

Senate Council
October 22, 2018

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, October 22, 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 3:01 pm.

1. Minutes from October 15, 2018 and Announcements

The Chair said that no comments had been received for the minutes from October 15. There being **no objections**, the minutes from October 15, 2018 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair explained that agenda item 3ai ("Proposed Change to *Senate Rules 4.2.5* ("Graduate School") [pending receipt of SAASC's motion]") was thought to have been ready for review by the SC, but some language is not yet decided upon, so she suggested it be removed from the day's agenda. Brion **moved** to strike the item from the day's agenda and Grossman **seconded**. Tagavi objected to the delay, saying that he had spent time reviewing the proposal. The Chair assured him that his efforts were not wasted and that the amended version would be likely only be slightly changed from what had been posted. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair offered a series of announcements.

Last Friday during the Board of Trustees' retreat, the Chair presented the results of the faculty's evaluation of President Eli Capilouto, to be used in his annual survey by the Board of Trustees (Board). The Chair explained that the Board's evaluation process would end in December but that she planned to share the information with SC members the following week. She noted that trustees asked about the low response rate and how to improve it, but that many trustees expressed to the Chair their appreciation for hearing the faculty's input.

The Chair noted that Spear had asked a question at the October 15 meeting regarding the answer to a question on the form (regarding comparable programs elsewhere) for the proposed new BA in African American and Africana Studies. The Chair explained that one specific question pertained to the Academic Common Market [Southern Regional Education Boards]. Later in the proposal there is another question about comparable programs, for which the answer was "yes," but for the particular item noticed by Spear, the technical answer was correctly negative.

Referring to a question from the prior week's meeting, the Chair said that the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) was in ongoing conversations regarding non-degree undergraduate students enrolling in undergraduate certificates, in conjunction with other conversations about non-degree seeking students in general. She explained that College of Arts and Sciences Dean Mark Kornbluh was chairing a committee that, among other related issues, was asking if non-degree seeking students can have different admissions standards than degree-seeking students. She said that the SAASC had effectively put the "certificate" question on hold while they worked on the larger issue of admissions requirements for non-degree seeking students.

The Chair explained that a parallel issue was that of graduate credit. She said she was in a meeting relatively recently regarding current practice and what the Senate Rules (SR) language means in regards to the standard of allowing nine credit hours of graduate coursework to be transferred to another graduate degree program. The Chair said that she understood that the Graduate Council's position was that any number of UK credits can be transferred into a graduate program, although that was not clear

in the SRs. She thought the Graduate Council (GC) would soon be sending forward a proposal to clarify the SRs. In response to questions, the Chair acknowledged that the GC's position might not have been well known. Also, there could be programmatic limits on credit transfers that could be stricter than the policies of the GC.

Blonder asked about the phased retirement issue. The Chair reported that the President asked that the issue be considered by a broader group, including staff, to solicit wider input on the possibility of widening the scope of service activities that employees on phased retirement could engage in. Given his request, she said it seemed like there would need to be a wider conversation before the President would be willing to consider recommendations. In response to an additional question from Blonder, the Chair reported that the Regulations Review Committee met regularly, although a recent meeting had been cancelled.

2. Development and Delivery of New Online Programs – Vice Provost Larry Holloway and Associate Provost for Teaching, Learning, and Academic Innovation Kathi Kern

The Chair explained that she invited guests Larry Holloway (EN/Electrical and Computer Engineering, vice provost) and Kathi Kern (AS/History, associate provost for teaching, learning, and academic innovation) to join SC in a discussion in regards to the recent email communication from them about online master's degrees. Both Holloway and Kern presented information to SC members and at the Chair's request, answered questions from SC members. The conversation continued for about an hour and included issues such as: the types of programs would be eligible for the 60/40 tuition share; the intent to adhere to the Senate's approval process; the resources and support offered to those whose proposals were chosen for funding through the Request for Proposals (RFP) process; and the intellectual properties rights that would remain with faculty, although the University would retain some usage rights for three years if the faculty member left UK.

4. Nominees for Confucius Institute External Review Committee

The Chair explained that Associate Provost for Internationalization Sue Roberts (AS/Geography), had contacted the Chair to request some nominees to serve on a committee to conduct an external review of the Confucius Institute (CI). The Chair added that she was interested in involving the wider University Senate (Senate) body with the varied requests for committee nominees from SC. She indicated that the practice could be continued if it worked well. Those present offered the opinions below regarding the solicitation of, or characteristics of, nominees for the CI.

- At least one members with expertise in issues pertaining to academic freedom.
- Those making nominations should include a sentence about why the nominee was appropriate.
- Nominees should not be themselves current/recent beneficiaries of CI grants or funding.
- The solicitation should make it clear that self-nominations are welcome.

After additional discussion, Cross **moved** that the SC solicit nominations from senators for membership on the CI external review committee. Firey **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The Chair reminded SC members that the process of asking senators for nominations could be repeated if there was a good outcome.

5. Continuing Discussion on Work Group on Policies Regarding Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment

Senate Council
October 22, 2018

SC members engaged in an extensive discussion regarding the proposed wording that would describe the work group's charge, composition, and appointment of members.

As discussion wound down, the Chair asked if anyone had a motion that they wanted to make, to change the wording. Grossman **moved** that the SC add "at least half of whom shall be faculty including at least three from among SC's nominees, at least one staff employee and one student," after "faculty, staff, and students" in the last sentence of the last paragraph. Spear **seconded**. There were a few additional comments. After a brief sidebar between the Chair and Parliamentarian Douglas Michael, the Chair asked Grossman to clarify his motion and Grossman agreed that the intent of his motion was to adopt then entire document as amended and have the Chair present it to the President as coming from the SC. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with one opposed and one abstained. The Chair said she would present the modifications to President Capilouto and let SC members know the outcome.

6. Items from the Floor (Time Permitting)

There were no items from the floor.

Walker **moved** to adjourn and Brion **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 4:54 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Jennifer Bird-Pollan,
Senate Council Chair

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

Invited guests present: Larry Holloway and Kathi Kern.

Provost's Liaison present: Turner.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, October 23, 2018.