

Senate Council
December 7, 2015

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, December 7, 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 3:00 pm.

1. Minutes from November 30, 2105 and Announcements

There were no changes to the minutes. Because there were **no objections**, the minutes from November 30 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair reported a handful of announcements.

- The Stakes Reception will take place on Tuesday, December 15. The Chair encouraged senators to attend.
- The first SC meeting of the year will be on Monday, January 11, 2016.
- SC members are invited to a year-end celebration and recognition of departing members on Wednesday, December 16, at Pazzo's. The SC office will pay for all food and drinks. The SC members whose service on SC will end on December 31 are Watt and Webb.
- The Chair met with the incoming dean of the College of Public Health (PbH) and discussed UK's commitment to shared governance. Other items of discussion were the PbH faculty rules and the likelihood of increased numbers of proposals from PbH.
- The Chair and other University leaders met with representatives from Shorelight, a recruiting firm that specializes in recruiting international students.
- The contract with the donor for a new honors college is now posted on the website of the University Senate (Senate). A meeting for committee chairs who may need to participate in the review of a proposed new honors committee has been arranged for December 17.

2. Officer Elections

a. Chair

The Chair asked Guest Connie Wood (AS/Statistics, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee), to assist the SC as it elected a new chair. Wood explained that notice was sent to all senators about the election, along with a request for nominations for the SC chair position. Six SC members were nominated and Wood contacted them all. Only one was willing to accept the nomination. Therefore, Wood announced that McCormick was the Senate Council chair-elect – no election was needed because there was only one candidate. McCormick's term as SC chair will begin June 1, 2016. The Chair said that he would invite McCormick to meetings with President Eli Capilouto and Provost Tim Tracy, as well as other relevant meetings.

b. Vice Chair

The Chair again turned to Wood to assist in the election of a vice chair for SC. Wood said that the main duties of the vice chair are to: support the chair; be available to chair meetings in the absence of the SC chair; and briefly read over the beautiful minutes prepared by Ms. Brothers. Wood explained that Bailey, Brown, Kraemer, Mazur, and Porter were eligible to serve as vice chair. Kraemer **nominated** Bailey and Bailey **nominated** Kraemer. Watt **seconded**. Porter **moved** to close nominations and Grossman **seconded**. [No vote was taken on closing nominations.]

Wood handed out pieces of paper on which SC members could register their votes. When all SC members had voted, Wood announced that Kraemer would be the next SC vice chair. [Votes: Kraemer – five; Bailey – two; abstentions – 2.]

3. Candidates for Degrees

a. 2015 December Degree List

McCormick **moved** that the elected faculty senators approve UK's December 2015 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.

4. Proposed Changes to College of Dentistry Calendar (spring 2016)

The Chair reported that the changes that the College of Dentistry wanted to request had already been incorporated, so there was no need for SC to discuss the matter. There were no objections from SC members.

5. Conversation with Senior Vice Provost for Academic Excellence Charles Carlson

Guest Charles Carlson (AS/Psychology, senior vice provost for academic excellence) gave SC members some background information on the reasons he accepted his new administrative position, as well as an explanation of his request for nominees to serve on a faculty committee to help advise him as he oversees the process for submitting a proposal for a new honors college. Carlson noted that when he saw the initial paperwork for an honors college and was informed of the process to date, he was not satisfied with the level of faculty participation thus far. Carlson said he wanted to hear from a broad base before submitting the proposal to the Senate for review. He said the faculty advisory group would give him a bigger and better picture of what has been put to paper at this point, prior to any proposal being submitted to Senate.

There were a variety of questions from SC members. Carlson explained that he would appoint the advisory committee; in addition to nominations from SC, he has already asked deans to submit names. Carlson said he had already invited Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Ben Withers to participate as an ex officio member. If the final proposal requires structural changes to *Governing Regulations*, *Administrative Regulations*, or *Senate Rules*, Carlson would like that to be obvious from the proposal. Nominees for the advisory committee will be expected to share their wisdom and counsel, although it was appropriate for members to also raise issues that concern colleagues. By and large, existing Honors courses will make up the majority of any revision to the Honors curriculum. The current faculty of record for the Honors Program will have a voice in the proposal, prior to it being reviewed by any additional groups.

