

University Senate  
February 12, 2018

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, February 12, 2018 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.

The Chair reminded senators to pick up a copy of the handout in the back of the room, noting that due to FERPA restrictions, only members of the University Senate (Senate) could take one. She said the Senate Council office had worked with Legal Counsel to ensure the student's privacy was protected. The Chair let senators know that they would be asked to turn in the handouts after discussion of the related agenda item.

Senate Council Chair Katherine McCormick (ED) called Senate meeting to order at 3:01 pm. She welcomed senators and urged those present to sign in and pick up their voting devices. The Chair reminded 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. [Due to technical difficulties, the usual attendance vote was not taken.]

The Chair noted that *Senate Rules 1.2.3* ("Meetings") requires that minutes, agenda, and supporting documentation be sent to senators six days in advance, but not all supporting documentation was available on Tuesday. Therefore, Senate needed to move to waive *Senate Rules 1.2.3* to allow the Senate to consider the agenda, etc. because not all supporting documentation was sent out six days in advance.

Brion (EN) **moved** to waive *SR 1.2.3* and Tagavi (EN) **seconded**. A vote was taken and the motion passed via a show of hands with none opposed and no abstentions.

1. Minutes from December 11, 2017 and Announcements

The Chair reported that two editorial changes were received. There being **no objections**, the minutes from December 12, 2017 were **approved** as amended by **unanimous consent**. The Chair then moved to announcements.

The Chair reminded senators that the Senate meeting date for April has changed. The Board of Trustees meeting date was scheduled to occur prior to Senate meeting, when degree lists would be approved. SC voted to change the meeting date from April 9 to April 23. The meeting on April 23 will still be from 3 – 5 pm, but will be in the Lexmark Public Room (room 209) of the Main Building. She added that the March Senate meeting was still scheduled for March 19 and the May Senate meeting was still scheduled for May 7.

There are three dean searches going forward. Melynda Price (LA) was the SC-nominated faculty member chosen to serve on the dean search committee for the Gatton College of Business and Economics. Senator Schroeder (ED) was the SC's nominee to serve on the dean search committee for the College of Engineering. The Chair indicated she was unsure of the SC's nominee for the Libraries' dean search committee, but would report that to Senate at its next meeting. Each committee's composition is available on the Provost's website ([www.uky.edu/provost](http://www.uky.edu/provost)).

The SC asked Provost David Blackwell for a liaison to attend SC meetings. He generously agreed to share the time of one of his members on his staff, Associate Provost for Academic Excellence Operations Kirsten Turner, and she will begin attending SC meetings.

On February 9, President Eli Capilouto sent an email to campus that described a process to address a projected \$200 million gap between resources and expenses over the next five years (“Our Path Forward”). The website was [www.uky.edu/sotu/ourpathforward](http://www.uky.edu/sotu/ourpathforward). The Chair said that in December, all deans and others, including the Chair, participated in preliminary discussions (state funding and other challenges to funding and sustainability). She said as efforts proceed, she will do her best to keep senators informed. SC was asked to identify nominees to serve on five concept teams: Joan Mazur (ED/Curriculum and Instruction), John Nash (ED/Educational Leadership Studies), Jenny Minier (BE), Bruce Webb (AG/) and Leslie Vincent (). The Chair said she looked forward to the opportunity for faculty to participate in these important discussions. She added that it was her understanding that both President Capilouto and Provost Blackwell were committed to seeking funding for annual employee raises, to keep UK on the same trajectory for annual raises as had been done in the past.

The federal General Accounting office (GAO) visited UK to discuss with students, faculty, and staff UK’s response to student food insecurity. The GAO is using Kentucky as an example of a state responding to these issues. The Chair said that there was an impressive list UK initiatives to prevent food insecurity among students. She offered her congratulations for their efforts to the College of Social Work, College of Agriculture, Food, and Environment, the Center for Community Outreach within Student and Academic Life, UK Health Services, and the other campus units and organizations involved in related initiatives.

