

Senate Council  
October 20, 2014

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, October 20, 2014 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 Andrew Hippisley called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:00 pm.

1. Minutes from October 6, 2014 and Announcements

A few revisions were received for the October 6 minutes. There being **no objections**, the minutes from October 6, 2014 were **approved** by **unanimous consent**. The Chair reported that one of the members of the SC's ad hoc Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher-Course Evaluations from the Department of Statistics stepped down from the committee, so another faculty member from Statistics was chosen as the replacement.

The Chair reported that he sent a gently worded email to the student involved in the rule waiver situation heard by the SC on October 6. He noted that the student in question has since been set up in a non-fee requiring course and the student was happy with the outcome. The Chair said that in his communication to the student's college, he included that SC's sense that rules on numbers of credits required for a degree should never be subject to a waiver. There were a few SC members who said they agreed with Grossman's assertion that the SC did not vote to say that such a rule waiver would never be permissible. There was one suggestion to use the phrase "in principle" to signify it was possible, but not likely.

The Graduate School is sponsoring a showing of "Ivory Tower" the evening of Monday, October 27. The Chair said he would send an announcement to this effect to senators. He suggested SC members hold their regular meeting, get a few drinks, and then watch the film as a group.

The Chair said he wanted SC to spend a little time thinking about what transpired at the Board of Trustees (Board) retreat on October 17 and 18. He said it was a little over a day of discussing UK's research strategy and how it ties in with education. President Eli Capilouto said UK must be the "University for Kentucky" and that health research was one way UK could support the needs of Kentucky. The Chair said he would like Grossman and Wilson, the faculty trustees, and Ingram, student trustee, to give their perspectives of the discussion, after which SC members could think about future actions, such as inviting the President to an SC or University Senate (Senate) meeting, or involving the Senate's Research and Graduate Education Committee (SRGEC) in working through related issues. Both faculty trustees offered their opinions of the retreat, as did Ingram, Student Government Association president (student trustee). The Chair asked SC members to go around the room and offer their thoughts. Below is a representative list of comments.

- The SRGEC should be included in the discussion, as well as the Senate's Academic Facilities Committee (SAFC). UK should encourage partnerships that are modeled on UK's relationship with Toyota, and encourage expansion to the equine industry and other occupational areas. New research infrastructure must be malleable enough to allow for rotation of multidisciplinary research teams to move in and then move out, but research infrastructure should also support good researchers who may find themselves between grants.
- The Senate should endorse the proclamation made by the Board and President and leave it at that.
- While focusing on the practicalities of health research, it is a tragedy that the University is not committing itself to the creative activities that go on across campus. A new center for the performing arts is sorely needed on campus. A focus on Kentuckians who suffer from devastating diseases should not stop UK from also engaging in activities that raise the human spirit.

- UK's regulations are an impediment to researchers who want to partner with industry. Small companies do not have time to wait between the time an idea is posed and the months that pass before the final paperwork is approved. Small business is a great untapped source for interdisciplinary work.
- The resolution from the Board's retreat sounds good, but it lacks any vision of what UK will be in the end and what the research environment will be. Building another building for new researchers does not support faculty who are already here, working in the worst research buildings on campus. Existing programs should be bolstered before new initiatives are begun.
- The President and Board should examine the context within which UK provides research to the Commonwealth. When the President talks about research, he normally mentions the fields of agriculture and medicine, or the health enterprise in general. Many faculty in the social sciences work very hard to impact the state. There are parts of the human self aside from health, such as the psychological state and aesthetics.
- For students it can be hard to find social sciences research to be involved in; what little is available through one particular college is almost entirely in a science-related field. Kentucky's problems are greater than healthcare; for example, the public school system is broken and graduating students who cannot read. Fixing that problem would certainly improve health among Kentuckians.

