University Senate
December 11, 2017

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, December 11, 2017 in the Athletics Association Auditorium of W. T. Young Library. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via electronic voting devices unless indicated otherwise. Specific voting information can be requested from the Office of the Senate Council.

Senate Council Chair Katherine McCormick (ED) called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:01 pm. She welcomed senators and reminded those present to sign in and pick up their voting devices. She said that Senate meetings were conducted in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order (Newly Revised). The Chair urged senators to be civil during conversations and to be sure to share with colleges and the people represented by senators the business of the Senate.

The Chair called for an attendance vote and 61 senators registered their presence.

1. Minutes from November 13, 2017 and Announcements
The Chair reported that no changes had been received for the minutes from November 13. There being **no objections**, the minutes from November 13, 2017 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**. There were a series of announcements.

The Chair and Bird-Pollan (LA), who chaired the ad hoc Committee on *Administrative Regulations 6:2* ("Policy and Procedures for Addressing and Resolving Allegations of Sexual Assault, Stalking, Dating Violence, and Domestic Violence") met with President Eli Capilouto and General Counsel Bill Thro in mid-November. The Chair commented that there were some senators who participated in the ad hoc Committee's activities. She said Chair reported that the meeting with the President and General Counsel was cordial and that she looked forward to the future possibility of having revised regulations for senators to review, but noted that next steps would be up to the President. The Chair added that Bird-Pollan had a meeting scheduled to discuss the employment questionnaire with the President and recalled that the questionnaire was perhaps an initial step in UK's efforts to ask future employees about past activities at prior institutions.

Tagavi (EN) noted that Bird-Pollan had been elected by SC members to serve as the next Chair and suggested that some recognition was in order. The Chair concurred and Bird-Pollan received a round of applause. The Chair noted that a formal report on recent SC-related elections would be forthcoming later in the meeting.

The Chair said that some senators had asked about student advising in the colleges. She explained that when students moved from the former unit "Undergraduate Education," resources were provided to help with that transition and that the ways in which those resources were used varied from college to college. Many colleges increased reliance on staff members for advising. She noted that faculty participation in advising also varied among colleges. She said she expected to meet soon with appropriate stakeholders to determine how to better ensure joint participation of faculty and staff for student advising.

With regard to recent comments from President Capilouto about his interest in ways that UK will respond to the changing landscape in higher education, the Chair (and deans as well as others) were invited to participate in some conceptual committee discussions surrounding UK's financial stability in difficult times, vis-à-vis state funding. The Chair said she would keep senators apprised of those activities as she is privy to them.

The Chair reminded senators of the ongoing search for a new provost and opined that an announcement would be made within the next few days. She said that Dean David Blackwell (BE) and Dean Donna Arnett (PbH) were the two finalists. SC members had an opportunity to meet with each candidate and used that information to craft an endorsement for one candidate. She said she would forward that communication soon to senators. In the interim, she reminded senators how they could submit anonymous feedback on the two candidates.

Noting that it was the third time she had made this particular announcement, the Chair reminded senators of the spring semester deadlines for receipt of curricular items in SC office [February 5, 2018 was the deadline for receipt of proposals requiring committee review, such as new degree programs, changes to organizational structure, and new departments. April 15, 2018 was the deadline for courses, program changes, and minors. She referred senators to an online calendar with the deadlines (http://www.uky.edu/universitysenate/forms, top of page).

The Chair reminded senators that the annual "Connect Blue Reception," hosted by University Senate and Staff Senate, would be held the following day, immediately following the Board of Trustees meeting. She encouraged senators to attend, noting that there could be difficult financial times ahead for the University. The Chair commented that if trustees have an opportunity to talk one-on-one with a faculty member, it may encourage stronger trustee-related support for faculty. Visona (FA) commented that when she last attended, only one trustee was present but that she enjoyed chatting with the members of the Staff Senate. The Chair stated she had a different recollection, that there were more trustees present than faculty, but it could have been a matter of attending the event at different times. The Chair added that she would ask Ms. Brothers to email senators when the Board meeting was winding down and that it was not too late to RSVP.

