

University Senate
March 19, 2018

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, March 19, 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.

Senate Council Chair Katherine McCormick (ED) called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:00 pm. She reminded senators to sign in and pick up their voting devices. She reminded senators that Senate meetings are conducted in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order (Newly Revised) and suggested civility in discussions. She urged senators to be good University community citizens by participating and reminded them to leave their voting devices upon departure.

The Chair called for an attendance vote and 54 senators registered their presence.

1. Minutes from February 12, 2018 and Announcements

The Chair said that there was one editorial change that was received. There being **no objections**, the minutes from February 12, 2018 were **approved** as amended by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair offered the announcements below.

- The Senate meeting date for April changed to April 23. It will still take place from 3 – 5 pm, but will be in the Lexmark Public Room (room 209) of the Main Building. (The May Senate meeting is still scheduled for May 7.) The April date was changed to ensure senators would be able to vote on degree lists prior to the Board meeting.
- The Office of Legal Counsel is undergoing some organizational changes, which will affect the activities of the Regulation Review Committee. The Chair opined that the Committee would continue to meet.
- Regarding the Blue-Ribbon Committee on Graduate Education, the SC will review the comments from forums and discuss the report and how to move forward.
- The February 5 deadline for receipt of program proposals has passed, but faculty still have the April 15 deadline available for changes to courses, program changes, and minors.

2. Officer and Other Reports

a. Chair

The Chair reminded senators that the Chair and the SC have the authority to waive some Senate Rules (SRs), as long as those waivers are reported to Senate. The Chair reported on the waivers and calendar changes that occurred since the last Senate meeting.

- On behalf of SC and Senate, on March 9 the Chair approved a change to the University calendar, proposed by the Graduate School. The change: added an April 15 deadline to apply to graduate and appear on the "early" August list; removed an unnecessary entry for May 30; and added an entry for June 20 as the deadline to apply for "late" August list.
- On behalf of the Senate, on February 26 the SC approved changes to the University calendar for 2017-18 and 2018-19 (involving removal of erroneous references to Pharmacy) and changes to Pharmacy's 2018-19 calendar (resulting from Pharmacy's new curriculum).

University Senate
March 19, 2018

- On behalf of the Senate, on February 19 the SC approved the waiver of a rule for Health Sciences student PM-01.

The Chair noted that it was an oversight that the following was not announced at the last meeting. After discussions about *Administrative Regulations 6:2* [“Policy and Procedures for Addressing and Resolving Allegations of Sexual Assault, Stalking, Dating Violence, and Domestic Violence”] on January 8 the SC deliberated on revocation of a degree as a sanction for a nonacademic offense. The motion moved by SC was that the SC endorse a policy change that would prevent UK from revoking a degree for non-academic reasons. The motion was approved with six in favor and four opposed. The Chair explained that the SC asked the Chair to inform the Senate, President, and Provost of SC’s sentiment, adding that to date, UK had never revoked a degree for any reason.

Regarding the Blue-Ribbon Committee on Graduate Education, the Chair repeated that later in the month the SC will review the comments from the Committee’s forums on February 28 and March 1 and would also help draft a charge for a Blue Ribbon Implementation Team.

b. Provost

Provost David Blackwell thanked the Chair and senators for allowing him time to address them. He reemphasized his stance regarding working with the Senate – he will continue to do his best to work collaboratively with the Senate and the Chair and with SC. He added that he hoped to be more proactive in general and reiterated his remarks from the previous meeting, in that he greatly respects the work of the Senate and appreciates the efforts of its members.

The Provost then offered updates to senators about the following: Blue Ribbon – Graduate Education Report; the status of dean searches; enrollment management; and the University Press of Kentucky. When he was finished with his update, Provost Blackwell solicited questions from senators.

Grossman (AS) asked about enrollment for the coming fall semester. The Provost indicated that the numbers were still active and turned to Associate Provost for Academic Excellence Kirsten Turner (guest, and Provost’s liaison to the SC). Turner indicated that UK was slightly behind the prior year. Duncan (ME) asked why there was a fee for Merit Weekend advising and what it covered. Turner answered that the fee covered the logistics of feeding guests and putting on the advising event. She said that it was those students’ version of the orientation fee, as they would not return over the summer. Brady (HO) added that 50% of the fee is applied to the student’s fall tuition.

