

University Senate
October 8, 2018

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, May 7, 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 Jennifer Bird-Pollan called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:02 pm. She thanked senators for attending and reminded them that Senate follows Robert's Rules of Order (Newly Revised). She suggested civility in discussions and ended with a friendly reminder for senators to participate in the meeting and to leave their voting devices upon departure. The Chair called for an attendance vote and 60 senators registered their presence.

1. Minutes from September 10, 2018 and Announcements

The Chair reported that no edits to the minutes had been received. There being **no objections**, the minutes from September 10, 2018 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**. The Chair offered a series of announcements to senators.

The Chair reminded senators that during the report from the Senate's Admissions Advisory Committee in September, Senator Wood asked if the ACT scores for entering freshmen, given by Kim Woodrum (AS/Chemistry, committee chair), were the mean or median scores. While it was unclear at the time, the Chair reported that Woodrum had since reported to the Senate Council (SC) office that the average ACT score was a mean (this year was 25.9 vs last year's 25.5).

President Eli Capilouto will be attending and presenting at the November Senate meeting.

The *University Senate Rules* have been updated and were emailed to senators and many other individuals on October 1; this version contains all edits through August 2018.

The Senate's new Advisory Committee on Diversity and Inclusion, chaired by Senator Guiton (AS/Chemistry), met for first time last week. The Chair attended, as did Vice President for Institutional Diversity Sonja Feist-Price. The membership of the Committee includes individuals from across the campus; the Chair said she looked forward to seeing the Committee's work.

The Chair informed senators that there was interest from the administration and from the SC to create an advisory group on matters related to *Administrative Regulation 6:2* ("Policy and Procedures for Addressing and Resolving Allegations of Sexual Assault, Stalking, Dating Violence, Domestic Violence, and Sexual Exploitation"). She said the process of developing an advisory group was in its nascent stages and that she would report more to senators as things develop. The Chair said she welcomed hearing about senators who would be interested in participating in this group's activities, as well as hearing about senators' colleagues who might have an interest in that work.

The Chair noted that the next PowerPoint slide was part of a regular announcement regarding important dates in the curricular approval process. If faculty are seeking a fall 2019 effective date, curricular proposals must be reviewed by the appropriate academic council(s) (Graduate Council, Health Care Colleges Council, and Undergraduate Council) and received by the SC office by:

- February 5, 2019 for new degree program proposals.

- March 15, 2019 for other proposals requiring committee review (new certificates, transfers of a degree, new department, change to credit hours required for graduation, significant program changes, etc.).
- April 15, 2019 for courses, all other program changes, and minors.

The Chair urged senators to contact her or Ms. Brothers if they had questions about the curricular process and deadlines.

2. Officer and Other Reports

a. Chair

The Chair explained that at the first Senate meeting in September, she talked a little bit about her philosophy regarding meetings. For the benefit of those who might have missed it, she said she would go over those things again.

The Chair said that her goal, in general, is to preserve time for substantive discussions and meaningful dialogue. She added that senators seemed to be pleased with the process during the previous month. The Chair said that she welcomed suggestions or comments and provided her contact information. She explained how discussions regarding proposals would be organized.

1. Call presenter to podium and introduce them.
2. Presenter speaks/explains proposal.
3. Chair solicits questions of fact for presenter to answer.
 - a. Chair calls on members whose hands are raised.
4. Presenter returns to seat.
5. Chair puts motion on floor – ready for pro/con debate.
 - a. Chair calls on members whose hands are raised.
6. If questions of fact are raised, Chair can invite presenter to respond.

The Chair asked if there were any questions from senators and there were none.

As her last item from the Chair's report, the Chair said that the Provost's office had asked the SC to suggest names to serve on three dean search committees (Libraries, Education, and Communication and Information). She said the SC had deliberated on possible nominees and forwarded names to the Provost's office. The Chair said that when she knew which faculty had been chosen for which committees, she would share that information with senators.

b. Provost

Provost David Blackwell thanked senators for the opportunity to talk with them and said he had a few things he wanted to highlight that he was focused on during the fall semester, but would undoubtedly play out over the school year. The Provost also said he intended to leave time for questions.

