1	UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY	
2	SENATE COUNCIL MEETING	
3		
4		
5	* * * * * * * * *	
6	FEBRUARY 10, 2020	
7	* * * * * * * * *	
8		
9	JENNIFER BIRD-POLLAN, CHAIR	
10	DESHANA COLLETT, VICE CHAIR	
11	SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR	
12	STEPHANIE WOOLERY, STAFF ASSISTANT	
13	TRISHA B. MORLEY, COURT REPORTER	
14		
15	* * * * * * * * *	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

		2
1		* * * * * * * *
2	BIRD-POLLAN:	Welcome everyone. We're going
3		to go ahead and get started. Thank
4		you so much for being here this
5		afternoon. I know it's only been
6		two weeks since we saw each other
7		the last time, but we have
8		important things on the agenda
9		today, so thanks for making time to
10		be here. Just a quick reminder,
11		again, we follow Robert's Rules,
12		although, unfortunately, our
13		parliamentarian is absent, so if we
14		have a crisis, we'll have to call
15		in additional experts. We ask you
16		to be civil in debate, but also a
17		good citizen, which means not only
18		participate here today, but take
19		the information from today's

20	meeting back to your constituencies
21	and share with them. And, of
22	course, all important, return the
23	clicker at the end of the meeting.
24	Take it, if you haven't yet, and
25	remember to sign in at the end.

1	That's how we track attendance in
2	these meetings. Oh, my goodness.
3	I'm so sorry. We still are having
4	flickering problems, which is not
5	our computer, but seems to be the
6	connection. We've got an IT person
7	who might bring us a better
8	connector. So let's hope that
9	happens in the meeting, but things
10	seem to be in working order, so
11	let's check that with our
12	attendance slide and see if our
13	clickers work. So please vote to

14	demonstrate your attendance. Any
15	remaining attendance votes? We're a
16	little light today. Oh, good. I'm
17	sorry for the one person who did
18	not have a good weekend. We can
19	surely make up for that this
20	afternoon. You were just waiting
21	for this meeting.
22	So we received a few editorial
23	changes to our minutes from the
24	January 27th meeting, but nothing
25	substantive. So we've made those

1	editorial changes. You received the
2	minutes electronically when you
3	received the agenda. So unless I
4	hear any objections now, those
5	January 27th minutes will stand
6	approved as amended editorially by
7	unanimous consent. All right. We're
8	going to give it a try. We're going

9	to try this alternate cable. Let's
10	see. Fingers crossed.
11	So a few additional
12	announcements. As we've told you
13	before, we're still working on the
14	clicker situation and also the
15	attachment situation. If you have
16	the clickers are working for the
17	moment. That doesn't mean we want
18	to rely on the system, so we are
19	still eager to hear from you about
20	polling systems that work for you
21	and whether you have suggestions.
22	You should've received an email
23	from Sheila in the last couple of
24	days asking for nominations for a
25	new Ad Hoc Committee the Provost's

5

Office has organized regarding the self-authored Textbook Policy. We

3	are looking for nominees from all
4	over campus, and we are looking
5	both for nominees who have authored
6	textbooks and also those who have
7	not. So please send those names to
8	Sheila, preferably by this Friday,
9	along with the information about
10	whether the person has authored a
11	textbook or not. Senate Council
12	will choose those nominees at the
13	meeting on this coming Monday.
14	We also are going to hear
15	although it was supposed to be
16	Monday, but it looks like it'll
17	pushed back a week. We're going to
18	hear from Professor Patrick Lee
19	Lucas from the College of Design
20	who's the current Chair of the Core
21	Committee, who is going to report
22	to the Senate Council on the
23	activities of the Core Committee so
24	far this year. And he may well also
25	come to the Senate a little later

Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter

1	in the semester, arthough it might
2	be more like the fall before the
3	Senate hears from him. I just
4	wanted to let you know we are in
5	touch and they are actively meeting
6	and working. Another announcement
7	the Senate Council heard last week
8	was, as you know, the Council on
9	Postsecondary Education is the
10	state level body that does
11	curriculum approval work and
12	educational policy at the state
13	level. And the faculty have a
14	repetitive on that body. Our
15	current repetitive is Dr. Bob Staat
16	who is from the University of
17	Louisville in the College of
18	Dentistry over there. And he wrote
19	to let us know that he's been
20	appointed chair of the CPE's
21	Committee on Equal Opportunity. So
22	he is also hard at work, and he is

23	your repetitive on the CPE, so you
24	can also always feel free to reach
25	out to him. And let him know we

	7
1	have some technical difficulties as
2	well.
3	I also wanted to let you know
4	that Aaron Cramer and I have been
5	working on a committee organized by
6	Annie Davis Weber about prior
7	learning assessment. And so this is
8	specifically thinking about ways
9	that, as a curricular matter, we
10	might provide credit to students,
11	incoming students or transfer
12	students, for work that they had
13	done outside of the university
14	setting. This is at the very
15	earliest stages. And so we're first
16	having conversations about what

17	this might look like, and then
18	we'll conversations well, we're
19	already having conversations with
20	people across campus who are
21	interested in doing this. So if you
22	have specific interest in this or
23	your program is considering this,
24	please let Aaron or me or Annie
25	know so that we can include you in

d

### Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.♠

8 1 these conversations early on. So 2 please reach out, also, to your colleagues and your various 3 4 colleges and let us know if this is 5 something that you're interested in 6 so we can make sure to sort of keep as wide of group of people informed 7 as possible. Although, you know, 8 9 ultimate decisions about this will 10 be made through the Senate Council as other curricular decisions are 11

12	made.
13	Our deadlines: One has passed.
14	We're past the deadline for new
15	degree proposals to get to the
16	Senate Council office through those
17	academic councils. However, there
18	are still two deadlines ahead of
19	us. If you're looking for a new
20	Undergraduate or Graduate
21	Certificate Program, changes to
22	departments, new departments,
23	changes to credit hours required
24	for graduation, other kinds of
25	significant program changes, things

9	

1	that would have to go through
2	committees, but not to the Board of
3	Trustees, have a deadline of March
4	16th.
5	This is so obnoxious. I'm

6	really sorry, you guys. We'll see
7	if we can do something about it for
8	March.
9	April 13th is our deadline for
10	all other program changes, minor
11	program changes, courses, things
12	like that that don't have to go to
13	committees.
14	I just don't know where the
15	problem is. The connection on this
16	end goes into a black box we can't
17	see, so we can't check that.
18	So keep those deadlines in
19	your mind and share them with your
20	department chairs, colleagues,
21	things like that, anybody
22	interested in making proposals
23	through the Senate.
24	I'm very excited to report
25	that we have a new Senate Council

1	Vice Chair, DeShana Collett.
2	Professor DeShana Collett from the
3	College of Health Sciences has been
4	elected to fill the remainder of
5	Professor Jennifer Osterhage's
6	term. Congratulations, DeShana.
7	And so she will continue that
8	term which goes through May 31st,
9	and then she'll pick right back up
10	and start her next term as vice
11	chair. She had already been elected
12	to serve in this position for the
13	next school year. So she is
14	starting early and is already our
15	vice chair.
16	Another sort of announcement
17	to you, as you might remember, the
18	Senate Rules give the Senate
19	Council the authority to take some
20	calendar-related actions, as long
21	as we report them to you. And so we
22	did that this past Monday. These
23	are related to the item that's
24	later on the agenda that is a
25	Senate Rule change about calendar

	11
1	items. We changed some registration
2	windows, in particular for non-
3	degree students and for some online
4	programs. And we changed the
5	application deadline for
6	graduation. So the graduation
7	deadline, meaning the deadline to
8	apply for graduation, either for
9	undergraduate or graduate students,
10	that is now April 1st. That's a
11	change that's already been made for
12	this spring semester. So for spring
13	2020, students who wish to graduate
14	in the May 2020 graduation must
15	apply for graduation by April 1st.
16	This is a very important deadline.
17	Please let as many people know
18	about this as you can. I expect
19	we'll hear some information about

20	this from the Registrar's Office
21	soon, but please spread that
22	deadline widely to your students,
23	to your colleagues. We want to make
24	sure people don't miss the deadline
25	so that we don't have to scramble

1	to fix the graduation list after
2	the fact. So April 1st is the
3	deadline for spring 2020.
4	It is also, as we will talk
5	about a little later, the deadline
6	to graduate in the summer. So that
7	is a new deadline as well. It used
8	to be the case that you could apply
9	to graduate in the summer late in
10	the summer, so in July. That is not
11	going to be true anymore. So if you
12	want to graduate in the summer of
13	2020, the application must be in by
14	April 1st. So there is no late-

15	summer degree list anymore, which
16	might be something you remember
17	from before. We could talk about
18	this a little later when we talk
19	about the Senate Rule change, the
20	proposed one from the Registrar's
21	Office, but the idea is if any
22	student expects to be eligible to
23	graduate in the summer, they should
24	put in an application. There's no
25	penalty to apply and then not

	13
1	actually graduate. So if you have,
2	for example, PhD students who are
3	expecting to defend dissertations
4	in the summer, they should put in
5	application to graduate, even if
6	they're, as of yet, uncertain about
7	defending that dissertation.
8	There's no penalty for putting that

9	application in and then not
10	actually graduating in the summer.
11	So apply early and often for
12	graduation is the message.
13	We've been saying we were
14	going to do this for a while. The
15	Senate Council has been very busy.
16	Our meetings have been full. We
17	have not yet gone through the
18	nominations for committees, but
19	that is on the agenda for this
20	coming Monday, a week from today.
21	It will happen at that meeting and
22	will be early on the agenda in that
23	meeting on the 17th.
24	Thanks to all of you who sent
25	in nominations. We are still thin

	14
1	on the Area Committee nominations.
2	Those need full professors, and we
3	just don't have that many of them.

4	We don't have that many
5	nominations. We don't have that
6	many on this campus, that's not
7	true. But we need those names, so
8	we need names of people who are
9	willing to do this. This is really
10	important work, and it's only full
11	professors who can serve in this
12	capacity. So please consider
13	whether you might nominate yourself
14	or whether you have other
15	colleagues who would be interested
16	in serving in this really important
17	role. A reminder: These are the
18	committees that review tenure and
19	promotion files, and it's important
20	it's built into our ARs for all
21	of the tenure and promotion
22	applications. So if you have
23	questions about what this work
24	entails, Associate Provost G.T.
25	Lineberry is the person who sort of

1	supervises this work and organizes
2	it, coordinates it. He'd be very
3	happy to talk to you about it. He
4	gets a little stressed out about
5	our lack of nominees for these
6	committees, so he would love to
7	talk to you about it. And we need
8	them, really, in all areas of
9	research and teaching. So right now
10	we have holes in, effectively,
11	every area committee. So regardless
12	of what your field is, we have
13	needs for someone in your field to
14	serve on this committee. So please
15	consider adding additional
16	nominees. If we could get those
17	from you by Friday, this Friday,
18	then we would be able to consider
19	them on Monday. So, please, again,
20	share this need with your
21	colleagues and think about
22	nominating others.

