

University Senate
May 1, 2017

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, May 1, 2017 in the Athletics Association Auditorium of W. T. Young Library. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via electronic voting devices unless indicated otherwise. Specific voting information can be requested from the Office of the Senate Council.

Senate Council Chair Katherine McCormick (ED) called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:01 pm. The Chair noted that the Senate attempted to adhere to Robert's Rules of Order (Newly Revised) as much as possible and that conversation should remain civil. She welcomed a new court reporter (transcriptionist), Brenda Yankey.

The Chair called for an attendance vote and 52 senators registered their presence.

The Chair explained that *Senate Rules 1.2.3* ("Meetings") requires that minutes, agenda, and supporting documentation be sent to senators six days in advance, but the minutes from April 17 were not sent out until Thursday.

The Chair solicited a motion to waive *Senate Rules 1.2.3* to allow the Senate to consider the agenda, etc. because the entire agenda and supporting documentation was not sent out six days in advance. McGillis (ME) moved accordingly and Mazur (ED) seconded. A vote was taken and the motion passed with 55 in favor, two opposed, and two abstained.

1. Minutes from April 17, 2017 and Announcements

A few editorial changes were received regarding the minutes. The Chair announced that unless she heard objections, the minutes from April 17, 2017 would stand **approved** as amended by **unanimous consent** and there were **no objections**.

The Chair offered announced that a new academic ombud should be named within the week. She thanked the members of the search committee and its chair (Jonathan Golding, AS). Also, the faculty trustee election recently concluded and Roger Brown (AG, chair of the SREC's Elections Subcommittee) will offer an update during the "Chair's Report."

The Chair thanked the departing senators whose terms were ending, asking that they stand and be recognized. Departing senators received a round of applause in appreciation of their service.

2. Officer and Other Reports

a. Chair

The Chair asked Guest Roger Brown (AG/Agricultural Economics), who chaired the Elections Subcommittee of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), to offer an update on election-related activity. Brown noted that there were two elections in the fall, one for SC members and one for the SC chair. In the spring there were two more elections: college elections to identify newly elected members of Senate; and the faculty trustee election. Brown reported that Bob Grossman (AS) was reelected to the position of faculty trustee, but he was not present due to being at a Board of Trustees (Board) meeting. Regarding the results of the recent faculty trustee election, Brown reported that there were about 830 votes cast and the College of Education exceeded 80% participation by its eligible voters.

Moving to college elections for Senate, Brown stated that nine colleges had completed elections already. Next year, the SREC will add the Lewis Honors College as the newest college at UK, adding to

University Senate
May 1, 2017

the existing 16 colleges, University Libraries, and the Graduate School. SREC will meet before the summer begins to review the elections conducted during the year and identify ways to improve the process. He encouraged senators to send suggestions to him or to any member of the SREC. Brown explained that there are a lot of activities that go on behind the scenes to ensure a proper election process, including many emails. He noted that the other members of the Elections Subcommittee were Davy Jones [ME], Joan Mazur [ED], Joe McGillis [ME], and Connie Wood [AS]. Brown offered particular thanks to Ms. Brothers, stating that without her responsiveness and good ideas, the elections may not have been as smooth as they were.

The Chair commented that the members of the Elections Subcommittee did an amazing task, particularly in thinking thoughtfully about making sure no faculty were disenfranchised because of issues outside their control. She stated that the Senate owed a multitude of thanks for the hard work conducted on behalf of the election processes.

Moving to other topics, the Chair said that the evaluation of President Eli Capilouto by the faculty is ongoing and hopefully senators had already completed the survey. The survey closes on May 15 and it is important to have a good response rate; the faculty's responses to the survey are part of a much larger evaluation effort conducted by the Board. Regarding the results of the survey, the Chair explained that the information from the survey will be shared with President Capilouto, after which it will be given to the SC as a whole and presented to the Board's Executive Committee. After that time it will be posted on the Senate's website.

The first associate provost for student and academic life will be Dr. Greg Heileman, who is currently serving as the vice provost for teaching and learning at the University of New Mexico. He will join UK in August 2017.

