

Senate Council Meeting  
April 20, 2015

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, April 20, 2015 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 3:02 pm.

1. Minutes from April 6, 2015 and Announcements

The Chair reported one minor change to the minutes from April 6. There being no further edits and no objections, the minutes from April 6, 2015 were **approved** as amended by **unanimous consent**.

There were a few announcements.

- The workgroup for the Outstanding Senator Award will be Alice Christ, Phil Kraemer, and John Wilson.
- The University experienced a sad loss recently when a UK student was shot and killed while walking home with a friend. It is likely that an In Memoriam honorary degree will be requested for this student. Because the student was scheduled to graduate in May 2016, it is quite possible that the honorary degree will be awarded at that time.
- The Chair reported that the President offered additional information to the Chair regarding the newly hired lobbying firm. A representative of the lobbying firm may be invited to present activities to the University Senate (Senate) in fall 2015.
- The position of vice president for diversity and inclusion reports to the President, not to the Provost.
- The neglected report of the SACPT on family leave policy, tenure clock delays, and evaluation standards may soon be used for a new *Governing Regulation (GR)*. This initiative will be undertaken by Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement G. T. Lineberry.
- The SC retreat will be on June 10 and will again be hosted at the Thoroughbred Club, courtesy of Watt's membership. Invited guests are Board of Trustees Chair Keith Gannon and Provost Tim Tracy, who have already agreed to attend. The primary topic of discussion will be enhancing the Senate's capacities to formulate academic policy rather than just implementing it.
- Provost Tim Tracy may meet with the SC during its April 27 meeting for an update on UK's Strategic Plan. Bailey, who is the SC's liaison to the strategic planning process, reported that the final document may be so short as to lack any real substance. Bailey did believe that the editing process has been fair in considering diverse faculty points of view. There are three town hall meetings planned for campus input.

2. Old Business

a. Proposed New Graduate Certificate Form

SC members discussed the proposed New Graduate Certificate Form. There was some tangential discussion about whether the Graduate School keeps track of faculties of record and if so, where that information is kept.

Grossman **moved** to approve the use of the new New Graduate Certificate form and Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

### 3. Committee Reports

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

##### i. Proposed New BS Neuroscience

Guest Margaret Schroeder, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal for a new BS in Neuroscience. The **motion** from SAPC was that the that the SC recommend the Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new BS in Neuroscience, in the Department of Biology within the College of Arts and Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. There were a few questions from SC members that Guest Mark Prendergast (AS/Psychology) answered.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The Chair noted that the BS Neuroscience was the first proposal that utilized the (relatively) recently redesigned 'New Undergraduate Degree Program' form. In response to a question from the Chair, Prendergast replied that the form did cause him and his colleagues to think more carefully about a few aspects of the proposal. Schroeder said that the new form made the SAPC's review much, much simpler because all the required information was easily located and reviewed.

#### b. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) - Greg Graf, Chair

##### i. Proposed Change to BS Nursing Admissions Change (Early Admission)

Guest Greg Graf, chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), explained the proposal. The motion from the SAASC was that the SC recommend the Senate approve the proposed admissions changes (early admissions) for the BS Nursing. Because the **motion** came from committee, no **second** was required. Guest Joanne Davis (Nursing assistant dean) answered questions for SC members. Davis reassured SC members that there is advising and career counseling available for students who for some reason are not able to graduate with a Nursing degree.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### c. Ad Hoc Calendar Committee - Kevin Real, Chair

##### i. Final Report

Guest Kevin Real (CI/Communication) presented the final report of the SC's ad hoc Calendar Committee. Guest Margaret Bausch (ED/Early Childhood, Special Education, and Rehabilitation Counseling), who chaired the previous ad hoc calendar committee in 2012, also attended. Real and Bausch explained how both final reports were complementary. The SC discussed the report but focused on a trial run of a 12-week summer semester. During discussion the SC posed a couple follow up questions and asked the Calendar Committee to find the answers. Can the Registrar's office facilitate: delivery of multiple start dates; prevention of students from registering for courses with overlapping start/stop dates; and location finding of rooms for courses for programs with no departmentally controlled classroom space? SC raised two additional issues: how many simultaneous hours should students be allowed to take; and how many hours can a student take, total, in a 12-week summer session? In other words, the SC asked the Committee to suggest a set of course schedules within the proposed 12-week summer session.

