Senate Council
February 22, 2021

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3:00 pm on Monday, February 22, 2021 via video conference. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Aaron Cramer (EN) called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:00 pm. The Chair welcomed those present. He informed everyone that the session was being recorded and noted that it was an open meeting. He asked everyone to use the chat box to sign in for attendance and provided guidance on how to participate in the discussion.

1. Minutes from February 15, 2021 and Announcements
The Chair reported that no edits were received for the set of minutes from February 15, 2021. There being **no objections**, the minutes for February 15, 2021 were **approved** by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair reported that a recent recurring theme in a variety of venues has been concerns about strength and clarity of the *Senate Rules (SRs)*. Specifically, the need to ensure that wide understanding of the fundamental responsibilities embedded within Senate's approval processes and committee functions (programs, admissions, academic organization and structure, research, etc.) are codified in meaningful and implementable ways. He has been in discussion with Vice Chair Collett and he will be appointing a workgroup to begin to work in this area. Preliminary discussions with SC will come in the coming weeks.

The Chair reminded SC that they charged Senate's Advisory Committee on Diversity and Inclusion (SACDI) to consider an undergraduate Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) requirement. Senate's UK Core Education Committee (SUKCEC) independently started to think along these same lines in relation to UK Core and has asked for some ex officio membership changes. He explained that since Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) is already working on a committee compositions proposal in response to administrative reorganizations, they will consider this request within the framework of the larger discussions.

The Chair announced that the Joint SC-President Working Group on Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Policies, which is co-chaired by Jennifer Bird-Pollan (LA) and Executive Director and Title IX Coordinator Martha Alexander, submitted a final report to President Capilouto. The report addresses the unresolved issue raised by the newest Department of Education Title IX Regulations, which prohibits the use of different standards of evidence in different types of possible hearings related to one incident. The working group determined that the two hearings (per *Administrative Regulation (AR) 6:2*, whether harassment occurred, and per *Governing Regulation (GR) X*, whether the sanction is appropriate) have separate and distinct goals, which justifies two different standards of evidence ("preponderance of the evidence" and "clear and convincing").

Bird-Pollan explained that the working group sent out a survey and consulted with the Senate, Student Government Association (SGA), and Staff Senate about the issue and the feedback was split. They also looked at other institutions across the country and found that they did not need to align the two standards. The working group found that it is appropriate to think about the two different hearings as assessing two different questions, so the standard does not have to be the same.

Bird-Pollan responded to a question about the potential for changes from the new Presidential administration by explaining that it is possible that parts of the Department of Education Title IX

Regulations could be changed but UK's overall process was designed with fairness in mind, so she was not sure if anything would need to change.

2. Committee Reports
a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) - Leslie Vincent, Chair
i. Proposed New BS in Computer Engineering Technology
Vincent explained the proposed new BS in Computer Engineering Technology. The Chair asked if there were any questions and there was clarification that the proposed BS would prepare students for a career in computer engineering technology but not information technology. The Chair stated that the **motion** on the floor was a recommendation from the SAPC that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new BS degree: Computer Engineering Technology, in the Department of Engineering Technology, within the College of Engineering. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. The Chair asked if there was any debate on the proposal and there was clarification that there are other degree programs at UK where students take a significant portion of classes at a local community and technical college. There was also clarification that students will complete part of the coursework at Bluegrass Community and Technical College (BCTC) and although enrollment is shared, BCTC will be the home institution while the student takes classes there and while the student takes classes at UK, UK will be the home institution. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstained.

ii. Proposed New BS in Lean Systems Engineering Technology
Vincent explained the proposed new BS in Lean Systems Engineering Technology. The Chair asked if there were any questions and there were none. The Chair stated that the **motion** on the floor was a recommendation from the SAPC that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new BS degree: Lean Systems Engineering Technology, in the Department of Engineering Technology, within the College of Engineering. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. The Chair asked if there was any debate on the proposal and there was clarification that it is common for UK's Engineering degrees to have no or few free electives. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstained.