D. Jones (ME) asked about the status of the positions of University Registrar, Associate Provost for Enrollment Management, and Dean of Admissions. Blackwell replied that Kim Taylor was hired to be the new registrar and Scott McDonald was hired to be the new dean of admissions. Blackwell said that he intends to fill the position of associate provost for enrollment management; in the interim, Enrollment Management-related decisions have been overseen by Associate Provost for Academic Excellence Kirsten Turner, Associate Provost for Finance and Administration Lisa Wilson, President’s Chief of Staff Bill Swinford, and Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration Eric Monday. D. Jones asked about participation in the Senate’s Admissions Advisory Committee and Blackwell replied that McDonald was serving in that role. The Provost added that he needed to have a few more conversations about the currently vacant associate provost position, but that he expected it to be filled within the next few weeks. There were no further questions from senators.

The Chair suggested to senators that thanks was in order for the members of the Blue-Ribbon Committee on Graduate Education, as they performed amazing work over the course of a year. She urged senators to review the report, if they had not already done so, which outlined the ways the Committee believed that faculty should think about the graduate education experience.

c. Vice Chair

Bird-Pollan (LA) explained that she was soliciting nominations for the Outstanding Senator Award. As Vice Chair, Bird-Pollan will chair the group that chooses the winner, but she noted that the first step was for senators to submit nominations. She referred to the criteria listed on-screen and added that there was a handout in the back that included all the details. Self-nominations and nominations of others are acceptable and she asked that senators email her their nominations by March 30.

d. Parliamentarian

The Chair said that she had received some comments from senators regarding the February meeting. She said she had asked Cross and Bird-Pollan to resolve some procedural issues that were causing items to be stalled on the Senate floor. She thanked senators for their comments and gentle reminders and said that Cross was prepared to suggest a strategy to employ in this and future Senate meetings.

Cross (CI) began by saying that he wished to thank Provost Blackwell for his comments about the University Press of Kentucky (UPK) and how funding for the Press could be found. Cross said that the UPK was an important part of UK and of the Commonwealth and he hoped to one day be able to publish with them.

Cross (CI) noted that some procedural issues had recently been raised, pertaining to role of committee chairs. He explained that Senate had traditionally and informally allowed committee chairs to act as Senate chair during presentations of committee reports, which facilitated the answering of questions of fact from senators. Because the Senate Rules were silent about this practice, it was therefore necessary to follow Robert's Rules of Order (Newly Revised) (RONR). Because RONR can be procedurally complex, Cross suggested that the Senate adopt a new process. At the start of each committee report that involves a motion, the Chair will say, "without objection, presenters will serve as acting chair for purposes of answering questions of fact only." If there are no objections from senators, the Senate will have agreed to that statement. If one senator objects but other senators want to proceed, a senator would need to move "to suspend the rules to allow a presenter to act as presiding officer." Cross added that such a vote required a two-thirds vote in favor of those present to pass.

The Chair said that when committee chairs came forward, she would repeat the phrase referred to by Cross ("without objection, presenters will serve as acting chair for purposes of answering questions of fact only") and senators would be free to ask questions of fact, which the committee chairs could answer. When the motion is made, the Chair will again resume authority for the meeting and guide senators' debate. The Chair noted that the process was tried at a recent SC meeting and although there were not a lot of debate-type comments, it had not proven to be cumbersome. She asked senators to continue to send her their thoughts about Senate meetings. She commented that the Senate performed important work and she wanted to be sure that Senate meetings were consumed with doing the work of the Senate.

In response to a question from Grossman (AS), it was explained that even though a motion will be on the screen in the PowerPoint presentation, a motion will not be on the floor until the committee chair states that they want to move approval on behalf of their committee.