23	I told you at our last Senate
24	meeting that we were going to
25	engage in this course purge. So

1		this is removing from the list of
2		available courses, courses that
3		haven't been taught I don't have
4		the details up here. We talked
5		about it last time. Is it four
6		years, Sheila?
7	BROTHERS:	A total of eight.
8	BIRD-POLLAN:	Say it again.
9	BROTHERS:	Total of eight years.
10	BIRD-POLLAN:	A total of eight years. If it
11		hasn't been taught for a total of
12		eight years, it'll be removed, but
13		you can object to the removal. The
14		thing is, what we're trying to do
15		is create an Excel spreadsheet that
16		we can share with everyone that's
17		organized by department, rather

18	than merely course prefix so that
19	it'll be easier for you and your
20	colleagues to review these
21	materials. So right now we just
22	have a course prefix list, and we
23	didn't really want to send that to
24	you. So we're still working on it.
25	Once we get a nice, clean

17 spreadsheet that'll be easier for 1 2 people to handle, you'll receive 3 that. It'll go out to senators. It'll also go out to our curricular 4 5 contacts in the colleges. We'll 6 send it to deans, department 7 chairs, people like that. Yeah? 8 BROWN: Alan Brown, Arts & Sciences. 9 Just want to be clear. Eight 10 consecutive, not total of the --11 BIRD-POLLAN: If it's been more than eight

12		years since the last time it was
13		taught, exactly. So what we're
14		looking for is courses that are
15		just not being taught anymore,
16		trying to get a more accurate list
17		of available courses in our
18		inventory. Yes?
19	BARRETT:	Susan Barrett, A&S. Did we
20		I can't remember if we had dates
21		yet, or are we waiting until this
22		comes out?
23	BIRD-POLLAN:	Well, we haven't given you the
24		date you mean the dates that are
25		available to review the list?

18 No. The dates when you need to 1 BARRETT: 2 make -- the departments need to let you know prior to --3 Well, we haven't created those 4 BIRD-POLLAN: dates because we haven't given you 5 the information yet. So we had

7		hoped it was going to be out to you
8		already, but because we want to
9		give you a more accurate list, we
10		haven't done that yet. So once we
11		have that, you should look out for
12		the email from me or from Sheila
13		about that. We'll put it in the
14		newsletter. We'll make sure
15		everybody has lots of information
16		about when it's coming out and when
17		we need to hear back from you by.
18		Our provost, unfortunately,
19		couldn't be here today, so we do
20		not have a Provost's Report. Vice
21		Chair Collett, any report?
22	COLLETT:	No report.
23	BIRD-POLLAN:	Our Parliamentarian is also
24		unavailable today. One of our
25		Trustees is here, Mr. Grossman.

1		Then we will turn to our first
2		action, an In Memoriam Degree.
3		Associate Dean Mohr-Schroeder is
4		here from the College of Education. Do
5		you want to come briefly describe this
6		application? Just a as a reminder:
7		We have written into our Senate
8		Rules the possibility to award In
9		Memoriam Honorary Degrees to
10		students who are in good-standing,
11		but not eligible to earn a degree
12		when they passed away.
13	MOHR-SCHROEDER:	The College of Education is
14		requesting a degree awarded
15		posthumously to the student. He
16		attended from fall 2016 through a
17		span of 2019. And he passed away on
18		August 8th of 2019, prior to the
19		start of the fall semester. At the
20		end of the spring semester, he had
21		completed 56 credit hours and is in
22		good-standing with the university
23		and with the college. Since he only
24		had completed 56 credit hours, he's
25		not eligible for his degree, but

1 the college requests an In Memoriam 2 Honorary Degree. 3 BIRD-POLLAN: Any questions about that 4 proposal? Thank you, Margaret. 5 So we have a motion on the floor that, again. Remember this is 6 7 for an honorary degree, and so it's 8 only elected faculty senators who 9 can vote on this one. The motion, which is coming to us from the 10 11 Senate Council is that the 12 recipient, LK11, be award an In Memoriam Honorary Degree in May 13 2020, and then you'd submit that 14 15 through the president to the Board of Trustees. 16 Any debate on that motion? Any 17 18 debate? We'll open that for voting. 19 Again, remember faculty senators, elected faculty senators. Any 20

21	remaining votes? Any last votes?
22	Motion passes. Thank you very much.
23	So the next item comes to us
24	from the College of Social Work. So
25	you might remember a few years ago

1	we approved a new degree program.
2	It's not really a new degree
3	program. It's a Master's in Social
4	Work Program, but it's being
5	offered in Fort Sam Houston, Texas,
6	through our College of Social Work.
7	And this whole program is happening
8	through a contract we have with the
9	U.S. Army, that the university has
10	with the U.S. Army. So this group
11	of students, on the degree list
12	that you saw, with the agenda for
13	today, they have their own
14	graduation ceremony in Fort Sam

15	Houston, and it happens in April.
16	They finished their coursework in
17	April and they have a ceremony. And
18	Provost Blackwell will travel to
19	Texas to sort of officiate at this
20	graduation-like ceremony.
21	Now, these students will still
22	have a May 2020 graduation, and
23	their diplomas will be dated May
24	2020. However, what the College of
25	Social Work is asking is that we

22 approve this degree list now, send 1 2 it to the Board of Trustees for 3 their February meeting so that the language that Provost Blackwell 4 5 uses at the graduation ceremony can be the same as the language that 6 7 President Capilouto uses at the 8 ceremony we have in Lexington so he 9 can say, as recommend to me by the

10		University Senate and approved by
11		the Board of Trustees, you earned
12		these degrees. Again, just like in
13		the May ceremony and December
14		ceremonies, contingent on the
15		registrar confirming that all of
16		the graduation requirements have
17		been satisfied. So we're not
18		changing the graduation date. What
19		we're doing is approving a degree
20		list early, if you vote to do that.
21		You saw the list. Are there any
22		questions about what we're doing
23		here? Any questions of fact about
24		this motion? Yes?
25	BROWN:	Roger Brown, College of Ag. Is

this something we're going to do on a regular basis, and is this an option that we anticipate would be

4		available to any other programs
5		that wanted to have an off-cycle
6		graduation date?
7	BIRD-POLLAN:	I'm not going to answer that.
8		I think that's up to the Senate in
9		every instance to decide whether it
10		wants to approve this request or
11		not. So, you know, I think in this
12		instance Chris Flaherty is here
13		from the College of Social Work. He
14		might explain why in this
15		particular scenario College of
16		Social Work asked for this.
17	FLAHERTY:	Yes. Actually, it's part of
18		the contract. These are all active-
19		duty military officers who are
20		going on to immediately on to
21		following assignments where they
22		
		will be doing a two-year supervised
23		will be doing a two-year supervised internship for getting their
23 24		

1		would get their degrees conterred
2		immediately so that when they
3		arrive at their next duty stations,
4		that they have that credential and
5		are able to start practice under
6		supervision.
7	BROWN:	Can I follow up?
8	BIRD-POLLAN:	Yeah.
9	BROWN:	So will this be something that
10		comes every spring?
11	FLAHERTY:	Yes, as long as we have the
12		contract.
13	BIRD-POLLAN:	Or it should say every spring
14		the College of Social Work will
15		have a list of names like this. I
16		think the particular procedures of
17		when we approve this list is
18		something that Senate Council
19		already talked about whether we
20		would want to put this in the list
21		with the December graduates, or
22		whether we want to continue to do
23		this is an off-cycle timeline like

24	this	5.	So whethe	er	you'll	always	see
25	it i	in	February	or	not,	I'm not	

25 1 sure, but I do think the College of Social Work will always be asking 2 3 to have these names approved 4 earlier than the degree list. 5 FLAHERTY: It would be the second-tothird week of April of each year. 6 7 BIRD-POLLAN: Is when the ceremony will 8 happen. 9 BROWN: So did you say this is in the contract with UK? Is this already a 10 foregoing conclusion? 11 12 BIRD-POLLAN: Well, I'm going to answer that. The answer is no, because 13 they're not getting diplomas in 14 15 April. So if you approve this degree list today, then Provost 16 Blackwell can say, as already 17

18	recommend to me by the Senate and
19	as approved by the Board of
20	Trustees, you will earn your
21	degrees when the Registrar
22	certifies you've completed the
23	requirements. Last year there was
24	an April ceremony. You had not
25	approved this list yet. We approved

26

this list with our May degree 1 2 candidates, and so -- and it was 3 actually Vice Provost Holloway who went down and did the ceremony that 4 5 time. And he had to use extremely 6 careful language not to promise anything that hadn't happened, even 7 the though the fact of that 8 9 instance is the students had 10 completed their requirements, but 11 the list did not come to the Senate or the Board of Trustees. So he had 12

13		to say assuming things go
14		correctly I wasn't there. Were
15		you at the ceremony?
16	FLAHERTY:	Yes.
17	BIRD-POLLAN:	So I think there was very
18		careful language that's how it
19		was explained to me to be sure
20		not to promise degrees that had not
21		been voted on. So it's now a
22		foregoing conclusion. If you decide
23		not to vote in favor of this today,
24		then the list will come to you
25		again in May. Yes?

1	FERRIER:	Wally Ferrier, B&E. We had
2		some precedence for this with our
3		what once was a University of
4		Kentucky MBA program in Athens,
5		Greece for 15 years. So I don't
6		know if the Senate had done this

7		prior to that, but Dave Blackwell,
8		when he was dean of our college,
9		had done the same kind of thing
10		over and over again.
11	BIRD-POLLAN:	Any other factual questions
12		about the proposal here?
13		So then we have a motion from
14		the committee that the elected
15		faculty senators again, just the
16		faculty approve the spring 2020
17		list of Social Work candidates for
18		graduates from Fort Sam Houston for
19		submission through the president to
20		the Board of Trustees.
21		Any debate on that motion? Any
22		debate? We'll open that one for
23		voting. Any remaining votes? Again,
24		faculty senators.
25		Motion passes. Thank you.