iii. Proposed New MS Aerospace Engineering
Vincent explained the proposed new MS Aerospace Engineering. The Chair asked if there were any questions and there were none. The Chair stated that the **motion** on the floor was a recommendation from the SAPC that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new MS degree: Aerospace Engineering, in the Department of Mechanical Engineering, within the College of Engineering. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. The Chair asked if there was any debate on the proposal and there was none. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstained.

iv. Proposed New PhD Aerospace Engineering
Vincent explained the proposed new PhD Aerospace Engineering. The Chair asked if there were any questions and there was clarification that it is common to house aerospace engineering in mechanical engineering departments. The Chair stated that the **motion** on the floor was a recommendation from the SAPC that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new PhD degree: Aerospace Engineering, in the Department of Mechanical Engineering, within the College of Engineering. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. The Chair asked if there was any debate on the proposal and there was none. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstained.

v. <u>Proposed New MS in Biostatistics</u>
Vincent explained the proposed new MS in Biostatistics. The Chair asked if there were any questions and there was clarification that the Department of Biostatistics already has a joint PhD with Epidemiology, and also how the proposed new MS differs from the online master's in the Department of Statistics. The Chair stated that the **motion** on the floor was a recommendation from the SAPC that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new MS: Biostatistics, in the Department of Biostatistics, within the College of Public Health. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. The Chair asked if there was any debate on the proposal and there was none. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstained.

vi. <u>Proposed Significant Change to PhD Studies in Higher Education</u>
Vincent explained the proposed significant change to PhD Studies in Higher Education. The Chair asked if there were any questions and there were none. The Chair stated that the **motion** on the floor was a recommendation from the SAPC that the University Senate approve the significant change to the PhD: Studies in Higher Education, in Department of Educational Policy Studies and Evaluation within the College of Education. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. The Chair asked if there was any debate on the proposal and there was none. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

vii. <u>Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Senior Diversity Officer Leadership</u>
Vincent explained the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Senior Diversity Officer Leadership. The Chair asked if there were any questions and there were none. The Chair stated that the **motion** on the floor was a recommendation from the SAPC that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate: Senior Diversity Officer Leadership, in the Department of Educational Policy Studies and Evaluation within the College of Education. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. The Chair asked if there was any debate on the proposal and there was none. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

viii. <u>Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Human Resource Management</u>
Vincent explained the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Human Resource Management. The Chair asked if there were any questions and there were none. The Chair stated that the **motion** on the floor was a recommendation from the SAPC that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate: Human Resource Management, in the Department of Management within the Gatton College of Business & Economics. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. The Chair asked if there was any debate on the proposal and there was none. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ix. <u>Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Substance Use Disorder</u>
Vincent explained the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Substance Use Disorder. The Chair asked if there were any questions and there was clarification about all faculty of record being in the College of Social Work. The Chair stated that the **motion** on the floor was a recommendation from the SAPC that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate: Substance Use Disorders, in the College of Social Work. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. The Chair asked if there was any debate on the proposal and there was none. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

There was brief discussion about how a faculty of record relates to the unit faculty, with unit faculty being defined in the *Governing Regulations* as the official educational-policy-making faculty body for a program.

b. Senate's Research and Graduate Education Committee (SRGEC) - Susan Cantrell, Chair
i. Response to Proposed Changes to Undergraduate Research
Cantrell reminded SC of the presentation at their meeting on February 1 about the reorganization of the Office of Undergraduate Research. She explained that SC charged SRGEC to review the reorganization plans and provide input about possible Senate endorsement. She reported that during the SRGEC meeting on February 10, 2021, the committee voted unanimously to endorse the plans for restructuring the Office of Undergraduate Research as presented to SC. She noted that SRGEC recommended that SC communicate to administration the importance of earlier involvement of the Senate in actions that involve structural reorganization of any educational and research opportunities/activities. They also recommended that the program, led by the new Director of Undergraduate Research, continue to refine the metrics and funding formula that will be used to distribute support resources to all Colleges. She reported that although SRGEC endorsed the plans, they prefer to rely on the judgement of SC about possible Senate endorsement.