The Chair commented that the range of opinions shared differed in interesting ways from those at the Board retreat. The SC meeting offered far more variety in opinions that was available during the retreat. The Chair asked SC for permission to invite President Capilouto to attend an SC meeting prior to the winter break where the matter could be discussed in greater detail, which would give the President the full range of perspectives. There was discussion among SC members about what steps should be taken, next. No final decision was made, although there were no objections to the Chair inviting the President to talk with SC either during a regular meeting or a special time about research and other pertinent topics.

## 2. Old Business

### a. Update from Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Disciplinary Action

Watt reported that the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Disciplinary Action had met once and will meet again towards the middle of the coming week.

### b. Discussion on Proposal from College of Allied Health Professions, circa 2000

Guest Ernie Bailey, chair of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC), explained that the College of Health Sciences submitted a proposal to move two degree programs, but SAOSC members felt the proposal was not complete and was missing some required elements. Although College of Health Sciences interim Dean Sharon Stewart presented the proposal as fixing minor details, the SAOSC felt that it could not review it without a full and complete proposal.

Guest Dean Stewart said that a proposal to restructure the College of Health Sciences into two departments was submitted in 2000. Part of the proposal included an assumption that two degree programs from the Department of Clinical Sciences would be moved to the Department of Rehabilitation Sciences; the Department of Rehabilitation Sciences was to hold the undergraduate and graduate degrees in Communication Disorders [now "Communications Sciences and Disorders"] as well as the program for Physical Therapy. A problem arose about two years ago when students were unable to register for graduation; the College assumed there was a glitch somewhere and went ahead and hand-entered the undergraduate and graduate degrees for Communication Sciences and Disorders. The College realized there was a true problem when the same thing occurred this past year.

Guest Davy Jones, member of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), explained that the current *Senate Rules and Governing and Administrative Regulations* clearly speak to how different academic organizational structure changes. Back in 2000, however, the *Governing Regulations (GR)* were not as clear and it was relatively common for the Administration to describe the movement of a

degree program from one unit to another as a purely administrative action. The *SR* and *GR* have since been changed to recognize different types of academic organizational structure changes. At the time of the proposal from the College of Allied Health Professions (subsequently changed to College of Health Sciences) the degrees in question would have been administratively moved. Jones said that the essence of the matter was whether or not SC was willing to state that under the rules in effect at the time, the movement of the two degrees (BS Communication Sciences and Disorders and MS Communication Sciences and Disorders) was also included in the proposal, as an administrative action. There were a few questions from SC members.

Grossman **moved** that the SC recognize the transfer of the Physical Therapy degree program and the Communication Sciences and Disorders degree programs to the Department of Rehabilitation Sciences in the College of Health Sciences as having been implemented correctly under the rules in effect when the Department of Rehabilitation Sciences was created. Pienkowski **seconded**. In response to a question from Grossman, Jones opined that the matter would not need Senate input, as the Senate already reviewed the proposal in 2000 – SC was making an interpretation that the past action included the movement of the degrees. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with one abstaining.

#### c. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee Guidelines, Revised

Bailey explained the proposed edit to the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee's guidelines. SC members discussed the possible edit and its effect on proposals. During the discussion, Debski suggested replacing "topic" with "questions" for clarity.

When discussion ended, the Chair reminded SC members that the motion to approve use of the form came from the SAOSC, and the SC requested changing "topic" with "question." Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

### 3. Confucius Institutes: National Conversation and UK Context - Susan Carvalho, Associate Provost for Internationalization and Interim Dean of the Graduate School

The Chair introduced Guest Susan Carvalho, Associate Provost for Internationalization and Interim Dean of the Graduate School. Carvalho introduced Huajing Maske, Executive Director of the Office of China Initiatives and Director of the Confucius Institute. Carvalho explained that there are strong faculty opinions on campus and also nationally about the pros and cons about Confucius Institutes and she wanted UK to be proactive in its consideration of the Confucius Institute. She asked the SC to consider naming a faculty committee to conduct an independent review of UK's Confucius Institute, including a review of UK's agreement with China, the Institute's budget and activities, and how issues of academic freedom are addressed. Carvalho said she could also provide a bibliography of articles pertaining to national and regional conversations. Her preferred outcome was an eventual statement by the Senate, based on the faculty committee's work, as to whether or not UK faculty were comfortable with UK's Confucius Institute. There were a number of questions from SC members, as well as many suggestions about possible other mechanism that would be more efficient than review by a Senate committee.