2	degree-related item. You'll
3	remember we see these occasionally.
4	We had a clerical error. There was
5	a student who should've graduated
6	with an MA in the December 2019
7	degree list, and merely by clerical
8	error, it was left off of that
9	list. We think maybe the faculty
10	member selected the wrong
11	graduation year or something like
12	that from the drop-down list. In
13	any case, it was merely clerical,
14	and so College of Arts & Sciences
15	has asked to have this student
16	there'll be an amendment of the
17	December 2019 degree list to add
18	this particular student for the MA
19	in Hispanic Studies. Any factual
20	questions about that proposal? Any
21	questions of fact?
22	Then we have a motion from the
23	Senate Council that the elected
24	faculty senators amend that
25	December 2019 degree list by adding

29

1 the MA of Hispanic Studies for 2 student GA69 and recommend through 3 the president to the Board of 4 Trustees that that degree awarded effective December 2019. 5 6 Any debate on that motion? Any 7 debate? And I'll open that one for 8 voting. Again, faculty senators, 9 please. Any remaining votes? Motion passes. Thank you. 10 We'll move on to committee 11 reports. Our first is Aaron Cramer 12 and the Academic Programs 13 Committee. 14 15 CRAMER: I've got four items today. The first is a recommendation that the 16 17 University Senate approve for submission to the Board of Trustees 18 the establishment of a new MA 19 20 degree in Orientation and Mobility

21	in the Department of Early
22	Childhood, Special Education and
23	Counselor Education within the
24	College of Education. Orientation
25	and Mobility describe the ways in

1	which individuals with visual
2	impairments know their position and
3	space and move within their
4	environment. The proposed program
5	with prepare instructors to address
6	the orientation and mobility needs
7	of children with blindness and
8	visual impairments, individuals
9	with complex needs and adults with
10	vision loss. The program includes
11	courses offered synchronously
12	online, face-to-face weekends and
13	intensive summer classes held at UK
14	and at the Kentucky School for the
15	Blind. At the end of the program,

16	students will complete an
17	internship in educational or
18	rehabilitation settings as needed
19	for national certifications as
20	Certified Orientation and Mobility
21	Specialists. There's a present
22	demand to increase the number of
23	specialists in this area by more
24	than 8,000, while existing programs
25	are currently only preparing about

1		250 professionals per year. An
2		initial enrollment of 8 students
3		growing to 12 is anticipated.
4	BIRD-POLLAN:	So I think we have Professor
5		Lee here to answer any questions
5		you might have. Any questions of
7		fact regarding this proposal?
3		Then we have a motion from the
9		committee that the Senate approve

10		for submission to the Board of
11		Trustees a new MA in Orientation
12		and Mobility in the Department of
13		Early Childhood, Special Education
14		and Counselor Education with the
15		College of Education.
16		Any debate on that motion? Any
17		debate? I'll open that one up for
18		voting. Any final votes? Any last
19		votes?
20		Passed.
21	CRAMER:	The next item is a
22		recommendation that the University
23		Senate approve for submission to
24		the Board of Trustees the
25		establishment of a new MS degree, a

teacher preparation program in

visual impairments in the same

department of Early Childhood and

Special Education and Counselor

5	Education within the College of
6	Education. The proposed teacher
7	preparation program in visual
8	impairments is designed to train
9	teachers of the visually impaired
10	to work with children from
11	preschool through graduation. The
12	proposed program supported by the
13	Kentucky Department of Education
14	consists of ten core courses,
15	followed by a final course for
16	student teaching and field
17	experience. The program will be
18	offered, again, with synchronous
19	classes, face-to-face weekends, and
20	intense summer courses at UK and at
21	the Kentucky School for the blind.
22	The previously existing teacher
23	certifications program in this area
24	has been high demand having
25	certified 59 teachers since its

1		start in 2013, With severe
2		shortages in Kentucky and
3		nationally. Cohorts of
4		approximately 15 students is
5		anticipated.
6	BIRD-POLLAN:	So Professor is Lee is here
7		for this one as well if you have
8		any questions. Any factual
9		questions about this proposal? Any
10		factual questions?
11		Then we have a motion that the
12		Senate approve for submission to
13		the Board of Trustees the
14		establishment of a MS Teacher
15		Preparation Program, again, in the
16		Department of Early Childhood,
17		Special Ed and Counselor Ed within
18		the college of education.
19		Any debate on that motion? Any
20		debate? We'll open that for voting.
21		Any final votes?
22		Motion passes.
23	CRAMER:	The next is a recommendation

24	that	the	Unive	rsit	y S	enate	approve
25	for	submi	ission	to	the	Board	d of

1	Trustees the establishment of a new
2	MS degree in Supply Chain
3	Management in the Department of
4	Marketing and Supply Chain within
5	the Gatton College of Business and
6	Economics. Kentucky's one of the
7	logistics hubs in the country due
8	to its central location. There are
9	nearly 500 logistics or
10	distribution operations throughout
11	the state employing more than
12	60,000 workers. The projected job
13	growth rate in this area in the
14	next five years is more than 13
15	percent. The proposed one-year
16	program has been developed in
17	cooperation with the College of
18	Engineering. I recall that two

19	weeks ago we approved an MS in
20	Supply Chain Engineering that was
21	developed collaboratively with this
22	proposal. The program here features
23	9 hours of common core courses
24	shared with that MS in Supply Chain
25	Engineering, 15 hours of business-

35

1 specific core courses, 3 elective 2 hours and then 3 hours of Capstone Industry Project. Initial 3 4 enrollment of 20 students growing 5 to 40 as anticipated. 6 BIRD-POLLAN: We have Professor Haoying Sun 7 in the back here as the proposer to 8 answer any questions you might 9 have. Any questions of fact regarding this degree? Yes? 10 11 FERRIER: Wally Ferrier, B&E. In general, I'm curious, is there a 12

13		minimum number of projected and
14		sustainable students to make a
15		master's degree go?
16	CRAMER:	I would say that that's
17		probably not exactly a Senate
18		question. So one of the things that
19		is part of the approval process, we
20		require a letter of administrative
21		feasibility, our statement of
22		administrative feasibility from the
23		dean of the college. And so if the
24		dean is willing to sort of commit
25		the resources necessary to offer

		,
1		the program, then we generally say
2		the dean's committed to providing
3		the necessary resources.
4	FERRIER:	Thank you.
5	BIRD-POLLAN:	Any other factual questions?
6		Then we have a motion that the
7		Senate annrove for submission to

8		the Board of Trustees this new MS
9		in Supply Chain Management in the
10		Department of Marketing and Supply
11		Chain within the Gatton College of
12		Business and Economics.
13		Any debate on that motion? Any
14		debate? And we'll open this one for
15		voting as well. Any last votes? Any
16		final notes?
17		Motion passes.
17 18	CRAMER:	Motion passes.  This one is not another
	CRAMER:	·
18	CRAMER:	This one is not another
18 19	CRAMER:	This one is not another master's program. It's a bachelor's
18 19 20	CRAMER:	This one is not another master's program. It's a bachelor's program. This is a recommendation
18 19 20 21	CRAMER:	This one is not another  master's program. It's a bachelor's  program. This is a recommendation  that the University Senate approve
18 19 20 21 22	CRAMER:	This one is not another  master's program. It's a bachelor's  program. This is a recommendation  that the University Senate approve  for submission to the Board of

2	process that drives innovation,
3	builds business success and leads
4	to a better quality of life.
5	There's significant demand for
6	graduates in this area in Kentucky,
7	but there are no current degree
8	programs in the state. Product
9	designers are employed wherever
10	products are produced, and creating
11	a pool of local design talent will
12	create space for new businesses to
13	emerge. The proposed 120-hour
14	program involves sequences of
15	design studios, supportive
16	coursework, technical classes and
17	specialized courses with advancing
18	complexity in pneumatic areas, such
19	as ergonomics, history and theory
20	and design visualization. An
21	initial 18 students growing to 93
22	students is anticipated. I guess in
23	this instance, it's a multi-year
24	program. That's as it build out as
25	cohorts move through.

1	BIRD-POLLAN:	So we have Dean Vernon and
2		David Pienkowski here to answer
3		questions about this proposal. Any
4		factual questions about this
5		proposal?
6	JONES:	Davy Jones, Toxicology. Is
7		this a bachelor's degree tagged at
8		the college level?
9	CRAMER:	I think that's right. Yes.
10	BIRD-POLLAN:	Any other factual questions?
11		Then we have a motion that the
12		Senate approve for submission to
13		the Board of Trustees the
14		establishment of a new BS in
15		Product Design in the College of
16		Design.
17		Any debate on that motion? Any
18		debate? Then we'll open that one
19		for voting. Any remaining votes?
20		Motion passes.
21		Next committee report comes

22	from Zach Bray, the Senate Academic
23	Organization and Structure
24	Committee with a proposed name
25	change of the Department of

1		Statistics.
2	BRAY:	Thanks, Jennifer. So the
3		motion to endorse the name change
4		came in front of the committee. The
5		Department of Statistics seeks to
6		change its name to the Dr. Bing
7		Zhang Department of Statistics. Dr.
8		Zhang is a '91 and a '94 graduate
9		of the department, and he and his
10		spouse have signed an agreement to
11		contribute 6.35 million to advance
12		the quality and prominence of the
13		Department of Statistics. That is
14		in addition to two endowed
15		professorships, funds for endowing

16	department chair, graduate student
17	support, graduate fellowship and
18	visiting professorships that are
19	covered by this gift. The vote at
20	the committee level was 7 in favor
21	with 3 abstentions, none against.
22	And at Senate Council the debate
23	was there was one abstention. I
24	have 8 folks in favor at Senate
25	Council. I could be off. Sheila

		46
1		will correct me, I'm sure.
2		Bill is here with us. Bill
3		Rayens is the Department Chair to
4		answer questions about the proposal
5		that I can't.
6	BIRD-POLLAN:	So we have Dr. Rayens here
7		from the Department of Statistics,
8		the Department Chair, Dr. Betty
9		Lorch is here, the Associate Dean
10		of the College of Arts and

11		Sciences, and Dr. Bill Swinford is
12		here as well to answer questions
13		that might have more to do with
14		administration, either with the
15		president's office or the provost's
16		office.
17		So are there any factual
18		questions about the proposed name
19		change? Yeah?
20	DEBSKI:	Liz Debski, A&S. I'm just
21		wondering how many other
22		departments in A&S have names
23		associated with it?
24	LORCH:	There are none. I believe
25		there's one other denartment in the

1		university that has a name
2		associated with it, but there are
3		none
4	DEBSKT:	But this is the first

5	LORCH:	named in the college.
6	BRION:	I'm just wondering how long
7		are these Gail Brion. How long
8		are these names for? I mean, should
9		someone else rise to prominence? Do
10		we have any administrative guidance
11		on this?
12	BRAY:	You know, other people who
13		other people should certainly
14		weight in here. The agreement is
15		similar to a similar agreement that
16		was before the Senate in terms of
17		its perpetuity. I guess I would
18		note about this change, so it is
19		it seeks to be perpetual. And I
20		can't remember what clause it is,
21		but because this is a department
22		and it's conceivable that it could
23		be merged into another department,
24		I believe you'll correct me if
25		I'm wrong, or others. I believe

1		that there is language that
2		contemplates that the name could be
3		preserved even if the department is
4		merged with another department. So
5		to the extent that sheds light on
6		the nature of it.
7	LORCH:	So, as I read in the
8		agreement, another name could
9		potentially be added if that was
10		appropriate, but this one would
11		stay.
12	BRION:	Thank you.
13	BIRD-POLLAN:	Davy?
13 14	BIRD-POLLAN: JONES:	Davy? Davy Jones, Toxicology. Just a
		•
14		Davy Jones, Toxicology. Just a
14 15		Davy Jones, Toxicology. Just a little more broadly, we've
14 15 16		Davy Jones, Toxicology. Just a little more broadly, we've revisited several times now this
14 15 16 17		Davy Jones, Toxicology. Just a little more broadly, we've revisited several times now this question of it's actually an
14 15 16 17 18		Davy Jones, Toxicology. Just a little more broadly, we've revisited several times now this question of it's actually an absence of policy and structure
14 15 16 17 18 19		Davy Jones, Toxicology. Just a little more broadly, we've revisited several times now this question of it's actually an absence of policy and structure around naming in educational units.
14 15 16 17 18 19		Davy Jones, Toxicology. Just a little more broadly, we've revisited several times now this question of it's actually an absence of policy and structure around naming in educational units. We have a college or two now. We've
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21		Davy Jones, Toxicology. Just a little more broadly, we've revisited several times now this question of it's actually an absence of policy and structure around naming in educational units. We have a college or two now. We've got Martin School, departments,

		43
1		meeting last week to get ahead on
2		policy. Where does it this next?
3		Name a degree? A minor? Can I buy a
4		course? We got a chance to get out
5		in front of some of that, and I
6		think the provost would welcome the
7		Senate's help with that.
8	BIRD-POLLAN:	Bill, do you want to say
9		anything about that?
10	SWINFORD:	Well, I'm Bill Swinford from
11		the President's Office. I think the
12		president almost certainly would
13		welcome the conversation to begin
14		to build some scaffolding around
15		these conversations. I believe the
16		point is very well-taken.
17		Absolutely.
1 Q	DERCKT.	liz Dahski 185 Is thana a

19	so the name is in perpetuity. Is
20	there a way that I hate to bring
21	this up, but if a donor got in some
22	kind of trouble, like other donors
23	have done, is there a way to for the
24	university to back out of this? I
25	didn't see that in the agreement,

actually.