The Chair noted that one deadline had already passed regarding spring semester deadlines for curricular proposals. She reminded senators that the deadline for receipt of curricular items in Senate Council office was February 5 for proposals requiring committee review (e.g. new degree programs, changes to organizational structure, and new departments). Other types of proposals can be accepted through April 15. In response to a question from the Chair, Schroeder (ED), chair of the Senate’s Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), informed senators that the SAPC had two remaining meetings and felt confident it could ensure that proposals already under review could be submitted to Senate in time to make it to the Board of Trustees and the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) so that the proposals would have a fall 2018 effective date. The Chair noted that the CPE does not meet over the summer and the February 5 deadline was identified after walking backward from the CPE deadlines.

The ad hoc Committee on Assessment of UK Core continues its work and will have a report before the end of the semester. It is an excellent group of faculty and staff who were charged with evaluating UK Core and providing their findings regarding how UK assesses UK Core requirements.

The Blue Ribbon Panel on Graduate Education has completed its work and will hold two Open Forums. The Chair noted that one of the co-chairs, Brett Spear (ME), is a senator. A few edits were suggested earlier in the day and the Panel was currently voting on the revised report. The open forums will be on February 28, from 3:00-5:00 pm (Lexmark Public Room, Main Building) and March 1, from 9:00-11:00 am (Karpf Auditorium in Pavilion A of Chandler Hospital). The Chair reminded senators that the Panel was charged jointly by former Provost Tim Tracy and the SC. She referred senators to the Panel’s website (<http://www.uky.edu/provost/blue-ribbon-panel-graduate-education>), noting that the final report

At the next Senate meeting, on March 19, Executive Vice President for Finance Eric Monday and Provost Blackwell will be present to discuss news from Frankfort about financial considerations and other state or federal initiatives and actions. At that time, they will provide further information regarding Our Path Forward.

## 2. Officer and Other Reports

### a. Chair

The Chair said that as part of her report, she invited Provost Blackwell to offer a few remarks. She said that he intends to regularly attend Senate meetings, schedule permitting, and will give a report to senators. Senators welcomed Provost Blackwell to the podium with a round of applause.

Provost Blackwell stated that he was honored to have been selected as UK's provost and while he has had a lot to take in, he has enjoyed learning what is happening in units across campus. He said he plans to make two-hour visit to all the colleges; his first visit was to the College of Nursing earlier in the day and has a visit planned with College of Arts and Sciences later in the week. The purpose of the visits is to give colleges an opportunity to share their opportunities and challenges moving forward, which will help him triangulate the areas where his attention should be focused, moving forward. He reiterated the Chair's comment about him attending Senate meetings, unless something urgent preventing him from coming. The Provost said he viewed the Senate as an important partner in what happens in the Provost's area. He noted that the Senate governs what happens in the classroom and also in matters that affect faculty at large. He said he respected the need to hear voices from all over campus about such issues and that the Senate was a great forum in which those discussions could take place. He thanked senators for their work on Senate, recognizing that it did take faculty away from time spent with students or research.

The Provost then moved to the five-year financial sustainability plan, which the Chair had referred to earlier. He said it started in November with efforts by all the deans and a group of senior staff from around campus, with a goal to start brainstorming ideas that could help UK save \$40 million annually. He explained that they developed about 35 ideas, which were pared down to eight project ideas. In total the eight ideas, once implemented over the next two to three years, could save UK at least \$30 million annually. The process now focused on developing detailed business plans and cost-benefit analyses regarding implementation. Provost Blackwell said that by the end of the month of February, the deadline for submissions of bills to the state legislature will have passed and in March UK would have a more detailed picture of how the five-year financial plan will look. He thanked the Chair and SC for submitting a long list of names as nominees for the five concept teams; Provost Blackwell added that there was one student on each team (nominated by the Student Government Association) and five additional staff members (nominated by the Staff Senate).

Provost Blackwell said that he had been working closely with President Capilouto and other members of the leadership team in response to the budget proposed by the Governor. They focused heavily on enrollment management, which is important to UK's financial sustainability. He explained that he was still learning about the processes in enrollment management and that he had received some good ideas from that group about new markets for recruiting undergraduate and international students. Referring to the decline in the number of high school graduates, he noted that demographics were working against UK so UK needed to be creative.

Turning to the issue of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Graduate Education, the Provost explained that the forums would be the chance to hear responses from the University community about the Panel's report. He said he would attend at least one forum, if not both. Someone from his office will be attending both forums to take notes and listen carefully, which will help him move forward with Senate, in regards to the proposals in the Panel's report. He added that he and the Senate Council leadership were working on the matter of revising faculty title series and that he had discussed it with the Chair as recently as the

week prior. He expected that he and the Chair would work together on a plan to respond to the recommendations from the ad hoc Committee on Title Series.