As discussion wound down, the Chair commented that while the suggestions for efficiency were well made, there was perhaps a bigger point to be made. If Carvalho was requesting the voice of the faculty, specifically the SC, then the SC should give that voice. It would mean more work, but hard work should not be a reason to not do it. He suggested SC members decide whether the review of the Confucius Institute should be conducted by an existing Senate committee or by an ad hoc committee. Christ **moved** to establish an ad hoc committee to review the Confucius Institute, with the membership to be determined at a later date. Porter **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 4. Committee Reports

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

##### i. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Health Coaching

Guest Margaret Schroeder, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal for a new Graduate Certificate in Health Coaching. Guest Kristen Mark (Education/Kinesiology and Health Promotion) was in attendance to answer questions.

Grossman expressed concern that the certificate was also available to students in the graduate program in Kinesiology and Health Promotion. Mark explained that the proposed new certificate in health coaching had a different focus from the master's degree in health promotion – coaching is an applied area, whereas promotion is more theoretical. Debski asked about how the certificate director will be chosen if a change needs to take place. Mark agreed to send in a revised proposal that addresses aspects related to the faculty of record.

The Chair said that the recommendation from the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) was that the Senate approve the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Health Coaching in the Department of Kinesiology and Health Promotion, in the Department of Education, with the SC's request to add clarification of how decisions occur with respect to the faculty of record. 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.

#### b. Final Report from Ad Hoc (2012) Committee on Calendars - Margaret Bausch, Chair

The Chair offered some background information about the agenda item. He explained that per the SR, the SC is responsible for reviewing the University calendar on an annual basis, although the SC could delegate that task to an ad hoc committee. If the SC is to review the calendar this year, it will be important to have the results of the last calendar committee on hand. He noted that the primary purpose of the day's report was to ensure the work of the most recent committee on calendar issues is appropriately passed on to the group that reviews the calendar this year. Guest Margaret Bausch, chair of the (now-defunct) ad hoc Committee on Calendars, presented the committee's final report. There were a variety of questions from SC members. At the end of her report, Bausch confirmed she was willing to serve as an ex officio member or just an information resource for the next calendar committee, but due to her responsibilities as department chair she could not chair it.

#### 5. Proposed Non-Standard Calendars for EDP 665 and EDO 670

Guest Robert Reese explained the request for nonstandard calendars for EDP 665 and EDP 670. He requested a calendar for EDP 670 that starts on the first Tuesday in July and ends on the last Thursday of July. The course will be taught on Tuesdays and Thursdays, from 9 am – 2 pm. Regarding EDP 665, Reese explained that the request was that course will begin when the first summer session begins, but that the course will not finish until the end of the second summer term. Christ **moved** to approve the nonstandard calendars for EDP 665 and EDP 670, based on pedagogical reasons. Anderson **seconded**.

Anderson commented that the SC needed to develop a better mechanism to approve deviations from the standard calendar. There were a few questions about how the calendar for EDP 665 would be implemented; SC members concurred with Brown's suggestion that Reese contact KY's Council on Postsecondary Education to determine if giving a student an I grade in the first summer session and then giving the final grade in the second summer term would negatively affect funding or reports on student progress. The Chair asked Guest Connie Wood, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), for input; Wood explained there is a specific grade that should be given if a student's work for a course is "in progress," which differs from the I grade for an incomplete.

