

Senate Council

Monday, February 21, 2022

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3:00 PM on Monday, February 21, 2022, in 103 Main Building, although a video conference link was also available. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken using electronically using Poll Everywhere unless otherwise specified. Specific voting information can be requested from the Office of the Senate Council (SC).

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.

The Chair informed SC members that SC office staff conducted a thorough test of the audio equipment in 103 Main Building earlier that day. He asked those attending via Zoom to indicate by using the “clapping hands” react in Zoom if they could not hear members speaking in-person at any point.

1. Minutes from January 31 and February 7 and Announcements

The Chair proposed the addition of two items to the meeting agenda including nominations for a work location workgroup that Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration Eric Monday had mentioned at the February 18 Board of Trustees meeting (item 3c) and the addition of a Senate Meeting Roundtable (item 6). There being **no objections**, the addition of the proposed agenda items was **approved by unanimous consent**.

The Chair reported that no edits were received for the minutes from January 31, 2022 or February 7, 2022. There being **no objections**, the minutes from January 31, 2022 and February 7, 2022 were **approved as distributed by unanimous consent**.

The Chair informed SC members that President Capilouto had initiated dismissal proceedings against a tenured faculty member. The Chair explained the procedures for such a process were outlined in *Governing Regulations (GR) X (“Regulations Affecting Employment”)*.

The Chair reminded SC members of a question about program proposals that arose in a previous SC meeting. The Chair commented he had several productive conversations with both the Provost’s office and the Dean, noting that there seemed to be a clearer understanding of respective roles. The Chair described the process to SC members, noting that the fundamental principle, articulated in the *Governing Regulations (GR)*, the *Senate Rules (SR)*, the Senate’s approval processes, and Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) standards, was that it was the administration’s responsibility to implement the faculty’s curriculum as well as possible within its resource constraints, not to specify the curriculum. The Chair observed that faculty and administrators at all levels would benefit from a careful reading of *GR VII (“University Organization”)*, which clearly delineates faculty and administration responsibility and provides a framework for working together cooperatively and effectively.

2. Committee Reports

- a. Senate's Academic and Organization Structure Committee (SAOSC) – Gregg Hall, Chair
 - i. *Proposed Name Change of the Department of Mechanical Engineering to the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering*

The Chair introduced SAOSC Chair Gregg Hall to describe the proposed name change of the Department of Mechanical Engineering to the Department Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering to the SC. Hall explained the name change would better reflect offerings to students. The Chair explained the motion from committee was for SC to endorse the name change in the structure by the name of the department. The Chair asked if there were any questions.

Vice Chair and Chair-Elect DeShana Collett (HS) inquired about the college faculty vote during the voting period, noting that there were two opposed and three abstained. Mike Renfro (EN) explained the results in question were from a college-wide vote and that the department vote was unanimous.

The Chair explained that because the **motion** to endorse the proposed name change of the Department of Mechanical Engineering to the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair asked if there was any debate and there was none. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

3. Nominees for Committees

- a. Summative Review Committee for College of Pharmacy Dean Kip Guy

The Chair announced that nominees were being solicited for a summative review committee for the College of Pharmacy Dean Kip Guy. The Chair informed SC members that nominees should have appointment outside the College of Pharmacy.

SC members provided three names to the Chair. The Chair noted that he would transmit the three names to the Office of the Provost for one to be selected.

- b. Search Committee for College of Nursing Dean

The Chair informed SC members that nominees were being solicited for a search committee for the College of Nursing Dean. The Chair noted nominees were typically sought from outside the college.

SC members provided three names to the Chair. The Chair noted that he would transmit the three names to the Office of the Provost for one to be selected.

- c. EVPFA Work Location Committee

The Chair informed SC members that the EVPFA Work Location Committee was being formed to assess work location in a post-pandemic future. The Chair asked if SC members wanted to suggest nominees for the committee, noting that these would be unsolicited nominees.

SC members discussed the committee, noting that staff may be affected more by the committee than faculty. Trustee Lee Blonder recalled the presentation regarding the work-life survey that was given at the Board of Trustees meeting and said that stress among employees regarding remote work was what led to the suggestion of the committee's formation. SC members provided feedback and names for potential nominees. The Chair noted that he would transmit the names.

6. Senate Meeting Roundtable

The Chair asked that SC members participate in a Senate meeting roundtable, as Senior Associate Provost for Administration and Academic Affairs Kathryn Cardarelli was not yet present for the discussion of the comprehensive transition and postsecondary program. There were **no objections**.

SC members participated in a Senate meeting roundtable and offered the following thoughts on the February 14 Senate meeting:

- The meeting was efficient and uneventful
- The shorter meeting provided more space for people to discuss items from the floor
- More people engaged and expressed opinions
- There was interest in having President Capilouto attend a future Senate meeting
- The voting process using Poll Everywhere went relatively smoothly

4. Discussion of Comprehensive Transition and Postsecondary Program

The Chair introduced Kathy Sheppard-Jones (ED) to provide information to SC members about the proposed Comprehensive Transition and Postsecondary (CTP) program from the Supported Higher Education Partnership at the UK Human Development Institute (HDI). Jones introduced colleagues Johnny Collett (ED) and Phillip Rumrill (ED), who were also associated with the proposal of the program. Jones provided background information about HDI to SC members and explained that CTP programs were higher education programs for students with intellectual disabilities (ID) created by the Higher Education Opportunity Act (2008). Jones informed SC members that three institutions for higher education in Kentucky had approved CTP programs including Northern Kentucky University (NKU), Murray State University (MSU), and the Bluegrass Community and Technical College (BCTC). Jones provided detailed information to SC members about the UK CTP program.

