

Senate Council
April 16, 2018

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, April 9, 2018 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Katherine M. McCormick called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:04 pm.

1. Minutes from April 9, 2018 and Announcements

There were a series of announcements.

- The Chair shared with SC members a document outlining the process for review of educational units and programs and what would need to be done, per UK's regulations, to close a program. The Chair said that the document could be shared freely and widely.

The Chair reported that there had been a lot of comments, particularly among staff, about the recent change at the state level (resulting from the biennial budget approved the prior week in Frankfort) which no longer required state institutions to allow employees at one university to take classes free of charge at other state institutions. The Chair said that President Eli Capilouto mentioned it in his email to campus overnight. She said that there was an administrative effort in the works to review available data to determine how many employees were accessing the waiver and to work with other state institutions to find solutions. UK would still support the enrollment of UK employees and their families in programs at UK.

- The Chair also shared with SC members a January 2018 report from Moody's Investors Service that described their evaluation of UK's credit rating and financial status. This information would suggest that financial exigency as related to the state budget was not a likely outcome in the near future. She said that this file, too, could be shared widely and freely.
- The Chair asked Brion and Blonder for an update on the past week's "rally for higher education." Brion said it was moderately attended, but there were a lot of "honks" from those driving by, presumably in support of the rally. Blonder said that there were a lot of students in attendance.
- The Chair said that the work on assessing UK Core was ongoing and she expected to receive recommendations from the ad hoc Review Committee soon. She noted that the Committee had been very productive.
- Regarding the charge to the Graduate Education Implementation Committee, the Chair said that Provost David Blackwell asked about including two references to the "Graduate School" in the charge. The Chair referred SC members to the document with the final charge language. There were no comments from SC members.

The Chair reported that there were no changes to the minutes. There being **no objections**, the minutes from April 9, 2018 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

Given the number of invited guests, the Chair suggested that all those present in the room introduce themselves. The Chair suggested that when a guest's agenda item was up for discussion, that the guest come to the table and participate in the discussion.

The Chair said that unless anyone objected, presenters would serve as acting chair for purposes of answering questions of fact only. There were no objections from SC members.

2. Old Business

a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) – Margaret Schroeder, Chair

i. Proposed New PhD in Forest and Natural Resource Sciences [pending receipt of SAPC documentation]

Schroeder, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal. She also noted that Office of Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (OSPIE) was now able to provide program proposers with an infographic that displays national trends in degrees awarded by program for individual new degree programs.

There were a handful of factual questions from SC members. There was some confusion about how many students would be enrolled and when; Schroeder indicated that budget- and enrollment-related information needed to be updated and the updates would be done overnight so the proposal could continue to the University Senate. Schroeder said that the **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, through the President, the establishment of a new PhD degree: Forest and Natural Resource Sciences, in the Department of Forestry and Natural Resources within the College of Agriculture, Food and Environment. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There was no debate on the proposal. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) – Herman Farrell, Chair

i. Proposed Change to Master of Public Policy

Guest Herman Farrell, chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), explained the proposal, noting that it was returning to SC with notes from both Graduate School Dean (interim) Brian Jackson and Assistant Provost for Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Annie Davis Weber stating that the difference in credit hours for the new executive track did not violate any Graduate School rule or Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) rule. There were no questions of fact from SC members. The **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation to approve the proposal from the Martin School of Public Policy and Administration involving a change in the Master of Public Policy (MPP). Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary.

There was extensive debate about the examples of degree programs that individually are comprised of different credit hours, which was included in the note from Dean Jackson. Some SC members expressed concern that the differing credit hours implied that the students in the executive track would be receiving credit for experiential education, which was prohibited by the Graduate School. Others spoke in favor of the proposal, noting that the proposers had done exactly as SC requested [solicited documentation to confirm the proposal did not violate Graduate School or CPE rules].

As discussion wound down, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with two opposed.

c. Reaction to and Action on Recommendations from Blue Ribbon Committee on Graduate Education

The Chair reminded SC members that this particular agenda item had been an "Old Business" item for a few weeks. She said she brought this back to the SC in case there were any comments that SC members wanted to make on the record before moving forward with the Graduate Education Implementation Committee (GEIC). Schroeder said it was important that there be a focus on interdisciplinary activities, noting that it was likely hidden within the existing charge to the GEIC. She suggested that the GEIC develop strategies for implementing interdisciplinary programs; currently, such activities are greatly

stymied by the current lack of a structure to help nurture interdisciplinary activities. Other SC members agreed with this assessment and there were no additional comments.

d. Senate Meeting Roundtable (March 19 Senate Meeting)

None of the SC members present offered a comment about the most recent Senate meeting.

