

Senate Council
April 2, 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 3:00 pm.

At the Chair's invitation Bill Swinford, President's Chief of Staff, was present to offer an update on legislative activities. Guest Swinford explained the current status of the budget bill, revenue bill, and pension bill and answered questions from SC members. As discussion wound down, SC members thanked Swinford for the update.

SC members then turned to Guest Lisa Wilson, associate provost for finance and operations, and asked questions related to financial exigency and tenure. Wilson explained that the "financial exigency" language in UK's regulations was applicable at the University level, not at the department or college level. The Chair said that she and the chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), Davy Jones, along with assistance from Wood, put together a document that explicitly described what would need to happen, regulation-wise, if financial exigency were ever declared and the jobs of tenured faculty were at risk. She suggested that she submit it to SC members, who could distribute more widely after SC members had a chance to review it.

Wilson reiterated that UK was far away from the circumstances that would be required for financial exigency. She added that UK has a AA bond rating and the idea of declaring financial exigency in the near future was highly unlikely. She said UK's leadership was interested in growing UK out of the current situation, which requires effective utilization of existing personnel, including the likelihood of hiring additional faculty. In response to a question from Cross, she indicated that UK had approximately 180 days' of cash on hand and roughly \$700 million in working capital. Cross noted that UK's bond rating was the best in the state. There were additional comments from SC members.

1. Minutes from April 2, 2018 and Announcements

Moving to other business items, the Chair indicated that the SC did not actually vote to approve the committee nominees that it discussed on April 2. She suggested there be a formal motion and vote. Wood **move** to approve the nominees identified by SC on April 2 and Brion **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair explained that there was some confusion regarding the SC's discussion on borrowed courses. Ms. Brothers added that there was a sentence in the minutes regarding lists of prefixes that were borrowed. She said that she suspected the sentence was correct ("For lists of prefixes (not a specific course prefix and number), no consultation or approval would be required.") but she wanted SC members to explicitly confirm that. Wood moved to approve the minutes as distributed and Blonder **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Referring to recent email communications on the listserv for the Coalition of Senate and Faculty Leadership (COSFL), the Chair asked for an update from Blonder, noting that Schroeder and Cross were also staying involved. Blonder described a recent conference call with other COSFL members in which she participated. Of particular interest to her were the suggestions that other higher education institutions in the state were talking about holding rallies in support of tenure, which had been a component in the legislature's biennial budget bill. She asserted that the rallies were something in which UK might participate and that it would send a bad message to legislators and regional universities

if UK did not participate. Bird-Pollan spoke in favor of broadening the subject of the rally so that it would be more inclusive, particularly for faculty in non-tenurable title series. SC members asked Blonder a series of questions regarding what the other institutions in the state might be planning.

There was extensive discussion among SC members, some of whom opined that it was important to express support for the right of other institutions to rally, but that the rally was unlikely to change anything. After some comments about possible language of a motion, Wood **moved** that SC endorse the calling of campus rallies by Coalition of Senate and Faculty Leadership (COSFL) on Thursday as a way for faculty, students, and staff to express their concerns about legislative actions that have serious implications for higher education. Blonder **seconded**. Grossman said that the motion raised all sorts of additional questions about the rally, particularly that of who would be responsible for planning it. During discussion, Wood clarified that the intent of her motion was to endorse rallies in general, not to imply that SC would organize any such rally. There were additional comments. Noting that it was 4 pm, the Chair asked Ms. Brothers to read the motion and suggested that a vote should be taken soon.

There were a few additional comments. The Chair called for a **vote** and the motion **passed** with four in favor, two opposed, and four abstained. During some brief comments after the vote, Cross indicated that Blonder could let COSFL representatives know that SC supported the rallies taking place, but was not organizing a rally.

Moving on to other announcements, the Chair said that Osterhage agreed to chair the Senate's Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (SAPPC).

There is interest by Registrar Kim Taylor to require faculty to have grades submitted by 5 pm on the date when they are due, instead of 11:59 pm on the date when they are due. She said that such a proposal had been circulated to other campus stakeholders. The Chair had reminded the Registrar that the academic calendars (with "midnight") had already been approved for this year and next year, so Taylor would need to come to SC and perhaps to Senate, to change the time by which grades would be due. The Chair said she was told that there were 1,400 missing grades most recently. SC members discussed the issue of late grades and if a time change from 11:59 pm to 5:00 pm would solve the problem. Brion and Wood pointed out that with 34,000 UK students each taking five courses each, 1,400 grades would be (approximately) less than 1% of all grades submitted. Brion opined that if she were in production engineering, an error rate of less than 1% could be considered a reasonable error rate.