Noting Blonder's absence, the Chair asked Grossman for a report.

e. Trustee

Grossman (AS) offered an update on the recent Board of Trustees meeting, as well as some changes to streets and land around campus. Visona (FA) asked if there were any plans to make Upper Street more pedestrian friendly. Grossman referred Visona to Parking and Transportation for details about that area. D. Jones (ME) commented that a local newspaper reporter documented much of the Board's discussions via Twitter, but he wondered about her references to "free speech." He asked Grossman for the context of the discussions. Grossman said that there had been such a discussion at a campus forum on hate speech. He opined that there were two related conversations occurring at the forum – students were discussing hate speech that is directed at them outside the classroom, but administrators were talking about offensive speech in the classroom. He noted that while UK cannot prohibit a student from yelling an ethnic slur, it was very likely that a student caught yelling an ethnic slur would be invited to a formal discussion about how their behavior could affect how they are perceived. Grossman explained that the Board meeting included a small discussion on the forum and what was said.

Shifting back to the land and street swap with the city, Pool (AS) said that in documents he had seen, Press Avenue had been part of the swap and he asked for more information about that. Grossman (AS) said he was not sure of the details regarding Press Avenue. There were no further questions from senators.

The Chair said that unless anyone objected, presenters would serve as acting chair for purposes of answering questions of fact only. There were no objections from senators.

3. Committee Reports

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

i. Proposed New BA in US Culture and Business Practices

Schroeder (ED), chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal. There were no questions from senators. Schroeder said that the **motion** from SAPC was a recommendation that the Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new BA in US Culture and Business Practices, an interdisciplinary degree program between College of Arts & Sciences and Gatton College of Business and Economics; the home educational unit will be the College of Arts and Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary.

There was no debate on the proposal. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 58 in favor, one opposed, and three abstained.

ii. Recommendation for Professional Degree Programs

Schroeder (ED) explained the SAPC's recommendations regarding professional degree programs. There were no questions from senators. Schroeder said that the **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the SAPC's three proposed recommendations for professional degree programs. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary.

There was no debate on the proposal. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 71 in favor and one abstained.

iii. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Leadership for Deeper Learning

Schroeder (ED) explained the proposal. In response to a question from Visona (FA), Schroeder explained that the certificate was part of the credits that a teacher could earn and apply towards a rank change at the state level. There were no further questions.

Schroeder said that the **motion** from the SAPC was that the Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Leadership for Deeper Learning, in the Department of Educational Leadership Studies within the College of Education. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary.

There was no debate on the proposal. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 67 in favor, one opposed, and three abstained.

iv. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Instructional Coaching

Schroeder (ED) explained the proposal. There were no questions from senators. Schroeder said that the **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Instructional Coaching, in the Department of Educational Leadership Studies within the College of Education. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary.

There was no debate on the proposal. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 67 in favor, one opposed, and three abstained.

v. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Professional and Technical Writing

Schroeder (ED) explained the proposal, noting that the motion from the SAPC was to not approve, based on its academic merit. She added that when the proposal was presented to SC and the SC consulted with proposers, the SC felt the proposal had merit on the basis of academic excellence. In response to a question from Swanson (PbH), Schroeder explained that the SAPC had asked for data on similar offerings from benchmark institutions; benchmark institutions had similar certificates that were comprised of 12 or more credit hours but the proposed certificate was comprised of nine credit hours, which was a concern for the SAPC. When the proposal was at the SC, someone noticed that the benchmark institutions included an elective course, while the proposed certificate did not, which accounted for the different in credit hours between the proposed certificate and those at benchmark institutions.

Visona (FA) asked if the proposed new certificate was part of a larger package of offerings with military personnel in mind. Schroeder said she was not sure of the answer and looked to the proposal's contact person for a response, but he did not attend. A guest from the College of Arts and Sciences indicated that he thought that it was not part of a larger package, but he was not sure. There were no additional questions from senators. Schroeder said that the **motion** from the SC was a recommendation that the University Senate approve, based on its academic excellence, the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Professional and Technical Writing, in the Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies within the College of Arts and Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary.

Wood (AS) spoke in favor of the proposal. There was no additional debate on the proposal. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 43 in favor, 21 opposed, and seven abstained.

The Chair said that unless anyone objected, the next presenter would serve as acting chair for purposes of answering questions of fact only. There were no objections from senators. Farrell (FA) asked if Senate

could review the proposals in a different order than was outlined on the agenda. There were no objections from senators.