The Blue Ribbon Committee on Graduate Education held its first forum on April 25 and will hold another on May 4 in the Lexmark Room from 3:00 - 4:30 pm. She asked Spear (ME) [a co-chair with Carl Mattacola (HS/Rehabilitation Sciences)] for a brief update. Spear said that a survey sponsored by the Blue Ribbon Committee was scheduled to close at midnight and encouraged senators to complete it. . He also invited senators to attend a second forum on May 4 for another discussion. The Chair explained that the survey has important issues regarding professional programs, relationships to graduate education, and work in interdisciplinary programs and efforts. She encouraged senators to complete the survey and to share the importance of the survey with their faculty colleagues. In response to a question from Whitaker (AS), the Chair added that the Blue Ribbon Committee will prepare a preliminary report and bring that back to faculty for additional comments. Spear said that there would be additional forums in the fall, informed by the information gleaned by the Blue Ribbon Committee. A website for the Committee's work is also being set up and faculty will be able to submit comments via that mechanism, too.

b. Vice Chair

Bailey (AG) thanked senators for all the nominations received for the 2017 Outstanding Senator Award. He noted that there was a groundswell of support for a single individual, with many affirmations. The 2017 Outstanding Senator Award was presented to Roger Brown (AG/Agricultural Economics). Senators offered their own appreciation through a round of applause for Brown's service.

c. Parliamentarian

Parliamentarian Seago (LI) had no report.

d. Trustee

Blonder (ME) explained that Grossman was currently attending Board of Trustees (Board) committee meetings. She said the agenda for each meeting is posted online and could be reviewed in advance of every meeting. She offered some general comments about Board agendas and meetings. She acknowledged the recent media reports about the intent to rename Commonwealth Stadium. There was some confusion about whether “Commonwealth Stadium” would remain as part of the name, but a guest representative from the Office of the Provost (Associate Provost for Finance and Administration Lisa Wilson) indicated that “Commonwealth Stadium” would no longer be used. In response to a question about the search for a new executive vice president for health administration, she said she did not have any information about it but would look into it.

The Chair noted that she had neglected to report the efforts put forth by Schroeder (ED) and Ms. Brothers in getting two programs from the May Senate meeting to the May Board meeting. She thanked the President’s office for accommodating those additions. After reviewing the CPE schedule, it became apparent that if the Board waited until June to review the two new degrees proposals, the proposals would not be approved by the Council on Postsecondary Education and in effect until one year later, in fall 2018.

3. Degree Recipients

a. December 2017 Honorary Degree Nominee(s)

The Chair welcomed Guest Morris Grubbs (Graduate School assistant dean for graduate student development), who presented senators with background information for two nominees for honorary degree recipients. There were no questions from senators.

The Chair said that the first **motion** from the SC was that the elected faculty senators approve L. Stanley Pigman as the recipient of an Honorary Doctor of Humane Letters, 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 65 in favor and one opposed.

The second **motion** from the SC was that the elected faculty senators approve Jewell Deene Ellis as the recipient of an Honorary Doctor of Humane Letters, 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 64 in favor and two opposed.

b. May 2017 Degree List

The Chair reminded senators that only elected faculty senators can vote on degree lists. The **motion** from the SC was that the elected faculty senators approve UK’s May 2017 list of candidates for credentials, for submission to the President to the Board of Trustees. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions from senators. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 65 in favor and none opposed.

c. Early August 2017 Degree List

The **motion** from the SC was that the elected faculty senators approve UK’s early August 2017 list of candidates for credentials, for submission to the President to the Board of Trustees. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions from senators. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 60 in favor and one opposed.