The Provost began by welcoming new senators and asking them to raise their hands. Provost Blackwell congratulated them; he acknowledged that Senate participation can be a huge time commitment but said it was very important service to the University. He said that over his past seven years on campus, he is seeing more and more engagement between the Senate and the administration, which was good for building trust and for getting things done. The Provost said that there were a lot of issues to tackle and

there was certainly a need for help, especially from senators. He said he appreciated the time and effort senators put into Senate activities.

The Provost spoke at length with senators about the following areas: Our Path Forward; the Graduate School; the College of Social Work; dean searches; and Wildcat Health and Wellness. He responded to questions from senators, below, during and after his presentation.

Grossman (AS, faculty trustee) commented that with increased freshman enrollment and other aspects of the Our Path Forward initiative, it sounded like there would be a lot more students on campus. Given that there would be a need for people to teach the increased numbers of students, what plans did Provost Blackwell have to hire faculty and avoid hiring faculty whose only duties are to teach. He wondered how UK would continue to hire research faculty, given the expensive start-up costs in the sciences for new researchers. Provost Blackwell said that UK would need to grow financially, which would support faculty lines. He referred to revenue sharing opportunities and said that the first stage of these was to incentivize new online programs, which is where UK sees a lot of capacity for growth in the short run. There will ultimately be additional revenue sharing opportunities for growing existing undergraduate degrees and traditional master's degrees. The revenue sharing income from these will be shared with colleges to be used to hire faculty. Provost Blackwell acknowledged that research funding start-up costs could be a challenge, but there was currently over \$70 million in fund balances in the colleges and he presumed that a large portion of that was earmarked for startup packages for new faculty. Because colleges would make hiring decisions, he said he could not ensure that certain types of faculty were or were not hired, although he acknowledged that the majority of faculty hired should have some focus on UK's research mission. Provost Blackwell added that the net tuition revenue team he mentioned previously was also considering alternative models for broadly sharing enrollment growth back with colleges; he said there were a lot of drafts and ideas that were being considered. He said he hoped to have complete proposals available to roll out closer to the middle of the semester.

Blonder (ME/Behavioral Science, faculty trustee) asked if Provost Blackwell had any information regarding the impending departure of the president of the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE), Bob King. Provost Blackwell responded that he did not know much about it, but he did know that a national search firm is involved and that the search has been ongoing for several months. He said he thought it reasonable to expect to hear something about a handful of finalists within the next few weeks.

Brown, A. (AS) asked Provost Blackwell to clarify his comments regarding demographics being a challenge to UK's enrollment. The Provost clarified that the high school-aged population in Kentucky was flat or shrinking and has been for a little while, based on birth rates and migration patterns. He said the trend was expected to continue for another seven or eight years so two obvious options for UK were to bring in more students from out of state or to find more creative ways to serve Kentucky's nontraditional students. In response to a follow-up question from Brown, A., the Provost Blackwell clarified that it was not that the pool was less prepared for college, but that the pool itself was getting smaller and that the phenomenon was not just in Kentucky.

Giancarlo (AS) asked if the retention rate [84.5%] mentioned earlier by the Provost earlier was a freshman-to-sophomore retention rate. The Provost described how UK and other universities defined a freshman cohort and said that in addition to the freshman-to-sophomore retention rate, the retention rates for sophomore-to-junior and junior-to-senior were improving, although at a lesser pace. Provost

Blackwell added that there was a non-linearity between the second and third year's retention rates and that while some individuals had hypotheses as to why, it was still not clear what the cause was.

Hamilton (SGA president) asked for more information about the selling of carbon credits from the Robinson Forest and income. Provost Blackwell said that UK expected to receive from \$500,000 to \$600,000 in income per year, but that was an average over several years; the initiative involved a multi-year contract. Hamilton asked if the expected monies were earmarked for anything and the Provost responded that there had been some discussion about possibly using those funds to offset the loss of state funding for the Robinson Scholar's program; that funding was ultimately restored by the state legislature for the current academic year, but it was only restored for this current year.

