

University Senate
December 8, 2014

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, December 8, 2014 in the Auditorium of W. T. Young Library. Below is the 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 Andrew Hippisley called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:02 pm. Quorum was met, with 79 voting members responding to the attendance slide. The Chair asked for a motion to waive *Senate Rules 1.2.3* to allow consideration of the agenda, because the agenda was not sent out six days in advance. Brion **moved** thusly and Mazur **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 75 in favor, three opposed and two abstaining.

1. Minutes from November 10, 2014 and Announcements

No corrections to the minutes were received by 9am Friday. There being **no objection**, the Chair said that the minutes from November 10, 2014 stood **approved** as distributed, by **unanimous consent**. There were a few announcements.

- The Staff and University Senates' Stakes reception will take place on Tuesday, December 9, from 2:30-4:30 pm on the 18th floor of Patterson Office Tower.
- The Chair explained that the Senate's "Other Business" agenda item was intended to be used for senators to raise issues that may be of interest to the Senate. During the November meeting, a couple issues were raised. First, the comment about students submitting online teacher-course evaluations (TCE) was particularly helpful. The ad hoc Committee on Teacher-Course Evaluations was subsequently asked to consider this issue. The Chair encouraged senators to contact Ms. Brothers if they had good practices that worked to encourage students to submit online TCEs. The Chair commented that using TCEs as the sole evaluation of teaching effectiveness is a tangential issue, but the Senate Council (SC) has suggested the Chair talk to the Provost about exploring other instruments for evaluating teaching effectiveness, perhaps via a joint Provost-SC committee. The second comment offered at the November meeting pertained to administrative bloat at UK; the Chair said SC discussed this issue a great deal. In the SC's evaluation of President Eli Capilouto last year, the President's ratings improved in almost all categories over the previous year, except for the issue of administrative bloat. The Chair said that the Senate's Institutional Finance and Resource Allocation Committee (SIFRAC) could be a place to investigate the matter; he said he would also discuss it with the President.
- The SC met with the President at his home on December 1 and the topic of conversation was the recent retreat held by the Board of Trustees (Board) and their focus on research. During the discussion, the SC invited the President to come speak to the Senate on research during the spring semester. In addition to discussion on research, the 2014—2020 Strategic Plan was also mentioned. The President assured SC members that outside consultants were only being used to identify missing data and do legwork. A draft of the 2014-2020 Strategic Plan will be presented to the Senate for comment prior to the Board seeing it.

2. Officer and Other Reports

a. Chair

The Chair noted a couple approvals made on behalf of the Senate: the SC approved non-standard calendars for NUR 900, 917, 918, 919, 925, 930, 520, and 752; and the SC approved a revision to the 2014-15 Pharmacy calendar.

The Chair approved an addition to the December 2014 degree list because the original omission was due to administrative error.

At the SC's request, the Provost's office is reviewing college and department rules. The Chair commented that all approved rules can be found on the Senate's website, but the rules were completely non-uniform in terms of being up to date, or even being there at all. The Provost has the responsibility for checking college and department rules for consistency with *Governing Regulations (GRs)*, *Administrative Regulations (ARs)*, and *Senate Rules (SRs)*; the Provost's office asked if the Senate was interested in participating some way in the review, specifically checking unit rules for consistency with the *SRs*. The Chair said it was possible that the charge of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) could be expanded to perform such a check.

The Chair was invited to attend a meeting of associate deans and took the opportunity to talk about two issues. First, the Senate Council office gets requests to add a student to a degree list due to administrative error. A couple colleges make such requests far more often than other colleges and such requests just do not look good. At the root of it, not being on an appropriate degree list is unfair to a student. The Chair encouraged associate deans to take more care in this area. The second issue he talked about pertained to the Senate committee structure. The Chair gave associate deans a list of Senate committees as well as the names of committee chairs. As a default, interactions between committees and colleges or individuals should be through the committee chair persons; at the very least a committee member must CC the committee chair when interacting with those outside the committee. The Chair suggested to senators that if their committee wished to express something to a college, it needed to be done through the committee chair.

b. Vice Chair

Vice Chair Christ had nothing to report.

c. Parliamentarian

Parliamentarian Kate Seago had nothing to report.

d. Trustees

Trustee John Wilson had no specific report, but said he was there to be sure senators had an opportunity to ask him questions. Wilson noted that the Board would meet the following day. He opined that now was a particularly critical time because of the limbo in the Provost's office, particularly with the onset of the new budget model and the strategic plan, as well as evaluations of colleges and deans. One big concern is what happens during an interim period and how UK can continue to move ahead in this critical time. Wilson said he was also in receipt of a number of complaints about parking transitions on campus; he has been assured that implementation without consultation will not happen again this year. There were no questions for Wilson.

