University Senate
November 14, 2016

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, November 14, 2016 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 reminded senators to participate in the meeting. She solicited comments and suggestions from any senator who did not feel comfortable participating regarding how to improve the environment. Regarding voting, the Chair explained that after the voting slide appears and the motion is read, senators were then able to register a vote on their devices.

The Chair called for an attendance vote and 63 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 items were not sent on Tuesday November 8 due to the University's closure in honor of the presidential election. There were a couple pieces of supporting documentation that were switched on the agenda and the proposed motion would address the switches, too. Blonder (ME) **moved** to waive *Senate Rules 1.2.3* to allow the Senate to consider the agenda, etc. because the entire agenda was not sent out six days in advance. Bailey (AG) **seconded**. A **vote** was taken via a show of hands and the motion **passed** with a vast majority in favor.

Next the Chair solicited a motion to revise today's agenda to remove the five proposals from the Senate's Committee on Distance and e-Learning. Whitaker (AS) **moved** to revise the day's agenda to remove the five proposals from Senate's Committee on Distance and e-Learning and Bondada (ME) **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 68 in favor and one abstained.

The last housekeeping item was a recommendation that one of the agenda items be returned to committee. Wood (AS) **moved** to return the Graduate Certificate in Engineering in Healthcare to the SAPC for further review and Schroeder (ED) **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 69 in favor.

1. Minutes from October 10, 2016 and Announcements
The Chair reported that an editorial change to the minutes from October 10, 2016 were received. There being **no objections**, the minutes from October 10, 2016 were **approved** as amended by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair informed senators that the University Senate and Staff Senate are again hosting the annual December reception with members of both senates and Board of Trustees members; it has been rebranded as "connect blue." The Chair asked senators to RSVP to the Staff Senate's admin coordinator, Brittany Begley.

2. Officer and Other Reports
a. Chair
The Chair explained that the chair of the UK Core Education Committee, Eric Sanday, is leading a review of the community, culture and citizenship component of UK Core. He, the Chair, and others met last week with interim Vice President for Institutional Diversity Terry Allen to respond to concerns expressed by students interested in more attention to issues of diversity. The Chair said she would keep senators apprised of what transpires. Sanday and the other members of the UK Core Education Committee are

also working with UK's Office of Assessment on assessment and evaluation to determine how best to evaluate student learning outcomes in all UK Core components.

The SC approved a new ad hoc Committee on Technology, which will work to find efficiencies and intersections with faculty-related technology concerns and desires between the Senate committee and computing committees appointed by the President.

The Chair called on Brown (AG), chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC)'s subcommittee on elections, to share information about elections. Brown said there were two elections ongoing, one for SC officers and one for SC members. He asked senators to be on the lookout for an email with voting information in the near future.

b. Vice Chair
There was no report from the vice chair.

c. Parliamentarian
There was no report from the parliamentarian.

d. Trustee
Faculty trustees Grossman (AS) and Blonder (ME) shared information with senators about the recent Board of Trustees (Board) retreat. Jones asked for their impressions if there was anything from the academic side of the University that Board members do not understand. Grossman said that he thought it was the issue of tenure; trustees tend to think that faculty value tenure for the job security but he does his best, as opportunities arise, to explain its importance. He added that it was not the case that anyone wanted to abolish tenure, rather they did not understand its value. Blonder agreed, saying there were varying degrees of depth of understanding of the concepts surrounding academic freedom.

Bailey (AG) asked about the extent to which trustees understood and respected the faculty concerns about the proposed Schnatter Institute. Blonder (ME) said that she offered a mini-speech to trustees and was hopeful she explained the concerns held by faculty. Tagavi (EN) suggested that when issues of tenure arise, trustees be reminded that there are very rigorous job protections for some federal employees.

In response to a question from Visona (FA) about the presence of trustee support for opinions such as those held by Governor Bevin, which are generally disparaging of the humanities. Grossman (AS) replied that while he did not know new trustees very well, it was his impression that the Governor's opinions were not shared in the slightest by the trustees with whom Grossman had spoken.

3. Old Business
a. Committee Reports
i. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) - Ernie Bailey, Chair
1. Change of Department of Anatomy and Neurobiology to the Department of Neuroscience
Bailey (AG), chair of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC), explained the proposal. The **motion** from committee was a recommendation that the Senate endorse the proposed name change from Department of Anatomy and Neurobiology to Department of Neuroscience. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary.