The Chair asked SC members for input about the UK CTP in order to address concerns before the program was transmitted to the United States Department of Education for approval. A robust discussion took place. SC members discussed and provided feedback about the following items:

- The need for a durable definition for how the words “program” and “certificate” were used in the proposal and whether they were included on a student transcript (Jones clarified the intention of the program was not to provide an academic certificate, but a certificate of completion that would not appear on a transcript)
- How other universities ensured that faculty were appropriately supportive and aware of such a program to ensure a quality classroom experience for students (Jones noted an opportunity for faculty and staff to engage in the program and informed SC members of the creation of an FTE coordinator role for the position)
- How students would be accommodated in some courses requiring certain admission criteria (Rumrill explained the students participating in the program would not be enrolled in a degree program and would be auditing courses to ensure a level of flexibility determined by the FTE coordinator, instructor, and student)
- If there were core courses included in the program (Collett (ED) noted that there was continuing conversation about the application of the program and what was most sensible)
- Where the record of completion of the program stored if not published on the transcript
- Whether the program was better fit for another institution like BCTC
- What the impact of the program would be on graduate students who were teaching

- The benefit of professional development that the program would offer for faculty interested in learning how to differentiate further for student benefit
- The benefit of resources offered by the program for students
- How student confidentiality would be protected (Collett (ED) explained that while ID would be criteria for admissions for the program, notification of such ID would have to be provided by the student or student's designee)

The Chair summarized the outstanding concerns from SC members, which included the following:

- The name of the specific credential
- What formal requirements would include
- The path for admission

The Chair then noted the issues were Senate related. The Chair asked SC members if they were amenable to the SC Chair or SC Office staff providing guidance for moving forward with the program. There were **no objections**.

5. Discussion Regarding Ad Hoc Committee for Academic Policies on Absences

The Chair invited SC members to participate in a discussion regarding an ad hoc committee for academic policies on absences. The Chair then said that unless there were objections, SC members should begin working on the committee to determine charge and composition. There were **no objections**.

The Chair shared thoughts regarding membership, suggesting the ad hoc committee contain representatives from the Senate's Committee for Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLLeL), the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), the Student Government Association (SGA), a representative from a unit with large undergraduate classes, and representative from a professional program. The Chair noted the Ombud had volunteered to participate on the committee and commented that it may be sensible to have a non-voting ex-officio member from the Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration office.

Grossman (AS) suggested discussing the committee charge to better represent the focus on academic policies and issues due to unscheduled closings of the campus. The Chair explained that there was an issue caused by unscheduled campus closure but noted that other related issues were present as well including definitions for attendance and interaction as they pertained to online and distance learning. The Chair noted that the question for SC members to discuss was whether the ad hoc committee should be more broad or narrow focused.

A robust discussion took place. SC members shared some of the following thoughts:

- Attempting to define an absence broadly could become confusing due to different course meeting patterns and modalities
- The charge of the committee should be more focused on University closures specifically
- The benefit of considering who the policy would serve
- Discussing absences too broadly would be too much for one committee
- The charge of the committee should be limited to instructional policy for days of closure and how to proceed with different course meeting patterns or events (synchronous courses, asynchronous courses, exam days, etc.)
- The possibility of inclement weather made it prudent to consider academic policies for closures before another issue arose
- Using the committee as an opportunity to think about the logic of what absences mean in each modality

The Chair noted that the SC was in favor of a narrow charge to the committee.

7. Items from the Floor (Time Permitting)

The Chair welcomed items from the floor.

Tagavi (EN) asked SC members to recall a previous discussion regarding SC receiving information about honorary degree nominees further in advance of voting. The Chair explained that after further discussing the subject with Acting Associate Provost for Graduate and Professional Education and Acting Dean of the Graduate School Martha Peterson, there was resistance to the idea. The Chair asked SC members if they wanted to pursue the topic further and offered to invite Peterson to discuss the topic with SC members. SC members agreed they were interested in pursuing the topic with Peterson.

SGA President Michael Hawse provided updates to SC members pertaining to the SGA. Hawse informed SC members that a discussion took place with University administration regarding issues surrounding free speech zones on campus. Hawse explained that the SGA passed a resolution asking for clarification and transmitted the resolution to the Office of Student Success and University Public Relations. Hawse also informed SC members that the SGA was aware of and planned to discuss the impact of Kentucky House Bill 51 which involved the prohibition of mask mandates.

Oltmann (CI) commented there was a recently approved proposal involving a Joint Doctor of Philosophy in Nursing between the University of Kentucky College of Nursing and the Applied Science Private University in Jordan. Oltmann noted that she would like to know more about the endeavor. The Chair explained that UK courses taught in the program would be UK Distance Learning courses and provided the link to the proposal for more information.

Charnigo (PbH) noted the Chair had mentioned proceedings regarding dismissal of a tenured faculty member. The Chair explained the process for dismissal of a tenured faculty member to SC members.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:01 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Aaron Cramer,
Senate Council Chair

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

Invited Guests Present: Sheila Brothers, Johnny Collett, Gregg Hall, Michael Renfro, Phillip Rumrill, Kathy Sheppard-Jones

Prepared by Katie Silver on Wednesday, March 23, 2022