In regards to ongoing college dean searches, Provost Blackwell explained that the searches were moving forward for Libraries, Engineering, and the Gatton College of Business and Economics. He added that there would be national dean searches for Education and for Communication and Information, likely beginning quickly when everyone returned to campus in fall 2018. Provost Blackwell reiterated that it was a great honor to serve and that he looked forward to seeing senators at future meetings.

Lauersdorf (AS) asked if the college meetings were with rank-and-file faculty or if the meetings were with college leadership. The Provost replied that it was primarily with leadership teams, noting that he had 26 direct reports and was experiencing difficulty finding time to meet with each of them individually. He said the intent of the visits was to get an overview of the college from its leadership perspective, its challenges, and a tour of the college's facilities. He said there would be something in the works for him to have opportunities to meet with rank-and-file faculty. He said he had asked his communication team to work with the Chair and SC to advise him on ways to meet with faculty. He noted he was willing to meet regularly with faculty and if he was invited to an event, he would be happy to engage with faculty as much as he could.

Tagavi asked if the Provost was supportive of the prior Provost's proposal to change to a system of just two title series for faculty. Provost Blackwell replied that he had not yet formed an opinion. He received the report from the ad hoc Committee on Title Series and had discussed it with the Chair and with Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement G. T. Lineberry. The Provost emphasized that he was not sufficiently well informed about the title series proposal (or the report from the Blue Ribbon Panel on Graduate Education) to have an opinion. Duncan (ME) asked if the Provost was able to share more details about the eight plans to improve UK's fiscal situation. Blackwell said he was not sure if the proposals were posted online, yet, but thought he could recite them from memory.

- Project Graduate and undergraduate completion
- Improving undergraduate retention
- Expanding the size of the freshman class
- Better utilization of University resources over the summer to facilitate student success and generate resources
- Procurement, specifically streamlining and automating the process to save money
- Continue the practice of not mining some UK-owned forestry lands that are rich in underground coal, to sell carbon credits to generate cash
- Online education
- Professional master's degrees

Provost Blackwell acknowledged that it was perhaps an odd mixture of ideas, but the intent was to find low-hanging fruit that could be used for immediate impact. Zhang (ME student) asked about opportunities for students to offer feedback regarding dean searches, particular the Libraries search – everyone uses UK's libraries. The Provost said that he was not sure about the composition of the search committee for a Libraries Dean, but that there was one student on the Gatton College of Business and Economics dean search and one on the Engineering dean search. He said that when dean search finalists came to campus, there would be public forums in which students could participate. The Chair noted that

there was a student on the Libraries search committee and suggested that Zhang could work with that student to offer input.

Provost Blackwell again thanked senators for giving him time during the meeting. The Chair introduced the Provost's liaison to the SC, Dr. Kirsten Turner, associate provost for academic excellence operations.

The Chair explained that both she and the SC have the authority to waive some SRs, as long as those waivers are reported to Senate. On behalf of Senate and SC, in mid-December she approved a request from Associate Provost Turner and the Registrar's office to change the 2017-18 calendar to extend the registration period to run through winter break. She said that as a result of the expanded window, UK gained 467 student registrations.

On behalf of SC and Senate, the Chair approved in mid-December a request from the Provost office and Registrar to change the 2017-18 calendar to extend the registration (add/drop) window for students to register over the winter holiday break (resulted in 467 registrations). On January 22 and on behalf of the Senate, the SC approved a series of nonstandard course calendars for Social Work (related to a proposal later on the agenda). Also on January 22 and on behalf of the Senate, the SC approved a waiver of *SR 5.2.4.8.1* ("Common Examinations") to allow a faculty member in Chemistry to offer his common exam at a time that differed from the time listed in the Schedule of Classes.

In November, Firey (AS) moved a motion to compel the SC to charge an appropriate committee to investigate the feasibility of instituting a fall break in the University's academic calendar. The President of the Student Government Association (SGA) Ben Childress sent proposal for a fall break to the Chair on February 5 and it will be discussed at SC on February 19. The report has support from Dean of Students and other stakeholders.

