

# Senate Council

Monday, January 31, 2022

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3:00 PM on Monday, January 31, 2022, in 103 Main Building, although a video conference link was also available. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Aaron Cramer (EN) called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:00 PM. The Chair welcomed those present. He informed everyone that the session was being recorded for notetaking purposes and noted that it was an open meeting. He asked that the SC members participating via Zoom to type their name and affiliation into the chat box and added that the chat function is generally only used for attendance and not monitored. He asked that all attendees, online and in person, state their name and affiliation prior to speaking, to ensure everyone knew who was speaking.

## 1. Minutes from January 10 and Announcements

The Chair requested that the SC move agenda item 5 to occur after announcements. There were **no objections**.

The Chair reported that edits were received for the minutes from January 10, 2022. There being **no objections**, the amended minutes from January 10, 2022 were **approved by unanimous consent**.

The Chair informed SC members that he received a query about combining Fall Break and Thanksgiving Break. The Chair asked SC members for their thoughts. SC members shared their thoughts, which included the following:

- Undergraduate students generally preferred two separate breaks, given the longer length of time between Labor Day and Thanksgiving
- A combined break would make traveling easier
- Monday and Tuesday class sessions during the week of Thanksgiving were frequently cancelled and not used optimally
- A combined break would offer a better parallel to the Spring semester

The Chair noted the motivation to combine the Fall and Thanksgiving breaks was likely in part due to poor attendance during the class sessions held early in the week of Thanksgiving. The Chair informed SC members he would report any proposals on the matter to SC members.

The Chair informed SC members that there was a wide range of responses after the Senate meeting with the Acting Provost Robert DiPaola and Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration Eric Monday.

The Chair announced that the “one-click” attendance survey that was distributed to faculty with the Senate newsletter yielded a mean of 76% and a 20% standard deviation. The Chair explained the results were not far from expectations, but that there did appear to be uncertainty between survey results and the dashboard data.

The Chair informed SC members that the SC office would be purchasing a trial of new voting software, “Poll Everywhere,” which would be piloted during the SC the following week. He explained if it went well, it would be used at the next Senate meeting.

The Chair noted the addition of the SC meeting’s agenda as a copy and paste into the email distributed to SC members before SC meetings. He asked SC members to indicate if this was a helpful addition.

## 5. Feedback on Idea from the Provost's Office

The Chair explained that the Office of the Provost was seeking input from Senate Council about an upcoming event to host an evening with author Heather McGhee for a conversation about her book *The Sum of Us: What Racism Costs Everyone and How We Can Prosper Together*. He noted that the Provost's office was partnering with Assistant Vice President for Community Engagement Lisa Higgins-Hord from Office of Institutional Diversity on the event and was specifically seeking ideas from SC for ways to engage faculty around the book prior to the April 28 event. The Chair noted that Senior Associate Provost for Administration and Academic Affairs Kathryn Cardarelli and Assistant Vice President Higgins-Hord were in attendance. Cardarelli explained that Higgins-Hord approached the Provost's office about the idea. Cardarelli noted she requested to come before the SC to receive input from faculty and students about ways to engage faculty and students. She also noted that the Provost's office had committed to purchasing 600 copies of the book to be made available to faculty, staff, and students.

Higgins-Hord provided detailed information and background about the author and book to SC members. Higgins-Hord highlighted McGhee's research in searching for solutions to economic inequality and other prevalent issues in society, noting the proof found in her research of what McGhee called the "solidarity dividend." Higgins-Hord went on to describe the opportunity for the University to work collaboratively with the Lexington community for inclusive learning and work environments by finding pockets of opportunity to discuss, move forward, and create relationships. She explained there were currently six external partners involved in the initiative. Higgins-Hord noted her intricate involvement in the community and explained she wanted to bring the University into the discussion on how to take engagement to the next level. Higgins-Hord mentioned the Walton Foundation, which was bringing McGhee to Lexington for the event, had decided to invest in the city of Lexington and made an additional monetary commitment that would allow for grants for ideas inspired by McGhee's publication. Higgins-Hord provided more detailed information about the April 28 event.

