southern Association of Colleges and Schools – Commission on Colleges (SACS) required member institutions to govern their own curriculum and that there the required elements of a program were as subject to the change process as any course requirement change. She said that a new policy to limit Senate's need to review similar proposals in the future sounded like a great option, but that present-time actions could not get ahead of present-time policy.

There was additional discussion about alternate approval processes. Brion asked if the program change could be handled as a minor program change. The Chair reviewed the language in *SR 3.2.3.D* regarding minor program changes and explained that the rule was intended to be used for changes in electives, new prefixes for the same course, etc.

Brion **moved** to waive the *SR* regarding the limitation of minor program changes [3.2.3.D.2] to include the structure of qualifying exams for the PhD in Chemistry. Cross **seconded**. At the request of the Chair, Weber opined that the SC waiving its rules would not likely run afoul of SACS. There was no debate. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Wood suggested that something similar would work for the PhD in Gerontology. The Chair noted that the SC had already vote to approve it and send it to Senate. At the request of the Chair, the Parliamentarian explained that the SC would essentially be moving to reconsider the previous motion pertaining to the PhD in Gerontology. Wood **moved** to reconsider the motion to approve the proposal from the College of Public Health, Department of Gerontology to change the total credit hours for the Ph.D. in Gerontology from 44 plus residency to 41 plus residency. Brion **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion to reconsider **passed** with seven in favor.

Wood **moved** to waive the *SR* regarding the limitation of minor program changes [3.2.3.D.2] to include the number of credits for the PhD in Gerontology. Brion **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. Parliamentarian Michael noted that because the SC had approved a rule waiver, it would need to be announced to the Senate at the November meeting.

iii. Proposed Change to *Senate Rules 5.4.1.1* ("Application for Degrees")

Senate Council
November 5, 2018

Farrell explained the proposal. The Chair solicited questions of fact from SC members but the comments offered were in support of the proposal. The Chair said that the **motion** was a recommendation from the SAASC to approve the proposal from the Registrar's Office to change the deadlines for applying for undergraduate degrees by updating *Senate Rule 5.4.1.1.A*. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. After a request from Ms. Brothers, Guest Kim Taylor (registrar) indicated the deadlines for spring would change and she would send in a request to change the spring 2019 calendar's deadline dates for degree applications. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Tentative Senate Agenda for November 12, 2018

SC members discussed the tentative Senate agenda, noting that the day's activities meant some proposals would be removed from the Senate agenda. Brion **moved** to approve the tentative Senate agenda for November 12, as changed. Wood **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Items from the Floor (Time Permitting)

There was no time left for items from the floor.

Walker **moved** to adjourn and Osterhage **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 5:06 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Jennifer Bird-Pollan,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bird-Pollan, Blonder, Brion, Cross, Firey, Grossman, Hamilton, Osterhage, Spear, Tagavi, Walker, and Wood.

Invited guests present: Aaron Cramer, Herman Farrell, Larry Holloway, Chris Richardson, Kim Taylor, John Watkins, Annie Davis Weber.

Provost's Liaison present: Turner.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, November 8, 2018.