There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair suggested that SC members look closely at the Senate roster that was handed out, to better identify faculty who can serve on the review committees needing SC nominees. The Chair said it seemed likely that those making self nominations already held a strong opinion about a dean or program. He said that senators have been duly elected by their college, but also because of their Senate service they will have sufficient experience outside the college, too.

6. 2014-15 Periodic Program Review Recommendations (Business & Economics, Medicine, Engineering, and Law)

SC members identified nominees for these three committees.

7. 2014-15 Summative Review Recommendations (Deans Mark Kornbluh, David Brennen, Dan O'Hair, and Mary John O'Hair)

SC members identified nominees for the summative review committees.

Porter **moved** to approve the identified nominees to send forward as the SC's nominees and the motion was **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

8. Faculty Nominee for Thursday Football Committee

SC members discussed possible nominees for the committee looking at logistics for the fall 2015 football game that will fall on. SC identified three nominees.

Because it was 5:15 pm, the Chair called for a motion to adjourn. Pienkowski asked for an opportunity to discuss new business, which the Chair allowed. Pienkowski said that he saw an email message in which a student and a member of the Registrar's office were included in the membership of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC). Pienkowski said he did not recall the SC discussing either appointment. The Chair reminded Pienkowski that at the last SC meeting, the Chair discussed the Wednesday evening reception for student members of the Senate and their eagerness to serve on various Senate committees. The Chair explained that he asked for SC's permission to assign students to various committees and SC agreed to do so.

Pienkowski stated that it was inappropriate to add a student to the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) for three reasons: first, students are biased and it is a conflict of interest for a student to participate in an SREC discussion; second, they do not have sufficient experience to discuss or rule on academic policies; and finally, the SREC is already overburdened with so many members that it is hard to meet. Pienkowski said there was no place for a student on the SREC. Wood, chair of the SREC, was still present and also commented. Wood said she agreed with Pienkowski; the SREC should be an exception when it comes to membership because the SREC is the only Senate committee whose charge does not involve formulating academic policy, but rather is responsible for interpreting existing Senate regulations and conducting elections. Further, the SREC is responsible for certifying the election of faculty to the Senate and students should not be involved in those certifications. Wood said she very much agreed with Pienkowski and said she hoped the Chair would reconsider and not appoint a student to the SREC. Wood added that with respect to a participant from the Registrar's office, an agreement was worked out about five years ago such that an associate registrar is an available resource, but is not a member of SREC. Wood said the SREC was a delightful group of members but she did not want to deal with the increased requirement for a quorum if a student were appointed. Wood said she preferred contacting UK's Registrar (Don Witt) directly in the event that a consultation was necessary.

The Chair commented that some committees desired the presence of a representative of the Registrar, so it was intended to be helpful. Wood reiterated that there had never been a regular practice of including anyone from the Registrar's office – such an individual is called upon only as needed, but did not attend regularly. The Chair suggested the matter of a student be determined. He said that it would be helpful to prioritize the reasons why a student should not be on the SREC. The Chair opined that concern about the size of a committee was a valid point. Regarding the point that a student should not be there because students do not belong there, the Chair opined that there was no restriction in the *Senate Rules* prohibiting students from participating in SREC. The student who requested service on the SREC did so due to his educational background and educational goals. If there is a de facto prohibition on student membership in the SREC, the Senate may miss an important student perspective. The Chair added that the student perspective was also very important – they were thoughtful and engaged and wanted to participate in the Senate fully. He thought the size of the SREC was a more valid point. Wood responded that the size of the SREC was primarily an administrative issue that would be rectified next year.

Wood said that she did not object to the particular student who was appointed, nor did she object to consulting a student when the matter was academic policy or the workings of the Senate. She said the function of the SREC is to interpret and codify *SR*. That does not involve students in formulating academic policy – it is interpretive and sets the SREC apart from other Senate committees. Wood added that sometimes the SREC interprets student issues and dissects what is meant in the *SR*. Pienkowski said the SREC spent a lot of time last year discussing syllabi and students who missed exams, did not turn in homework, etc. It would be a conflict of interest for the student to participate in such discussions.

