

Senate Council

Monday, March 28, 2022

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3:00 PM on Monday, March 28, 2022, in 103 Main Building, although a video conference link was also available. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken 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 informed SC members that the chat function was not enabled. 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 February 21 and March 7 and Announcements

The Chair reported that no edits were received for the minutes from February 21, 2022, or March 7, 2022. There being **no objections**, the minutes from February 21 and March 7 were **approved by unanimous consent**.

The Chair asked SC members to start considering the Senate's meeting modality for the Fall of 2022.

The Chair announced that nominees for the Associate Vice President/Associate Provost for Diverse Faculty Success search committee had been transmitted.

The Chair informed SC members that he had begun having regularly scheduled meetings with Chair-elect and SC Vice Chair DeShana Collett (HS). The Chair explained that the Chair-elect had also begun attending certain meetings that the Chair regularly attends, including a meeting with President Capilouto the prior week.

The Chair announced that the Board of Trustees meeting was scheduled for April 29 and the Senate was scheduled to meet on May 2, causing a problem with the Senate's ability to approve degree lists. He explained that on April 25, the SC would approve the degree list on behalf of the Senate, with the degree list being circulated among senators around April 15. The Chair noted that he expressed a formal concern about planned Board of Trustees meeting dates for the 2022-23 academic year that would prohibit the Senate from reviewing degree lists in December and May.

The Chair asked SC members to recall a concern from the March 7 SC meeting regarding the Rosenberg College of Law calendar for the 2022-23 academic year and the last day to withdraw from classes with a full refund. The Chair informed SC members that he was requesting the College of Law and the Registrar submit a request for a calendar change for SC to consider next week.

The Chair informed SC members that there were questions regarding the Economic Development Collaborative and asked Acting Provost Robert DiPaola where questions should be directed. The Provost noted that he would find out where questions should be directed. The Chair commented that he would transmit questions about the Economic Development Collaborative to the Provost.

The Chair noted that a productive model for administrative requests for deeper interactions with the SC might be to select individuals from SC with whom to schedule additional meetings. He noted that he and Collett were pursuing this approach for discussions of college finances with the Provost Budget Office. A couple of individuals would be identified and scheduled for a meeting, although SC members would be invited to participate as well. The Chair indicated a similar model could work for a request from Senior Associate Provost for Administration and Academic Affairs Kathryn Cardarelli regarding participation in the Council on Postsecondary Education's

(CPE) Kentucky Graduate Profile Academy. The Chair informed SC members that Cardarelli was seeking two SC representatives to be the anchor for discussions on the CPE activity, with meetings open to SC members. The Chair recommended SC members Bob Grossman (AS) and Student Government Association (SGA) President Michael Hawse. Grossman and Hawse agreed to participate.

2. Old Business

a. Proposed Reorganization of the School of Human Environmental Sciences (within the College of Agriculture, Food and Environment)

The Chair informed SC members that the proposed reorganization of the School of Human Environmental Sciences (with the College of Agriculture, Food and Environment) was for the transfer of the Departments of Dietetics and Human Nutrition, Family Sciences, and Retailing and Tourism, within the School of Human Environmental Sciences into direct reporting to the College of Agriculture, Food and Environment. The Chair explained that the Senate had an obligation to recommend to the President and the Provost on the establishment, abolition, or change of reporting relationships, so Senate would have to review the proposal. The Chair explained that SC could take action to recommend for the Senate to endorse, not endorse, or present the proposal to Senate without any recommendation.

Grossman **moved** that the SC recommend Senate endorse the transfer of the Departments of Dietetics and Human Nutrition, Family Sciences, and Retailing and Tourism, within the School of Human Environmental Sciences (HES) into direct reporting to the College. Cantrell **seconded**. The Chair asked if there was any debate and there was none. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed and two abstained.

The Chair noted that the proposal would come before the Senate in April.

b. Input on Facilities-Related Survey from Senate's Academic Facilities Committee

The Chair informed SC members that the Senate's Academic Facilities Committee (SAFC) Chair Mark O'Bryan was not present for the SC meeting but noted that O'Bryan would value SC's input on how and to whom the facilities-related from the SAFC would be distributed. The Provost commented that he would be happy to include the survey as an additional administrative exercise. SC members discussed the distribution of the survey and offered the following input:

- Distributing the survey to a larger group of faculty members than only senators would ensure a broader response covering more areas
- If students and staff are included, there should be a drop-down menu for a respondent to self-identify as student, staff, or faculty.
- A "drop-down" menu to require survey responders to select which specific building they worked in would be beneficial for analyzing survey responses Providing an indication to survey responders of the intended use of the survey data would be useful

The Chair asked if there were any objections to recommending that the survey be distributed to all faculty and there were none. The Chair said he would transmit feedback to O'Bryan and include Hawse and Staff Senate Chair Olivia Ellis to include participation from students and staff.

3. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) - Gregg Hall, Chair

i. Proposed Suspension of Admissions for Executive MBA

The Chair invited SAOSC Chair Gregg Hall to provide information to SC members about the proposed suspension of admissions for the Executive MBA program.

Hall explained that the Executive MBA program was a joint program with the University of Louisville. He noted that both the University of Kentucky and the University of Louisville believed it would be best to suspend admissions to the program due to low enrollment and high operating costs. Hall explained that courses offered in the program were exclusive to the program and taught by professors on an overload basis. Hall informed SC members that the SAOSC voted to endorse the proposed suspension of admissions for the Executive MBA.

The Chair asked if there were any questions of fact and there were none. The Chair then said the **motion** from committee was for the SC to recommend for the Senate to approve the proposed suspension of admissions for the Executive MBA. Because the motion 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.

b. Senate's UK Core Education Committee (SUKCEC) - Keiko Tanaka, Chair

i. *Recommendation Regarding Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE)*

The Chair invited SUKCEC Chair Keiko Tanaka to provide information about the committee's recommendation regarding WICHE.

Tanaka informed SC members of a proposal from Enrollment Management for the University to join WICHE. Tanaka explained the proposal would allow students to complete general studies curriculum by use of a "passport" from WICHE and be waived automatically from UK Core courses. Tanaka noted that the committee as a whole expressed concerns about misalignment between the WICHE program learning outcomes and UK Core learning outcomes. Tanaka explained the committee did not feel the proposal was a benefit to the University since there was already a process in place for UK Core exceptions of transfer credit and that there was no strong justification for the proposal. She informed SC members that the committee recommended the SC not approve the proposal.

The Chair asked if there were any questions of fact. Cagle (AS) asked a question of clarification about the committee's rationale. Tanaka clarified the committee's rationale for not recommending approval of the proposal was because of the misalignment between WICHE and UK Core learning outcomes and the lack of benefit the proposal provided. Tanaka explained the University had a robust process to ensure learning outcomes were met by UK Core. Grossman (AS) asked a procedural question for placing an item on a Senate meeting agenda, noting that it was unusual for a committee to have such a strong negative recommendation. The Chair clarified that per *Senate Rule 1.2.3.3*, a committee recommendation shall be placed on the Senate agenda unless both the committee and the Senate Council determine otherwise.

The Chair then said that the **motion** from committee was for SC to reject the proposal per the committee's recommendation. Because the most came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair asked if there was any debate. A brief discussion took place and the items below were discussed:

- How the University's rejection of the WICHE passport would appear to individuals outside the University
- A strong current in higher education to make academic activities interchangeable among institutions and
- The University's robust transfer system that is already in place
- Expanding reach to students on the west coast by implementing the WICHE passport did not justify relinquishing internal control over UK Core requirements

The Chair clarified that a positive vote on the motion indicated approval of rejecting the proposal; a negative vote would indicate the recommendation would be seen by the Senate. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstained. Referring to a variety of administration-proposed policies/changes that the Senate previously approved, the Chair commented that the Senate would continue to welcome proposals from administrators.

4. Outstanding Senator Award

The Chair informed SC members that the Outstanding Senator Award (OSA) committee was usually chaired by the SC Vice Chair and included two additional SC members. The Chair requested two nominees to assist Vice Chair DeShana Collett in determining the recipient for the OSA. Cantrell (ED) and Vincent (BE) both self-nominated to participate on the OSA committee. There were no objections.

5. Nominees for RFP for Employee Engagement Survey

The Chair explained that he and Collett met with Employee Engagement and Work-Life Director Erika Chambers in January to discuss the employee engagement survey, noting that Chambers requested nominees from SC members for the committee evaluating the request for proposals for a new vendor responsible for creating and distributing the survey. The Chair explained the importance of the survey, noting the survey's impact on measuring employee engagement at the University and the impact on college funding models. The Chair requested nominees from SC members. Cagle asked what characteristics would be helpful. The Chair clarified that someone interested in employee engagement and interesting in how to select a vendor would be beneficial. SC members provided three names to the Chair for transmission to Chambers.

