

Senate Council
April 8, 2019

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, April 8, 2019 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 Jennifer Bird-Pollan called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:00 pm.

1. Minutes from April 1, 2019 and Announcements

The Chair said that two clerical edits had been received for the minutes from April 1. There being **no objections**, the minutes from April 1, 2019 were **approved** as amended by **unanimous consent**.

Grossman noted that it was the Chair's birthday and asked that the minutes reflect the SC's good wishes for a great birthday.

The Chair had a few announcements.

The Chair received a request from the chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) that several University faculty employees have claimed that unsolicited documents relating to their professional function were placed into their standard personnel file, but the faculty employees were not notified of that placement and hence were not timely afforded the opportunity to document into the file their response. The Chair said that she shared that information with President Eli Capilouto during their meeting earlier in the day and would also share it with Provost David Blackwell at her next meeting with him.

The Chair said that in thinking about remaining SC and Senate meetings, she was inclined to recommend that the meetings begin earlier to allow sufficient time to review curricular proposals. Brion **moved** to change the start time of both Senate meetings to 2 pm. Grossman **seconded**. SC members discussed the motion. In regards to ordering of agenda items, SC members agreed with a suggestion that informational presentations, if any, should be scheduled from 2 – 3 pm. There was additional discussion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

SC members then discussed the timing for SC meetings. After comments and suggestions from SC members, she said that the SC meeting on April 15 would start at 2:30 and she would wait to see if an earlier start time was needed for the meeting on April 29.

The Chair announced that the SC office's official communications to contact persons regarding newly received proposals from academic councils that require review by a Senate committee is that the proposal will not be effective for the fall 2019 semester. The Chair reiterated her appreciation for the SC's support for adhering to the curricular proposal deadlines that have been discussed all year.

Ms. Brothers will be out for surgery on April 18 and will be out for about 10 days.

The Chair's last announcement involved the timing for the SC survey of faculty regarding the President's performance over the past year, specifically as it related to email communications regarding the faculty trustee election. The voting for the trustee election begins Monday, April 15 and goes through Monday, April 22. The Chair and Osterhage, who is overseeing the President's evaluation, suggested sending out the initial email regarding the survey later in the week and leaving it open until about May 1. It would completely overlap with the trustee election, but emails about the survey during the trustee election

would be avoided. There were no objections from SC members. The Chair said she would try to ensure that no reminders for the survey would be sent during the time of voting for the faculty trustee election.

2. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) - Aaron Cramer, Chair

i. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Structural Engineering

Cramer, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal. The Chair called for questions of fact and there were some questions about the faculty of record and its responsibilities. Concerns were expressed that, as written, the faculty of record did not have the authority to add and remove members (per question 3b on the form) and also that the certificate director, instead of the faculty of record, would be responsible for the curriculum, which should be in the purview of the faculty of record. During discussion it was also established that a departmental vote could be conducted via email; it is also acceptable for the text of an email soliciting input to indicate that a lack of emailed objections by the faculty would demonstrate support and approval.

When there were no additional questions of fact, the Chair stated that the **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation to approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Structural Engineering, in the Department of Civil Engineering within the College of Engineering. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. During discussion, SC members indicated that the proposal did not need to return to the SC – if Cramer believed the edits addressed the sense of the SC's comments, the proposal could move directly to the University Senate (Senate). A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Tobacco Treatment Specialist Training

Cramer explained the proposal. There were no questions of fact. The Chair said that the **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation to approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Tobacco Treatment Specialist Training, in the College of Nursing. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. There was no debate. 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 Equality and Social Justice

Cross, chair of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC), explained the proposal. He explained that the proposed Center for Equality and Social Justice (CESJ) did not meet the definition of an educational unit but the proposing college [Arts and Sciences] had nonetheless sought the endorsement of the SC and Senate. There were many questions of fact and Guest Mark Kornbluh (AS/History, dean) also participated. When there were no additional questions of fact, the Chair said that the **motion** from the SAOSC was a recommendation to endorse the proposed academic organization of the Center for Equality and Social Justice in the College of Arts and Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed.