McCormick and Porter commented that students regularly sit on the University Appeals Board (UAB), which makes final decisions about student matters – student participation there has never been considered to be a conflict of interest. Porter said that if students have an opportunity to vote on changes to the *SR* in the Senate, then there was no reason why a student should not participate in SREC discussions and decisions. Wood clarified that interpretations of the SREC do not need to go to the Senate floor for approval. Porter said he did not see much practical difference between participating in the UAB and serving on the SREC so he supported having a student member of the SREC. Further, the one student member will have one vote so there was no way a student could override the wishes of the majority faculty-comprised SREC.

The Chair acknowledged the different type of charge for SREC, but he expressed concern about treating one Senate committee as exclusive to faculty only. He said he did not see any harm a student could do; he could only see benefits – a benefit to the SREC to hear the student perspective and a benefit to the student who is interested in rules and regulations and interpreting codes and what the student can learn from the experience. Anderson said that inclusion of the student is beneficial for their learning experience at UK to see the process and how rules are made.

Osorio said that in her opinion, it was very unlikely that the student appointed to the SREC would come in with a biased perspective towards students. She said he was smart and was a good student who was likely to agree with faculty on the SREC. She did not think he expressed interest in the SREC solely to advocate inappropriately for students who do not do their work, etc. Pienkowski said the individual's characteristics were irrelevant, as it was the principle that was concerning. Osorio repeated that she thought the student would make a good contribution to the SREC. Wood asked if the *SR* should be rewritten to ensure that any student who participates in the SREC has a particular skill set. The Chair commented that SC appoints committee membership, so if there was more than one student interested in the SREC, the SC could appropriately determine which student (and the assumed associated skill set) should be appointed to SREC and be deliberate about appointments. The Chair said he could not figure out the damage or harm that a student's participation would do. Osorio asked if the student appointed to the SREC was also recommended by Ingram, as well as having self-nominated for the position. The Chair replied in the affirmative. If it was a tenure and promotion committee, the Chair said there could be an argument made that a student should have no role in that type of committee. Wood said she had stated her position and, she was the current SREC chair, at least for the time being.

In response to Debski, the Chair said the students had already been notified of their committee appointments via email. Wood added that the appointments were made without discussion with committee chairs to inform them. The Chair said that normally when committee members are added, chairs are typically happy to receive notice of new members. Wood said that may be the case when the committee is not already at 10 members. She said there was one time slot in the week when the SREC can meet this semester. The Chair said that in the future, he will solicit student committee preferences at the same time as when faculty senators make their committee preferences. The Chair asked if anyone who had not yet spoken had a strong opinion about a student participating in the SREC. Anderson said that it could be a future agenda item for discussion, at which time the SC could discuss the SREC's composition for the coming year. At the present time, however, students were already notified of their committee memberships and the student who requested SREC seemed to be a good candidate for the SREC. Todd suggested that Wood report back on how things go this year with a student member. Wood said she had served under three separate SREC chairs and there had never been a student on the SREC, nor had the SREC membership exceeded six members, for very good reasons. Porter asked if the concern had to do with a worry on Wood's part about meeting quorum with so many members. Wood

responded and Porter commented that it seemed like six individuals were needed for quorum of an 11-member committee, which is the same quorum necessary for a 10-member committee. Wood said she would be in contact with the Chair in the near future about this matter.

McCormick **moved** to adjourn and Anderson **seconded**. There being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 5:36.

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Hippisley,  
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Brown, Christ, Debski, Grossman, Hippisley, Ingram, McCormick, Oberst, Osorio, Pienkowski, Porter, Watt, and Wilson

Invited guests present: Ernie Bailey, Margaret Bausch, Susan Carvalho, Davy Jones, Huajing Maske, Kristen Mark, Margaret Schroeder, Robert Reese, Sharon Stewart, and Ben Withers.