The SC heard a presentation by UK's Registrar and Director of Financial Aid regarding federal financial aid disbursement and class attendance. UK must report the number of students receiving financial aid and is also accountable for reimbursement or disbursement of those dollars. It has come to the attention of the Registrar that if a university disburses financial aid for a student who is not in class, the university is held responsible for returning the money; that is a position that UK would like to avoid. Registrar Kim Taylor will come to Senate in the future to explain more fully. In summary, to remain in federal compliance, UK must examine the system by which students who are not in class are removed from class roles (*SR 5.1.10* ("Not in Class")). She suggested that senators could expect more information on this initiative in the coming months.

b. Vice Chair

Vice Chair Bird-Pollan (LA) had no report.

c. Parliamentarian

Parliamentarian Cross (CI) had no report.

d. Trustee

Grossman (AS) and Blonder (ME) had no report.

Moving to action items, the Chair reminded senators that all Senate members (ex officio and elected) may discuss degree-list related items but per KRS 164.240 and *SR 1.4.0*, only senators elected by college faculty ("elected faculty senators") may vote on such items.

3. Degree Recipients

a. May 2017 In Memoriam Honorary Degree Recipient

i. College of Medicine Student

The Chair invited Guest Andrew Hoellein (ME/Internal Medicine, associate dean for student affairs) to explain the request, noting that the student in question was part of an academic partnership with the College of Dentistry. The student had already earned his DMD and was working on his MD at the time of his passing. Hoellein confirmed for Wood (AS) that the honorary degree sought was a “doctor of medicine.”

The Chair explained that the **motion** was a recommendation from the SC that the elected faculty senators approve College of Medicine student KN-98 as the recipient of an In Memoriam honorary degree, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. Grossman asked that the motion be revised to include the degree designation (“doctor of medicine”) and there were no objections. A **vote** was taken on the motion that the elected faculty senators approve College of Medicine student KN-98 as the recipient of an In Memoriam honorary degree (doctor of medicine), for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. The motion **passed** with 76 in favor and two abstained.

The Chair reminded senators that the degree list that the Senate receives from the Registrar for each graduation is essentially a list of students who have applied for graduation. The Senate approves the list with the caveat that after Board approval of the same list, the Registrar will then certify that each student has actually satisfied all degree requirements. Upon such certification, the degree conferral is then shown on the transcript. The steps happen in this order because frequently Senate and Board approval occur prior to the time when final course grades are submitted at the end of the semester.

b. Late Additions to May 2017 Degree List (per Senate Rules 5.4.1.1.D.1-2)

i. Motion to Amend Something Previously Adopted (May 2017 Degree List) for College of Communication and Information Student RT-61: Bestow BS in Communication and Rescind BS with Double Major in Communication (primary) and Sociology (secondary)

The Chair explained the request. Bird-Pollan (LA) commented that the motion read “December” but it should be “May.” Ms. Brothers revised the motion accordingly and the Chair accepted the change on behalf of SC as a friendly amendment. The **motion** from the SC was a recommendation that the elected faculty members amend the May 2017 degree list for College of CI student RT-61 by conferring the BS Communication (single major) & rescinding the BS with a Double Major in Communication (primary) & Sociology (secondary), for submission through 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 none opposed.

c. Late Additions to Early August 2017 Degree List (per Senate Rules 5.4.1.1.D.1-2)

i. Motion to Amend Something Previously Adopted (Early August 2017 Degree List) for Graduate School Student TA-71: Bestow PhD Education and Counseling Psychology – Educational Psychology and Rescind PhD Education and Counseling Psychology - Counseling Psychology

The Chair explained the request. The **motion** from the SC was a recommendation that the elected faculty senators amend the early August 2017 degree list for Graduate School student TA-71 by conferring the PhD in Education and Counseling Psychology – Educational Psychology and rescinding the PhD in Education and Counseling Psychology - Counseling Psychology, for submission through 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 78 in favor and none opposed.

d. Late Additions to December 2017 Degree List (per Senate Rules 5.4.1.1.D.1-2)

i. Motion to Add to December 2017 Degree List: College of Arts and Sciences Student CM-33

