

Senate Council  
April 18, 2016

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, April 18, 2016 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 Andrew Hippisley called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:01 pm.

1. Minutes from April 4, 2016 and Announcements

The Chair said that there was one substantive edit to the minutes from April 4, specifically the addition of comments about campus culture and teacher-course evaluations. There were no additional edits and **no objections** so the minutes from April 4 were **approved** as amended by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair had two announcements.

- The Chair reported the composition of the Ombud Search Committee.
- President Eli Capilouto would like to address the University Senate at its May 2 meeting. The Chair noted that when the SC reviews the tentative agenda next week, it may be necessary to start the meeting at 2 pm instead of the normal start time of 3 pm

2. Old Business

a. Review of Board of Trustees' Questions for President Capilouto's 2015-16 Evaluation

The Chair asked if any SC members had comments or suggestions regarding the Board of Trustees' proposed questions for President Capilouto's 2015-16 evaluation. There were no comments or suggestions.

b. Nominations for Participation in Board of Trustees' Evaluation of President Eli Capilouto

The Chair solicited names of faculty from a variety of colleges that SC could send forward as the faculty members who would participate in the Board's 2015-16 evaluation of President Capilouto.

c. Donor-Related Name Changes of Existing Academic Units

SC members discussed whether or not to adopt an abbreviated review (move from college directly to SC, bypassing Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee) for unit name changes that are proposed as a result of a significant philanthropic donation. SC members were of the opinion that the current review process was appropriate for donor-related name changes.

d. Proposed Revision to *Senate Rules 1.2.2.1.B* ("Functions & Composition of the University Senate," "Elected Faculty Membership")

Grossman explained that in reference to the SC discussion on chairs in Senate a few weeks ago, he drafted some possible language that would leave it up to individual college faculties as to whether or not a department chair could serve in Senate. Grossman and Wilson were the only SC members present who spoke in favor of considering the proposal. Grossman **moved** that the proposed changes be referred to the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) for consideration with a response due back to SC by the end of the fall 2016 semester. Wood objected to the motion, saying that the SREC had too much to do to consider the proposed wording; she also objected to having to respond by the end of the fall 2016 semester. The Chair noted that after having conducted some research, he learned that the interpretation [inserted into *Senate Rules (SR) 1.2.2.1.B*] was never approved by Senate, was never approved by the SC, and was also never approved by the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC). Discussion continued.

Bailey **called the question**. A **vote** was taken on calling the question and the motion **passed** with none opposed. A **vote** was taken on the motion to send Grossman's proposed changes to *Senate Rules 1.2.2.1.B* to the SREC with a response from SREC by the end of the fall semester and the motion **failed** with one in favor.

### 3. Degree Candidates

#### a. May 2015 In Memoriam Posthumous Degree Candidates

The Chair offered some background information on offering posthumous In Memoriam degrees.

##### i. College of Arts and Sciences Student

The Chair noted that Bruce O'Hara (AS/Biology) would not attend due to illness. He suggested SC members review the written comments that O'Hara had previously submitted regarding Mr. Martin Striz, a doctoral student in Biology, who passed away during the course of his studies at UK. SC members confirmed with O'Hara (reached by phone) that Mr. Striz had not completed his defense, so the honorary In Memoriam degree was the appropriate degree for the student to receive. Grossman **moved** that Mr. Striz be added to the May 2016 *In Memoriam* Posthumous Degree List and that the elected faculty senators approve UK's May 2016 *In Memoriam* list of candidates for credentials, for submission to the Senate and then through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Porter **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

##### ii. College of Engineering Student

Guest Kim Anderson (EN/Chemical and Materials Engineering, associate dean) shared information about Mr. Garrett Spence, a student in the Mechanical Engineering program, who passed away during the course of his studies at UK. Wood **moved** that Mr. Spence be added to the May 2016 *In Memoriam* Posthumous Degree List and that the elected faculty senators approve UK's May 2016 *In Memoriam* list of candidates for credentials, for submission to the Senate and then through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Brown **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

##### iii. Gatton College of Business and Economics Student

Guest Summer Eglinski (BE, Gatton Global Initiatives director) shared information about Mr. Tyler Foster, a student in the Accountancy program, who passed away during the course of his studies at UK. Blonder **moved** that Mr. Foster be added to the May 2016 *In Memoriam* Posthumous Degree List and that the elected faculty senators approve UK's May 2016 *In Memoriam* list of candidates for credentials, for submission to the Senate and then through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Wood **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

### 4. Committee Reports

#### a. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) - Ernie Bailey, Chair

##### i. Proposed Name Change of Department of Biomedical Engineering to F. Joseph Halcomb III, M.D. Department of Biomedical Engineering

Bailey, chair of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC), explained the proposal. Guest Abhijit Patwardhan, chair of the Department of Biomedical Engineering, offered a few comments. Blonder asked if the SAOSC had determined if the proposal was in compliance with *Administrative Regulations 8:4* ("Endowment and Naming Policies for Academic Positions,