Luhan (DS) asked if the 60%/40% tuition split would be specific to online programs or to new programs in general. Provost Blackwell said that the 60/40 split was specifically for only new online programs and for growth in online programs, using academic year 2017-18 (AY 2018) as the benchmark; tuition growth over last year will be shared at 60%. New programs will be shared at 60%. Later on there will be comprehensive sharing mechanisms for other types of proposals. The Provost said that the sharing mechanism was not yet finalized, but when it was it would provide for a direct flow of tuition dollars to colleges for program growth. He said that if a unit created a new program, it would receive a percentage of the tuition generated. The Provost thought that additional details could be ready within the next month or so.

Campbell (FA) asked about the effect that Kentucky's recent state-level change to drop the requirement that teachers hold master's degrees might have for the College of Education. Dean Blackwell asked to refer the question to Rosetta Sandidge, interim dean of the College of Education. The Chair called on Dean Sandidge and Dean Sandidge explained that there were a lot of technical details involved in the situation, but because some of Education's programs were non-teacher education-related (non-ed prep), she said that there was no anticipation that their enrollment numbers would drop, but that they would have to wait and see. The Provost added that Education offered a number of innovate online programs, too.

There were no further questions for the Provost. He thanked senators for the opportunity to speak with them and senators responded with a round of applause.

c. Vice Chair

Vice Chair Osterhage (AS) indicated she did not have a report to give.

d. Parliamentarian

Parliamentarian Doug Michael (LA) indicated he did not have a report to give.

e. Trustee

Bob Grossman (AS) and Lee Blonder (ME), the faculty trustees, spoke to senators. Blonder explained that the Board of Trustees (Board) had a two-day retreat coming up; she said that given the recent transmissions to trustees regarding the retreat, she thought it likely that the retreat would have a focus on Kentucky's opioid epidemic. Blonder also updated senators on the Board's recent election of officers and members of the Board's Executive Committee. She reported on the committees to which she had been assigned for this year: Academic and Student Affairs Committee; Finance Committee; and Human Resources and University Relations Committee.

Grossman (AS) reported that he was assigned to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee; Healthcare Committee; and Human Resources and University Relations Committee. He noted that at the Board's last series of committee meetings, the Investment Committee held a retreat and was met with some individuals protesting the inclusion of fossil fuels in UK's investment portfolio. Grossman explained that the protesters had been very polite and nice and that he encouraged them to continue trying to persuade people to their point of view and also to continue being polite while doing so. There were no questions for the trustees.

3. Degree Recipients

a. Late Additions to Second August 2018 Degree List

The Chair explained that late the prior week she learned about some clerical errors related to the degree, in the Registrar's office. The Chair said that the affected students had complied with all requirements to be on the second August 2018 degree list, but for reasons that were primarily clerical and related to human error, the names were left off the list that was sent to the SC office. The SC approved that list of students and it was subsequently emailed to senators this past Tuesday. The Chair further explained that subsequent to that, it was discovered that two more students were omitted and those names were sent to senators upon the SC's decision via email to do so. Unfortunately, that addendum itself was incorrect and only one name should have been sent forward.

The Chair said that Registrar Kim Taylor could not attend so the Chair was presenting the item on the Registrar's behalf. She reminded senators that per *Kentucky Revised Statutes (KRS) 164.240* and *Senate Rules (SR) 1.4.0*, and *Senate Rules 5.4.2.3*, only the senators elected by college faculty members could vote on degree lists. The Chair said she would like the Senate to hold two motions, one for each group of names.

i. Students on List Emailed 10/2/2018

The Chair said that the **motion** from the SC was a recommendation that the elected faculty senators amend the second August 2018 degree list by adding the 29 students/degrees who were inadvertently omitted and recommend through the President to the Board of Trustees that the degrees be awarded effective August 2018. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 59 in favor and none opposed.

The Chair said that the next motion would pertain to the additional one student (earning a Doctor of Physical Therapy), not two, who also needed to be added to the second August 2018 degree list.

Wood (AS) **moved** that the elected faculty senators amend the second August 2018 degree by adding the additional student/degree who was inadvertently omitted and recommend through the President to the Board of Trustees that the degree be awarded effective August 2018. Brion (EN) **seconded**. There was no discussion and prior to voting the Chair reminded senators that only the elected faculty senators could vote on degree lists. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee (SRWAC) – James Donovan, Chair

i. 2017-18 Annual Report

Guest James Donovan (LA), chair of the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee (SRWAC), presented senators with a report on SRWAC's activities for 2017-18. Upon approval by the Chair, Donovan answered a series of questions from senators.