2. Officer and Other Reports
a. Chair
The Chair reminded senators that Provost Tim Tracy was leaving the University at the end of the month. She said that she and the Senate as a whole had enjoyed great collaborations with him and asked that he come forward to the podium. The Chair presented Provost Tracy with an award documenting the Senate's appreciation of all his efforts and senators thanked the Provost with a long and loud round of applause.

The Chair asked Guest Roger Brown (AG/Agricultural Economics), chair of the Elections Subcommittee of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), to give senators an update on recent elections. Brown explained that the first election was to elect a new SC chair to replace the current Chair. He identified the three eligible candidates who were willing to serve: Bird-Pollan (LA), Schroeder (ED), and Tagavi (EN) and said that Bird-Pollan won the vote and would serve a term of June 1, 2018 – May 30, 2019.

In regards to the recent Senate election for members to serve on the SC, Brown reported that the candidates were: Brion (EN); Firey (AS); Kearney (ME); Osterhage (AS), Spear (ME) and Visona (FA). In the final voting round, the elected faculty senators chose Brion, Osterhage, and Spear to serve on SC. D. Jones (ME) expressed his appreciation towards Brown for his phenomenal, behind-the-scenes work on all the election processes.

The Chair asked Brown for information on the vice chair elections. Brown said that SC elected Bird-Pollan (LA) to serve as vice chair during the spring semester, because Bailey (AG) would be resigning to

go on sabbatical. Schroeder (ED) was elected to serve as vice chair for the term of June 1, 2018 – May 30, 2019. The information was met with a round of applause from senators. The Chair reminded senators that SC meets every week from 3 – 5 pm. She said that there was a lot of work that went into those meetings and she and members of Senate were fortunate to have a great group of SC members to work with. She asked current SC members to stand and they were recognized by senators with a round of applause.

The Chair offered an update on the motion that Firey (AS) made in at the November Senate meeting. ["That the SC charge an appropriate committee to investigate the feasibility of instituting a fall break in the University's academic calendar."] The Chair reported that when Firey made the motion, the wheels were already turning in regards to a fall break. She explained that Student Government Association Ben Childress planned to bring forward a proposal regarding how a fall break might be implemented. She said he had the support of the Dean of Students office, where there was a sentiment that moving the start date for the fall semester could be helpful in many ways, in part shortening the time after move-in and before classes start to lessen the time when students are not busy at the work of being students. She said that the proposal would go first to SC and assuming SC approval, will then go to Senate.

b. Vice Chair
Bailey (AG) did not have a report.

c. Parliamentarian
Cross (CI) did not have a report.

d. Trustee
The Chair reported that Grossman (AS) and Blonder (ME) were attending Board of Trustees-related meetings and were not present for the Senate meeting.

3. Degree Recipients
a. December 2017 Degree List
The Chair reported that three undergraduate students from two separate colleges were added as a result of requests from faculty senators. The Chair explained that the **motion** from Committee was that the elected faculty senators approve UK's December 2017 list of candidates for credentials, for submission by the President to the Board of Trustees. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 75 in favor and one abstained.

4. Committee Reports
a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) – Margaret Schroeder, Chair
i. Proposed New USP between the BS Computer Engineering and MS Computer Science
Schroeder (ED), chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal. The **motion** from Committee was that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new University Scholars Program between a BS Computer Engineering and MS Computer Science within the College of Engineering. There were no questions from senators. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 74 in favor.

ii. Proposed Suspension of Graduate Certificate in Pharmaceutical Sciences
Schroeder (ED) explained the proposal. Swanson (PbH) asked why the request was to suspend admissions, rather than to delete the certificate. Schroeder replied that it was generally easier to suspend admissions rather than to delete it. In addition, if a certificate is suspended, it more or less

becomes unavailable after five years, but the option to reactivate the certificate is still an option. If the certificate were to be deleted, the unit would need to start over with a brand new creation. There were no further questions.