Grossman **moved** to table the final report pending answers to the SC's questions and Bailey **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

d. Senate's Academic Facilities Committee (SAFC) - John Nash, Chair

i. New Research Building - Charge from Senate Council

The SC charged the Senate's Academic Facilities Committee (SAFC) with informing the SC and Senate on developments related to the planning and execution of the new multidisciplinary research building. The SC charged the SAFC with keeping an eye on: how and to whom space will be allocated; how non-medical researchers will be identified and included; if the Senate has a role in identifying and/or constituting the research teams that will live in the new building.

Mazur noted that it appeared from a recent story in the Lexington Herald-Leader that a decision has been made to locate the STEAM Academy of the Fayette County Public Schools (FCPS) adjacent to the buildings used by the College of Education without any faculty consultation, although the STEAM Academy has been a collaboration with FCPS. Grossman **moved** that the SC charge the SAFC to review the proposed new STEAM Academy building and location, specifically review the project in terms of how and to whom space will be allocated if faculty are involved and also if STEAM Academy curriculum will involve educational programming at UK such as dual credit courses for STEAM students. Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

e. Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) - Connie Wood, Chair

i. Proposed New Course GS 708 Doctoral Internship in Psychology

Guest Connie Wood, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), explained the problems associated with the proposed new course GS 708. The overarching problem was that the course was proposed to have an administrative office as its home educational unit, and it would be taught by staff rather than faculty. Wood explained that the SREC recommended to the SC that the SC not approve the proposed new course. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed Change to Senate Rules 4.2.8 ("Undergraduate Certificates")

Wood explained the proposed interpretation and said the SREC recommended the SC approve the proposed change in language (the addition of an asterisked interpretation). Kraemer asked how a graduate student taking an undergraduate certificate would be any different from a graduate student taking an undergraduate minor. Wood replied that graduate certificates have no place for minors, but do allow notations of certificates. Because this was recommended as an interpretation, and it was not challenged as such, it did not need a motion. It will be added to the revised edition of SRs over the summer.

iii. Proposed New College of Health Sciences Student Appeals Policy

Wood explained that there were a number of problems with the proposed new College of Health Sciences Student Appeals Policy. Wood said that the proposal raised issues of conflicts with existing rules and jurisdictions. Further, if Health Sciences wishes to have such a policy, it will need to develop distinct policies on probation, suspension, and dismissal for their students in the programs for bachelor's degrees, graduate degrees, and professional degrees. Wood said that the **motion** from SREC was that the proposal be revised to address the concerns raised by the SC and SREC and then returned to the SREC for further deliberation and discussion. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iv. Proposed Changes to Senate Rules 4.2.9 ("Graduate Certificates")

Wood presented the need for edits to the *Senate Rules 4.2.9*. The Chair noted that the New Graduate Certificate Form already includes information about a faculty of record, so the SREC's first recommendation was essentially already accepted. The second component of the issue still needed discussion. The motion from the SREC was that the Graduate Certificate Guidelines be amended to specify the process for appointing graduate certificate faculty of record including voting rights, entrance and exit, and service terms.

Grossman **moved** that the SC ask the Graduate School to devise a process to ensure that faculties of record for graduate certificates are appropriately documented and available for anyone to review or reference. Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstaining.

v. Non-educational Units Housing Courses and Programs (Undergraduate Education)

SC members discussed the agenda item. Grossman **moved** that the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee be charged with exploring a college-like structure for Undergraduate Education (which would include a dean as unit head), to propose a change to *Governing Regulations* to create an Honors College, and to develop a process to establish a college faculty of record for Undergraduate Education, in compliance with *Governing Regulations VII* and with requirements of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools – Commission on Colleges (SACS). Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. International Health, Safety and Security - Susan Carvalho and Jason Hope

Guest Jason Hope (International Center) informed SC members of a new international insurance program for staff, faculty, and students who travel abroad under UK's auspices. The benefit will be funded by the Office of the Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration, beginning in August. Hope noted that he would be happy to attend a Senate meeting to make a similar presentation, perhaps in the fall.

5. Nominees for Committees

a. Student Survey Coordination Committee

The SC decided to forward the names of two faculty, one from the College of Agriculture, Food and Environment and the other from the College of Arts and Sciences.

b. Teaching Effectiveness Committee

The SC deliberated on possible nominees. Grossman **moved** that the SC send forward the four names discussed and Bailey **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. Planning for Senate's Second Reading on Proposed New Governing Regulation on Faculty Disciplinary Action

The Chair passed around a tentative draft agenda for the May Senate meeting to show the sheer number of agenda items slated for the May 4 Senate meeting. He suggested the meeting start at 2 pm. The body can deliberate on actionable items until President Eli Capilouto arrives for his presentation on the State of the University which will likely include comments on the proposed new *GR* on faculty disciplinary action. At this point the body will transition to a discussion and a vote by the Senate on the proposed new *GR*. The Chair said he thought there would be time to review each submitted amendment, section by section.