Soult (AS) asked why there was a two-year limit on appeals if SRWAC consistently approved waivers of the two-year rule. Donovan explained that the form to apply for a waiver was minimal and did not provide sufficient information for SRWAC to make a reasoned and equitable decision on whether or not an appeal should be heard. Soult said that the rule sometimes discouraged students from applying even though they would be eligible; she suggested that the rule should be changed. Donovan replied that that solution could not be implemented unilaterally by SRWAC.

Giancarlo (AS) asked if Donovan had a sense as to whether the growth in appeals from 2010 to present was due to proportional growth in the student body, or due to other factors. Donovan responded that he could not say definitively, but that he and other members had the sense that it was due to the word getting out. More and more advisors and associate deans are doing a better job of letting students know that this option exists for them. Donovan attributed the growth in numbers to more students knowing about the retroactive withdrawal process and utilizing it.

At the Chair's request, Donovan provided senators with a brief overview of SRWAC's charge and work. Brion (EN) asked for more information regarding partial-semester withdrawals. Donovan said that they had been seeing increased numbers of partials, but he thought that was now a downward trend; he said he hoped he and other members of SRWAC had communicated to deans that withdrawal requests for part of a semester are generally not approved by SRWAC. He said that there were some good reasons for SRWAC to approve a request for a partial withdrawal, so he did not want to see partials prohibited as a whole. He said he would likely be bringing a proposal for some modifications to the Senate before too long and hoped it could balance meritorious requests for partial withdrawals with those who attempt to cherry-pick the best grades from the semester while dropping the worst. Donovan added that members have different opinions regarding what qualifies as a good reason for a partial withdrawal.

The Chair thanked Donovan and he departed.

b. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) – Aaron Cramer, Chair

i. Proposed New Undergraduate Certificate in Cybersecurity

Cramer (EN), chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal. The Chair asked if there were any questions of fact for either Cramer or Guest Zongming Fei (EN/Computer Science), who was present in case there were questions. There were no questions of fact from senators.

The Chair stated that the **motion** from SC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the establishment of a new Undergraduate Certificate in Cybersecurity, in the College of Engineering. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. There was no debate.

The Chair called for a **vote** and the motion passed with 65 in favor and none opposed.

5. Items from the Floor (Time Permitting)

The Chair asked if there were any items from the floor for discussion. Swanson (PbH) suggested that the Senate's new Advisory Committee on Diversity and Inclusion address the issue of religious holidays and Senate meetings. He said he was upset that the last Senate meeting was held on a Jewish holiday and that SC had decided it was more important to honor Mondays rather than religious holidays. Swanson asserted that large-scale meetings should not be held on major religious holidays. Guiton (AS/Chemistry), chair of the Senate's Advisory Committee on Diversity and Inclusion, said she would put the issue on a meeting agenda. There were a few additional comments.

University Senate
October 8, 2018

The Chair solicited a motion to adjourn. Wood **moved** to adjourn and **Beck** seconded. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:21 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Jennifer Osterhage,
University Senate Secretary

Absences: Arnett; Atwood; Bailey, A. *; Bailey, P.; Birdwhistell; Blackwell; Brady; Bray*; Brennen; Bruckner; Capilouto; Cassis; Caudill; Cofield; Collins; Cox; Cross; DiPaola; Dziubla*; Eckman; Effgen; Feist-; rice; Flaherty; Frierson; Gent; Guy; Hall; Hamilton; Hampton; Harley; Harmon; Harper; Heath; Heileman; Huang; Jackson; Jacobs; Jones*; Kearney; Kerns; Kim; Kirk; Koch*; Kornbluh; Kyrkanides; Lane; Lauersdorf*; Lephart; Limperos*; Loftin*; Lovan; Mardini; Mark; Martin; McCormick; Miller-Spillman; Mitchell; Murray; Musoni; Obute; Pool; Quinn; Richey; Roch; Runyon*; Scaggs; Sheather; Spear; Tagavi*; Troland*; Vail ; Vernon; Vosevich; Wasilkowski*; Wilcock; and Wilson.

Invited guests present: James Donovan, ZongMing Fei, and Douglas Michael.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, October 9, 2018.

* Denotes an explained absence.