There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 74 in favor, two opposed, and two abstained.

ii. Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) – Joan Mazur, Chair
1. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 3.1.2* ("Blocks of Numbers for Certain Courses")
Mazur (ED), chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), explained the proposed changes. The SC had previously tasked the SREC with examining some draft definitions of various types of experiential learning that had been prepared by a University committee and initially vetted by the Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee. SC then-Vice Chair and then-Chair-elect Katherine McCormick asked in May 2016 if the SREC could please draft for the SC what a rule might look like that codified those definitions and the SREC did so. Mazur confirmed for Tagavi (EN) that the paragraph immediately under "3. Experiential Learning Activities" was informational and would not be part of the rule.

Fiedler (AS) asked about the language in "A. 395 Independent Work or Independent Study" and objected to being required to use 395 or a lower number for independent study courses. Mazur (ED) explained that there were no changes being made to that particular passage. Mazur also clarified for Whitaker (AS) that there would be no requirement for existing courses to change numbers to comply with the proposed changes. The Chair stated that the **motion** was a recommendation that the Senate approve revisions to *Senate Rules 3.1.2* ("Blocks of Numbers for Certain Courses") contained within *Senate Rules 3.0* ("Course Numbering System and Curriculum Procedures"). Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary.

When there was no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 58 in favor, three opposed, and three abstained.

The Chair noted that Yost, chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), was unable to attend but had asked SAASC member Kevin Donohue (EN) to attend in his place.

iii. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) - Scott Yost, Chair
1. Review of *Senate Rules 3.1.0* ("Course Numbering System") and *Senate Rules 3.1.1* ("Exceptions")
Donohue (EN), representative for the SAASC, explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the revisions to *Senate Rules 3.1.0* ("Course Numbering System") and *Senate Rules 3.1.1* ("Exceptions"). Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary.

There was a brief discussion about the wording regarding professional programs but Schroeder (ED), chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained that her committee was involved in a review of professional programs and she suggested that the section in question be left as is for now, until the SAPC brought forward their recommendation(s). Tagavi (EN) asked that in the future, proposals on the Senate agenda include a rationale. There were a handful of comments for and against the proposal.

When there was no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 67 in favor, nine opposed, and 4 abstained.

b. Academic Ombud Report for 2015-16 – Ombud Michael Healy

The Chair thanked Academic Ombud Michael Healy (LA) for returning to Senate after his report was delayed from the October meeting. Healy commented that he was honored to serve as Ombud for a third year and thanked his assistant, Laura Anschel, for her critical contributions to the Ombud's office. There were no questions from senators.

4. Provost's Initiatives – Provost Tim Tracy
The Chair welcomed Provost Tim Tracy, noting that he was interested in hearing senators' comments and feedback on graduate education and interdisciplinary education. The Provost thanked the Chair and said he wanted to use ongoing and sustained dialogue with faculty about UK's academic mission to move the University forward across several initiatives, noting that he wanted senators' expertise and ideas. Provost Tracy then shared information about three ongoing initiatives, focused on graduate education, undergraduate education, and interdisciplinary initiatives.

Brown (AG) commented that the Senate already has processes in place for reviewing and possibly sunsetting programs. Brown asked the Provost to share his thoughts on the pros and cons of using an existing structure versus a parallel structure. Provost Tracy replied that he did not want a parallel structure, but rather a process with a diversity of input to ensure the ability to determine if UK was functioning effectively, with correct processes, and with the right people engaged.

Tagavi (EN) asked why UK's vice president for research was constantly cutting support for multi-college research facilities and if the Provost was willing to consider differentiating among colleges because some colleges had higher stipends than others. Provost Tracy said he would prefer the question about the vice president for research be posed to her, as he was not well placed to answer that question. He said there was a pilot program in place that was almost ready to be expanded to all colleges whereby monies would be allocated to colleges and those colleges would have to determine how many teaching assistants and graduate assistants they wanted to support with those dollars.