If 16 people have amendments for section 1, then after conversations with the authors a single amendment is offered. Many amendments will dovetail together. SC will coordinate amendments to make them more efficient;

Some amendments will be purely editorial. The SC could make one massive “editorial changes” amendment with all the various comma corrections, capitalization, etc. The SC could accept those editorial amendments on behalf of the Senate to help make the Senate discussion successful in that everyone will have chance to offer their opinions in a timely manner so that the meeting can end on time at 5 pm

Watt spoke in support of one omnibus editorial change. He commented that there may be a contingent of senators who attempt to use parliamentary procedure to draw out discussion to the point that the Senate cannot complete its deliberations during the May 4 Senate meeting. Watt recommended that the editorial changes be the first amendment.

Porter said there were many senators who would be offering a variety of editorial suggestions on the floor. He thought it would not be a good use of time to gather up the editorial changes ahead of time if more will come during discussion. The Chair noted that the deadline for submission of amendments was in a couple days, on Wednesday. Blonder did not think that the SC could require senators to submit amendments in advance; they could make any amendment they want on the Senate floor.

Watt noted that since the announcement was previously made that amendments had to be submitted in writing, the amendments would have to be submitted in writing in advance. Blonder thought that such a requirement violated parliamentary procedure. Guest Catherine Seago, Senate Parliamentarian, explained that there was justification for the written amendment restriction because an announcement to that effect was made during the Senate meeting and was also sent to senators via email prior to the April 22 deadline; senators had sufficient notice and time to comply. The *SR* has language that says the Chair “may” request written amendments in advance, which is what the Chair did. When Senator Tagavi commented that “may” was quite different from “must,” Seago recalled that she ruled that it was must, although the language did have “may.” She noted that senators understood from the Senate meeting and from the emails to get as many amendments sent in writing prior to the meeting. Blonder opined that nothing could stop a senator from raising their hand during the meeting.

Seago said the only way to prevent amendments from the floor would be to hold a discussion to specifically suspend the rule on “may” submit written amendments and instead use another rule that requires amendments to be submitted in writing, in advance. The Chair noted that the *SR* used the phrase “whenever possible” regarding having written amendments submitted in advance. The Chair opined that it was possible and senators had plenty of notice and guidance on how to submit proposed amendments in writing, prior to the Senate meeting. Blonder said she disagreed with the Chair. Porter asked if the Chair planned to prohibit any amendments and the Chair replied that it was certainly appropriate to have senators make amendments to the previously submitted written amendments, but that *de novo* amendments on the floor would contradict the intent of having amendments submitted in advance in writing.

Kraemer said that some faculty have been surprised that this policy had even been created to begin with and viewed its development with suspicion. Further, there were concerns that the proposed new *GR* was moving too quickly; Kraemer thought it would be safe to assume that some senators would request

more time to spend deliberating on the proposed new *GR*. Kraemer asked if it was too late to ask the President if the issue could be slowed down.

Watt said that the President has reported that some number of Board of Trustees (Board) members who wanted to see such a policy in place. When the President sent the memo to the SC to request a faculty disciplinary policy, he had also asked that it be completed by December so it could be implemented as of July 1. While he was not willing to speak for the President, Watt thought that if the review process for the proposed new *GR* was dragged out, President Capilouto would likely just issue an *Administrative Regulation* to accomplish the same thing and that would be the end of it. Watt also said he was not sure about the best way to proceed, but that if additional substantive amendments were allowed to come up from the floor of the Senate on May 4, it would never get done, even if it was the only agenda item under deliberation, which it will not be. Porter agreed.

Blonder said she wanted to make a point, that if the Senate does approve the *GR*, the President must take it to the Board even if he did not like what the Senate approved. That would put the Senate in a strong position before the Board. If the President did not agree with what the Senate approved, he would still have to take it to the Board and that would put the Senate in a good position. Watt said that if the Senate does not hold a vote prior to adjourning, the faculty will be seen as not having acted on an important issue that the President attempted to engage the faculty on. Blonder suggested that the Chair send an email to senators explaining all of this – the importance of this policy, the President’s wishes, and the focus on amendments, regardless of how or when they were submitted. Porter said if any opportunity for additional amendments is allowed, the body will deliberate for a very lengthy period of time.