3. Degree Recipients

a. Honorary Degree Nominees - Interim Graduate School Dean Susan Carvalho

Interim Graduate School Dean Susan Carvalho explained that the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees (UJCHD) made a special effort this year to request nominees; 16 were received, which was a larger number than in the past. In addition, the candidates were all very competitive. She offered thanks to all those who submitted nominations. Dean Carvalho then gave a presentation to senators on the three nominees for honorary degrees for May.

The Chair said that the motions for the honorary degree candidates came from the UJCHD, so no second was necessary. He noted that only elected faculty senators could vote on honorary degree candidates. The **motion** from the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees was that the elected faculty senators approve Les McCann, as the recipient of an Honorary Doctor of Arts, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended recipient of an honorary degree to be conferred by the Board. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 82 in favor and 1 opposed.

The next **motion** from the UJCHD was that the elected faculty senators approve Lillian Press, as the recipient of an Honorary Doctor of Humanities, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended recipient of an honorary degree to be conferred by the Board. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 76 in favor and 1 opposed.

The last **motion** from the UJCHD was that the elected faculty senators approve O. Leonard Press, as the recipient of an Honorary Doctor of Letters, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended recipient of an honorary degree to be conferred by the Board. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 79 in favor.

b. December 2014 In Memoriam Posthumous Degree Candidate

The Chair explained the background for the *In Memoriam* posthumous degree process, which was approved by the Senate in February 2014. College of Arts and Sciences Dean Kornbluh offered some background information on the deceased student for senators' benefit. He noted that the student was a member of Project Grad and had completed 150 credit hours. As would be done for any Project Grad student, the College of Arts and Sciences waived two units of 300-level credit, as well as the foreign language requirement; therefore, the student had essentially completed the requirements for the degree. Dean Kornbluh asked for approval, stating the posthumous degree was important to the student's family.

The recommendation from SC was that elected faculty senators approve a December 2014 In memoriam posthumous degree, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degree to be conferred on Robert Ernest Stith, Jr by the Board of Trustees. Ilahiane **moved** thusly and Lewis **seconded**. The Chair placed the motion on the floor to allow discussion.

Tagavi asked if the motion could be amended to indicate that the student had completed all degree requirements. Both Ilahiane and Lewis **accepted** the suggestion as a **friendly amendment**. There was additional discussion among senators because it appeared that the student should receive a regular, earned degree, posthumously, as opposed to an honorary *In Memoriam* degree. As discussion wound down, the Chair said on behalf of the Senate, he could add the student to the December 2014 degree list, after which time the student's degree would be treated as any other earned degree. Ilahiane said he wanted to **withdraw his motion**, and Lewis **agreed**. Via a show of hands, a **vote** was taken on withdrawing the motion and the motion **passed** with a vast majority in favor.

c. December 2014 Degree List

The Chair noted that as of Friday, there was one change to the degree list, to change a BS degree to a BA degree. The recommendation from SC was that the elected faculty senators approve the December 2014 degree list, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Brion **moved** thusly and Wood **seconded**. After a brief comment, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 67 elected faculty senators in favor, one opposed, and two abstaining.

4. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (SAPPC) - Wally Ferrier, Chair

i. Update on Committee Activities

The chair of the Senate's Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (SAPPC), Wally Ferrier, gave senators an update on activities of the SAPPC. Ferrier said the committee had met a couple times and also with the Chair. One of the SAPPC's major activities is assisting in university-wide efforts to identify potentially new and interesting academic programs. The programs would be consistent with UK's new strategic plan when it becomes public and reflect existing programs at UK's peers and aspirational benchmarks that are missing from UK. One such type of program could be in the field of big data, specifically analytics-driven approaches. When the SAPPC is aware of a degree offering that UK might want to consider offering, the SAPPC plans to contact the relevant and appropriate faculty to determine if those faculty have any interest in making a degree proposal. In addition, the SAPPC is developing a survey to ask faculty about awareness of or ideas for new degree programs.