4. Committee Reports

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

i. Proposed Name Change of Department of Forestry to Department of Forestry and Natural Resources

Bailey, chair of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee, explained the rationale for the proposal and shared the list of entities that reviewed and approved the proposed name change. The name change was proposed to better describe the activities of the department and to aid in recruitment of faculty and students. Bailey reported that the SAOSC identified only one point of contention, which pertained to absence of consultation with an interdisciplinary program ("Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences", NRES) that identified as having a potential interest in the name change. The potential issue was that part of its name ("Natural Resources") was duplicated in Forestry's proposed new name. When the proposal was being considered in the College of Agriculture, Food and Environment (AG) it was approved by vote in the relevant departments and, at the AG faculty council and curriculum committee. However, during the curriculum committee evaluation, committee members commented that the NRES chair had previously noted a potential conflict when the Department of Forestry changed the name of its MS Forestry degree to "Forestry and Natural Resources." Because this change was for name of a department and not a degree program, the AG curriculum committee did not object in this case.

The SAOSC recommended approval of the name change but asked that representatives of the Department of Forestry (interim chair of the Department of Forestry Jeff Stringer) and NRES (NRES steering committee member Dave McNear) attend a SC meeting and discuss the concerns about the proposal. One result of the discussion was that SC recommended Senate endorse the proposal if Stringer and McNear generated a letter affirming that there would be value in crafting a letter to define the interactions between their two programs and associated faculty. Such a letter was received by the SC office on April 27. Bailey concluded by saying that with that letter in hand, the SC would recommend endorsement of the name change.

There were many questions from senators who represented a variety of colleges. The primary concern was the overlap in the existing name of the NRES interdisciplinary program and the proposed new name of "Department of Forestry and Natural Resources," and the extent to which the duplication could create problems for either entity. Guests Stringer and McNear were also present for the discussion and actively participated. Bailey explained during discussion that the root of the problem was that interdisciplinary programs are not attached to departments and yet the review and approval procedure for collecting information is to talk with departments, deans, and college councils and committees; interdisciplinary programs are not currently part of the review process.

The Chair said that the **motion** from the SC was that upon submission of a joint letter from the Department of Forestry and the Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences program outlining a way to resolve differences, the Senate endorse the proposed name change of the Department of Forestry to the Department of Forestry and Natural Resources. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. Senators discussed the proposal. Debski (AS) expressed concern that submission of a letter about an MOU was not sufficient for endorsement of the name change. Discussion continued.

Debski stated that it did not make sense to include language about "submission" if the letter had already been received. She said she wanted that language to be stricken. The Chair asked Parliamentarian Seago to offer some advice. Seago asked if the Chair would accept striking the language about submission of the letter and the Chair said that she would not accept that (on behalf of SC) as a friendly amendment. Debski (AS) **moved** to change the motion by removing all the language prior to the comma, so that the

motion would change to “endorse the proposed name change of the Department of Forestry to the Department of Forestry and Natural Resources” and Yost **seconded**. Bird-Pollan spoke in favor of retaining language that indicated a letter had been required and received. Mazur asked if it would be acceptable to instead change the motion to indicate the letter had been received, instead of removing all the language prior to the comma. Debski and Yost **agreed** with changing the motion to indicate the letter was received, instead of striking all language pertaining to the letter. A **vote** was taken via a show of hands and the motion **passed** with a vast majority of senators in favor and two opposed.

The Chair noted that the motion currently on the floor for discussion was the **amended motion** – given receipt of a joint letter from the Department of Forestry and the Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences program outlining a way to resolve differences, the Senate endorse the proposed name change of the Department of Forestry to the Department of Forestry and Natural Resources. There being no further discussion, the Chair called for a vote. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 34 in favor, 28 opposed, and five abstained.