3. Degree Recipients

a. May 2018 In Memoriam Degree Recipients

i. College of Engineering Student GR-90

Guest Kim Anderson (EN/Chemical and Materials Engineering, associate dean for administrative and academic affairs) explained the request for Student GR-90. Grossman **moved** that the elected faculty members of SC approve College of Engineering student (GR-90) as the recipient of an In Memoriam honorary degree, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Tagavi **seconded**. There was no discussion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. College of Engineering Student TM-15

Anderson explained the request for Student TM-15. Brion **moved** that the elected faculty members of SC approve College of Engineering student (TM-15) as the recipient of an In Memoriam honorary degree, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Tagavi **seconded**. There was no discussion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. May 2018 Degree List

The Chair reminded SC members that the list had been sent via email and solicited a motion for approval. Blonder **moved** that the elected faculty members of SC approve UK's May 2018 list of candidates for credentials, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Bird-Pollan **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

c. Early August 2018 Degree List

Bird-Pollan **moved** that the elected faculty members of SC approve UK's May 2018 list of candidates for credentials, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Schroeder **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair said that unless anyone objected, the next presenter would serve as acting chair for purposes of answering questions of fact only. There were no objections from SC members. The Chair offered a suggestion to bundle the Engineering proposals and Cross [parliamentarian] said it was a reasonable procedure. Cross added that it would be a motion to approve the proposals "en masse" but a motion could subsequently be moved to separate them if one proposal was not ready for approval. With Farrell's agreement, Cross **moved** to approve the Engineering proposals en masse. Brion **seconded**. Tagavi expressed concern that the proposals were not sufficiently identical to be bundled together. After additional discussion, Cross **withdrew** his **motion** and Brion **withdrew** her **second**.

4. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) – Herman Farrell, Chair

i. Proposed Changes to BSMAE Materials Engineering [pending receipt of SAASC documentation]

Farrell explained the proposal and noted that a revised proposal had already been sent to the SC office to correct the degree designation. There were no factual questions from SC members. Farrell said that the **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation to approve the proposal from the College of Engineering, Department of Chemical and Materials Engineering (BSMAE Materials Engineering) to

change credit hours to 128. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There was no debate. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed Changes to BSMIE Mining Engineering [pending receipt of SAASC documentation]

Farrell explained the proposal, noting that a revised proposal with corrected degree designation had already been sent to the SC office. There were no factual questions from SC members. Farrell said that the **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation to approve the proposal from the College of Engineering, Department of Mining Engineering (BSMIE Mining Engineering) to change the required credit hours to 128. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There was no debate on the proposal. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iii. Proposed Changes to BSCHE Chemical Engineering [pending receipt of SAASC documentation]

Farrell explained the proposal, noting that a revised proposal with corrected degree designation had already been sent to the SC office. There were no factual questions from SC members. Farrell said that the **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation to approve the proposal from the College of Engineering, Department of Mining Engineering (BSCHE Chemical Engineering) to change the required credit hours to 128. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There was no debate on the proposal. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iv. Proposed Changes to BSBN Biosystems Engineering [pending receipt of SAASC documentation]

Farrell said the SAASC had not yet completed its review of the proposed changes to the BSBN Biosystems Engineering but anticipated that it would be ready to come to SC at its next meeting.

v. Proposed Changes to BSCOE Computer Engineering [pending receipt of SAASC documentation]

Farrell explained the proposal, noting that a revised proposal with corrected degree designation had already been sent to the SC office. There were no factual questions from SC members. Farrell said that the **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation to approve the proposal from the College of Engineering, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering (BSCOE Computer Engineering) to change the required credit hours to 128. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There was no debate on the proposal. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

vi. Proposed Suspension of Admissions into Dual Degree Program: MS Physician Assistant Studies and PharmD [pending receipt of SAASC documentation]

Farrell explained the proposed suspension of admissions. Guest Carl Mattacola (HS/Rehabilitation Sciences, associate dean of academic and faculty affairs) was also present to answer questions. There were no factual questions from SC members. Farrell said that the **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation to approve the proposal from the College of Health Sciences and College of Pharmacy involving the suspension of admissions to the PharmD/Master of Science in Physician Assistant Studies Dual Degree Program. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There was no debate on the proposal. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

vii. Proposed Changes to College Medicine Grading System for MD Students (Proposed Changes to SR 5.1.2.3 ("Grading Systems," "College of Medicine"); SR 5.3.3.3.A ("Attendance and Academic Discipline in the Professional Colleges," "College of Medicine," "Assessment of Student Learning"); and SR 5.3.3.3.B ("Attendance and Academic Discipline in the Professional Colleges," "College of Medicine," "Promotion and Retention Criteria")) [pending receipt of SAASC documentation]