1		actually.
2	BIRD-POLLAN:	Tom, did you want to say
3		something about that?
4	BARKER:	Sure. Tom Barker, Office of
5		Philanthropy. I like the way you
6		introduce yourself. That's nice.
7	BIRD-POLLAN:	Tom is also a graduate of the
8		College of Law.
9	BARKER:	So it's a real treat to be
10		here, and thanks for your questions.
11		I think, yes, there's a way to
12		unwind what we do. I think we saw

13

that once before with the

14	administration appropriately,
15	swiftly. You may recall the incident
16	with John Schnatter, Papa John's. He
17	made a significant gift. But we saw
18	a problem and our president moved
19	swiftly there. So we did unwind that
20	and return the funds that weren't
21	spent. And I think even though the
22	agreement doesn't contemplate
23	formally a termination, there would
24	be certain precedence for doing
25	that, and I think given the

	45
1	temperament of this administration,
2	they would do that in the event of
3	something that our continued
4	association with Dr. Zhang would
5	undermine the institutional
6	credibility and reputation. So I
7	think we've seen that before. We do

8		contemplate if he's unable to
9		complete his pledge, that the naming
10		would be removed. Did that address
11		the question?
12	DEBSKI:	Not really, actually, because I
13		just remember in some agreement with
14		the law school that there was
15		specifically something in it that
16		said that if the donor got in
17		trouble, you know, that had nothing
18		to with fulfilling the amount of
19		money that the donor gave that could
20		be withdrawn, but I didn't actually
21		see that. I saw a clause having to
22		do with what you said, if the donor
23		doesn't fulfill the financial
24		obligation, but I guess I'm more
25		worried about a case like the

46

1 Schnatter case.

2 BIRD-POLLAN: I'm going to turn it back over

3		to Zach for a minute.
4	BRAY:	Well, Tom, look, I mean, this
5		is observation is a little grand.
6		This is a question for you, but is
7		it accurate I mean, because this
8		has come up at the committee a
9		couple times, but is I have it in
10		my hands, you don't. So this is not
11		fair. But paragraph 13 in this
12		agreement is the change in
13		circumstances. That language, I
14		think is similar to the change in
15		circumstances language in the law
16		school agreement. Would it be
17		accurate or may be inaccurate? I
18		don't want to pin your office or
19		this institution down to an absolute
20		position, but would it be accurate
21		to say that Paragraph 13 provides
22		some basis for the kind of changes
23		that you're suggesting if we get
24		into another, what the committee has
25		been referring to as the "Papa John

1		situation."
2	BARKER:	I think there's several
3		variance powers, you know, in the
4		event of I'm fortunate I brought
5		my copy. The event that fulfillment
6		of the purpose becomes unlawful,
7		impossible, wasteful or obsolete as
8		determined by our Board of Trustees.
9		The endowment was created to be
10		expended to the point exhaustion.
11		And so we include these in all of
12		our endowment agreements. I'm not
13		sure this is a factual point, but I
14		think this whole conversation about
15		naming, we've talked about what we
16		call a morality clause. And it's
17		difficult to insert such a
18		provision. Who's judge? Who's jury?
19		We should ask ourselves that. And so
20		I think there are known institutions
21		that are certainly naming theirs

22	perhaps more quickly than we are. So
23	we do due diligence to move forward
24	if our continued association would
25	be improper.

1	YOST:	Scott Yost, Engineering. If we
2		vote, what's the ramification if
3		this were to be key?
4	BIRD-POLLAN:	So this is an endorsement
5		question. The determination is made
6		by the Board of Trustees. It's not
7		an educational policy matter since
8		it's not related to a specific
9		degree item. So the Board of
10		Trustees I think is interested to
11		hear with the faculty have to say
12		through the voice of the Senate, but
13		this is an endorsement. So it will
14		go to the Board of Trustees on
15		Friday, either with the Senate's
16		endorsement or without it. Although,

17	I suppose the President's Office
18	could make a decision to change the
19	agenda on the Board of Trustees if
20	there were not a signed endorsement.
21	Remember when we're talking about
22	as Davy like to remind me so an
23	academic policy component we would
24	have so, for example, when we've
25	created centers here, we both

		49
1		approved the academic content of the
2		center and endorsed the creation of
3		it as an administrative matter, so
4		this is an administrative matter.
5		Yeah?
6	FIREY:	Abagail Firey, Arts and
7		Sciences. I would think that in the
8		event of a no-vote, it would be
9		appropriate to have a motion from
10		the floor to constitute a committee

11		of faculty and administration to
12		explore the policy question.
13	BIRD-POLLAN:	On this particular item?
14	FIREY:	Not on this particular item.
15		The general policy questions related
16		to naming academic units after
17	BIRD-POLLAN:	We could certainly do that
18		either way. We could do that whether
19		there's no vote here or not.
20	DEBSKI:	Liz Debski, A&S. Could I ask
21		one more question about whenever
22		the donor gives money, a large
23		amount of money, is it always that
24		they get the name in perpetuity? Is
25		the donor asking for the in

		50
1		perpetuity, or is there a sum of
2		money that you have to go above to
3		get in perpetuity?
4	BIRD-POLLAN:	Do you want to answer this,
5		Betty?

6	LORCH:	Yeah. Betty Lorch from A&S and I
7		represent the dean here, but feel
8		free to correct me if I have any of
9		my information wrong. My
10		understanding is that the dean
11		sought this and proposed this. This
12		is a donor who has given to the
13		department for some time now, and
14		his motivation is very much have the
15		department do what is going to be
16		best for it and its faculty for its
17		students and advance that. So the
18		donor really doesn't want anything
19		here in the sense, but that really
20		wants what's best for the
21		department. And so, really, it was
22		more the dean and the department's
23		proposal that they would like to
24		associate the donor's name with the
25		department, that that was something

1		that would be kind of something
2		notable for the unit itself. But the
3		donor is very hands-off in the sense
4		of he wants the department to making
5		the decisions about how these monies
6		are used to advance the department.
7		So I hope that answers your
8		question, but that's what I know.
9	BIRD-POLLAN:	Do you want to say something
10		about that, Bill, about the
11		department's relationship to Dr.
12		Zhang?
13	RAYENS:	Bill Rayens, Statistics. Well,
14		I think what Dean Lorch said is
15		correct. Bing did not come to us and
16		ask to have a department named after
17		him. Part of the answer you didn't
18		get and I don't know the number
19		or if it's a college rule or
20		university rule, there's a certain
21		amount of money someone can donate
22		in order to qualify for a name. And
23		it's a certain percentage of the
24		entire budget of the department. Do

52 of your -- 20 percent. He had 1 2 offered that money, and I believe 3 the college approached him and said, 4 you know, for money at this level, 5 we could name the department after 6 you. But that doesn't answer your 7 question about naming the department 8 after you for, you know, 20 years or 9 30 years or forever. As far as I 10 know, that's not been discussed at 11 an administrative level. Yeah. I mean, what's going to 12 DEBSKI: happen if in five years you have 13 14 somebody who gives a larger amount? 15 **RAYENS:** Those are really good questions, but just to clarify that, 16 17 Dr. Zhang, he doesn't know the answers to these questions. He's 18 just following what he considers to 19

20		be the drum beat of the university.
21	LORCH:	But as stated earlier, the
22		agreement seems to read that if that
23		were to happen, there could be a
24		second name associated with the
25		department. It would not stand in

bor Reporting & video rechnologies, inc. \*

53

1 the way of that. 2 BRAY: I think this gets into --3 Senator Debski's on the committee. I 4 don't know to what extent you were 5 asking about the rubric or not, which is not something that we've 6 7 talked about. I don't want to make 8 your question for you, but I mean, 9 that is something that consider at the committee level. The other 10 point, too, relevant to this issue, 11 and I should've mentioned it up 12 front, but the conversation that our 13

14		committee had about the name change,
15		we spent a lot of time with Bill
16		talking about the level of support
17		in the college, and I believe the
18		vote was 15 to 2. And the support
19		for the sort of idea of naming and
20		perpetuity, I think, was pretty
21		substantial throughout the college
22		as well. In other words, the people
23		who didn't vote
24	BIRD-POLLAN:	The department?
25	BRAY:	For the department. Excuse me.

		54
1		The people who voted not were still
2		generally okay. I don't want to
3		characterize your colleagues, but
4		the idea of naming and perpetuity
5		was not a particular problem for at
6		least one of the no-votes.
7	GROSSMAN:	Bob Grossman, Trustee. There is
8		precedent for renaming something

9		that has already been named, and
10		when the football stadium was named,
11		there was C.M. Newton's name was
12		moved from the field to the grounds
13		or something. I don't remember the
14		exactly details because I don't
15		follow football, but there was
16		his name was removed from something
17		that was previously named after him
18		so that someone else's name could be
19		attached to that. And that was done
20		with the agreement of the Newton
21		Family. So there is precedent for
22		that. Are we still in fact?
23	BIRD-POLLAN:	We are. We are supposed in the
24		fact-finding, yes. We do not have a
25		motion on the floor yet. That's

55

1 right. Any other factual questions?

