The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, September 11, 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.

Those present introduced themselves.

1. Minutes from August 28, 2017 and Announcements
The Chair noted that a couple of editorial comments had been received. There being **no objections**, the minutes from August 28 were **approved** as amended by **unanimous consent**.

2. Old Business
a. Next Steps for SAPC's Recommendations for Significant Changes (formerly "Program Changes Involving New Emphases (Tracks, Concentrations, and Specializations)")

b. Next Steps for SAPC's Recommendations for Recommendations for Professional Degree Definitions and Approval Processes
The Chair asked Schroeder, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), to explain both "Next Steps for…." proposals. Schroeder explained that in May, the SC reviewed the two proposals ("Recommendations for Significant Changes" and "Recommendations for Recommendations for Professional Degree Definitions and Approval Processes") and both were the subject of Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) deliberations over the summer. Schroeder said that the intent was to ask SC to refer the proposals back to Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) for further work. Grossman **moved** to return "Recommendations for Significant Changes" and "Recommendations for Recommendations for Professional Degree Definitions and Approval Processes" to the SAPC for additional work. Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. In response to Tagavi's comment that he had made some notes about the language in both proposals, Schroeder invited him to send those comments to her, so she could share with the SAPC for possible response and incorporation into the final proposals.

3. Requested Waiver of *Senate Rules 3.2.3.B* ("Procedures for Processing Academic Programs and Changes," "Procedures to be Used," "Approval by Academic Council") for Certain Academic Programs - Assistant Provost for Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Ann Weber
The Chair introduced Guest Ann Weber, assistant provost for strategic planning and institutional Effectiveness. Weber explained that work started over the summer to respond to the request from the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) for standardization of CIP codes. UK, like most other educational institutions, uses the federal government's series of numerical digits (the classification of instructional programs codes, or CIP codes) to identify the disciplinary field of individual programs. It did not happen often, but there were some instances where the same CIP was used for two different degrees at the same level. The CIP code has six digits, but in the past an additional two digits was added to the end of the official CIP code for internal recordkeeping purposes. UK is moving to an independent identifier in SAP to differentiate one program from another, alleviating the need for the extra digits. Furthermore, the CPE requires UK to provide certain data for various reports and the extra digits in some of UK's CIP codes causes issues for reporting purposes. In response to a question from Lauersdorf, Weber clarified that her area would like to avoid having the same CIP for degrees at the same level. It

was customary, however, that the same CIP will occur for a program that offers degrees at the undergraduate, master's and doctoral levels.

Grossman **moved** that SC waive *Senate Rules 3.2.3.B* to allow an expedited program change process (requiring approval by the department and college and placement on a Senate web transmittal, without review by the academic councils) for only those academic programs that were inadvertently approved with an eight-digit CIP code instead of the customary, six-digit CIP code. Childress **seconded**. There were a variety of comments and questions from SC members. Cross suggested amending the motion to add the words "to correct the CIP code" prior to "for" in the motion. Both Grossman and Childress accepted the change as a friendly amendment.

When there was no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion that the SC waive *Senate Rules 3.2.3.B* to allow an expedited program change process (requiring approval by the department and college and placement on a Senate web transmittal, without review by academic councils) to correct the CIP code for the academic programs that were inadvertently approved with an eight-digit CIP code instead of the customary, six-digit CIP code. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Comments from Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) Regarding UK's 2015-16 Academic Program Review - SAPC Chair Margaret Schroeder and Assistant Provost for Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Ann Weber
Schroeder explained that she wanted the SC's input into some of the areas of concern noted in the report; she said that Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) had struggled with similar issues in the past and wondered if SC could offer some guidance. Weber explained that the most common comments from the review of UK programs by the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) pertained to low enrollment, low number of degrees produced, and any degrees for which students graduated with well over 120 credits. She said the CPE was also interested in answers to questions regarding the satisfaction of employers and satisfaction of graduates, both of which were extremely difficult to answer at the program level.

There were a variety of questions and comments from SC members. SC members asked for more information about a handful of issues: how CPE defined a "native" and a "transfer" student; what exactly is meant when CPE refers to "declining enrollment"; and if the CPE's sample of 14 programs indicated that the 14 chosen randomly all had issues, or if the CPE identified 14 particular programs because of the issues. In response to a query from Schroeder, SC affirmed that low enrollment was acceptable in many situations and it should not be something that stops a new program proposal from moving out of the SAPC.

5. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules* Regarding Changes in Provost's Area - Associate Provost for Academic Excellence Operations Kirsten Turner
The Chair referred SC members to the memo from Provost Tim Tracy regarding the proposed changes to the SRs. She drew their attention to the Provost's comment that he had not proposed any changes to the section on University Honors Program because those changes should come from Honors faculty. She noted that there were a handful of outdated terms that needed to be removed ("associate provost for undergraduate education," "dean of undergraduate studies," and "undergraduate education) and replaced with current terminology. The Chair noted that in addition to the Provost's memo and a version of the SRs with changes in "track changes," there was also a short file that outlined each reference that was changed and the page number where it was.