The Chair asked SC members for thoughts and ideas to provide to Higgins-Hord about faculty and student involvement. SC members offered thoughts and feedback, including the following:

- Lessons learned about successful practices from previous events, such as the Trevor Noah event
- Connecting to the UNITE Research Priority area on campus and the overlap with community listening events
- Utilizing college diversity officers to disseminate information and asking how colleges could participate
- Audiobook options for those wanting to access the book
- Involving principals of local high schools for essay opportunities from high school students
- Cross-pollination of ideas by joint book clubs between different groups, like the Board of Trustees and the Black Student Union
- Involving the Student Activities Board and Student Government Association to help with promotion for the event, particularly via the use of posters across campus
- Partnering with the Civil Rights and Education Initiative
- Disseminating information about the event to UK 101 instructors to inform their students
- Announcing the event in the Senate newsletter
- Encouraging faculty to participate in book reading or other related activities by crediting participation under professional development as part of their job responsibilities

Higgins-Hord thank SC members for their thoughts and feedback. The Chair thanked Higgins-Hord.

## 2. Proposed Calendar Changes

### a. 2021-22 Calendar (Graduate School)

The Chair explained the proposed change to the 2021-22 Calendar pertaining to the Graduate School. The initial description read: “August 11 - Thursday - Last day for candidates for an August 2022 degree to submit final revised thesis/dissertation (EDT) for acceptance by the Graduate School for those students who first submitted July 28.” The proposed change was to replace “July 28” with “August 4” to correct the description. The Chair asked if there were any questions and there were none.

Collett **moved** to approve the proposed change. Grossman **seconded**. The Chair if there was any debate and there was none. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

### b. 2021-22 Calendar (Changing Majors)

The Chair explained the proposed change to the 2021-22 Calendar; the timeframe during which students were prohibited from change majors was shortened. The Chair noted that technology allowed for more flexibility and that the Registrar was able to reduce the window by one month. The Chair asked if there were any questions and clarified for DeCorte that this would contract the window.

Grossman **moved** to approve the proposed change. Takenaka **seconded**. The Chair asked if there was any debate and there was none. The Chair asked if there were any objections and there were none. There being **no objections**, the proposed change was **approved by unanimous consent**.

## 3. Committee Reports

### a. Senate’s Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) – Leslie Vincent, Chair

#### *i. Proposed New BS Leadership for Community Education and Human Learning*

The Chair introduced SAPC Chair Leslie Vincent, who provided a committee report about a proposed new BS in Leadership for Community Education and Human Learning. The Chair asked if there were questions. Collett asked who the faculty of record were for the proposal. The proposer, Beth Rous (ED), clarified that faculty of record would include faculty across both the College of Education and the College of Agriculture.

The Chair stated that the **motion** from the committee was for the SC to approve, for transmission to the Senate and Board of Trustees, the proposed new BS in Leadership for Community Education and Human Learning. The Chair asked if there was any debate. A brief discussion took place and SC members inquired about the justification for a BS instead of a BA. Rous noted that after much discussion from faculty working on the proposal, they felt a BS was a better fit for students entering the program. Rous informed SC members that she would further explore the subject.

Because the **motion** came from committee, no **second** was required. There was no further debate. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed and two abstained.

### b. Senate’s Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) – Gregg Hall, Chair

#### *i. Proposed Suspension and Closure of DrPH Public Health*

The Chair introduced SAOSC Chair Gregg Hall to provide a committee report. Hall explained the proposal from the College of Public Health was to suspend admissions into the Doctor of Public Health program and close the degree program. Hall explained that a particular faculty member would continue in his role in the program as director of graduate studies until the students who were currently enrolled successfully completed requirements for the program. The Chair noted there was a conversation with the Office of Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (OSPIE) about a discrepancy between the language for suspension and closure used by the University and the language used by the Southern

Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC). The Chair explained suspending admissions would prohibit any new students from entering, but a closure could prohibit anyone from completing the program. The Chair commented that since there were still five students in the program, the Senate may not want to vote to close the program. The Chair asked the proposer, Director of Graduate Studies for the Master of Public Health Program Sarah Wackerbarth (PbH) if it was correct that there were students that would not necessarily be finished with the program in Spring 2022.