The **motion** from the Committee was that the University Senate approve the suspension of admission into the existing Graduate Certificate in Pharmaceutical Sciences, in the College of Pharmacy. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 72 in favor and one abstained.

iii. Proposed New Dual Degree Program: BA/BS in a STEM Major in A&S and MBA
Schroeder (ED) explained the proposal. Firey (AS) asked why the proposal was limited to students in the STEM [science, technology, engineering, and math] disciplines. Guest Anna Bosch (AS/Linguistics, associate dean for undergraduate programs) said that any student was eligible to participate. She explained that the emphasis on students in STEM disciplines was largely due to modeling the current proposal on the Engineering + MBA programs that already exist. Bosch noted that she regularly received email notices that the MBA was open to all students and that it would continue to welcome students from the social sciences. Guest Harvie Wilkinson (BE, MBA program director) added that the MBA would be delighted to take any students. There were no further questions or comments from senators.

The **motion** from Committee was that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new Dual Degree Program: BA/BS in a STEM major (i.e., Biology, Chemistry, Geology, Mathematics, Mathematical Economics, Neuroscience, and Physics and Astronomy) within the College of Arts and Sciences and MBA in the Gatton College of Business and Economics. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 72 in favor, two opposed, and one abstained.

b. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) – Herman Farrell, Chair
i. Proposed Change to PhD Music
Farrell (FA), chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), explained the proposal. The **motion** from Committee was that the Senate approve the proposed changes to the PhD Music. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions or comments from senators. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 76 in favor and none opposed.

c. Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLeL) – Roger Brown, Chair
i. Proposed Implementation of a Syllabus Bank
The Chair noted that the proposal was a good example of collaboration, this time with Associate Provost for Student and Academic Life and students. Guest Roger Brown (AG/Agricultural Economics), chair of the Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLeL), explained the proposal.

Brion (EN) asked if there would be multiple copies of syllabi if there were multiple individuals teaching the same class and if a student would be able to use them to select a class that most met the student's learning style. Brown replied that the syllabus would not be specific to the section number, but rather would follow the instructor and course. If there was more than one instructor, the student would see more than one syllabus. Brion asked how students would find a syllabus and Brown replied that students would visit the regular course registration system and identify the course(s) the student is interested in. The student would see a list of sections and for each section, the student would see the following: the instructor's name, the course's meeting time, date, and location; an option to email the

instructor; and a link to an unofficial syllabus. In other words, the opportunity to see an unofficial syllabus would be embedded in the course registration system.

Pool (AS) asked Brown to elaborate on the ways in which faculty at other universities were forced to provide draft or unofficial syllabi. Brown explained that a good example was in Texas, where the state legislature mandated that a course syllabus must be posted no more than three clicks away from a university's home page and must be available to the public. Kellum (AS) asked update frequency of updating a syllabus. Brown reiterated that individual instructors would have complete control over when (and if) a syllabus would be updated.

Provost Tim Tracy explained that students had brought up the issue of a syllabus bank with him in the past and he had spoken extensively with Childress [president of the Student Government Association (SGA)]. Provost Tracy said that accessing a course syllabus at registration would give students more information about a course and how it would fit into their plan of study. He said that sometimes a student signed up for a particular course based on the course title and description but after classes had started and the syllabus was disseminated, the student could realize that the course was not what they wanted. At that point, the student might want to change courses but the student might not be able to add the course they want; the syllabus bank would help students do a better job of choosing their courses. Provost Tracy commented that a fall break and a syllabus bank were the two issues that students brought up with him most frequently and vocally. He acknowledged that keeping unofficial syllabi up to date could be a logistical challenge, but that students felt that the ability to access course syllabi during registration would give them greater opportunities to be informed.

Brion (EN) asked about the steps that an instructor would need to go through to upload a syllabus. Brown replied that in the mock-up provided with the agenda, there would be a link for each course in the area where student enrollments are found. There would be a link to "upload unofficial syllabus" and if the instructor clicked there, there would also be a pop-up window to remind the faculty member that even though the unofficial syllabus would be uploaded, it would include information that the uploaded syllabus did not affect intellectual property-related concerns. Brown added that there would be options for adding, changing, or deleting the syllabus.