2 Yes?

3	UDVARDY:	Monica Udvardy, Anthropology.
4		Does anybody know what universities
5		do on this question of naming and
6		what happens if a moral issue comes
7		up concerning that person?
8	BIRD-POLLAN:	Tom, do you have observations
9		about this?
10	BARKER:	Somewhat, but I think all
11		universities struggle with this. So
12		I think some has to do with
13		administrative regulations,
14		government regulations, depending on
15		how their regulations are
16		established. In a recent conference
17		I asked that question to my
18		colleagues in a room bigger than
19		twice this size. And I said, who in
20		this room are giving morality
21		clauses in their agreements? Zero
22		hands. And these are all the largest
23		schools in the nation, so I think
24		it's something that we're struggling
25		with as we're turning to private

Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter

1		philanthropy to really support our
2		faculty, and that's what Dr. Zhang
3		is doing with his gift. And one
4		question that he asked me, what
5		would you guys what would you
6		like? And so we asked him to
7		structure things, because he
8		believed he was supported by the
9		faculty. His gifts are all to the
10		faculty and also to graduate
11		students. But to your point, I think
12		all universities are struggling with
13		it, and I think we have precedence
14		on what we choose to do if a bad
15		situation comes up.
16	BRADY:	Christian Brady, Honors. This
17		is sort of a commentary discussion
18		based
19	BIRD-POLLAN:	Well, we're still in the
20		factual questions.
21	BRADY:	Oh, the factual question. Well,
22		and I will say, Penn State

23	University, I know these sorts of
24	matters are defaulted to the Board
25	of Trustees. And one way going

57

1 forward might be for there to be a 2 university policy governing it, that 3 way we wouldn't have to have a 4 morality clause in the actual gift 5 agreement, because the gift 6 agreements always do say in line 7 with university policy and procedures, so... 8 9 Any other factual questions? We BIRD-POLLAN: can move on to the debate if -- oh, 10 11 one more question. 12 POOL: Chris Pool, A&S. So if a policy were created for a morality clause 13 sort of thing, that it's a policy, 14 generally, in the university, then 15

16

that would apply retroactively? Is

17		that my understanding?
18	BRADY:	I don't know.
19	BARKER:	So, I think we'd have to look
20		at it; right? You'd have to know
21		what was written and then respond to
22		how it was written. Could it be made
23		retroactively? That's a good
24		question.
25	POOL:	I mean, would something like

58 1 this be grandfathered in so that 2 regardless of what we do subsequently, would the name be attached in 3 4 perpetuity? And I'm just wondering 5 what the attachment creating a 6 policy would be; would it be related? Those are my suggestions. 7 8 MCCORMICK: Katherine McCormick, College of 9 Education. I'd like to speak in 10 favor of --11 BIRD-POLLAN: We're not at the debate yet.

12	MCCORMICK:	Oh, I thought you were.
13	BIRD-POLLAN:	No, still factual. Any factual
14		questions? Any factual questions?
15		Yes?
16	JONES:	Davy Jones, Toxicology. We do
17		have already on the board governing
18		regulations and ethical principle
19		statement. Does that attach into
20		this agreement?
21	BIRD-POLLAN:	Tom?
22	BARKER:	So the agreement made is
23		subject to all university policy.
24	BIRD-POLLAN:	Any other factual questions?
25		Yeah?

1 UDVARDY: Monica Udvard, Anthropology.
2 What does that ethical statement
3 say?

4 JONES: I don't have that memorized.

5 BIRD-POLLAN: What? That's it, Davy. You're

6		out of here.
7	GROSSMAN:	He's already out of here.
8	UDVARDY:	And I have another questions.
9		So was it Dr. Zhang who wanted the
10		department to be renamed?
11	BIRD-POLLAN:	No. That's what they were
12		saying earlier, that it was the
13		dean.
14	UDVARDY:	Okay. I see.
15	BIRD-POLLAN:	Yes?
16	BROWN:	Alan Brown, Arts & Sciences. So
17		if I understood correctly, we don't
18		have any sort of precedent not
19		just at the University of Kentucky,
20		but elsewhere in the country of
21		people putting in morality clauses
22		or what will happen if someone wants
23		to donate twice as much. I mean, is
24		that what I understood? Did I

1		don't
2	BIRD-POLLAN:	I think Tom is saying he's not
3		aware of any such current policies
4		at other universities.
5	BROWN:	So then from there, it would be
6		interesting and I don't think
7		this is for debate. I think this is
8		more factual to see how those
9		clauses might affect the donors on
10		how much they give, whether they
11		want to give. It surprises me that
12		as a country, for hundreds of years
13		we've had universities, that we
14		don't say we don't have an out
15		for, hey, we're no longer aligned
16		with your values or morals or
17		whatever the case may be. If that
18		doesn't exist, then I wonder if the
19		reason why that is is that, oh, the
20		donor is hesitant, potentially, to
21		donate. I don't know. That's
22		conjecture
23	BIRD-POLLAN:	We can go home a nonprofits law
24		class and Tom and I could teach you
25		all about what happens when I

1		mean, there are all sorts of cases
2		where, you know anyway. Sorry.
3		But there are lots of cases about
4		this happening. So it's not I
5		think the question is is it being
6		written into current agreements. And
7		just because it isn't being in
8		written in the current agreement
9		doesn't mean courts aren't willing
10		to do deal with that.
11	WALKER:	We're not suggesting that
12		others institutions don't have a
13		policy. I'm suggesting that it's
14		very difficult because as soon as
15		you propose one in a document,
16		they're not willing to sign it. Why
17		would they? So it's very difficult
18		to negotiate. It's very
19		discouraging.

20	BIRD-POLLAN:	So factual questions? Sounds
21		like we have a lot of interest in
22		having larger conversations about
23		this. And as Davy already pointed
24		out, it sounds like Bill and Tom
25		were open, too, maybe we'll create

62

1 either an Ad Hoc Committee or have a 2 larger conversation that includes 3 the administration and the Senate 4 for the policies here. Factual 5 question? DONOHUE: Yeah. Kevin Donohue, College of 6 Engineering. Just had question based 7 8 on the latter comment. Does the donor agreement include the name change? 10 BARKER: 11 Yes. 12 DONOHUE: Oh, it does? Okay. Subject to the Board of 13 BARKER: Trustees' approval.

15	BIRD-POLLAN:	Any other factual questions
16		before we move to debate? Any other
17		factual questions?
18		So now we have a motion from
19		the committee that the Senate
20		endorsed the proposed name change of
21		the Department of Statistics to the
22		Dr. Bing Zhung Department of
23		Statistics. Yeah?
24	MCCORMICK:	Katherine McCormick, College of
25		Education. So I'm going to speak in

favor of this. I understand that 1 2 there are questions, but I believe 3 that that is unfair for this program 4 to hang all of those broader 5 questions around this proposal. My 6 second is that it has been endorsed 7 by a committee of our peers who've 8 looked at this carefully. It has

9		been endorsed by the department in a
10		vote of 13 to 2 15 to 2.
11	BARKER:	15.
12	MCCORMICK:	So the department are the
13		people who would be most impacted by
14		this gift, and I believe that I want
15		to trust my peers. And we can have a
16		larger conversation on another day,
17		so I endorse it.
18	BRADY:	Christian Brady, Honors. I
19		would also endorse it. Again, like I
20		said, and also trusting the
21		knowledge Dr. Zhang has been engaged
22		with our department here in the last
23		few years, but there is a strong
24		relationship. That being said, these
25		are valid concerns and questions, I

think, both with donor with future
giving in mind, as well as
university designers. Could be

4		addressed within university policy,
5		so it doesn't have to go in the
6		future gift agreement. So I think we
7		have to trust the long relationship
8		that Dr. Zhang has had with the
9		department and our colleagues
10		already vetted this ahead of us.
11	BIRD-POLLAN:	Any debate on the motion? Yeah?
12	GROSSMAN:	Bob Grossman, Trustee. I would
13		also speak in favor of this. We have
14		several examples of successful, named
15		departments and colleges, and
16		there's no reason to think this
17		would be any different. And we do
18		have a precedent, as the person from
19		Philanthropy pointed out, that the
20		university can take action our
21		association with the individual
22		becomes no longer to our advantage.
23	BIRD-POLLAN:	Scott?
24	YOST;	Scott Yost, Engineering. I'm
25		going to speak against it, only

1	just out of principle. Any time we
2	name a building or a lab or
3	something like this, I've always
4	been marginally against it, ever
5	since we named our Civil Engineering
6	Building back in 1998. I think it's
7	just and I know we've let the cat
8	out of the bag, but there are all
9	these issues when it comes to, like,
10	a donor comes up tomorrow and wants
11	to give more money, I mean, if we're
12	willing to take have a bidding
13	war, and someone else comes
14	tomorrow, and let's remove his name
15	and let's put another name on there.
16	Let's use that for an opportunity to
17	raise funds for the university and
18	let the donors bid against each
19	other. It just opens up a bunch of
20	can of worms that you don't want.
21	And don't get me wrong, I would like
22	to think that Dr. Zhang walks on

23	water. I would hope that he does,
24	okay, but that still doesn't mean we
25	name anything after a donor

1		whatsoever. So that's just my
2		opinion.
3	BIRD-POLLAN:	Yeah? Your name, please?
4	PEFFER:	Yeah, I'm getting there. Sean
5		Peffer, Von Allmen School of
6		Accountancy and the Gatton College
7		of Business. The cat's out of the
8		bag. I mean, this was 15 years
9		ago or something that Douglas
10		Von Allmen bought the School of
11		Accountancy. So I agree with it. It
12		has to be thought about, especially
13		since I'm also from the college that
14		Papa John in it; right? So I believe
15		that has to be thought about, but
16		I'm not sure hanging it on this one
17		is the place to hang it. So bringing

18		it up as a separate issue seems to
19		be a really good idea and something
20		we need to think about.
21	BIRD-POLLAN:	Any other debate on the motion?
22		Any debate? Yeah?
23	FARRELL:	I'm endorsing it as well.
24	BIRD-POLLAN:	Your name?
25	FARRELL:	Herman Farrell, College of Fine

67 Arts. I'm endorsing it as well, 1 2 because the naming of it doesn't 3 seem problematic to me. If there's 4 any academic issues, curriculum 5 issues related to it, then I'd be 6 full stop and we would have a long discussion. But since it is about 7 naming it as coming from somebody's 8 who had a history with the 9 10 department, I see no problem with that. In an age where state money 11

12	continues to go down in terms of its
13	endorsement and support, and if
14	deans are finding ways to come up
15	with solutions for funding our
16	educational interests, then I have
17	no problem with them naming part of
18	it. It's just when you start to tip
19	over into academics and any other
20	question about any faculty or
21	anything like that, then I've got a
22	big problem with it. But for the
23	sake of what I've heard so far, it
24	seems like it's a clean proposal, so
25	I endorse it.

1	DEBSKI:	Liz Debski, A&S. And so I would
2		also like to make clear that as a
3		member of the committee who vetted
4		this, I also endorse this proposal.
5		And I would just like some of the
6		issues to be addressed. I think

7		going forward, we're getting a lot
8		of these donors coming forward, and
9		I understand they're wonderful
10		opportunities. People are working
11		very hard to bring money in to the
12		university, but I do think that we
13		do need to, at least maybe
14		someone's done it, but they haven't
15		communicated to us what are the
16		actual rules for this naming
17		process. And so I would really like
18		these issues to be addressed, but I
19		absolutely agree that it should be
20		hung on this proposal to do so, and
21		it's just an opportunity to bring
22		those issues forward.
23	PIENKOWSKI:	David Pienkowski, Engineering.
24		The Department of Biomedical
25		Engineering was renamed the F.

1		Joseph Halcomb III, M.D., Department
2		of Biomedical Engineering. The
3		department's recruitment of faculty
4		and students has been materially
5		aided by that gift.
6	YOST:	Scott Yost, Engineering, again.
7		While the faculty, students, the
8		whole university would be aided by
9		gifts, I don't think it's aided by a
10		name, person. It's the money that
11		brings the people. It's not the name
12		and person. And so the Board of
13		Trustees is going to do what they're
14		going to anyway, which is fine. I
15		think as faculty, I don't think we
16		need to be in this game of but
17		we're endorsing, we're not
18		endorsing. Board of Trustees of
19		still going to do what they want to
20		do, so
21	BIRD-POLLAN:	Any debate on that? Any debate?
22		Then we will open that motion for
23		voting. Any last votes on this one?
24		Remaining votes?
25		Motion passes.