Farrell explained the proposal. There were some questions from SC members. The **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation to approve the proposal from the College of Medicine to change the grading system for the College of Medicine and *Senate Rules 5.1.2.3, 5.3.3.3.A, and 5.3.3.3.8*. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There was no debate on the proposal. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) – Al Cross, Chair

i. Proposed New Center for Innovation in Population Health

Cross, chair of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC), explained that the proposal was not quite ready for SC review. He explained that he intended to bring forward the SAOSC's motions, but asked that someone immediately move to defer action on the proposal until the next SC meeting. Cross said that the proposal needed to be revised to include a vote by the faculty council in the College of Health Sciences, clarification that the center will be an educational unit, information about the faculty who will be part of the proposed new Center as well as their FTEs, a letter of support from the Vice President for Research, a letter of feasibility from the Provost, and a change to the proposal to include a reference to approval by the Board of Trustees. Cross said the intent was to submit a revised proposal for SC review, but noted that placement on the day's agenda allowed SC members to identify any other issues with Dean Arnett's proposal.

SC members asked Guest Donna Arnett, dean of the College of Health Sciences, some questions about the proposal. Grossman asked for clarification regarding the differences between the two proposals for centers on the SC's agenda. Arnett and Nancy Schoenberg (ME/Behavioral Science), who was the contact person for a second center proposal, explained the differences between the two proposed new centers. Essentially, the centers would complement each other through multidisciplinary work, but Schoenberg's center would be community or clinically based, while Arnett's center would partner with industry and other agencies. Discussion continued.

When there were no further comments, Cross stated that the first **motion** from the SAOSC was a recommendation that the SC approve the proposal on its academic merits. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. Blonder **moved** to defer consideration until the next SC meeting and Brion **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Cross then explained that the second motion was a recommendation to endorse the proposal, based on its organizational and structural merit, as an MRDC. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. Blonder **moved** to defer consideration until the next SC meeting and Bird-Pollan **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed New Center for Health Equity Transformation

Cross explained the proposal. There were no factual questions from SC members. Schroeder complimented Schoenberg on the proposal, stating that it was very well organized; Schroeder said she appreciated the proposal's structure, objectives, priorities, etc. and thanked Schoenberg for all her hard work. Cross said that the first **motion** from the SAOSC was a recommendation to approve the proposal on its academic merits. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There was no debate on the proposal. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Cross said that the second motion from the SAOSC was a recommendation to endorse the proposal on its organizational and structural merit, as a multidisciplinary research center. Because the motion came

from committee, no **second** was necessary. There was no debate on the proposal. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iii. Proposed Transfer of Undergraduate Certificate in Universal Design from Undergraduate Education to School of Interiors (within the College of Design)

Cross explained the proposal. Guest Elaine Eisenbaum (Human Development Institute) was present and helped in answering a few questions of fact from SC members. Cross said that the **motion** from the SAOSC was a recommendation to endorse the proposal. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Tentative Senate Agenda for April 23, 2018

SC members discussed the tentative Senate agenda for April 23. There were a number of changes discussed. There was extensive discussion surrounding the Chair's announcement that President Capilouto intended to speak for an hour, as well as the news that he intended to present changes to *Administrative Regulations 6:2* ("Policy and Procedures for Addressing and Resolving Allegations of Sexual Assault, Stalking, Dating Violence, and Domestic Violence") to senators. Some SC members expressed concern that the proposed changes would not be submitted to SC, first, for review.

SC members continued discussing the agenda, removing some of the officer and other reports, due to the many action items. Grossman suggested that the May 7 meeting might need to begin at 2 pm, in case any of the items from the April 23 agenda are not reviewed and are held over as "Old Business" for the May 7 Senate meeting. Schroeder indicated she would have well over 15 proposals for the May 7 Senate meeting; there was some discussion about the possibility of putting the USP proposals from the May 2017 Senate action on a web transmittal. SC members ultimately opted to decide about the USP proposals at the next SC meeting, when the proposals will be discussed and the Senate agenda will be reviewed and approved.

There was additional, extensive discussion regarding the appropriate steps for SC and Senate endorsement of *Administrative Regulations*.

Blonder **moved** to approve the tentative agenda as revised and Grossman **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. Items from the Floor (Time Permitting)

The Chair noted that Joe McGillis, the current ombud, was interested in serving for another year. There were no objections from SC members. The Chair asked for a motion to support a second term for McGillis and Grossman **moved** accordingly. Brion **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:12 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine M. McCormick,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bird-Pollan, Blonder, Brion, Cross, Grossman, McCormick, Marr, Osterhage, Schroeder, Spear, and Tagavi.

Provost's liaison present: Turner.

Senate Council
April 16, 2018

Invited guests present: Kim Anderson, Donna Arnett, Elliott Bloomer, BJ Brandenburg, Elaine Eisenbaum, Herman Farrell, Helen Garces, Andrew Hoellein, Hannah Knudsen, Patrick Lucas, Carl Mattacola, Carrie Oser, Steven Price, Nancy Schoenberg, Annie Davis Weber, Ron Zimmer.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, April 19, 2018.