During discussion and debate, Cross stated that the proposed administrative center could be changed to a multidisciplinary research center (MDRC), an educational unit, if at least one FTE were added. Guest Davy Jones (ME/Toxicology and Cancer Biology, chair of Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC)) commented that he presumed Dean Mark Kornbluh would bring another proposal to the Senate if he wanted to request approval to change the administrative nature of the CESJ to an MDRC. Kornbluh concurred. When debate wound down, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

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

i. Proposed Changes to MA Philosophy

Guest Herman Farrell (FA/Theatre and Dance, chair of Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC)) explained the proposal and noted that the justification for the changes to the MA were the same as the justification for the change to the PhD. There were a couple of questions of fact that were answered by Guest Eric Sanday (AS/Philosophy). The Chair said that the **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation to approve the proposal. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. There was no debate. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed Changes to PhD Philosophy

There were no questions of fact. The Chair said that the **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation to approve the proposal. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. There was no debate. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iii. Proposed Changes to PhD in Epidemiology and Biostatistics

Herman explained the proposal. Guest Steven Browning (PbH/Epidemiology) joined the discussion. During questions of fact, it became apparent that there was a disconnect between the proposal on the agenda and the proposal that Browning thought was being discussed. The Chair apologized to Browning and said she would look into the issue and report out on what she discovered.

iv. Proposed Changes to BAEDU Early Elementary Education

Farrell explained the proposal. There were no questions of fact. The Chair said that the **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation to approve the proposal. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. There was no debate. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

v. Proposed Suspension of Admissions for BACH-AH

Farrell explained the proposal, noting that the recommendation to approve was also accompanied by a suggestion to waive *SR 3.4.2.B.2 [new numbering 3.4.2.2.2]*, which required an open hearing for a variety of types of proposals, including a proposal to close a program. The Chair led SC members in a discussion about the requirement for an open hearing. The Chair reviewed the pertinent *SR* and noted that the SAASC was responsible for holding an open forum and Guest D. Jones agreed that the SAASC's regular meeting could constitute an open hearing. The Chair suggested that the SAASC could ask an associate dean or similar individual to inform affected individuals about an SAASC meeting that could serve as an open forum. She preferred having the open hearing held, because it was a relatively easy way to satisfy that requirement.

The Chair stated that the first **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation to waive the open hearings and disclosure requirements set forth in *SR 3.4.2.B.2 [new numbering 3.4.2.2.2]*. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. There was no debate. The Chair said she would announce at the Senate meeting the contemplation of different ways to comply with that rule, even when a proposal was routine. In response to a question from Hamilton, the Chair confirmed that the waiver applied only to the proposal on the day's agenda. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair stated that the next motion was a recommendation from the SAASC to suspend admissions and close the program. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

d. Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Engagement (Title IV) – Roger Brown, Chair

i. Report and Recommendations

The Chair welcomed Guest Roger Brown (AG/Agricultural Economics), chair of SC's ad hoc Committee on Academic Engagement. Brown described the work of the Committee. Grossman asked if the first sentence of the second paragraph for "Concern 2" was intended to read, "...course attendance policies is not absolute" and Brown concurred. Grossman **moved** to accept the report and Osterhage **seconded**. There were no comments about the motion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

There were a number of comments about the report and its recommendations. The Chair commented that the documentation of anecdotal evidence within "Concern 1" was conjecture and should be documented with publicly available data. Brown indicated he could revise the language to make it less editorial. The Chair suggested that Brown and the Committee continue its work, this time to convert the recommendations into specific proposals. Osterhage suggested announcing the Committee's work to the Senate and asked that it include information on the number of students who were affected. SC members thanked Brown and honored his hard work and that of the Committee with a round of applause.

3. Duo: Two Factor Authentication – Chief Information Technology Officer Brian Nichols

Guest Brian Nichols (chief information officer) and Adam Recktenwald (executive director of enterprise applications) explained the new way in which UK was working to protect myUK accounts. There were a number of questions from SC members. As time wound down, the Chair suggested that additional questions and comments be sent directly to Nichols and/or Recktenwald.

4. Admissions Strategy – Associate Provost for Internationalization Sue Roberts and Associate Provost for Enrollment Management Christine Harper

Guests Sue Roberts (AS/Geography, associate provost for internationalization) and Christine Harper (associate provost for enrollment management) explained the newly developed admissions-related marketing strategy. While nothing will change about the admissions criteria for international students, Enrollment Management plans to advertise widely in China that UK will accept the gaokao and will adjust the schedule for admissions to allow students to submit their scores when they receive them in June for fall admission. There were a variety of questions from SC members. The Chair thanked Roberts and Harper for attending and explaining the matter.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Jennifer Bird-Pollan,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bird-Pollan, Blonder, Brion, Collett, Cramer, Cross, Grossman, Hall, Hamilton, McCormick, Osterhage, Tagavi, and Walker.

Invited guests present: Steven Browning, Audrey Darville, Christine Harper, Davy Jones, Mark Kornbluh, Carl Mattacola, Brian Nichols, Adam Recktenwald, Sue Roberts, Eric Sanday, Reginald Souleyrette, and Kimberly White-Zeigler.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, April 11, 2019.