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

i. Proposed New Undergraduate Certificate in Sexuality Studies

Schroeder (ED), chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), described the proposal. The Chair said that the **motion** from the SAPC was that the Senate approve the establishment of a new Undergraduate Certificate in Sexuality Studies, within the Department of Gender and Women's Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences. 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 58 in favor, two opposed, and two abstained.

ii. Proposed New Undergraduate Certificate in Baroque Trumpet

Schroeder (ED) explained the proposal and the Chair stated that the **motion** from the SAPC was that the Senate approve the establishment of a new Undergraduate Certificate in Baroque Trumpet, in the School of Music in the College of Fine Arts. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. Yost (EN) asked about the small number of faculty involved in the certificate. Schroeder explained that the justification used when the issue came up in the past for other certificates was that the number of faculty involved could not be controlled by the SAPC or the Senate. If a critical faculty member leaves, the SAPC, and likely others, can expect the School to replace them. If not, then a certificate would need to be suspended. In response to a question from Debski (AS), Schroeder said that the SAPC had not specifically discussed the increase in numbers of graduate and undergraduate certificates; although the number had increased over time, the current year's numbers were comparable to the year before... Schroeder said she had noticed that fewer minors were being proposed; in addition, degree programs were more often recommending that students fulfil elective requirements through undergraduate certificates, rather than just minoring. Certificates, in her experience, were seen as useful in terms of retention, career experience, and expertise in multiple fields; certificates also tended to be a test bed for trying out curricula for degree programs.

Yost (EN) asked if there was any particular push for undergraduate certificates. A guest representative from the Office of the Provost (Associate Provost for Finance and Administration Lisa Wilson) said she was unaware of any such initiative in the Provost's area. In response to a question from Debski (AS) about assessment, Schroeder (ED) explained that according to UK's Office of Institutional Effectiveness, certificates are reviewed at the same time and with the same criteria as other programs. There being no further comments or questions, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 54 in favor, two opposed, and one abstained .

iii. Recommendations for University Scholars Programs Not Approved by Senate

Schroeder (ED) explained the proposal and clarified that it referred to University Scholars Programs (USPs) that had not reached, nor been presented, to Senate for approval, not that the USPs were voted down by Senate. She said she met with interim Dean of the Graduate School Brian Jackson and he thought the Graduate Council would also find the proposal acceptable. Schroeder said there were three recommendations from SAPC. First, contact all the USPs not approved by Senate (on pages two through three of the documentation provided) and ask them to submit the USP form; because the vast majority were approved by the Graduate School, Schroeder explained that an assumption was being made that the USPs all previously received department and college approval and therefore no such approval-related information would be required at this time. The USP forms will be due by August 31. Second, the forms will be reviewed by the SAPC and approved no later than September 30. The third and final step pertained to USPs with no record of approval by the Graduate School. For these proposals, the dean of the Graduate School will contact DGSs of the USPs not approved by the Graduate School and ask them to submit paperwork (with proof of college level review) no later than August 31 to the Graduate Council to be reviewed and processed through the normal approval process. The motion from the SAPC was that the Senate approve the SAPC's three recommendations on University Scholars Programs not approved by Senate. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. In response to Whitaker (AS), Schroeder said that the identification of who would complete the paperwork (USP form plus sample curriculum contract) would be left up to each individual program – the form was only three pages long and can easily be completed between the time nine-month faculty return on August 16 and the end of August. Also, there was no discussion about suspending any of the USPs, nor any suggestion that it was necessary, even from the perspective of Institutional Effectiveness. Schroeder said it was important to clean up the problem after it was identified and as part of that, Senate needed to ensure it was on record that it was following its own curricular procedures and have paperwork to document it. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 56 in favor, none opposed, and one abstained.

iv. Year-end Report

Schroeder (ED) offered a report on the SAPC's activities over the current academic year. The SAPC reviewed 27 proposals: four undergraduate certificates; one BA program; one MS program; seven graduate certificates; two PhD programs; three University Scholars Programs; two graduate certificate suspensions; three Masters suspensions; two BS suspensions; and two BAEd deletions. One program withdrew their proposal after/during SAPC review; two programs were tabled until fall 2017 for lack of necessary additional information, and three interpretations or recommendations were given. Schroeder said that there had been an uptick in proposals this academic year. Schroeder thanked senators for their participation in thoughtful processes and asked for the members of the SAPC to stand and be recognized. Senators offered their appreciation to SAPC members with a round of applause. Giancarlo (AS) offered his appreciation for Schroeder's service and she was also thanked by senators with a round of congratulatory applause.