6. Senate Council Retreat discussion

The Chair asked SC members to participate in a discussion about the SC retreat to determine date, location, and agenda items. The Chair asked SC members to consider the week of May 9th and informed SC members that the retreat generally lasted for three-quarters of a day. Grossman commented that finals grades were due on Monday, May 9th and suggested avoiding that date. The Chair informed SC members that a Doodle poll would be distributed to determine date. The Chair asked for broad thoughts from SC members about the modality of the retreat. SC members expressed the following:

- In-person would be a good modality
- The possible need for hybrid modality for SC members that were not local
- The difficulty that a conference room setup presented for hybrid modality
- Quality was diminished by hybrid modality and conversation was more productive with fully online or fully in-person modality

The Chair noted that members with suggestions for agenda items for the SC retreat should email them to Sheila Brothers in the Senate Council Office. The Chair explained that agenda items for the retreat would be of high importance to Vice Chair and Chair-Elect Collett as she assumed the role of Chair. The following items were suggested for agenda items for the retreat:

- Development of a pandemic plan
- Discussion about committees and committee roles, responsibilities, and workload balancing
- A previous discussion of the oversight of UK 101 (the Chair noted the committee charged to investigate as nearing completion of their review and that SC should expect to receive information from the committee soon)
- Communicating with constituents as an elected senator and how to increase faculty engagement and awareness of the Senate

- The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) required by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC)
- The Strategic Plan and associated need for faculty-, staff-, and student- related processes
- Online course delivery strategy and how technology would be used moving forward, especially for access to recorded lectures
- The minimum number of faculty required for a viable academic department (the Chair indicated this topic would be a good one for the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC))

The Chair asked SC members to email additional retreat agenda items to Sheila Brothers.

7. Items from the Floor

The Chair welcomed items from the floor.

The Provost provided SC members with an update on the search for the College of Arts and Sciences dean and explained in-person visits were being scheduled for faculty to have an opportunity to interact with the candidates. The Provost noted the strength of the candidates. After a comment from the Chair, the Provost confirmed that SC members would be included in sessions, noting that there would be a plethora of communication about the candidate visits.

Hawse introduced SC members to the SGA President-elect Andrew Laws and informed SC members that Laws, in addition to the new SGA SC members, who would be elected in April, would begin their terms after Spring commencement. The Chair congratulated Laws and noted that SC looked forward to working with him.

Davy Jones (ME) asked a clarifying question about the action taken on the HES proposal earlier in the meeting and whether the motion was framed a compound motion verbally, noting the motion language only included mention of transferring of departments and not graduate certificate programs. The Chair clarified that the cover sheet included in the proposal made clear that the movement of the departments and certificates would occur in the same action. The Chair explained that the movement of faculty was a necessary condition of the proposal, but that SC was not specifically voting on the movement of faculty.

Takenaka (AS) informed SC members that she recommended to the search committee for the College of Arts and Sciences Dean for SC members to have an opportunity to meet with candidates. She also informed SC members that the Ad Hoc Committee for Academic Policies on Absences met earlier today and had drafted language to circulate via email for a week that she would send to SC early next week. The Chair thanked Takenaka for the committee's efficiency. Takenaka informed SC members that campus visits from the candidates for the College of Arts and Sciences Dean would take place the weeks of April 18 and April 25. The Chair noted that candidates for the Provost position would be on campus during a similar timeframe as well.

Oltmann (CI) asked SC members to consider a discussion regarding the pandemic impact on tenure clocks. Oltmann explained that in Spring of 2021, an extension to the tenure clock was approved. Oltmann noted there was not unanimous agreement on whether an additional extension on the tenure clock or reduced expectations would be beneficial. Oltmann expressed support for faculty members who would benefit from such an extension, especially women, caregivers, and people of color. SC members were supportive of such a discussion, noting concerns expressed by junior faculty members. The Chair suggested SC members discuss and formulate language about the topic via email to place on an agenda.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 PM with no objections.

Respectfully submitted by Aaron Cramer,
Senate Council Chair

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

Invited Guests Present: Sheila Brothers, Bob DiPaola, Gregg Hall, Brian Lee, Lorna Patches, Keiko Tanaka

Prepared by Katie Silver on Tuesday, March 29, 2022