Tagavi (EN) asked if the option to email the instructor could be removed and said he thought having unofficial syllabi would cause a lot of problems if a student mistook an unofficial syllabus (and references to exam dates, grading policies, etc.) for the official class syllabus. Provost Tracy noted that email addresses were already available through the University directory. Regarding Tagavi's ombud-related comment, the Provost acknowledged that problems could arise, but it might be appropriate to give students the benefit of the doubt in regards to them being able to differentiate between unofficial syllabi and the syllabi handed out during class. Brown added that if a student clicked on the link to download an unofficial syllabus, there would be an explicit message that it was an unofficial syllabus and that the official syllabus would be provided in the first class period, in accordance with the *Senate Rules*.

Visona (FA) commented that in order to have an updated syllabus available during advising/registration, an instructor would need to have their syllabus done a semester in advance. Brown said that an instructor was not obligated in any way to post anything, let alone post the next semester's syllabus. If the instructor wanted to, the unofficial syllabus that they uploaded could add language like "draft syllabus" to the syllabus prior to uploading. Duncan (ME) said that it could be challenging to post an unofficial syllabus for a new course that had not yet been taught, but that for previously offered courses, it would be an advantage to both students and faculty to have an unofficial syllabus available

for students. She explained that students in her classes and that students who add or drop after the first day of class made it difficult to plan for and carry out group activities in class when attendees changed. Brown noted that his contact in Information Technology Services (ITS) indicated it was possible to label all unofficial syllabi with "UNOFFICIAL" as a watermark.

In regards to Tagavi's comments about confusion about unofficial and official class syllabi, an instructor could simply remove all references to dates and final exam information from the unofficial syllabus. The Chair noted that having a syllabus bank could help students identify courses that use learning styles with which they are most comfortable. Having a syllabus available digitally could help in more clearly communicating to students what a course entailed. Brown reiterated that instructors would have complete control over what, if anything, could be uploaded for an unofficial syllabus.

Soult (AS) asked if someone other than an instructor could upload the syllabus, stating that instructors for some courses are not assigned until closer to the beginning of the semester. Brown replied that his ITS partner indicated that it could be arranged for a staff person to have the ability to upload an unofficial syllabus. e. Whitaker commented that multiplicity could be helpful in this case and suggested that the text for the syllabus download be changed from "Syllabus" to "Unofficial Syllabus" and Brown agreed that that suggestion was a good idea.

There were no further comments from senators. Brown commented that there were few students present to speak on behalf of the proposal, likely due to it being the first day of final exam week. Brown noted that the proposal was "pilot" in the sense that if it was an utter failure, it could be ended. The **motion** from Committee was that the Senate endorse a pilot online system to be developed to make unofficial versions of course syllabi voluntarily available to students securely (e.g., behind LinkBlue login) as part of advising and priority registration. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 71 in favor, five opposed, and one abstained.

5. <u>Proposed New Senate Advisory Committee on Diversity and Inclusion – Discussion Only</u>
The Chair stated that the proposed new advisory committee was an opportunity for senators to think about future activities in relation to an issue that was of importance to all faculty. She noted that there was currently no Senate committee related to diversity and the inclusion of a proposal for a new advisory committee was a good time for faculty to share their thoughts. The Chair explained that after the solicitation of input from senators, the next steps would involve the development of a charge. She noted that the motion from the SC was to establish a permanent committee (that is not required to be chaired by a senator) on diversity and inclusion and that the charge of the new committee includes the following responsibilities: 1. to increase the diversity among senators, in particular representation of underrepresented minorities; 2. to work with administration to disseminate best practices for recruiting and retaining faculty of color; and 3. address other issues around diversity and inclusion as they arise. She noted that Vice President for Institutional Diversity Sonja Feist-Price was willing to partner with Senate, as was Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement G. T. Lineberry.