The Chair reminded senators that the names of honorary degree nominees should be kept confidential until it was widely announced.

5. Proposed Changes to Administrative Regulations

a. Background Information

The Chair introduced Guests Nick Kehrwald (interim dean of students) and Marcy Deaton (senior associate general counsel). The Chair said she appreciated the opportunity to work with both of them in efforts to improve the circumstances for members of the University community. Kehrwald offered

background information on both *Administrative Regulations* and answered a variety of questions from senators.

b. Proposed Changes to *Administrative Regulations 4:11* (“Community of Concern Team”)

The Chair reported that the **motion** from the SC was that the Senate endorse the proposed changes to *Administrative Regulations 4:11* as amended. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. After additional discussion, McGillis (ME) **moved** to amend the proposal by recommending the addition of four positions of teaching faculty to the Community of Concern. Fiedler (AS) **seconded**. There was extensive discussion about the proposed amendment, as well as related issues; both Kehrwald and Deaton participated. McGillis (ME) and other senators discussed other possible changes to the proposed amended language, with concerns being raised that the language could inadvertently exclude lecturers or clinical faculty. Debski (AS) suggested use of “current teaching DOE assignment.” An additional suggestion was to change the motion to endorsing the proposed changes to *Administrative Regulations 4:11* (“Community of Concern Team”) with the additional recommendation to add four positions of faculty from the regular title series, special title series, or lecturer title series to the Community of Concern.

Ultimately, senators expressing opinions were comfortable with the additional recommendation being to add to the Community of Concern a pool of four positions of faculty with a DOE that includes teaching. Both McGillis (ME) and Fiedler (AS) **approved** of the new language. A **vote** was taken on the motion to recommend amending the proposal and the motion **passed** with a vast majority in favor and three opposed. A **vote** was taken on the motion to endorse the proposed changes to *Administrative Regulations 4:11* (“Community of Concern Team”) with the additional recommendation to add four positions of faculty with a DOE that includes teaching. The motion **passed** 31 in favor, five opposed, and one abstained.

c. Proposed Changes to *Administrative Regulations 4:12* (“Student Involuntary Medical Withdrawal Policy and Procedures”)

The Chair explained that the motion from SC was that the Senate endorse the proposed changes to *Administrative Regulations 4:12*. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. In response to comments from Wood, the Chair said that the Senate’s Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee was consulted and was willing to serve as an appeals body. The Chair asserted that an appeal simply could not be heard by the same body that made the initial decision. Debski asked a series of questions pertaining to a professor’s control of the classroom.

At 4:55 pm, Lauersdorf raised a **point of order** to ask if quorum was still present. After some brief consultations, the Chair called for a **vote** and 32 senators voted in favor and two were opposed. The Chair ruled that the motion **failed** due to lack of a quorum.

The remaining senators departed at 5:01 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Ernie Bailey,
University Senate Secretary

Absences: Anyaegbunam; Beaulieu; Birdwhistell, M.; Birdwhistell, T.; Blackwell; Botts; Brennen; Buck; Butler; Capilouto; Cassis; Cheng; Clark; Cofield; Cox; Danner; de Beer; DiPaola; Effgen; El-Mallakh*;

* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.

University Senate
May 1, 2017

Escobar; Folmar; Ford; Forren; Freeman; Grossman; Guy; Harris; Healy*; Heath* ; Herrera; Hippisley; Holloway; Iocono; Jackson; Jones, D.; Kennedy*; Kilgore ;Knott ; Koher; Kornbluh; Kurczaba; Kyrkanides; Lephart; Martin, A.; Martin, T.; McMahon; Mills; Murray; Nichols; O'Hair; Regard; Reid; Rice; Richey; Rohr; Royster; Sogin; Sokan; Stekardis; Summey; Tagavi; Thompson; Tracy; Troutman; Truszczynski; Valdez; Vosevich; Webb* ; Wilson, K.; Witt; Woodrum*; Woods; Xenos*; Yeager; and Youngberg.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Friday, May 26, 2017.