		70
1		So the next item on the agenda
2		is something that comes to us from
3		the Registrar's Office.
4		Unfortunately, she couldn't be here
5		today, so I'm going to present this
6		motion and we'll see whether I or
7		is Mike Shanks here today?
8	BROTHERS:	He was.
9	BIRD-POLLAN:	All right. If there are
10		questions that can't be answered,
11		then we can postpone the vote on
12		this, but I will try to you had a
13		document explaining what the
14		registrar is asking for here. This
15		is a proposed change to our Senate
16		Rules regarding the application
17		deadline for degrees.
18		So you remember just a few
19		minutes ago I told you about a
20		calendar change that the Senate

21	Council voted on last week, which
22	was to change the application
23	deadline for both the spring and the
24	summer to April 1st. And if you look
25	at the Rule change you want to

1	just pull this up so I can show
2	people what we're doing here?
3	So the language that we have right
4	now says that the deadline for
5	application for a degree will be no
6	more than two months prior to the
7	conferral date for December, May and
8	August. The idea of changing to an
9	April 1st deadline for the summer
10	means we have to change that
11	language. If we're going to have an
12	April 1st deadline, it will be more
13	than two months before August
14	1st, generally, or something like

15	that, which is the graduation date
16	for the summer, so that's why we
17	have to eliminate this. I'll just
18	tell you briefly why we're
19	interested in moving to the April
20	1st deadline for application for the
21	summer and why the Registrar's
22	Office has proposed this change.
23	I'll tell you that Sheila and Joanie
24	and Stephanie and I have had
25	conversations with the President's

	72
1	Office and lots of people from the
2	Registrar's Office about this
3	problem.
4	So, if you remember, every year
5	at the first Senate meeting of the
5	year, we vote on what we call the
7	second summer degree list; right? So
3	that is the list of people who
9	applied later in the summer to

10	graduate in August. But, of course,
11	by then, we're already six weeks
12	past the August graduation date, and
13	the Board of Trustees doesn't meet
14	until later than that. So the actual
15	conferral of the degree, even though
16	it's going to be dated August 1st,
17	they don't actually get, sort of,
18	the actual diploma or their
19	transcript that says they've
20	graduated until everything has gone
21	through the Board of Trustees. So
22	this means that people who have, for
23	example, jobs that require
24	demonstrating that they've
25	graduated, this is the teachers. We

had a recent example of someone who
had received an offer of a tenure-
track position at another

4	university, who was required to then
5	instead of being a tenure-track
6	assistant professor, had to spend a
7	year as a lecturer because she
8	couldn't demonstrate that she'd
9	earned her PhD before she started.
10	So all these sorts of bureaucratic
11	technical problems arise because the
12	Senate hasn't voted on the degree
13	list, the Board of Trustees hasn't
14	voted on the degree list before the
15	summer graduation deadline.
16	So the registrar's proposal to
17	solve this problem is to have
18	everyone who would graduate in the
19	summer apply by April 1st, which
20	then allows the Senate and the Board
21	of Trustees to vote on those degree
22	lists well in advance, which means
23	effectively immediately August 1st,
24	or whatever the date is. The
25	registrar can start checking whether

1	the requirements have been satisfied
2	and then start issuing those
3	degrees. So that's why they're
4	asking for this change. And in order
5	to operationalize that going
6	forward, they have to remove this
7	requirement that applications for
8	degrees be no more than two months
9	before the graduation date. So
10	that's my articulation of what the
11	request is.
12	Are there factual questions
13	about what the change would be here?
14	And I should also say, even though
15	what that means is there won't be an
16	actual date in the Senate Rules about
17	the graduation deadline. That's true
18	about a number of things that have to
19	have dates attached to them. And so
20	every year the Senate Council sees
21	the calendar, both for the coming
22	year and a tentative calendar for two
23	years out, so the Senate Council is

24	reviewi	ing the	ese anr	nually,	and	they
25	will ch	heck th	nings ]	like wh	at is	the

75 deadline for applying for degrees and 1 does it comply with what our Senate 2 3 Rules are; any other factual questions about that? 4 5 WEBER: It says "deadliness." BIRD-POLLAN: Deadliness? Where? 6 "Registrar will publicize the 7 WEBER: deadliness." 8 9 BIRD-POLLAN: That's hilarious because that's 10 not a change, so... The "S" is red. 11 GROSSMAN: 12 BIRD-POLLAN: They're fixing it. 13 14 WEBER: I'm sorry. 15 BIRD-POLLAN: They're correcting the deadliness. They will publicize that 16 applying for degrees is deadly. Annie 17

18		Weber says applying for degrees
19		should not be deadly. Thank you.
20		Any other factual questions
21		about this proposal? Yes?
22	FARRELL:	Herman Ferrell, College of Fine
23		Arts. This gives the university
24		registrar flexibility with regard to
25		the deadline for graduates and

76 1 undergraduates, and you're saying 2 that what we understand now, it will 3 be April 1st; is that correct? BIRD-POLLAN: Correct. For the summer and for 4 5 the spring, yes. 6 FARRELL: But those are university-wide? 7 BIRD-POLLAN: They're university-wide for undergraduate and graduate degrees, 8 9 yes. So there's no chance that we've 10 FARRELL: 11 opened up the opportunity for varying 12 deadlines college to college? Or is

13		that a silly question?
14	BIRD-POLLAN:	Well, it says the university
15		registrar will recommend appropriate
16		deadlines for Senate Council
17		approval, and that will still be
18		true. So I suppose if the dean of the
19		college wanted to propose to the
20		registrar, our college should have a
21		different date. My understanding of
22		conversations with the registrar is
23		right now she would say no way, but I
24		supposed a future registrar could
25		still do that. I'm not sure that

	77
1	would be, then, a change from what
2	the policy would've permitted
3	beforehand, maybe just a wider range
4	of dates than would've been available
5	beforehand.

6 FERRELL: I'm just thinking 15, 20 years

7		down the line. Having varying degree
8		deadlines for different school, it
9		could be very confusing to the
10		students.
11	BIRD-POLLAN:	Absolutely. And I think, you
12		know, one of the things that the
13		Senate Council, I think, is trying to
14		do when it reviews those calendars
15		annually is see how transparent our
16		deadlines are and see how easy to
17		understand this would be for students
18		or for faculty who have to comply
19		with deadlines. So I think it's
20		this still requires the Senate
21		Council to approve the calendar. It
22		just gives more flexibility to the
23		registrar about when to set the
24		deadline.
25	BARRON:	Susan Barron, A&S. So we're

2		to a set deadline if they might know
3		over the course of time that it's
4		going to change?
5	BIRD-POLLAN:	Well, I think the goal for the
6		summer would always be April 1st and
7		winter would always be November 1st,
8		but I think that's not going to be
9		written into the rules because if
10		November 1st were a Sunday, that
11		wouldn't be the deadline. It would
12		probably be November 2nd or something
13		like that. So I think
14	BARRON:	I worry about the moving target a
14 15	BARRON:	I worry about the moving target a little bit on that.
	BARRON: BIRD-POLLAN:	
15		little bit on that.
15 16		little bit on that.  Well, there is more there is
15 16 17		<pre>little bit on that.  Well, there is more there is a moving target now as well; right?</pre>
15 16 17 18		<pre>little bit on that.  Well, there is more there is a moving target now as well; right? So if you go up in her explanation,</pre>
15 16 17 18 19		<pre>little bit on that.  Well, there is more there is a moving target now as well; right? So if you go up in her explanation, she says this is the explanation</pre>
15 16 17 18 19 20		little bit on that.  Well, there is more there is a moving target now as well; right?  So if you go up in her explanation, she says this is the explanation for why she wants this. It's always
15 16 17 18 19 20 21		little bit on that.  Well, there is more there is a moving target now as well; right?  So if you go up in her explanation, she says this is the explanation for why she wants this. It's always going to be April 1st for the spring
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22		little bit on that.  Well, there is more there is a moving target now as well; right?  So if you go up in her explanation, she says this is the explanation for why she wants this. It's always going to be April 1st for the spring and summer. It's always going to be

1	BARRON:	Is on a Sunday?
2	BIRD-POLLAN:	A Sunday. It wouldn't be that
3		day, but I think the goal would be
4		that it would always be that day or
5		close to it.
6		Now, I will tell you that the
7		conversations that many of us have
8		had with the registrar is that we
9		have to do a better job of publishing
10		this deadline and making sure that
11		students know about it; right?
12		Because what we often do of fixing
13		the degree list is as problem created
14		by the fact that people don't know
15		what the deadlines are; right? And we
16		are making the deadline earlier for
17		the summer, so there's a little less
18		room for error there. So it is
19		extremely important that we make sure
20		people know about this.

21	So we can all help with that,
22	but I hope the registrar will take
23	whatever action possible to make sure
24	that deadline's publicized. Any other
25	factual questions about this change?

1	So we do have a motion from the
2	Senate Council, and the motion is to
3	approved those proposed changes to
4	the Senate Rules for both
5	undergraduate and graduate degrees.
6	Any debate on that motion? Any
7	debate? Then I'll open that up for
8	voting. Any remaining votes? Any last
9	votes?
10	Motion passes.
11	So that was the last vote we
12	have today. The last item on the
13	agenda, I'm going to ask Allison
14	Soult to come to the podium.
15	So the reason this is discussion

16	only at the moment is because the
17	Senate Council did not have an
18	opportunity to discuss this at our
19	meeting last week, and I think we in
20	the Senate Council wanted to have an
21	opportunity to have a conversation
22	about this in our committee before
23	officially making a recommendation to
24	the Senate. However, because it was
25	already on the agenda and because we

	81
1	knew this would be a relatively short
2	meeting compared to some of the ones
3	we'll have in a few weeks or months,
4	we wanted to share this with you now,
5	and Allison has been working on this
6	for a long time, along with Katherine
7	and some other people across campus,
8	which Allison will describe to you.
9	So at this point, this is really

10		a discussion item, but we would
11		really love to hear your feedback,
12		both in person in this meeting and if
13		you think about things over the next
14		couple of weeks, share them with
15		Allison or with me or others. So I
16		will turn the floor over to Allison.
17	SOULT:	Thank you. So this started a few
18		years ago when we were in
18 19		years ago when we were in Undergraduate Council and reviewing
		,
19		Undergraduate Council and reviewing
19 20		Undergraduate Council and reviewing course proposals, and we were seeing
19 20 21		Undergraduate Council and reviewing course proposals, and we were seeing lots of different things written.
19 20 21 22		Undergraduate Council and reviewing course proposals, and we were seeing lots of different things written.  There was text language that was very

	82
1	changing target, and also there was a
2	lot of or some discrepancies about
3	what was required in a course
4	syllabus. So three of us from the

5	Undergraduate Council went through,
6	basically, the Senate Rules, and we
7	found every place that recommended
8	anything or required anything in the
9	syllabus, both in the Senate Rules,
10	as well as the template from the
11	Senate website, from the Ombud's
12	Office, all of those places, and
13	tried to compile it all in one place
14	and make sure it was clear. I think a
15	lot of things we found in reviewing
16	courses was that it wasn't that
17	people intentionally didn't want to
18	include something in their syllabus.
19	They just didn't know they needed to
20	include something in their syllabus,
21	or they didn't know that it would
22	save them a lot of hassle on the
23	other end at the Ombud's Office if
24	they just put these two sentences in
25	their syllabi to prevent a lot of

1	issues that were going on. So we went
2	through this, and this has been an
3	ongoing process working with the
4	Ombud's Office with Undergraduate
5	Council and Graduate Council, and
6	it's been reviewed by HealthCare, the
7	HCCC and working with various people
8	across campus trying to figure out,
9	well, what is actually required in a
10	syllabus. And it turns out there are
11	several things listed in the Senate
12	Rules that are required. The just
13	don't happen to be all in one place.
14	And so the goal of this is primarily
15	to kind of compile all that
16	information in one place, and to
17	clarify anything that was kind of
18	ambiguous by the way it was presented
19	before. So it's basically taking
20	information and putting it into
21	6.1.1, and in that, there are
22	references back to where the original
23	rule was, so if there's something

24	that's suggested there. But this wa
25	it puts everything in one place.