Farrell (FA) spoke in favor of the proposed new advisory committee and said it seemed reasonable and he was in favor of it. Brion (EN) asked what the purpose of the new committee would be and what exactly it would do. The Chair replied that the intent was to share the work of the committee with search committees or with Vice President Feist-Price and learn about best practices. She said the committee could work with the Vice President's office on best practices and support her office's work in increasing the numbers of underrepresented minority (URM) students, staff, and faculty. The Chair said it was not likely that the committee would influence hiring or search decisions, but it could make

information available to others about how best to go about searching or hiring. The committee could make recommendations to the administration about retaining URM faculty and methods to do so. The committee could also encourage faculty (when attending conferences, etc.) to act as emissaries for UK. Opportunities for the committee were wide open. Brion wondered if the committee could serve as an equity review committee, which the Senate lacked but was common in some other universities.

Visona (FA) said she thought that promotion and retention policies would be important aspects for the committee to review. The Chair noted that some URM female faculty have said that their "promotion" to administrative positions hindered their professorial advancement and that could also be a topic of discussion. Bird-Pollan (LA) said she supported the idea, but noted that in her experience, many of her URM faculty colleagues were asked to perform a lot of service activities. She worried the committee would be populated with URM faculty who also had many other service obligations and that that concern should be recognized when populating the committee.

The Chair said she would take these comments back the SC and a formal proposal would be brought to the Senate in February.

6. <u>Items from the Floor (Time Permitting)</u>
The Chair noted that it was an hour prior to scheduled adjournment and asked if any senators had items they wanted to discuss. Firey (AS) asked about the proposed changes to federal tax legislation and what plans were in place to assist financial burdens on graduate students. The Chair said she would check on that information. The Chair said that she was aware that UK's federal liaison was active in that issue and that President Capilouto and members of his staff recently met with legislative representatives about the same issue. The Chair added that Chair-elect Bird-Pollan (LA) was a guest on KET a week prior to discuss the possible changes to federal tax law. Bird-Pollan opined that there was a low likelihood that graduation tuition waivers would be included in gross income. She added that the proposed changes, whatever their final form, were expected to be effective January 1, 2018.

Raissi (ME) asked about the proposed taxation on university endowments. Provost Tracy said it was not clear if there would be a tax on every university endowment over a certain amount, or if the intent was to tax endowments that were a certain amount over the specific threshold. He indicated that the legislation was currently very fluid but that UK could potentially be affected.

Brion (EN) said that the news she heard had not included any statements from college or university presidents about the effect of possible taxation of university endowments. She said that the end result of a tax on endowments would be akin to the universities losing their non-profit status. Mazur (ED) added that during her work in Western Kentucky, citizens there wondered why members of university leadership were not making any statements about the proposed federal tax legislation and its effect on universities.

The Chair wrapped up the meeting by again thanking Provost Tim Tracy for his work with the Senate. She commented that he was typically present for Senate meetings and she appreciated his partnership. On behalf of Senate, she stated that they were sad to see him go. Senators honored Provost Tracy with another loud round of applause.

Kearney **moved** to adjourn and Cross **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 62 in favor and none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 4:09 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Ernie Bailey,
University Senate Secretary

Absences: Agbali; Atwood; Bailey, C.; Beck; Birdwhistell; Blackwell; Blonder; Brady; Brennen; Capilouto; Cassis; Caudill; Cheng; Childress; Cofield; Collins; Couti; Cox; Crofcheck; DiPaola; Dobson; Escobar; Feist-; rice; Flaherty; Freeman; Geneve; Gent; Griffin; Grossman; Gunasena; Guy; Hall; Harris; Holloway; Hopkins; Jackson; Kennedy*; Kornbluh; Kyrkanides; Lauersdorf*; Lephart; Lovan; Mardini; Marr*; Martin*; Mazur; McClure; McCormick; Miller-Spillman; Munson*; Murray; O'Hair, D.; O'Hair, M.; O'Neil; Pakath*; Regard; Richey; Sandmeyer; Scaggs; Sheff; Spear*; Stevens; Tracy; Vail ; Vosevich; Warshawsky*; Wasilkowski; Webb ; Whitaker, M.; Wilson, K.; Witt; Wittkamp; Woods; and Zadeh.

Invited guests present: Anna Bosch, Roger Brown, Jonathan Glixon, Catina Rossoll, Mirek Truszczynski, and Harvey Wilkinson.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, December 14, 2017.

---

* Denotes an explained absence.