Ferrier went on to say that the SAPPC has also looked at the approval path for new degree programs, which is much like a maze. He added that if one has been a senator for any period of time, the senator has witnessed or been party to potentially uncomfortable discussions about one department proposing something and another department protesting the proposal based on not having been appropriately consulted, perhaps not consulted at all. After this, the discussion largely devolves into a turf battle. Ferrier said the SAPPC was willing to informally

assist in such discussions and at the earliest stages possible. He said that faculty who may worry about turf battles could benefit from the SAPPC's willingness to broker information and help a faculty member and/or unit improve collaboration with other units. Ferrier said that senators should check their inboxes in mid or late January for a campuswide survey from the SAPPC about new program development. There were a few comments from senators.

b. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) - Greg Graf, Chair

i. Masters Final Examination Enrollment Policy

Graf, chair of the SAASC, explained the proposal to change the master's student final examination policy. Because the **motion** to approve the proposed new master's final examination policy came from committee, no **second** was required.

Tagavi asked for clarification about master's degree students who disengage and then return. He said that as he read the proposal, thesis students and non-thesis students were treated differently – thesis students must enroll in a one-credit course in order to sit for the final examination but non-thesis students must enroll in a zero-credit course in order to sit for the final examination. Tagavi opined that both courses should each carry zero credit, or should carry one credit, but not be different. Graf clarified that a student will enroll in a zero-credit course, for zero cost, regardless of whether the student is thesis or non-thesis, and that continuous enrollment was required for both types.

Wood objected to the proposal's recommendation that an "XXX" 748 course will be created for non-thesis students. Wood explained that 748 courses are used for the purposes of loan deferment. She suggested editing the proposal so that it referred to a zero-credit hour master's thesis course and not a 748 course. Guest Cleo Price, assistant dean in the Graduate School, said such a course was in the process of being developed. Truszczynski spoke against the motion, saying the proposal cannot be implemented because an integral part, development of a new course, was not yet complete. Brion also spoke against the proposal – there were a sufficient number of typos and factual errors that the version as revised on the Senate floor may not meet the original intent of the Graduate School when it made the proposal.

Brion **moved** to table the proposal and return it to the SAASC for revisions. The Chair noted that he called on senators out of order – although a senator wanted to move a motion, the Chair said he should first allow another senator their turn to speak. Swanson offered a couple of suggestions for the SAASC, including removal of the specific course number because different master's students in different programs use different course numbers. In response to the Chair, Swanson said he had no objection to the proposal returning to the SAASC so long as his suggestion to simplify is considered.

Dietz **seconded** the motion to table. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 61 in favor, nine opposed, and three abstaining.

c. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) - Ernie Bailey, Chair

i. Proposed New Department of Integrated Strategic Communications (ISC) and Move of BA/BS in ISC to the Proposed New Department of ISC

Bailey, chair of the SAOSC, explained the proposal for a new Department of Integrated Strategic Communications (ISC) and the associated move of the BA and BS in ISC to the proposed new Department of ISC. Because the **motion** to approve the proposed new department and the move of the two degrees came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair put the motion on the floor and invited discussion. Guest Beth Barnes, director of the School of Journalism and Telecommunications and proposer, commented that the correct name of the both the department and degrees was "Science" in its singular form, not "Sciences."

There being no comments from senators, a **vote** was taken on the motion that the Senate endorse the creation of the proposed new Department of Integrated Strategic Communication (ISC) within the College of Communication and Information and the associated move of BA/BS Integrated Strategic Communication to the proposed new

Department of Integrated Strategic Communication. The motion **passed** with 61 in favor, nine opposed, and 11 abstaining.

d. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) - Margaret Schroeder, Chair

i. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Inclusive Education

Schroeder, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Inclusive Education, in the Department of Early Childhood, Special Education, and Rehabilitation Counseling within the College of Education. Because the **motion** to approve the proposed new department and the move of the two degrees came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair put the motion on the floor and invited discussion. There were a couple questions from senators. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 75 in favor, one opposed and one abstaining.

ii. Proposed Change to *Senate Rules 5.1.2.1.D* ("Limitation on Pass/fail Units Creditable for College of Law Students") and *Senate Rules 5.3.3.1.C* ("Limitation on Pass/fail Units Creditable for College of Law")

The Chair explained the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 5.1.2.1.D* and *Senate Rules 5.3.3.1.C*. There were no questions from senators. Anderson **moved** that the Senate approve the proposed revisions to *SR 5.1.2.1.D* and *SR 5.3.3.1.C* and Ilahiane **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 67 in favor, seven opposed, and four abstaining.