The Chair explained the request. The **motion** from the SC was a recommendation that the elected faculty senators amend the December 2017 degree list by adding the BA Geological Sciences for student CM-33 and recommend through the President to the Board of Trustees that the degree be awarded effective December 2017. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 76 in favor and none opposed.

ii. Motion to Add to December 2017 Degree List: College of Arts and Sciences Student BJ-32

The Chair explained the request. The **motion** from the SC was a recommendation that the elected faculty senators amend the December 2017 degree list by adding the BA Psychology for student BJ-32 and recommend through the President to the Board of Trustees that the degree be awarded effective December 2017. There were no questions or comments from senators. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 77 in favor and none opposed.

iii. Motion to Add to December 2017 Degree List: College of Arts and Sciences Student CT-81

The Chair explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SC was a recommendation that the elected faculty senators amend the December 2017 degree list by adding the Bachelor of Liberal Studies degree for student CT-81 and recommend through the President to the Board of Trustees that the degree be awarded effective December 2017. 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 79 in favor and none opposed.

iv. Motion to Add to December 2017 Degree List: College of Arts and Sciences Student NM-03

The Chair explained the request. The **motion** from the SC was a recommendation that the elected faculty senators amend the December 2017 degree list by adding the Bachelor of Liberal Studies degree for student NM-03 and recommend through the President to the Board of Trustees that the degree be awarded effective December 2017. 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 78 in favor and one abstained.

v. Motion to Add to December 2017 Degree List: College of Arts and Sciences Student LH-90

The Chair explained the request. The **motion** from the SC was a recommendation that the elected faculty members of SC amend the December 2017 degree list by adding the BS Geological Sciences degree for College of Arts and Sciences student LH-90 and recommend through the President to the Board of Trustees that the degree be awarded effective December 2017. D. Jones (ME) noted that the motion should instead refer to "elected faculty senators." Ms. Brothers revised the motion accordingly and the Chair accepted the change on behalf of SC as a friendly amendment. A **vote** was taken on the motion that the elected faculty senators amend the December 2017 degree list by adding the BS Geological Sciences degree for College of Arts and Sciences student LH-90 and recommend through the President to the Board of Trustees that the degree be awarded effective December 2017. The motion **passed** with 78 in favor and one abstained.

vi. Motion to Add to December 2017 Degree List: College of Health Sciences Student PM-01 (will be handed out in meeting)

The Chair explained that student PM-01 entered the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) program without having first earned an undergraduate degree, which was in compliance with admission standards included in the DPT program as approved by Senate in 2005. In mid-December 2017, it was discovered that some aspects of the DPT program policies and practices were not consistent with SRs. As a result, student PM-01 was not included on the December 2017 degree list. Faculty and staff in the college and department have already begun the process of engaging with the Senate Council office for help in revising the program to be in accordance with applicable SRs.

The Chair said that the **motion** from SC was a recommendation that the elected faculty senators amend the December 2017 degree list by adding the requested degree for College of Health Sciences student PM-01 and recommend through the President to the Board of Trustees that the degree be awarded effective December 2017. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

Grossman (AS) said that it was his understanding that the Registrar would not authorize the degree until the student completed the degree requirements. The action item being asked of Senate was to put the student on the degree list. If the Registrar finds that the student did not complete the degree requirements, the student can only earn the degree if the College comes to the SC to ask for a waiver of certain requirements. Grossman summarized by saying that if the student had not completed the degree requirements, the issue would be presented to SC before the student could receive the degree. Wood (AS) said it was her understanding that the Registrar would inform the College if the degree requirements had not been satisfied.

Cramer (BE) asked why this particular situation was treated differently from other FERPA-protected records. The Chair explained that this FERPA protection related to senators' need to see the document to carry out professional, Senate-related duties. There were no additional questions or comments from senators. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 68 in favor, two opposed, and seven abstained. The Chair asked senators to pass the FERPA-protected handouts to the end of the row, where they would be picked up. In response to Cramer's comment, the Chair added that she was asking that the files be returned because the student was in a small program. If someone so desired, they could probably find sufficient information to identify the student; the Senate had taken steps to protect that student's right to privacy.