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

ii. Proposed Change to Required Credit Hours for BSME in Mechanical Engineering

Farrell (FA), chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), explained the proposal. Farrell clarified for D. Jones (ME) that the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) was the acronym referred to in Farrell's report. There were no further questions from senators.

Farrell said that the **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the proposal from the College of Engineering involving a change in the BSME Mechanical Engineering program. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There was no debate. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 67 in favor, one opposed, and two abstained.

i. Proposed Change to BSCIE Civil Engineering

Farrell (FA) explained the proposal. There were no questions from senators. Farrell said that the **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the proposal from the College of Engineering involving a change in the BSCIE Civil Engineering program. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There was no debate on the proposal. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 68 in favor, two opposed, and one abstained.

iii. Proposed Changes to Engineering Standing and Academic Standards for Eight Engineering Undergraduate Degree Programs (Biosystems Engineering, Chemical Engineering, Computer Engineering, Computer Science, Electrical Engineering, Materials Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, and Mining Engineering)

Farrell (FA) explained the proposal. There were no questions from senators. Farrell said that the **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the eight proposals from the College of Engineering involving changes to the Engineering Standing Admission (from pre-major to major) policy for the entire college and specific changes to the course requirements, GPA calculation, and the overall GPA requirement for the eight undergraduate engineering programs. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There was no debate on the proposal. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 70 in favor, one opposed, and one abstained.

iv. Proposed Change to MSW (Change in Concentrations)

Farrell (FA) explained the proposal. There were no questions from senators. Farrell said that the **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the proposal from the College of Social Work involving changes to the Master of Social Work. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There was no debate on the proposal. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 69 in favor and two opposed.

v. Proposed Change to MS Athletic Training

Farrell (FA) explained the proposal. There were no questions from senators. Farrell said that the **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the proposal from the College of Health Sciences, Department of Rehabilitation involving changes to the Master of Science in Athletic Training. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There was no debate on the proposal. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 66 in favor, one opposed, and three abstained.

vi. Proposed Change to MS Medical Sciences

Farrell (FA) explained the proposal. There were no questions from senators. Farrell said that the **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the proposal from the College of Medicine involving a change in the MS Medical Sciences program. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There was no debate on the proposal. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 70 in favor and none opposed.

4. Proposal from Student Government Association (SGA) on Proposed New Fall Break – Ben Childress, SGA President (First Reading – Discussion Only)

The Chair reminded senators that the agenda item was for discussion only – the SC had determined that the proposal was of such import that Senate would first discuss and then vote at a subsequent meeting. Childress thanked the Chair and explained the rationales for the proposal.

D. Jones (ME) asked if the proposed new fall break would cause any congestion as it relates to end-of-summer and beginning-of-semester campus activities. Childress said that he worked closely with Associate Provost for Student and Academic Success Greg Heileman and talked with Grossman and others about the proposal. Childress explained that the concerns in the past were from Residence Life in regards to K Week, but K Week is currently being revised and Greek life experiences at the beginning of the semester are also changing. Therefore, Childress did not think that the proposal would be the cause of congestion issues.

Grossman (AS) suggested that one way to even the number of instructional days would be to artificially change the Monday and Tuesday of Thanksgiving week so that on those days, students would attend classes for a Thursday and Friday. Farrell (FA) offered a personal anecdote about how a fall break helped him when he was a student and he spoke in favor of the proposal. He did express concern about removal of two instructional days in the middle of the semester. Farrell explained that Fine Arts students have requirements beyond the classroom, such as rehearsals, and he wondered if Childress could add language to clearly state that the weekend was not part of the fall break proposal. Childress explained that for a subsection of students who have ties to campus during the week, it might be a challenge. He said he thought that most students engaged in extracurricular activities would understand that rehearsals would still carry on.

Woodrum (AS) wondered if the proposal would result in now a second struggle to keep students in the classroom, during the fall break that would fall before the existing Thanksgiving break. She said she wanted students to know that professors were not ogres for scheduling an exam prior to the break, but that it would be a natural result of a changed calendar. Childress said that part of the impetus for choosing a Thursday and Friday was to prevent scenarios in which the break would “creep” into other instructional days, causing students to skip class. Kearney (ME) said that time was an artificial construct and suggested that any change to the calendar was made up at some point. Kellum (AS) said that in science courses, particularly those with weekly labs, it was particularly hard from the instructor’s perspective in terms of making sure that all sections of a course receive the same content, regardless of meeting days. Childress said he understood that changing the calendar might cause complications for some but he hoped that if the change improved student wellness, that it was worth trying, even if classes needed to be rearranged.