Bailey said that if significant changes are made to the proposed new *GR*, the Senate runs the risk of making edits that the President will not like. Bailey said he had also heard concerns from faculty about the perceived rush towards approval of this new *GR*. He wondered what would happen if the Senate would be in a better position if it delays the deliberation instead of rejecting the language outright or passing a *GR* that the President will not support. Watt said he was not sure the Senate would not approve the proposed new *GR* – Watt said he had not received any correspondence saying faculty were categorically opposed to it, rather many have said to him that the policy was appropriate to have. Bailey said that responses he was aware of were very muddled responses from faculty about the issue. He was concerned the proposed new *GR* would be rejected by the Senate. Porter said that restricting amendments and forcing senators to take it or leave it, they will think the *GR* was rammed down their throats. The alternative is not to pass it until next fall, which is probably the best course. Kraemer asked if the President would be willing to accept a delay given the hard work done thus far.

Grossman said he did not think a delay until fall would change anyone’s perspective on the process – it will just delay the discussion again and again. In terms of editorial changes, the Senate is only recommending the *GR* to the Board and any editorial changes will be fixed prior to submission to the Board. Bailey asked if the Board could make changes to the *GR* and Grossman said they could. Grossman noted that all senators had ample notice to submit amendments in writing in advance and no one could complain. Amendments to amendments should be allowed because they might be necessary. *De novo* amendments should be ruled out of order. Blonder said it was not in the SC’s right to do it. Grossman said that it was announced in advance and the Chair noted that it was certainly possible to submit amendments in advance – sufficient notice was given. Blonder said that if someone was in Europe all this time and comes back to UK the day before the meeting and wants to make an amendment, it is unfair to prohibit that. Bailey brought up the issue of amendments that arise from discussion about an

amendment submitted in writing in advance. The Chair said that amending amendments should be allowed; while it was possible that someone could come up with a brand new idea during discussion, which was rather unlikely. Submitting the amendments in advance was also a courtesy to senators so that they have sufficient time to review them and think about how they feel about the edits. In regards to Blonder's example about a faculty member having been in Europe, the Chair commented that they would have had to have been away for quite some time because the first reading was on April 13.

Watt said that one approach could be to take all minor changes to the Senate and make that one amendment and then sort and categorize the remaining, substantive edits. He said that if 17 senators have the same amendment, the SC should put that language forward under the name of the first person who submitted the edit as the proposer; the others can be notified that that is what happened. The SC should go through all the written, sensible amendments and vote to accept the amendments one at a time. Then the Senate should hold a vote to close the floor to further amendments and then vote to endorse or not endorse the revised document. Watt clarified for Grossman that the written amendments would be discussed first, after which the Senate can decide for itself if it wants to hear additional amendments. Blonder supported that idea.

Seago said that another option is for a senator to call the question and make a vote. While it would cut off debate, it was possible. Seago confirmed that calling the question required a two-thirds vote. Brown said that a decision by the Senate, of a majority, was desired. If enough did not feel comfortable voting, they could abstain. He said it was an aggressive timeline; Brown said he thought the staff and student governing bodies would also need to weigh in on the proposal and wondered if even that could be done prior to fall. Watt commented that faculty were often seen by administration as being incapable of making any decision in a timely manner. Porter joked that faculty were not unlike the United States Congress, in which no one can make any decisions. Mazur said she would not want to be compared to the U. S. Congress. She noted that a senator had noticed a serious issue during the April Senate meeting. Although Mazur said she had read and re-read the document a number of times, she had overlooked the language that would allow an administrative investigation to offer an opinion of guilt/innocence as well as suggest possible sanctions. There are certain things that the Senate may see that will make the language palatable. Mazur supported sticking to the timeline, unpalatable as it was, as well as supported urging senators to do their senatorial duty and solicit feedback from constituents and come prepared to the Senate meeting. The Chair noted that to date, he had received a couple suggestions from Grossman and another senator. Blonder suggested continuing the discussion on the 27<sup>th</sup> when the SC would know what amendments were submitted.

Mazur suggested the Chair email senators again to remind them of the April 22 deadline for submission of amendments and senators' duty to canvass colleagues for their input, as well. Porter spoke in favor of limiting de novo amendments from the floor, although amending the amendments could also cause delays.

Given the time, Grossman **moved** to adjourn and Mazur **seconded**. A vote was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 5:45.

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Hippisley,  
Senate Council Chair

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

Invited guests present: Joanne Davis, Jason Hope, John Nash, Mark Prendergast, Margaret Schroeder, Catherine Seago, Ben Withers, and Connie Wood.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, April 23, 2015.