The Chair explained that the day's agenda did include an item from the Registrar, but that part of it pertained to distance education. The Chair shared with the Registrar that the distance learning-related details needed to be vetted with the Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLel) prior to SC reviewing the proposal.

The Chair requested that SC rearrange its agenda to accommodate invited guests, as well as an agenda item regarding the membership of the Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure. Tagavi **moved** to approve those changes and Grossman **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Degree Recipient

a. May 2018 In Memoriam Honorary Degree Recipient

i. College of Medicine Student RC-05

Guest Andrew Hoellein (ME/Internal Medicine), associate dean for student affairs, explained that his college had another request for an In Memoriam degree, this time for a medical student who was in his third year. He said that the family had requested it and was supported by College of Medicine Dean Robert DiPaola.

Grossman **moved** that the elected faculty members of SC approve College of Medicine student (RC-05) as the recipient of an In Memoriam honorary degree, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Brion **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Committee Reports

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

i. Proposed Change to Master of Public Policy

The Chair explained that Farrell could not attend, but that committee member Hulse (BE/Accountancy) was in attendance to present the proposal. Guests Ron Zimmer (GS/Martin School of Public Policy and Administration, director) and Nicolas Petrovsky (GS/ Martin School of Public Policy and Administration) were present and participated in the discussion.

Wood asked if the proposed new track had a different number of credit hours (30 credit hours) than the existing number of credit hours for the program (37 credit hours) and Hulse answered in the affirmative. Wood asserted that it was not possible to have a program where tracks had different numbers of credit hours. SC members discussed possible solutions for the proposal, such as transfer of existing graduate credit or use of experiential education. Wood noted that at the graduate level, credit could not be granted for experiential courses. There were a number of suggestions from SC members about possible solutions.

Grossman **moved** to pass over the proposal until further clarification about tracks with different credit hour requirements was available. Wood **seconded**. Schroeder said that she had sent a text to Assistant Provost for Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Annie Davis Weber and Weber had replied via text to indicate that different credit hour requirements for different tracks within the same program would not violate any requirements from the Council on Postsecondary Education, although she was not sure if there were any such limitations in the *Senate Rules*. Tagavi commented that one way to increase the required credit hours for the track was for students in the Executive track be given an opportunity to test out of the econometrics course because Zimmer had previously explained that the course was not advanced enough for the students enrolling in the Executive track. There were a variety of additional comments and suggestions.

When discussion wound down, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** to pass over with none opposed. In response to a question from Blonder, the Chair said that the proposers would need to contact Graduate School Dean (interim) Brian Jackson and Assistant Provost for Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Annie Davis Weber to solicit confirmation that the proposal did not conflict with existing policies at the CPE and Graduate School.

Nominee for Vacancy on Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure

The Chair asked SC members to deliberate on a replacement for one of the members of the SACPT. SC members identified four faculty from the special title series (non-clinical phase) as nominees. Grossman **moved** to approve the nominees and Schroeder **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Clinical Title Series (CTS) Faculty

The Chair invited Guest G. T. Lineberry, associate provost for faculty advancement, to explain the reports on numbers of faculty in the clinical title series, which he did. SC members asked a variety of questions about the report. Lineberry explained that he was in the process of working with the three colleges that were above their approved limits. He had asked for responses by April 15. The Chair thanked Lineberry for the information.

7. eduroam WiFi and Increased Visibility of Information Technology Services (ITS) - Chief Information Officer Brian Nichols and ITS Executive Director Rick Phillips

The Chair welcomed two guests, Brian Nichols (Information Technology Services (ITS) chief information officer) and Rick Phillips (ITS executive director). Phillips and Nichols explained to SC members how UK has been transitioning to a new wireless internet system. There were a variety of questions from SC members. SC members suggested that a campuswide email be sent to all faculty to let them know about the upcoming switch from ukyedu to eduroam.

Noting the time, the Chair thanked Nichols and Phillips for attending and encouraged them to send out a campuswide email, particularly for faculty.

2. Old Business

b. Charge to the Graduate Education Implementation Committee

The Chair presented the draft charge to SC members for review. Grossman **moved** to endorse the draft charge to the Graduate Education Implementation Committee and Cross **seconded**. Spear supported the charge but suggested that the issues of teaching assistant positions and graduate assistant positions should be addressed by some entity. A **vote** was taken on the proposed charge and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Grossman **moved** to adjourn and Wood **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 5:06 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine M. McCormick,
Senate Council Chair

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

Invited guests present: Brian Nichols, Nicolas Petrovsky, Rick Phillips, Bill Swinford, Lisa Wilson, and Ron Zimmer.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, April 11, 2018.