#### 4. Committee Reports

##### a. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) – Herman Farrell, Chair

##### i. Proposed Change to MSW (Army)

Farrell (FA), chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the proposed changes to the MSW (Army). Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

Tagavi (EN) expressed concern about the course load for students in the program. Farrell explained that the SAASC had reviewed that concern prior to submitting the proposal to the SC and had been informed that students would be dedicating all their time during the seven weeks of each "mini-mester" to coursework. Flaherty explained that students in the MSW (Army) program would have no outside responsibilities. He said that the students would go through a competitive selection process on the military end and would be active-duty military personnel or non-commissioned officers. About 20% of the students would already hold a graduate degree in another discipline. One-fifth of the applicants would be selected by the military to go through Social Work's regular application process for admission to UK. The program would run continuously for 14 months with no summer breaks. Flaherty added that



students who were involved in the program in the past had experienced high completion rates and high licensure pass rates. The students would be drawing full pay and benefits from the military, all paid by the Department of Defense. The program had been approved by the accrediting body for the College of Social Work. In addition, the prior university that had been previously contracted to provide this sort of program had also been accredited by UK's accrediting body, the Southern Association for Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. Wood (AS) commented that the Council of Graduate Schools restricts hours to no more than the length of the session in weeks and that she was sure that this program had received special dispensation for its structure. She acknowledged that it was not a common practice at the graduate level.

There being no further comments or questions, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 75 in favor, two opposed, and eight abstained.

b. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) – Margaret Schroeder, Chair

i. Proposed New MFA in Curatorial Studies

Schroeder, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new MFA in Curatorial Studies, in the School of Arts and Visual Studies within the College of Fine Arts. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions from senators. Guest Anna Brzyski (FA/Art and Visual Studies) commented that the department name should have a singular "Art" and the motion was revised accordingly.

A **vote** was taken on the motion that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new MFA in Curatorial Studies, in the School of Art and Visual Studies within the College of Fine Arts. The motion passed with 75 in favor, one opposed, and two abstained.

ii. Proposed New MS in Urban and Environmental Design

Schroeder explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new MS in Urban and Environmental Design within the College of Design. 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 83 in favor and one opposed.

iii. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Non-Profit Management

Schroeder explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Non-Profit Management, in the Martin School of Public Policy and Administration within the Graduate School. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no comments or questions from senators. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 80 in favor, one opposed, and two abstained.

iv. Recommendations for Significant Changes

Schroeder explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the University Senate approve the SAPC's proposed recommendations for significant changes. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

Tagavi (EN) said that the title of the document referred to "tracks, concentrations, and specializations" and applied to degree programs, but the language was inserted into a section of the *SRs* that includes

certificates. He also suggested that the standard of changing 25% of a degree program (in the proposed new section “a.1” was a logical problem – it seemed embarrassing to allow the suggestion that a change of 24% would not be significant. He suggested that the reference to 25% be changed to four credit hours. Schroeder explained that the title of the document harkened back to the time when the issue was originally sent to the SAPC for review and that the scope had expanded beyond tracks, concentrations, and specializations. She said that she was assured by two different directors of institutional effectiveness and a review of her own of standards promulgated by the UK’s accrediting body (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges) that 25% was the appropriate standard. She added that the language in the new section “a” indicated that an occurrence of one or more of the situations in the new section 1 – 5 could trigger a “significant change” review. She asked for confirmation from Guest Annie Davis Weber, assistant provost for strategic planning and institutional effectiveness and Weber replied that the standard of a 25% change was part of the substantive change policy from SACSCOC.

Jones, D. (ME) stated that there was nothing in the new subsections 1 – 5 that would serve as a litmus test for what entailed a significant change to a certificate. He said that if there was no urgency surrounding the proposal, the SC should clarify the language. Tagavi (EN) raised a **point of order** and said it was not fair that he had to wait for a turn to comment on the proposal and that the Chair should be presiding over the discussion. The Chair commented that Jones, D. had raised his hand prior to Tagavi and that any senator was restricted to speaking about an issue once. Tagavi corrected the Chair to indicate that he had the right to speak twice on any issue.

English (HS) asked if the concerns raised by members of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) about some of the aspects of 1 – 5 not applying to certificates could be fixed by simply removing the word “degree” in the third line of the new section “a,” which currently referred to “significant degree program changes.” Schroeder explained that “degree” was not part of the SAPC’s original recommendation but was added at the request of the SC. She said she was willing to accept removal of that word as a friendly amendment. Tagavi (EN) objected and said he did not consider that to be a friendly amendment.