There was discussion about the recommendation for SC to communicate to administration the importance of earlier involvement of the Senate. There was little interest in suggesting the Senate endorse the changes. The Chair reported that he will share with the Office of the Vice President of Research the SRGEC's second recommendation to refine the metrics and funding formula that will be used to distribute support resources to all Colleges. There was additional discussion about the possible Senate endorsement but the idea had little support.

Vincent (BE) **moved** to include SRGEC's report on the proposed changes to Undergraduate Research on a Senate agenda. Collett (HS) seconded. The Chair asked if there was any debate and there was none. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

c. Ad Hoc Committee on University Accolades - Leslie Vincent - Chair
i. Update
Vincent reminded SC of their recommendation to form an ad hoc committee to evaluate University accolades. The committee was asked to develop an inventory of all University honors/accolades and develop recommendations regarding the standards and processes for such accolades. She explained the historical context of the concerns that were raised by Lewis Honors College about how to distinguish honors offered by Lewis Honors College from other honors such as University/Latin Honors and Departmental Honors. She explained that the ad hoc committee was formed from nominations by Associate Deans. She thanked Ms. Brothers for her help in identifying an inventory of departmental honors.

She went over the committee's findings and identified their recommendations which include:
- Units may offer both "awards" and "departmental honors" but the two are different. Both types should be approved by departmental faculty and do not need Senate approval
- The current University naming structure to designate "honors" is sufficient and should remain, although more regular use of adjectives with "honors" would help alleviate confusion ("University/Latin Honors" and "Lewis Honors College" and "departmental honors"). This tiered break-down of honors at the University needs to be clearly conveyed.
- There needs to be a clear list of departmental honors.

- There should be guidance regarding best practices for the establishment and maintenance of departmental honors, such as establishment by faculty vote and a review every five to ten years, but this should not include Senate review/approval.

The Chair thanked Vincent and the ad hoc committee for their work and asked SC for feedback. There was discussion about sharing the recommendations with Lewis Honors College. It was noted that some colleges and professional program also give honors, although Vincent clarified that they focused on undergraduate honors. Grossman asked whether the committee considered whether the current criteria for Latin honors should be modified or made more stringent. Vincent replied that it had not. Chair Cramer said he would consider what committee would be most appropriate to consider this question. There were no objections to the Chair and Vincent discussing the recommendations with a representative of the Lewis Honors College.

d. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) - Jennifer Bird-Pollan, Chair
i. Request for Feedback on Recommendations Related to Senate Rules 5.2 ("Credit Hours")
Bird-Pollan reminded SC of their charge to SAASC to standardize the maximum amount of credit hours for undergraduates, graduates, and professional school students for the various terms and academic statuses, including compressed courses. She explained that the charge was prompted by the creation of the single summer session. She reported on the SAASC findings which included a table designed to show the total credit hours a student may attempt (Student Load), per session or equivalent rolling periods of time, for all types of registration (i.e., graded credit, audit, P/F, etc.), including courses taken at another institution or via Distance Learning. There was discussion about creating a formula in place of the table for better clarity. Charnigo (PbH) agreed to draft a formula and SC agreed that the credit intensity of the current table was acceptable. There was also discussion about how course loads for different student groups were calculated. It was noted that students may request a waiver from their college dean to attempt more credit hours. Student members of SC were supportive of using a formula that could be automatically enforced. It was also noted that input from the Registrar's Office would be needed for implementation and investigation into the technical feasibility of enforcing it.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:59 pm with no objections.

Respectfully submitted by Aaron Cramer,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bird-Pollan, Blonder, Cantrell, Charnigo, Collett, Cramer, Duncan, Grossman, Hall, Kuhnlein, Oltmann, Swanson, Vincent, Wheeler, and Williams.

Guests present: Nelson Akafuah, Kalea Benner, Sheila Brothers, Roger Brown, Rudy Buchheit, Amanda Ellis, Joanie Ett-Mims, Larry Holloway, Jane Jenson, Davy Jones, Michael Renfro, Scott Soltis, and Annie Davis Weber.

Prepared by Stephanie Woolery on February 24, 2021.