Undergraduate Scholarships, Faculty and Graduate Fellowships, Programs, Units, and Property”) and Bailey responded that he had not consulted that particular *AR*. There were some comments about whether or not the SAOSC needed to ensure the proposal complied with the requirements in *AR 8:4*. Bailey said that the SAOSC motion could be changed. He was comfortable offering a motion from SAOSC to recommend endorsement of the proposed name change from the Department of Biomedical Engineering to the F. Joseph Halcomb III, M.D. Department of Biomedical Engineering, pending compliance with *AR 8:4*. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

Discussion continued. Kraemer suggested that philanthropy-based name changes to units and spaces could be a topic for the SC’s June retreat. There was additional, extensive discussion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstaining.

ii. Proposed Move of Biosystems Engineering Major from College of Agriculture, Food and Environment to College of Engineering

Bailey explained the proposal. Guests Sue Nokes (CAFE/Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering, chair), Kim Anderson (EN/Chemical and Materials Engineering, associate dean), and Larry Grabau (CAFE/Plant and Soil Sciences, associate dean) answered questions. There was some confusion about the proposal, but the details surrounding the proposal were ultimately made clear. The College of Engineering currently owns the degree, but not the major. The proposal is to move the major from the College of Agriculture, Food and Environment to College of Engineering, thereby unifying the owner of the degree and major. There will be no change in facilities/offices; the Department of Biosystems Engineering will continue to reside in the College of Agriculture, Food and Environment and its faculty will continue to have courtesy appointments in the College of Engineering; all undergraduate services (student records, freshman advising, career services) will continue to reside in the College of Engineering; and the faculty of record for the degree program will continue to be the faculty in the Department of Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering. Nokes explained that the primary impetus for the proposal was to ensure that UK’s Tableau system will appropriately record data for the program as being part of the College of Engineering, which was necessary for accreditation purposes.

The **motion** from the SAOSC was to recommend approval of the move of the Biosystems Engineering Major from the College of Agriculture, Food and Environment to the College of Engineering. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair commented that he had forgotten to ask Wood for updates on a couple of current issues. Wood said that the survey on President Eli Capilouto’s 2015-16 performance would close the following morning; a final reminder to those who had not yet completed the survey went out earlier in the afternoon. There were 638 responses out of approximately 2,700 recipients. Wood, also chair of the Senate’s Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), reported that the second round of voting would begin around noon the next day. The Chair commented that he was ineligible to vote and Wood concurred, stating that the Chair’s distribution of effort (DOE) included 50% effort in administration. Blonder commented that he should have put his 50% effort as service, not administration, and he should have talked to the chair of the SREC [Wood] about it. Wood commented that “a rule is a rule” and that ended the discussion.

iii. Proposed New Department of Arts Administration

Bailey explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAOSC was a recommendation to endorse the proposed new Department of Arts Administration in the College of Fine Arts. Because the motion came

from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair commented that UK's regulations require a search committee to identify a chair; the language in the proposal regarding an existing faculty member as a *de facto* chair was in conflict with existing policy. Guests David Sogin (FA/Music, associate dean) and Rachel Shane (FA/Art and Visual Studies) agreed to revise the proposal accordingly and submit the revision within the week. There was no further discussion so a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) - Scott Yost, Chair

i. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 4.2.2.1* ("Admission to College of Nursing")

Guest Scott Yost, chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), explained the proposal. Guest Darlene Welsh (NU) said that the changed deadline would help the College of Nursing recruit more BSN students and would give those students more time to complete things such as background checks. There were no questions from SC members. The **motion** from the SAASC was to approve the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 4.2.2.1* ("Admission to College of Nursing"). Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions from SC members so a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

In response to a query from Porter, Yost replied that in the fall, the SAASC would deliberate on which types of changes to admissions and academic standards should be reviewed by the SAASC.

c. Advisory Committee for Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement - Jane Jensen and Scot Yost, Co-Chairs

Yost explained that he (Advisory Committee for Graduate Composition and Communication Requirement, co-chair) and Guest Jane Jensen (ED/Educational Policy Studies and Evaluation, also co-chair) were present to discuss two Graduate Composition and Communication Requirement (GCCR) items – a new assessment policy that Jensen would describe in depth, and a course substitution policy that Yost would explain.

Yost said that the transfer issue applies to two situations: if a student transfers between UK programs; and if a student transfers into UK from another institution. The GCCR requirement was intended to be embedded in the student's major field of study, so the current, unwritten substitution policy has attempted to remain true to the major. If a student transfers internally, their new major department must be petitioned for a substitution as well as approve it. If a student took a non-GCCR course and wanted it to be approved for GCCR credit, the response was typically negative because if the student has been at UK, there is no reason the student could not have taken a GCCR-approved course. The proposed substitution policy was intended to offer guidelines to departments and programs regarding what would be acceptable justification for substitution. If a department wants to request a substitution for GCCR that is comprised of a writing intensive course plus a supplemental course to make it relevant to the major, the Advisory Committee for GCCR will require more information, such as the syllabus, examples of types of writing, etc. While that may be perceived as burdensome, the whole purpose of GCCR was for the course to be relevant to the major as well as meet certain multimodal standards.