Visona commended Childress for paying attention to student wellness. Noting that some students at college are far from home and that hunger and financial resources are an issue for some, Visona urged Childress to work to ensure sufficient support for students who remain on campus. Childress said that

there was no intent to encourage students to leave campus, but rather students would be encouraged to relax, however that would work for them individually. He noted that food insecurity was something to keep an eye on. Morey (AS) asked if it was feasible to coordinate the new UK fall break with local school systems. Childress said that he looked at the Fayette County Public Schools (FCPS) schedule and the dates for fall break, but it was not possible to match them up. He noted that he had friends who were student teaching and had to miss spring break, indicative of the fact that it was impossible to make a fall break logistically feasible for everyone.

Bird-Pollan (LA) responded to Grossman's suggestion to offer Monday and Tuesday classes on a Thursday and Friday. She said that Law tried it and it only worked when the college had the authority to schedule every classroom in its building. She thought it would be too complicated for it to work on a campuswide basis. Cramer (EN) said that the breaks not matching up between UK and local school systems created a big problem, especially for staff. Hulse supported Bird-Pollan's comments, saying that he was at an institution that tried it many years ago and it created a lot of confusion. Soult (AS) asked if Childress had reached out to FCPS to see if they could work with UK on a fall break that matched. Childress said that the fall break was designed for students and that he thought that faculty would remain on campus. Swanson (PbH) said that there were a lot of counties' spring breaks to consider in addition to FCPS and that tying the policy to one school system's break was too big of a burden. e. Whitaker (AS) said that the proposal could affect common hour exams and Childress explained that part of the impetus behind delaying the implementation date until fall 2019 was to build in time to address some of those sorts of considerations.

As there were no further questions, Childress thanked senators for their comments and questions and indicated that it would be back on the Senate's agenda for the April meeting.

The Chair suggested that senators review the information available online regarding "Our Path Forward."

5. Commonwealth of Kentucky's Budget Process – Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration Eric Monday

Provost Blackwell explained that Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration Eric Monday was not available to attend, so Blackwell would give the presentation in Monday's place.

Provost Blackwell offered senators an update on the budget process and five-year financial plan. There were a handful of questions from senators. There was a request for additional statistical information regarding UK LEADS, a program to improve retention.

Grossman (AS) **moved** to adjourn and Brady (HO) **seconded**. There was no vote because senators were busy leaving. The meeting was adjourned at 5:06 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine M. McCormick,
Senate Council Chair

Absences: Agbali; Arnett; Atwood; Bailey; Bailey; Bailey; Beck; Birdwhistell; Blackwell; Blonder; Brennen; Capilouto; Cassis; Caudill; Cheng; Cofield; Collins; Couti; Cox; Crofcheck; Danner; DiPaola; D'Orazio; Dziubla; Ederington; Escobar; Feist-Price; Fields*; Gent; Giancarlo; Griffin; Gunasena; Guy; Hall; Heath*;

* Denotes an explained absence.

University Senate
March 19, 2018

Holloway; Hopkins; Hunt*; Hustedde; locono; Jackson; Kennedy; Koch*; Kornbluh*; Kyrkanides; Lauersdorf*; Lovan; Luhan*; Mardini; Martin*; Mazur; McClure; Miller-Spillman; Mitchell*; Munson; Murray; O'Hair, D. *; O'Neil; Peloza; Regard; Richey; Rohr; Scaggs; Shanda; Sheff; Skinner; Stevens*; Tagavi*; Tracy; Vernon; Vosevich; Warshawsky*; Wasilkowski; Webb ; Whitaker; White*; Wilson; Witt; Woods; and Zadeh.

Invited guests present: Kim Anderson, Justin Bathon, Janet Ford, Phillip Gribble, Hannah Knudsen, Carl Mattacola, John Nash, and Richard Schein.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Monday, April 9, 2018.