1	So say a new faculty member
2	who's creating a syllabus or a person
3	who hasn't updated their syllabus in
4	some time and needs to refresh that,
5	that they can now go to one place and
6	find everything that they need in
7	their syllabus. I mean, I think it's
8	been like a year and a half since I
9	was on Undergraduate Council. We were
10	still seeing Jake Karnes' name and
11	people sending the ARC students to
12	the Alumni Gym, which at that time
13	was really kind of a problem since it
14	was a construction zone. And Jake's
15	not been here at the university for
16	some time, so there was a lot of
17	outdated information. So part of
18	this, we'll say, here's what has to

19	be in the syllabus. And in lieu of
20	the eight pages of boilerplate that
21	we feel like we're getting in our
22	syllabi now, there is a website that
23	Sheila has put together very nicely,
24	that will have those Senate Rules,
25	the things that have to be in there

1	regarding academic integrity,
2	regarding the Disability Resource
3	Center regarding the rules for
4	excused absences. So, for example, we
5	added the new policy about interviews
6	for a full-time job being an excused
7	absence, and that just never made it
8	into most people's syllabi, so a lot
9	of students weren't aware of it. So
10	they were actually seeing conflicting
11	information in a different syllabi or
12	missing information, and this way

13	there's one URL. You don't have to
14	use the URL. You can continue to put
15	the pages of boilerplate in your
16	syllabi should you so choose, but if
17	you don't want to do that, you can
18	say university policies, relevant
19	university policies that you need to
20	be aware of and responsible for
21	knowing are at this link, and Sheila
22	and her lovely wisdom will make sure
23	that when there is a rule change here
24	that impacts one of those, that that
25	gets updated on the web page so it's

	86
1	always up to date and that students
2	are getting that information so they
3	have that when they need it. They
4	know what that information is.
5	There's also a page the other
5	issue is a lot of people have put a
7	lot of nosquinces in their cyllahi

8	some of which some people know about
9	and some people don't know about
10	others, and so we're getting a lot of
11	mixed information. So there's a
12	separate web page, which is not
13	required, but it's made available to
14	faculty should they choose to put a
15	URL in there, and working with other
16	offices. So there is a statement
17	about the Title IV policy. That came
18	from the Registrar's Office, the
19	statement about the LGBTQ Center came
20	from there, the Veteran Resource
21	Center, working with those different
22	offices. So they've kind of
23	constructed those statements so that
24	they would have accurate information.
25	And, again, if office locations

2		change, it's easy to update it in one
3		spot. And that way you can give
4		students a lot of information by
5		sending it to a couple URLs and
6		knowing it's up to date. And then it
7		saves you a lot of time not having to
8		go through and nit-pick every rule to
9		make sure you've got every single
10		thing updated every time you teach a
11		course.
12		So that's kind of the overview,
13		so we're hoping to update the rule,
14		put everything in one place. So it's
15		really just compiling everything into
16		one spot to make it easier for
17		everyone. So I'm happy to answer any
18		questions or take suggestions.
19	BROWN:	Alan Brown, Arts and Science. So
20		what you're saying is if we give our
21		students a paper copy of the
22		syllabus, like on the first day of
23		class, we can just have the link?
24	SOULT:	Yep. So whether you give it
25		paper or electronic, you can use the

88 URL. The Ombud's Office has reviewed 1 2 that and said, yes, that is -- you 3 just say these policies are also, you 4 know --5 BROWN: Found here. SOULT: Found here, part of this course 7 syllabi. And technically, they're 8 part of the Senate Rules, so whether they're in there or not, they're 10 still bound to them, but they're the ones that we need to make sure 11 12 students are aware of. 13 BROWN: You don't have to reproduce them 14 as they're --15 SOULT: Correct. And so the Ombud has 16 said that works for them. 17 **BROWN:** Nice. I had a question about the 18 FARRELL: 19 proposal that I saw in the key. Is it 20 possible to pull that up?

Which part?

21

BROTHERS:

22	FARRELL:	Just the actual language of the
23		proposed change to the rules. Scroll
24		down. Here it is. Does everyone see?
25		"Except for programs and courses that

1		have rules that supercede the
2		requirement." I just had a question
3		about that new proposed language.
4		Because it seems to me that the
5		exception negates all the
6		requirements. So I
7	SOULT:	So this is sorry.
8	FARRELL:	want to know what the
9		qualifications are for programs and
10		courses that have rules that
11		supercede these requirements.
12	SOULT:	So this is primarily in colleges
13		that have Honor Code, that the so
14		for academic integrity, and I believe
15		College of Law, College of

16		Journalism, Pharmacy. Some programs
17		have an Honor Code, which actually is
18		more restrictive than this. So they
19		wouldn't need to include the link to
20		the Academic Integrity Policy that
21		the vast majority of us use. They're
22		going to link to their Honor Code
23		Policy that applies to them.
24	FARRELL:	I understand that that there's
25		probably already established programs

90 1 that have these exceptions. I'd be 2 curious to know how they do that. You 3 know, the idea of the rules, do they allow you to go away from what Honor 4 Rule is here? And it seems like this 5 language right here invites me, 6 7 someone who's in charge of my cores, 8 to supercede the requirements, just 9 by putting it in as an exception. I just don't know if --10

11	BIRD-POLLAN:	Well, I think we should hear
12		I think that's a really good point,
13		Herman. And what we need to clarify
14		is that except for programs and
15		courses that have rules articulated
16		in the Senate Rules that supercede
17		the requirements.
18		So every college on campus that
19		has those different rules, it's
20		articulated in the Senate Rules.
21	SOULT:	It's in the Senate. Okay.
22	BIRD-POLLAN:	So we should make sure that's
23		clear. Thank you for that. Yes?
24	OLTMANN:	Shannon Oltmann, College of
25		Communication Information. Just to

follow up on that, does that line

just refer to colleges that have

courses or does it refer to

individual courses that have rules

5		that supercede?
6	BIRD-POLLAN:	Again, if there were such a
7		course that had a rule, for whatever
8		reason, whether it was because some
9		accreditation requirement that had
10		some separate policy, I mean, it's my
11		view that would have to be in the
12		Senate Rules. So I don't think there
13		are currently any courses that have
14		policies
15	SOULT:	I'm not aware of any.
16	BIRD-POLLAN:	in the Senate Rules
17		themselves. Everything is at the
18		level it's actually at the college
19		level.
20	SOULT:	At the college level.
21	BIRD-POLLAN:	I mean, I supposed there could
22		be programs
23	SOULT:	Maybe a department, but it's
24		primarily at the college level. I'm
25		not aware of any course listings that

1		have the special policies.
2	BIRD-POLLAN:	But we should be clearer about
3		that.
4	SOULT:	It's just something that's
5		enumerated in the Senate Rules
6		elsewhere.
7	OLTMANN:	And then my actual question was
8		the link, is the link the same for
9		undergraduate, graduate and
10		healthcare courses?
11	SOULT:	Yes, because those are the
12		policies they're basically copied
13		verbatim from the University Senate
14		Rules that apply to all except fo
15		the carve-out for those
16	OLTMANN:	Okay.
17	SOULT:	Yeah. So the language is the
18		same.
19	POOL:	Chris Pool, A&S. First of all,
20		this is wonderful. It's so useful to
21		have
22	SOULT:	It's only taken, like, two
23		years.
24	DIDD DOLLAN:	And a lot of work by a lot of

93

## Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.♠

1		this with Allison and Sheila worked
2		really hard on this, a lot of people
3		in Undergraduate Council.
4	POOL:	I'm also TA coordinator for my
5		department, and in that capacity,
6		it's been really useful to have
7		boilerplate language that I can point
8		to for their syllabi. And so my
9		question is will the syllabus
10		template remain and be updated as
11		rules change, or is this going to
12		supercede that or just replace it
13		completely?
14	SOULT:	Well, the template is still
15		there because there's still other
16		things that you have to put in the
17		actual document, your name, the
1 있		course information

19	BIRD-POLLAN:	Turns out there's no Senate Rule
20		that you have to put your name it.
21	SOULT:	The link will be in the
22		template, but they can click on the
23		link and find that text as well. So
24		that will still be there. That ways
25		it's in one spot.

1

BIRD-POLLAN:

And I think the idea would be

2		the template will continue to be
3		updated as necessary if there are
4		changes to the rules and things. And
5		at the end, this document that Sheila
6		will be sort of monitoring on our
7		website will also be updated.
8	POOL:	I think this will really help.
9	BIRD-POLLAN:	Yes.
10	BARRON:	Susan Barron, A&S. So is it
11		premature to mentioned this to
12		departments? Is there a timeline? Is
13		it next semester that we're aiming

14		for? Do you know?
15	BIRD-POLLAN:	I mean, this is sort of ready to
16		go live. We need to change the Senate
17		Rule, but as I said, I think the
18		Senate Council would appreciate a
19		chance to discuss it among ourselves
20		at one of our meetings. So this could
21		come on to the Senate agenda as soon
22		as the next meeting, our March
23		meeting. And if that were true, then
24		we would change the Senate Rule and,
25		you know, Sheila has made the website

		9:
1		and it's ready to go live, so we can
2		make that available, you know, once
3		the Senate votes to change it.
4	SOULT:	And there's nothing in here tha
5		people aren't already doing. So this
6		is not a radical change, so if people
7		didn't get the message and they were

8		still putting that stuff in their
9		syllabi next fall, it's okay. There's
10		nothing wrong with that. It's just
11		more work for them.
12	BIRD-POLLAN:	There's no policy
13	SOULT:	There's no
14	BARRON:	Then there's a change the
15		students will actually read the
16		syllabus if we don't have all that in
17		there.
17 18	SOULT:	there.  Exactly. And that way they're
	SOULT:	
18	SOULT:	Exactly. And that way they're
18 19	SOULT:	Exactly. And that way they're getting the same information every
18 19 20	SOULT:	Exactly. And that way they're getting the same information every time. Everybody has the same link, so
18 19 20 21	SOULT:	Exactly. And that way they're getting the same information every time. Everybody has the same link, so they're seeing the same hopefully,
18 19 20 21 22	SOULT: BRION:	Exactly. And that way they're getting the same information every time. Everybody has the same link, so they're seeing the same hopefully, some of it will sink in. Wishful

