

Senate Council
April 3, 2017

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, April 3, 2017 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 3:01 pm.

1. Minutes from March 27, 2017 and Announcements

The Chair said there were no changes submitted for the minutes. There being **no objections**, the minutes from March 27, 2017 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair announced that Jonathan Golding (AS/Psychology) accepted the offer of serving as chair of the Ombud Search Committee. She added that the solicitation for nominations had gone out earlier in the day. Also, candidates for the position of dean of the Lewis Honors College will be on campus towards the end of this week and on campus next week. The curriculum vitae for each candidate will be posted online 24 hours before their respective visits.

2. Old Business

a. Discussion on Faculty Evaluation of the President

The Chair said that the purpose of the agenda item was to approve the use of the same questions as last year, which included two open-ended questions. She explained that the SC needed to identify the best way to conduct the survey annually so that it did not hinge upon the ability and availability of one single person. There were no comments about the questions themselves, although there was some discussion about the process, which in the past was supported by REDCAP. Mazur suggested looking into the College of Education's Evaluation Center. After additional, brief discussion, the Chair said she would explore some options and share information with SC via email. There were no objections.

b. Senate Forms

i. New Doctoral Program Form

Ms. Brothers explained the proposed new Doctoral Degree Program Form. Bailey **moved** to approve the use of the new form and Mills **seconded**. Mazur requested that the EdD be removed from question 1d, as it could cause confusion. There were no other comments. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

c. Senate Meeting Roundtable

SC members offered their thoughts about the March 20 University Senate (Senate) meeting. The Chair said she was particularly interested in hearing how to ensure that invited guests keep to a previously agreed upon duration for a presentation. She also asked for input about having a regularly scheduled update during Senate meetings from the President's chief of staff.

There was still some concern among some SC members about the implementation of the change to the *Senate Rules (SR)* regarding a new type of excused absence for students. The consensus of those offering an opinion was that the language needed to be tightened up to better clarify what "full time" means when referring to a job interview and how to prevent students from inappropriately taking advantage of it. There were also worries about the rule being effective immediately, instead of being made effective for a future date.

Regarding the length of presentations, SC members had some suggestions.

- Hold guests to the previously discussed time limit.
- Return to the practice of including on the agenda the duration of a presentation. This practice, according to Robert's Rules of Order (Newly Revised) (RONR), gives the Chair the ability to cut short the presentation.
- Ask senators to hold their questions until after a presentation is over; this may help prevent tangents.
- RONR states that before a senator can speak a second time, anyone else who has not yet spoken should have an opportunity. Some senators keep saying the same thing over and over again.
- The Chair can offer a gentle verbal reminder about the time.
- If the Chair just approaches the podium, it might be a good nudge to a presenter to wrap it up.
- Business should be conducted before any informational presentation, no matter how pertinent the information may be.
- Use a timer or other widget in PowerPoint so the presenter knows how much time has elapsed.

3. Enrollment Management Realignment – Associate Provost for Enrollment Management Don Witt

The Chair introduced Guest Don Witt, associate provost for enrollment management. Witt updated SC members on recent organizational changes in Enrollment Management. Witt explained some of the philosophies behind the reorganization. One of the biggest changes will be to cleave off some of Witt's current responsibilities and make those responsibilities the basis for hiring two new individuals. Witt will retain the title of "associate provost for enrollment management" but other individuals will be hired to serve as university registrar and dean of admissions.

Witt answered a handful of questions from SC members. When there were no further questions, Witt mentioned that for the 2017-18 academic year, the intent was to enroll 4,900 first-year, first-time freshmen. The Chair thanked him for attending and sharing information with SC and Witt departed.

The Chair commented that there was a new face at the table, that of the incoming Student Government Association (SGA) president, Ben Childress. Those present at the table introduced themselves.

4. Committee Reports

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

i. Proposed Suspension of Graduate Certificate in Maternal and Child Health

Schroeder, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the suspension of admission into the existing Graduate Certificate in Maternal and Child Health, in the Department of Epidemiology in the College of Public Health. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were a couple of questions for Guest Corinne Williams (PbH/Health Behavior). When there were no further questions, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed Suspension of Master of Mining Engineering in Mining Engineering

Schroeder explained the proposal. She noted that the SAPC was okay with the dates of approval by faculty in the college – the college had intended to put forward the suspension previously but had neglected to do so. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the suspension of admission into the Master of Mining Engineering in Mining Engineering in the Department of Mining Engineering in the College of Engineering. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions from SC members. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iii. Proposed New University Scholars Program: Bachelor of Public Health (BPH) and Master of Public Health (MPH)

Schroeder explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the establishment of a new University Scholars Program: BPH Public Health and MPH Public Health within the College of Public Health. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions from SC members. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

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

i. Proposed Endorsement of the Honors College Transition Committee Report of January 30, 2017 (and its Contents)

Bailey offered some background information for SC members. Guest Phil Harling, interim dean of the Lewis Honors College, offered additional information and responded to questions. There were a number of questions from SC members; there was no indication that anyone present was unsatisfied with the answers they received from Bailey and/or Harling. During discussion it was made clear that the voting status of Faculty Fellows would be ex officio voting. Guest T. Lynn Williamson, senior associate general counsel, added that RONR describes “ex officio” members as always having full voting rights, unless non-voting status was explicitly stated. Harling also clarified that the Honors College faculty of record was the same body as the Honors College Council; Bailey opined that the use of “Honors College Council” was to create symmetry with the faculty councils in other colleges. Mills expressed concern about the new, increased fee for students who wished to participate in the Honors College. Harling replied that the fee was deemed necessary to help ensure financial support for the college in the future. Current UK students would have a steeply graduated fee rate, though, with payments spread out over three years.

The **motion** from the SAOSC was notice of its endorsement of the Honors College Transition Committee report of January 30, 2017 (and its contents) and recommendation of endorsement by the Senate. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed Changes to *Governing Regulations VII* ("University Organization")

SC members then discussed the proposed changes to *GR VII*. Bailey reported that the SAOSC moved a motion to recommend that Senate endorse a change to *Governing Regulation VII* (“University Organization”) to allow primary appointments of lecturers in the Lewis Honors College. Harling noted that there had been a couple of changes to the *GR* after the SAOSC reviewed the proposed language he supplied. There was mild concern that the motion from the SAOSC would not suffice, given that changes had occurred after the SAOSC met. Grossman **moved** that the SC recommend to Senate that it endorse the proposed changes to *Governing Regulations VII*. Schroeder **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Senate Council
April 3, 2017

5. Items from the Floor (Time Permitting)

Grossman commented that he was unaware of any prior occasion when a Senate meeting was moved because it conflicted with a Jewish holiday. He said he could not remember that ever having happened and expressed his appreciation for the meeting being moved, even if it was an inconvenience.

There was a brief discussion about some perceived delays in the processing of items from a standing committee.

The Chair noted that interest had been expressed in changing the ad hoc Technology Committee into a standing committee. She noted that one of the co-chairs of the Technology Committee also chaired another standing committee, so SC would need to figure out those logistics.

There being no additional business to conduct, Cross **moved** to adjourn and Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine M. McCormick,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bailey, Bird-Pollan, Blonder, Cross, Grossman, Lauersdorf, McCormick, McGillis, Mazur, Mills, and Schroeder.

Invited guests present: Ben Childress, Sarah Cprek, Phil Harling, Tom Novak, Corrine Williams, and Don Witt.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, April 4, 2017.