Wackerbarth said she believed that was correct. Wackerbarth noted it may be more sensible to wait to close the program until current students were finished. The Chair asked Hall if the committee was amenable to a friendly amendment to suspend the program rather than close. Hall agreed to accept the friendly amendment. A brief discussion took place, where SC members discussed the following:

- Program suspensions that lasted five years were required to be closed by that point
- The importance of the language used in the teach-out plan to clearly communicate expectations to students
- The shift from a research-based degree to a practice-based degree (Wackerbarth clarified that the University's previous description of a practice-based degree for the program differed from the definition of the college's accrediting body)

The Chair then stated that the **motion** from the committee was for the SC to approve the proposal with the friendly amendment of suspending rather than closing the program. The Chair asked if there was any debate and there was none. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

c. Senate's Research and Graduate Education Committee (SRGEC) – Alison Gustafson, Chair

*i. Report on Wethington Awards*

The Chair introduced SRGEC Chair Alison Gustafson to provide a committee report on the Wethington Awards. Gustafson explained how Wethington Awards were determined among colleges, noting that the Provost's office was responsible for ensuring that standard operating procedures were in place for the college level and that colleges were responsible for having funds available for Wethington Awards. The Chair asked if it was correct to suggest faculty speak with their corresponding faculty council about any changes in structure within the college for the distribution of Wethington Awards. Gustafson confirmed this was the appropriate course of action. A brief discussion took place, where SC members and guests discussed the following:

- Whether the Wethington Awards were a sustainable incentive for faculty, particularly in the College of Medicine (Provost DiPaola commented he would address this with College of Medicine Acting Dean Chipper Griffith)
- Inequity across colleges and whether the incentivizing opportunity for Wethington Awards were available across the campus (Provost DiPaola commented that he would bring this up with the Vice President of Research Lisa Cassis)

The Chair thanked Gustafson for her report.

4. Nominees for Search Committee for Chellgren Chair and Director of the Chellgren Center

The Chair asked SC members to submit nominees for the search committee for the Chellgren Chair and Director of the Chellgren Center. A brief discussion took place, and SC members provided names for the Chair to give to the Provost for consideration.

## 6. Preliminary Discussion on Badges

The Chair reminded SC members that as part of a shared governance process, the SC approved a pilot initiative of offering badges as a micro-credential. The Chair explained that Vincent participated in the working group for the Digital Badging Program, which was a concerted effort to inject shared governance from the very initial stages. The Chair invited SC members to take the opportunity to provide feedback about challenges. The Chair introduced Associate Provost of Teaching, Learning, and Academic Innovation Kathi Kern, who facilitated the Digital Badges Working Group. Kern described the program, noting the opportunity it provided for faculty to creatively showcase the benefits of their courses and disciplines to a wide variety of students and other stakeholders. Vincent explained that this was an initiative that the Senate had been involved in since its inception in 2020. Kern noted the involvement from others on the project, including Associate Provost for Internationalization Sue Roberts, Senior Director for Teaching, Learning, and Academic Innovation Patsy Carruthers, Associate Director for the Center for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching Trey Conatser, and Acting Associate Provost for Planning and Assessment Katherine McCormick.