Wood (AS) said she concurred with the comments from Tagavi and Jones, D. and said it was not clear to her if the language sufficiently clarified the difference between a “change” and a “significant change.” She supported having SC review the proposal. Wood **moved** that the proposal be returned to the SC for review. Tagavi **seconded**. Bird-Pollan (LA) stated that it was important for senators to know that the SC had reviewed the proposal more than once and a majority of SC members had recently voted to send the proposal to Senate for Senate approval. She thought the Senate’s conversation erroneously implied that the SC had not already carefully considered the proposal. She commended the SAPC for its work.

Grossman (AS) said that any time a *SR* is approved, the SREC was obligated to incorporate that rule into the *SRs* and that incorporation could include editorial changes and clarifications. He acknowledged that fellow SREC colleagues might consider the language too challenging to wordsmith, but that it was a possibility. Schroeder commented that the SREC had reviewed the language over the summer and during the fall semester. Blonder (ME) spoke in favor of the motion. Tagavi explained that he was a member of the SREC and that dropping the word “degree” was not an editorial change and could not be “editorially” removed. Bird-Pollan noted that Schroeder had already accepted the change to remove the word “degree” so the SREC would not have to do it. Tagavi stated that he objected to that change, so it could not be a friendly amendment. Cross, the parliamentarian, stated that if there is any objection, a motion could not be accepted as a friendly objection. He also noted that the current motion on the floor

was to return the proposal to the SC, so the friendly amendment to change the proposal was not relevant. Visona (FA) reminded members of SREC and SC that the language would be used by faculty far and wide as they prepared program change proposals and she asked that that fact be remembered as language was being crafted. Schroeder commented that the SAPC had put a lot of thought into the proposed language and had received input on it from a variety of colleges.

Tagavi (EN) raised a **point of order** and stated that senators had to raise their hands to be able to speak. He complained that it was unfair for the person presenting the proposal to be able to respond to questions and comments. Tagavi stated that the Chair had to allow the presenter to speak before the presenter could speak. M. Whitaker (AS) stated that he had a question for Schroeder. The Chair indicated that she would not prohibit Schroeder from responding. Whitaker asked if the intent was to exclude certificates. Schroeder explained that in the SAPC's original discussions, they were focused on degree programs, as that seemed to be the pertinent issue. When they looked further into the issue, the SAPC then believed that it was appropriate to also capture certificates in the proposed new language, although a review of prior certificate changes did not discover certificate changes that would have fallen under the proposed new language. She said the SAPC also took into account the burden on colleges and departments while drafting the language. They wanted the language to be broad enough to capture a significant change wherever it occurred, but that they did not see certificates as being heavily affected. Whitaker wondered if the language was ambiguous and Schroeder opined that the language should indeed include certificates.

The Chair asked if there was any further discussion regarding the **motion** to send the proposal back to the SC and there were no further comments. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 42 in favor, 33 opposed, and four abstained.

c. Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLeL) – Roger Brown, Chair

i. Proposed Changes to: *Senate Rule 5.1.8.3* ("Permissive Withdrawal"); *Senate Rule 5.2.4.2* ("Excused Absences"); and *Senate Rule 9.1* ("Glossary of Terms")

Guest Roger Brown (AG/Agricultural Economics), chair of the Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLeL), explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SCDLeL was a recommendation that the Senate approve the proposed changes to: *Senate Rule 5.1.8.3* ("Permissive Withdrawal"); *Senate Rule 5.2.4.2* ("Excused Absences"); and *Senate Rule 9.1* ("Glossary of Terms"). There were no questions or comments from senators. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 66 in favor, two opposed, and seven abstained.

d. Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC)

i. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 1.3.1.3.A* ("Officers of the Senate Council," "Senate Council Chair")

Brown, a member of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), presented the proposal and explained it. The **motion** from the SREC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 1.3.1.3.A* ("Officers of the Senate Council," "Senate Council Chair"). Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions or comments from senators. The Chair commented that the proposal truncated the list of the Chair's responsibilities; there were actually 15 responsibilities. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 71 in favor and one abstained.

ii. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 1.3.1.3.B* ("Officers of the Senate Council," "Senate Council Vice Chair")

Brown explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SREC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 1.3.1.3.B* (“Officers of the Senate Council,” “Senate Council Vice Chair”). 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 73 in favor and three abstained.

5. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 1.3.1.2.A.3* (“University Senate Council,” “Elected Faculty Membership,” “Election”)

Tagavi, a member of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), presented the proposal and explained it. He noted that there were some last-minute changes to the proposal and those were highlighted in yellow in the revised PDF. The **motion** from the SREC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 1.3.1.2.A.3* (“University Senate Council,” “Elected Faculty Membership,” “Election”). Brown explained that Tagavi intended to accept the changes in yellow as friendly amendments. Tagavi added that the only thing changed in the highlighted areas was to allow for the SREC chair's designee to oversee the election. Brady (HO) stated that the SREC needed to decide which version it was putting forward; a committee cannot simultaneously present two separate proposals. The Chair asked Tagavi to clarify. Tagavi stated that he was bringing forward the original proposal without yellow highlighting, but the highlighted version contained revisions that the SREC forgot to put in the original version. Brady said the appropriate step would be for someone to move to review the proposal with yellow highlighting, have Senate vote to accept the proposed changes or not, and then vote on the proposal in its entirety. Jones D. (ME) **moved** that the Senate consider the revised version with yellow highlighting. Wasilkowski **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** in a show of hands with a clear majority in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

Senators then voted on the revised proposal. The motion **passed** with 72 in favor, two opposed, and two abstained.

6. Proposed Changes to *Governing Regulation IV* (“The University Senate”)

Guest Marcy Deaton, senior associate general counsel, explained the proposed changes. The **motion** from the SC was a recommendation that the Senate endorse the proposed changes to *Governing Regulations IV*. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. Ms. Brothers noted that a friendly amendment had been raised to correct the spelling of the College of Communication and Information, to remove the unnecessary “s” at the end of “Communication.” Deaton said that she could accept that change. There were a few comments. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 69 in favor.

7. Proposed New *Senate Rule 1.4.4.4-5* (“Senate Advisory Committee on Diversity and Inclusion (SACDI)”)

The Chair explained the proposed new *Senate Rule*. The **motion** from the SC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the new *Senate Rule 1.4.4.4* (“Senate Advisory Committee on Diversity and Inclusion (SACDI)”). Hunt (AG) stated that there was a discrepancy between the agenda description (“*Senate Rule 1.4.4.4*”) and the language within the proposal (“*Senate Rule 1.4.4.5*”). Ms. Brothers apologized for the oversight and stated that the correct reference was “*Senate Rule 1.4.4.5*”; she changed the reference accordingly.

A **vote** was taken on the motion that the Senate approve the new *Senate Rule 1.4.4.5* (“Senate Advisory Committee on Diversity and Inclusion (SACDI)”) and the motion **passed** with 60 in favor, two opposed, and one abstained.

University Senate  
February 12, 2018

Given the time, the Chair solicited a motion to adjourn. Grossman so **moved** and Osterhage **seconded**, but no one stayed around to vote. The meeting was adjourned at 5:01 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine M. McCormick,  
Senate Council Chair

Absences: Agbali; Arnett; Atwood; Bailey, C.; Birdwhistell; Skinner; Blackwell; Brennen; Capilouto; Cassis; Caudill; Cheng; Childress; Cofield; Collett; Collins; Couti; Cox; Crofcheck; DiPaola; Dobson\*; D'Orazio\*; Escobar; Feist-Price; Fields; Frisby\*; Gent; Griffin; Gunasena; Hopkins; Holloway; Hustedde; Iocono; Jackson; Kearney; Knutson\*; Kornbluh; Kyrkanides; Lephart; Lovan; Mardini; Marr; Mazur; Martin\*; McClure; Munson; Murray; Murrell Taylor; O'Neil; Pelosa; Richey; Scaggs; Sheff; Tracy; Vickery\*; Vosevich; White\*; Wilson, K.; Woods; and Zadeh.

Invited guests present: Ruth Beattie, Roger Brown, Marcy Deaton, Suanne Early, Andrew Hoellein, Cleo Price, Randa Remer-Eskridge, Brent Sturlaugson, Gena Toma, and Annie Davis Weber.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, February 14, 2018.

---

\* Denotes an explained absence.