5. University Calendars

(2015 - 2016 Calendar; 2017 - 2018 Calendar, Tentative; 2015 - 2016 Dentistry; 2017 - 2018 Dentistry, Tentative; 2015 - 2016 Law; 2016 Summer I (four-week) Law; 2016 Summer Law; 2017 - 2018 Law, Tentative; 2018 Summer I (four-week) Law, Tentative; 2018 Summer Law, Tentative; 2015 - 2016 Medicine; 2017 - 2018 Medicine, Tentative; 2015 - 2016 Pharmacy; 2017 - 2018 Pharmacy, Tentative; 2015 - 2016 Winter Intersession; and 2017 - 2018 Winter Intersession, Tentative)

The Chair solicited a motion for approval. Tagavi **moved** to approve the University Calendars as presented and Kennedy **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 73 in favor, one opposed, and one abstaining.

6. Proposed Revision to *Governing Regulations X* ("Employment") & *Governing Regulations XIV* ("Ethical Principles and Code of Conduct") - Marcy Deaton, Associate General Counsel

Guest Marcy Deaton, associate general counsel, explained the proposed changes to *Governing Regulations X* and *Governing Regulations XIV*. There were a variety of comments from senators. Debski expressed concern that the revised language did not encompass promotion, training, and payment for employment. Deaton explained that the term "employment" encompassed the activities of promotion, training, and payment. A number of comments were made regarding the inclusion, or lack thereof, of "training, promotion, and pay." There were no concerns raised about the changes to the groups listed in the anti-discrimination statements. There was discussion about the next steps.

Swanson suggested taking the wording suggestions back and revising both *GRs*. Anderson suggested the revised *GRs* go to the SC, which could endorse the revised versions on behalf of the Senate. There was consensus on the wording to be sent back for revision.

7. University Appeals Board Report for 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14 and Trends - Joe Fink, UAB Chair

Guest Joe Fink (PH/Pharmacy Practice and Science), chair of the University Appeals Board (UAB), offered a report on the UAB's activities for 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14. There were a variety of comments and questions from senators. The primary reason for granting appeals is that faculty members making the charge do not attend the hearing.

8. UK's Learning Management System (LMS) - Patsy Carruthers, Director of Academic Technologies (15 minutes)

Guest Patsy Carruthers, director of Academic Technologies, gave a presentation on the new learning management system, which will replace Blackboard.

9. Proposed Changes to the UK Retirement Plan - Joey Payne, Chief Benefits Officer (15 minutes)

Guest Joey Payne, director of Employee Benefits, gave a presentation on proposed changes to UK's retirement plans. There were a few questions from senators.

10. Other Business (Time Permitting)

The Chair used "Other Business" as an opportunity for an update on elections for SC officers and SC members.

McGillis **moved** to adjourn and Brion **seconded**. Senators voted with their feet and the meeting was adjourned at 5:11 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Alice Christ,
University Senate Secretary

Invited guests present: Beth Barnes, Patsy Carruthers, Marcy Deaton, Joe Fink, Lee Ann Jung, Joey Payne, and Cleo Price.

Absences: Adams, I., Adams, M., Bailey, P., Bird-Pollan* , Birdwhistell, M, Blackwell, Brennen, Butler, Campbell*, Cassis, Clark, Cox, de Beer, Dickson, Doolen*, Fox, Grace, Grossman*, Ingram, Jackson, J., Jackson, N., Jong, Karan, Kornbluh, Lauersdorf*, Lee, C*, Martin, A, McManus, Nash, Oberst, O'Hair, MJ*, Osorio*, Profitt*, Rey-Barreau, Richey, Rompf, Royse, Royster, Schoenberg*, Sekulic*, Tick, Tracy, Turner, Vosevich, Walz, Watt, Williams, and Witt.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Monday, January 26, 2015.

* Denotes an explained absence.