Jensen added that in regard to students who transfer to UK from another institution, typically from a community college and who want to use a 200-level writing course to count for the GCCR, such 200-level courses may have looked similar to the old Graduation Writing Requirement, but the current GCCR required multimodal communication, not just writing. It is also difficult to know course details such as page length of written papers, whether or not there were peer review exercises, etc.

Brown asked if the substitutions were specific to the student and Yost and Jensen concurred. Yost added that if there was a particular course being substituted repeatedly, it would make sense for the department to add that as another GCCR-approved course and develop a new Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the offering department, which would negate the need to submit substitution paperwork in the future. The MOU is a professional way to protect both programs and addresses staffing, assessment, etc.

The Chair said that the **motion** from the Advisory Committee for GCCR was to approve the substitution policy, as well as approve the required use of the GCCR substitution form, which was accompanied by instructions for filling out and for submission. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There was additional discussion about where the substitution language should reside and which committee should review it prior to inclusion in the *SR*. The final determination was that the substitution language should be submitted to the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) for review and insertion into *SR 5.4.3.1* ("Composition and Communication").

Porter **moved** to approve the substitution policy, as well as approve the required use of the GCCR substitution form (accompanied by instructions for filling out and for submission) and send it to the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) for review; if no problems are identified with SAASC, the proposal will be sent to the Senate for approval. Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Jensen explained the proposal for GCCR assessment, noting that it did not have the same policy impact as the substitution issue. Departments had plans developed by their faculty for executing the GCCR for each major and the GCCR course could be within the department or outside the major. There was a statement at the bottom of each GCCR submission explaining that each department would need a plan regarding how they as a department would assess learning outcomes and program learning outcomes associated with GCCR. Many of the assessment plans were not rigorous and there was certainly no university-wide GCCR assessment opportunity. Each major has GCCR learning outcomes they assess and the Advisory Committee for GCCR reviews the plans and collects artifacts like any other assessment activity for learning outcomes. The Advisory Committee for GCCR does not adjudicate assessment, but rather creates a plan. The control remains in the major so assessment will follow the same process as any other student learning outcome assessment. In response to a question from McCormick, Jensen said that the planned University-wide GCCR assessment will be similar to UK Core assessments – all majors will submit evidence of meeting the four GCCR learning outcomes and the assessment process will sample artifacts from all majors using the UK Core composition and communication rubric. Guest Ben Withers (FA/Art and Visual Studies, associate provost for undergraduate education) added that within the context of a national debate on the value of higher education, having the ability to conduct a campuswide assessment of GCCR should help UK be able to show clear added value.

Jensen stated that the work load entailed by the proposal might be a concern. She said that as the GCCR Advisory Committee reviews assessment plans for individual courses, if a plan is identified as being in need of additional assistance, the GCCR Advisory Committee will offer to help and hopefully move the assessment plan to a better place. Part of UK's SACS-mandated quality enhancement plan (QEP) is effective assessment so technical help is already available; the assessment plan was not an unfunded mandate. The Chair commented that it would make sense to note in the *SRs* that there was an assessment plan, but that the *SRs* could point to a policy that lives elsewhere. Jensen noted that the Undergraduate Council had approved the assessment plan so it could at least temporarily reside in that area.

Senate Council  
April 18, 2016

The Chair noted that the **motion** from the GCCR Advisory Committee was to approve the assessment policy. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Nominees for Area and Advisory Committees

SC members deliberated on a slew of faculty nominees for various academic area advisory committees, as well as other advisory committees. There was strong consensus among SC members for the names ultimately suggested.

6. Senate Meeting Roundtable (Time Permitting)

SC members discussed how best to manage discussion on the final report of the Senate's Teaching and Course Evaluation Implementation Ad Hoc Committee. The Chair suggested that SC require senators to submit amendments in writing in advance for that report; and that the committee chair [Golding] was amenable to that idea. There were no objections from SC members.

Grossman **moved** to adjourn and McCormick **seconded**. The meeting was adjourned at 5:33 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Hippisley,  
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bailey, Blonder, Brown, Grossman, Hippisley, Kraemer, McCormick, Mazur, Porter, Wilson, and Wood.

Invited guests present: Kim Anderson, Summer Eglinski, Larry Grabau, Jane Jensen, Sue Nokes, Abhijit Patwardhan, Rachel Shane, David Sogin, Darlene Welsh, and Scott Yost.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, April 20, 2016.