96

do have to provide paper copies to

our students of our syllabi --

3	SOULT:	You don't have to provide paper.
4		You have to provide a copy. It can be
5		electronic.
6	BRION:	I provide paper for those that
7		don't have a computer handy. But this
8		would reduce the amount of copying
9		paper that I have to
10	SOULT:	For those people who do choose
11		it, yes, it does make a significant
12		difference.
13	BIRD-POLLAN:	Roger?
14	BROWN:	I think the Senate Rules already
15		I'm sorry. Roger Brown, College of
16		Ag. The Senate Rules already have a
17		way for Senate Council to act on
18		behalf of the Senate to make changes,
19		even to Senate Rules, so in
20		principle, I'd like the committee and
21		the Senate Council to reconsider the
22		merits of the language that gives
23		explicitly the Senate Council the
		1 ,
24		authority by itself just to make

1	if it was an emergency, the other
2	rule would cover this. And if it
3	wasn't an emergency, this ought to be
4	something that just comes before the
5	Senate as a matter of force.
6	And then the other thing is, as
7	someone on the SREC that looks at a
8	lot of these Senate Rules, I'm not
9	sure I'm real happy to see optional
10	information on the syllabi in the
11	Senate Rules. I understand that there
12	could be an argument for that if it's
13	sort of in the same location for
14	people as a reminder, but maybe that
15	website would serve that function in
16	a more public way, where in my
17	experience, a lot of people don't
18	even read the Senate Rules. So if the
19	website's there, maybe that would be
20	enough to include the optional
21	information without cluttering the

22		Senate Rules with optional
23		information.
24	BIRD-POLLAN:	The lean, mean Senate Rules.
25		Thank you, Roger.

1	CHARNIGO:	Richard Charnigo, Public Health.
2		Two comments of details of this
3		document. First, it's stated that the
4		syllabus should be made available by
5		the first day of class, which in
6		general, makes a lot of sense. But in
7		the spring semester, if there is a
8		Monday-only class, the consequences
9		that the students might not see the
10		syllabus until after the end of the
11		drop/add period. That is potentially
12		a concern. The second issue I wanted
13		to mention is that there's a
14		copyright statement and example of a
15		copyright statement that basically
16		says the student should only use the

17	instructional material for as long as
18	they're in the course. I would
19	hesitate to give that as a template.
20	I could imagine, for example,
21	graduate students taking the core
22	course, and then wanting to use the
23	materials to prepare for their
24	comprehensive exam, and I wouldn't
25	want them to feel that they couldn't

1		or shouldn't do that per an
2		inadvertent addition to the template
3		in the Senate Rules.
4	SOULT:	There was nothing changed about
5		the date. The current language is
6		about from the first of classes, and
7		I'm not sure it's very clear whether
8		it's the first day of classes for the
9		semester or the first class meeting
10		of the semester. So that might be

11		part of the issue. While we're
12		cleaning up, that might be something
13		to look at. I'm trying to find where
14		the copyright
15	BROTHERS:	It's at the very end.
16	SOULT:	And that was listed as part of
17		the optional information. So if
18		somebody wanted to put that in their
19		syllabi, if they didn't want people
20		using it afterwards, then they could
21		put that in there. If you were to
22		say, hey, I want my graduate students
23		to have access to this forever, then
24		you could just omit that statement.
25		There was nothing

1	CHARNIGO:	Sure, but some people might cut
2		and paste.
3	BIRD-POLLAN:	Yeah. We can think about that.
4		Yes?
5	YOST:	Scott Yost, Engineering. I think

6	this great that we have kind of a
7	central clearing house. What I'm
8	concerned or, I guess, have we
9	asked legal about his in this
10	context? You know, we have the
11	University Bulletin, which is a legal
12	document, and if we have something
13	that's a discrepancy, you know, we
14	always go back to the legal document.
15	We enforce the rules in the Bulletin.
16	With the web page, if there's more
17	detailed language that may not be
18	covered in the Senate Rules, for
19	instance, if they have language or
20	the boilerplate information, would
21	the web page be considered still a
22	legal standard where if there was a
23	discrepancy or a student wanted to
24	bring a case, could we refer back to
25	something that was on the web page,

1		but not necessarily in the Senate
2		Rules, and still have the support of
3		type I have no idea what that
4		would be, but some type of
5		disagreement or some type of conflict
6		between a student interpretation or
7		not.
8	SOULT:	Well, everything on the one
9		website is actually from the Senate
10		Rules.
11	BIRD-POLLAN:	Well, that's how it's supposed
12		to be, but I think your question is
13		what
14	SOULT:	What if there was something
15		else?
16	BIRD-POLLAN:	if one gets updated and the
17		other doesn't, or something like
18		that.
19	SOULT:	Yeah. As it stand right now,
20		everything is actually from the
21		Senate Rules, it's just instead of
22		saying go read the Senate Rules to
23		the students, it's here are some
24		things are really, really important

102 1 are directly from the Senate Rules. 2 So we're just reproducing them in a 3 easier-to-read format. 4 BIRD-POLLAN: But I think that's a good 5 question. 6 YOST: So it's intended to be --7 BIRD-POLLAN: It's intended to be exactly the 8 same, but I think we should ask the 9 question, what kinds of consequences 10 if we can't --11 COLLETT: Hyperlink. 12 Hyperlink, says DeShana. 13 BIRD-POLLAN: 14 SOULT: Because, ultimately, the Senate 15 Rules still prevail. Regardless what's in the syllabus, the Senate 16 17 Rules trump that, so... 18 BIRD-POLLAN: We have created another document, another source of 19

20		information, so we should be clear.
21		Yeah?
22	FARRELL:	Herman Farrell, College of Fine
23		Arts. And, yes, I am so happy that
24		this is happening, and I really
25		appreciate all the work that's gone

1	into it. I just want to sort of
2	travel this idea of allowing for a
3	link from, let's say, my syllabus to
4	more information that I would
5	normally put in the syllabus.
6	Because, again, I think students come
7	in with a certain sort of
8	understanding of what they're
9	expected to know. And more often than
10	not, the syllabus is the thing that
11	is like the ruling document of the
12	class. Now, let's link a way to a
13	whole nother set of rules if the

14	professor decides that they don't
15	want it included in their syllabus, I
16	think creates I think even for the
17	Ombud, I'd be curious to know what
18	they have to say about this more
19	problems when they get to that point
20	where a student says, I didn't know.
21	I didn't see that. I didn't know. I
22	didn't understand. Even though
23	they're being told in the syllabus,
24	read it, it's over here, the fact
25	that it's now not being laid out to

104 1 them in full in that long document 2 that I hand out the beginning of 3 every semester, I think will create more problems rather than less. And 4 5 so I'm just asking the question, is 6 it possible to keep it still, the 7 boilerplate and everything still 8 within the syllabus when we hand it

9		out first day
10	SOULT:	Absolutely. Yeah. If you want to
11		put it in there, yeah, that's fine.
12	FARRELL:	But I'm asking about whether
13		we're recommending to faculty, PTIs,
14		what have you, that it's an option
15		for them, because they may not
16		foresee the problem of not making it
17		all up front and available on that
18		first day of class for every student
19		in the class.
20	SOULT:	So there's two things. One is
21		were they reading it before? Which is
22		usually no. Secondly, we've actually
23		been doing this in Gen-Chem. We have
24		a Gen-Chem website where we put a lot
25		of procedures, and we've actually

1

2

105 been linking thing with the blessing

of the Ombud. We have created our own

3		page, but it's basically copy and
4		paste that boilerplate text. And
5		we've seen absolutely no difference
6		in terms of students being aware or
7		unaware of the rules. And this is
8		about 3- or 4,000 students a
9		semester. So we've been already doing
10		this. Our syllabus is front/back for
11		all of our Chem 100 classes, and so
12		we've just been referring to that,
13		and we did okay that with the Ombud,
14		but with the same boilerplate policy.
15		And it seems that and I don't know
16		if it's improved anything, but it
17		certainly hasn't made it any worse as
18		far as students being aware of
19		policies.
20	BIRD-POLLAN:	And, also, I think, one thing to
21		be clear with folks that this isn't
22		necessary, but the other thing, just
23		to remind you, part of the motivation
24		for this was that the Undergraduate
25		Council was seeing lots of people who

1		didn't include any of these policies
2		in their syllabi. So at least, at
3		this point, if we centralized, the
4		hope is if the faculty member knows
5		enough to know that there is some
6		policy out there that'll include that
7		they are default, including all the
8		policies.
9	SOULT:	And that it's correct and up to
10		day. But if you choose that and you
11		want to put it in, there's nothing
12		that precludes that. It's just
13		putting this in there, but we haven's
14		seen any issues.
15	BIRD-POLLAN:	Any other observations at this
16		point? This is also not your last
17		chance to share your views about
18		this. You know, Allison will be eager
19		to hear from you. I will as well.
20		Anything else you might want to
21		share, we'd be very happy to hear.
22		Thank you so much for that, Allison.

23	Well, I think that is our final
24	agenda item for today. So is there
25	any other items from the floor? Yes?

1	BROWN:	Well, I'm wondering if sorry.
2		Roger Brown, College of Ag. I'm
3		wondering if the body wants to
4		address this lingering motion to
5		create an Advisory Committee to the
6		Administration regarding the naming
7		of different things. That was
8		something that people seemed to have
9		an interest in. Is that something
10		that this body could vote on?
11	BIRD-POLLAN:	Bob?
12	GROSSMAN:	If I could make a suggestion.
13		How about we, Senate Council, agree
14		to put this on the agenda for
15		discussion? We can't actually have
16		any motions, I don't think, during

17	this portion of the Senate meeting
18	because it hasn't been announced in
19	advance. But I think the sentiment is
20	clear, and most of Senate Council is
21	here, and so I think we can take it
22	off and have a conversation with the
23	administration on the best way to
24	proceed. I promise to get it on the
25	Senate Council Agenda. How about

1		that?
2	BIRD-POLLAN:	Roger?
3	BROWN:	Okay. That's it. That sounds
4		good. Thanks, Bob.
5	BIRD-POLLAN:	Any other items from the floor?
6		Then I would take a motion to
7		adjourned. Oh, I've already moved to
8		the slide. Was there a motion to
9		adjourn? Anyone?
10	GROSSMAN:	So moved.
11	BIRD-POLLAN:	Bob. Second? Any second out

12	there? Herman, all right. Great.
13	Thank you. You can vote now on
14	motioning to adjourn. Thank you all
15	for your vivid debate today. That was
16	fantastic. I really think it means a
17	lot. It makes our deliberations
18	better. I will see you all in March.
19	* * * * * * * *
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

STATE OF KENTUCKY )

COUNTY OF KENTON )

I, TRISHA B. MORLEY, the undersigned Notary

Public in and for the State of Kentucky at Large, certify

that at the time and place stated, I personally appeared at said proceeding to take the record in stenotype, later reduced to computer-aided transcription under my direction, and that the foregoing is a true and accurate record of said proceeding.

My commission expires: April 23, 2022.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunder set my hand and seal of office on the 10th day of February, 2020.

Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter
Notary Public

My commission expires: 4/23/22

Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter
An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.♠