Blonder (ME) said she was puzzled by the Provost's comments about process and referred to the policies in the *Senate Rules*. She expressed concern about a top-down approach that did not recognize the power and authority of the Senate. Provost Tracy said he would be cognizant of that. Regarding development of new programs, he said that it was possible that people external to the process could identify disciplines that UK could develop. He said he was not intending to subvert Senate, but rather have a campuswide conversation.

Sandmeyer (AS) said he applauded that entirety of the initiative the Provost described and asked about dialogue and conversations and wanted to know how the Provost would facilitate his ability to know what other faculty are discussing and advancing so he could bounce ideas off them and otherwise engage in their discussions and conversations. The Provost replied that he was trying to perform some facilitation by discussing the matter with the Senate and asking how to have a campus conversation. He said that as opposed to a top-down approach, he was trying to facilitate a bottom-up approach that involved as many people as possible. He said everyone should be involved but he was not sure what would be the best method (focus groups, town halls, etc.). Sandmeyer commented that one thing he wanted the Provost to do was to maintain a history of the discussions, because one great flaw in such processes was that as forward movement progresses, individuals forget what was discussed in the past. The Provost thanked him for that feedback.

Truszczynski (EN) said it would be helpful to know when the dialogue would conclude and what the outcome should be. He said that it needed to end with something useful, implementable, and worthy of

buy-in by everyone. Truszczynski asked the Provost to explain what in the Provost's mind indicated a problem and what sort of measure the Provost had in mind to see what would change. Provost Tracy replied that he thought identification of expected outcomes and a timeline for them could be done by May [2017], but it was more likely that it could be expected by the end of the next academic year. He said that the problem that he has heard about most frequently from employers was that students were taught the prerequisites, but not how to do the job – a lack of balance between foundational knowledge and a degree program's breadth and depth. Students tend to move from one field and/or job to another many times, so their degrees must be sufficiently flexible to prepare them for more than one job. For example, if a student earns a PhD, is the student the truly prepared to be in charge of individuals who have been in the unit for several years? What does a student need to know to perform in the workplace? What should a student experience to best prepare them for the next 15 to 20 years?

Cheng (EN) said most graduate research was driven by funding and expressed a desire to see a balance of discussion on funding and graduate education. Provost Tracy replied that there was a need to balance the intersection between a student's experience and the faculty member's research and find ways to enhance the student's experience, which may not need additional funding. Provost Tracy said that outcomes would be different in different fields, but there could be ways to enhance graduate experiences regardless of field.

Because the number of questions had dwindled, the Chair suggested that Provost Tracy move to his next topic of conversation, which was a description UK LEADS (Leveraging Economic Affordability for Developing Success). LEADS is expected to improve academic outcomes for students with unmet financial needs; UK is moving to a system whereby UK awards more need-based financial aid than merit-based financial aid. The data regarding UK students has shown that unmet financial aid often inhibits a student's ability to remain at UK, let alone graduate on time. There were a variety of questions from senators about the UK LEADS presentation.

Shortly after 5 pm, the Chair thanked the Provost for his presentation and noted Provost Tracy would return to Senate in December to answer more questions.

There was no formal motion to adjourn, but senators willingly departed the room at the time of adjournment, which was 5:11 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Ernie Bailey,
University Senate Vice Chair

Invited guests present: Anna Bosch, Geza Bruckner, Camille Harmon, and Brian MacPherson.

 Absences: Allaire, Allday*, Allen, Amaral-Phillips*, Arnett, Atwood, Birdwhistell, Birdwhistell, Blackwell, Brennen, Brown, Browning, Buck, Butler, K. *, Capilouto, Cassis, Clark, Cofield, Cox, Danner, de Beer, Debski*, DiPaola, D'Orazio*, Dziubla, Ederington*, Escobar, Filson*, Ford, Geneve*, Guy, Harris, Hazard*, Heath, Hippisley, Holloway, Jackson, Kerns*, Knott, Knutson*, Kornbluh, Kurczaba, Kyrkanides, Lacki*, Lee*, Martin, Martin, Mills*, Noland, Oser*, Payne*, Richey, Rohr*, Sogin, Sokan, Stemple, Summey, Valdez, Vosevich, Webb *, Wilson, K., Wilson, M. *, Witt, Xenos, Yeager*, Yost*, and Youngberg*.

---

* Denotes an explained absence.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Monday, December 5, 2016.