The Chair explained the purpose of the discussion was for SC members to provide feedback before the proposal was presented in a final draft to the Senate. A robust discussion took place. SC members and guests discussed the following:

- How badges would appear on the student transcript (Kern clarified badges were not a transcript credential at this point)
- How credentials were used (Carruthers explained badges were managed by a third-party source and could be shared on social media outlets such as LinkedIn)
- If the creation of more badges would devalue the credential (Vincent clarified the potential proliferation of badges was mitigated by the requirement of full faculty support)
- Whether research showed that these credentials were beneficial in successful securing employment (Carruthers noted other universities were using similar “pathways” built with similar credentials)
- The intended audience for the badge program (Carruthers commented that this was usually non-traditional students, students in a particular work field, or students who wanted to pursue a specific skill as part of a pathway)
- Whether students needed to be enrolled in a program (Vincent noted this was a decision made by the faculty, who would determine whether it would be open to non-degree seeking students, as faculty would with any other program)
- The structure of the faculty body creating and approving badges (Vincent noted this would vary across colleges depending on their faculty of record and explained she envisioned the process to be similar to that of a certificate program)
- The visual design of the badges and what designs were preferable (Kern noted she would provide the feedback to University Public Relations)
- The similarity of the program to previous initiatives like Massive Open Online Courses or “MOOCs” (Kern commented that she believed this incentive would serve students better)
- Concerns about the safety of third-party servicing and student data and the costs associated with using a third-party (Carruthers noted the agreement went through the University’s purchasing process, held a predictable cost from year-to-year, and was not integrated with any systems that stored student data)
- Concerns about governance and aspects of disciplinary overlap (Vincent noted that oversight by the Senate would help to alleviate these concerns and increase visibility)

The Chair informed SC members that any further feedback should be communicated to Vincent in order to represent SC interests in the initiative.

## 7. Senate Meeting Roundtable

The Chair invited SC members to participate in a Senate meeting roundtable to discuss the January 24 Senate meeting. SC members made the following comments and observations:

- The meeting was positive, with ample time for discussion and plenty of variety in participation
- Senate members were interested in education and guidelines on campus about masks, particularly with KN95s
- Expectations for speaking time for both Senate members and guests were clearly communicated
- Appreciation was expressed for the report from the faculty trustees about the December Board of Trustees meeting
- Appreciation was expressed to Blonder for having announced her retirement from the Board, providing ample time to consider new candidates

## 8. Items from the Floor

The Chair welcomed items from the floor.

Vincent informed SC members that, in her role as the Senate's Academic Programs Committee Chair, she had been made aware of concerns from faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences regarding new programs that had been proposed. Vincent explained that three program proposals that had been curated over the last year, which leveraged existing resources in the college and departments and previously had support from the Dean, were no longer supported by Interim Dean Christian Brady (AS). She explained there the pause in the programs moving forward and lack of support from the Interim Dean created concerns that faculty would leave the college. Vincent also commented that the programs had support from the faculty and some of the programs were designed to address curricular gaps. The Chair noted that he had heard some of these concerns as well.

Senior Associate Provost for Administration and Academic Affairs Kathryn Cardarelli offered a response to Vincent. Cardarelli noted the Provost's office had also been made aware of the concerns expressed by Vincent. Cardarelli explained that in conversation with the Provost and the Interim Dean, a message was conveyed on behalf of the Provost that the programs should be allowed for consideration. She commented that the Interim Dean had assured them they were on the same page, noting that Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs Anna Bosch (AS) had been a part of the conversation as well.

Bosch offered a response to SC members. Bosch explained their present concern was the financial situation for the College of Arts and Sciences. Bosch commented that the Interim Dean felt he was unable to commit ongoing resources to new programs, and that such a commitment would be more appropriate for the incoming Dean of Arts and Sciences. Bosch said they were very supportive of the programs in question, noting that the intention was not to turn the programs down, but that there were budget constraints.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 PM with **no objections**.

Respectfully submitted by Aaron Cramer,  
Senate Council Chair

SC Members Present: Blonder, Broyles, Cagle, Cramer, Cantrell, Charnigo, Collett, DeCorte, Duncan, Grossman, Hawse, Oltmann, Swanson, Tagavi, Takenaka, Vincent

Invited Guests Present: Sheila Brothers, Alison Gustafson, Gregg Hall, Lisa Higgins-Hord

Prepared by Katie Silver on Wednesday, February 2, 2022