Grossman **moved** to send the proposed revisions to the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) for further examination. There were additional comments about the changes. The Chair commented that earlier in the year when she approached the SREC about working on the changes, the SREC said that the changes needed to come from the Provost. She indicated that she wanted confirmation that the SREC did now want to review the changes.

Bird-Pollan **seconded** the motion. There was extensive discussion regarding when the changes would be returned to the SC. The Provost's memo indicated that the effective date should be January 2018. Ms. Brothers stated that if that deadline was to be met, the SREC would need to have the revisions sent back to SC by the Monday before the December Senate meeting. After additional discussion, Grossman agreed to amend his motion (and Bird-Pollan agreed) so that the revisions would be due back to the SC office no later than October 20.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to send the proposed revisions to the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) for further examination and return the proposal to the SC office by October 20. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. Senate Committee Compositions, Round 2
SC members discussed the committee compositions that were presented to them. There were two committees that did not have a chair identified, yet, and SC members identified committee members who would be a good fit for serving as chair. Regarding the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee (SRWAC), the Chair explained that she was still reaching out to certain faculty to ensure the committee was comprised of a diverse group of faculty. She asked for permission to identify and appoint the final member of the SRWAC and there were no objections from those present.

Grossman indicated that the SREC needed a student member and Childress said he would work to find a student who could serve in that capacity, as well as identify a student who could serve on SRWAC.

Schroeder **moved** to approve the committees as discussed and Wood **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Tagavi suggested the agenda be rearranged to accommodate a guest's schedule and there were no objections.

8. Planning for Assessment Activities Regarding UK Core - Eric Sanday, UK Core Education Committee Chair
Guest Eric Sanday (AS/Philosophy, UK Core Education Committee (UKCEC) chair) explained that he came to ask for additional members to assist with UK Core assessment activities. After discussion, it became clear that it would be simpler to create an ad hoc committee instead of change the composition of UKCEC. Sanday was willing to return to SC with a more detailed request, including membership and charge and SC members were amenable to that.

7. Committee Reports
a. Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) – Joan Mazur and Davy Jones, Co-Chairs
i. Possible Form to Accompany Student Requests for Excused Absences for Interviews (related to *SR 5.2.4.2.E*)
Mazur explained that the SREC created the form after receiving feedback from the April Senate meeting when the new type of excused absences for interviews was approved. She said the previous form that

SREC developed had too many details and was considered to be too intrusive by the former Student Government Association (SGA) president. The new form simply asks for information about the interview and directs the student to affirm that the interview could not be rescheduled. SC members discussed the form. In response to a question from the Chair, Mazur said that the form could be posted on the Senate's forms site. After comments about the lack of student traffic on that page, Childress suggested he could provide a link to the form from the SGA's website.

There was extensive discussion about the form, particularly the wording and how to verify what a student asserts. Grossman **moved** to add fields to the form for the email address and/or phone number of the interviewer and the interviewer's name, if available. Bird-Pollan **seconded**. After additional discussion, including concerns that a faculty member could negatively affect a student's interaction with the interviewer by contacting the interviewer directly, Grossman **withdrew** his motion and Bird-Pollan concurred.

SC members were amenable to changing a word in the title of the form from "verification" to "notification." Another change supported by those offering opinions was to remove the requirement that the form be submitted two weeks in advance and substitute "as soon as possible" prior to the interview. Cross **moved** to substitute "notification" for "verification" and change the language to indicate that it was due prior to the interview. Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

9. Nominees for Dean Searches (Engineering, Libraries)
SC members deliberated on possible nominees. They ultimately named three faculty nominees for each dean search committee.

10. Proposed Change to *Senate Rules 3.2.3* – New Language for "Minor Program Changes" - Senate Council Office
The Chair explained that she convened a group of faculty and staff the prior year, referred to as "Curriculum Stakeholders.," This group met several times and discussed ways to improve the curriculum process and how to make the process more streamlined. One recommendation from those meetings was an abbreviated approval process for certain types of "minor" program changes. The Chair added that in addition to the members of the Curriculum Stakeholder's Committee, the language also had been sent to two associate deans who process a lot of curricular changes and they both thought it was a reasonable approach.

Tagavi had a handful of comments. While not everyone thought revisions were necessary, there were no objections from SC regarding the changes Tagavi suggested. The words "narrative, descriptive" will be added to modify "Bulletin language for the program." The first line of the proposed section b) will change from "…one course for another course with no change…." to "…one course to another comparable course with no change…." The first line of the proposed section c) will change from "…a list of guided electives or free electives…." to "…a list of electives…."

Schroeder **moved** to approve the proposed new language, with the three changes from Tagavi. Bailey **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with eight in favor and two opposed.

11. Items from the Floor (Time Permitting)
Grossman gave SC members an update from the Board of Trustees meeting that was held the previous week and SC members offered comments and questions.

Bailey **moved** to adjourn and Bird-Pollan **seconded**. SC members voted with their feet and the meeting was adjourned at 5:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine M. McCormick,
Senate Council Chair

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

Invited guests present: Eric Sanday and Annie Weber.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, September 21, 2017.