Kraemer noted that the contract between the University and the donor supporting a new honors college laid out some explicit curricular offerings, but the curriculum at UK has normally been considered to be pure educational policy. Carlson said that one reason he wants feedback is to get a clear sense of how a

broader group of faculty perceive a proposal. Although the contract stipulates creation of an advisory committee by November 1, Carlson explained that work creating the advisory committee was still ongoing and will be composed soon. Carlson added that he was not sure how the three deadlines in the contract (November 1: establish advisory committee; December 31 – advisory committee reviews proposal; June 30 – entire proposal approved by Senate) were being interpreted. Carlson said it was his understanding that the donor was somewhat flexible with those deadlines. Carlson confirmed that there will be four general groups of faculty involved in the process: the Honors Program faculty of record; the advisory committee as outlined in the contract; an advisory group to work directly with Carlson; and the Senate apparatus (including Senate subcommittees).

The Chair asked how soon Carlson would like nominees for his advisory group and Carlson said he would like to have them as soon as possible so his advisory group could be constituted prior to the holidays. This would allow Carlson's advisory group to hit the ground running immediately following the winter break. Carlson clarified that he wanted two nominees for his advisory committee, but that he had not yet determined the process for identifying faculty to serve on the official advisory committee for an honors college. Carlson noted that there would be six other members of his advisory committee, suggested by college deans.

After Carlson departed, SC members deliberated on how to identify nominees for Carlson's advisory committee. After discussion, it was determined that the Chair would send an email to senators to solicit nominations for faculty senators (including self-nominations) to serve on Carlson's advisory committee.

6. Committee Reports

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

i. Proposed Suspension of MS in Agriculture

Guest Margaret Schroeder, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal to close the MS in Agriculture (Rural Sociology). She said that after reviewing the proposal, it became clear that the proposal should be to close the program, not just have admissions suspended. All the necessary paperwork has been submitted to the Council on Postsecondary Education and the proper votes were taken at the department and college levels. Guest Keiko Tanaka (AG/Community and Leadership Development) explained that there had not been any students in the program for the last 30 years.

The **motion** from the SAPC was that the University Senate approve the deletion of the existing MS in Agriculture (Rural Sociology), in the Department of Sociology within the College Arts and Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were a handful of questions from SC members. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

2b. May 2016 Honorary Degree Nominee(s) - Interim Graduate School Dean Susan Carvalho

Guest Susan Carvalho (AS/Hispanic Studies, associate provost for international affairs) offered SC members a presentation on the proposed honorary degree nominees for the May 2016 commencement ceremonies.

Grossman **moved** that the elected faculty senators of the SC approve the recommendation of an Honorary Doctor of Science for AD, an Honorary Doctor of Laws for MT, an Honorary Doctor of Science for OH, and an Honorary Doctor of Humane Letters for RE, for submission to the University Senate and then through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended honorary degrees to be conferred by the Board of Trustees. Bailey **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. Senate's Academic Facilities Committee - John Nash, Chair

i. Update on STEAM Academy and Space Utilization in New Research Building

Guest John Nash (ED/Educational Leadership Studies), chair of the Senate's Academic Facilities Committee (SAFC), gave SC members an update on the new STEAM Academy (science, technology, engineering, arts, and mathematics) and space utilization in the new research building.

SC members engaged in a lively discussion with Nash about various aspects of the proposed new research building. SC members asked Nash to consider additional aspects when the SAFC meets again with Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration Eric Monday and Vice President for Research Lisa Cassis.

- The processes governing how researchers enter and exit resources in the new research building, particularly the criteria by which projects exit, i.e. are no longer associated with the building.
- How to deal with a scenario in which a tenure-track professor may be isolated from her/his home department if that professor is allocated start-up space in the new research building.
- Describe the types of research *currently* being conducted at UK that would fit the bill for being granted space in the new research building.

There was a brief discussion of how the term “campus core” means different things on campus, depending on the context (campus core for revitalization vs. parking core zone).

Nash then explained what information had been shared with him regarding the proposed STEAM Academy location, including the news that the on-campus site was no longer considered viable; discussions were ongoing about a location at Coldstream Research Campus. SC members and Nash discussed the lack of inclusion of broad faculty support from within the College of Education regarding STEAM Academy discussions and the lack of information shared with UK faculty serving on the STEAM Academy’s advisory board. Also discussed was the perceived lack of a dual credit agreement with Fayette County Public Schools. SC members encouraged Education faculty members to invite College of Education Dean Mary John O’Hair to attend a meeting of Education’s faculty council so more information could be shared. If Education faculty are unable to find out more information after engaging Dean O’Hair, the SC can revisit the issue.

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

i. Vetting of *Administrative Regulations 6:2* ("Policy and Procedures for Addressing and Resolving Allegations of Sexual Assault, Stalking, Dating Violence, and Domestic Violence")

Guest Connie Wood, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), explained to SC members that *Administrative Regulations 6:2* ("Policy and Procedures for Addressing and Resolving Allegations of Sexual Assault, Stalking, Dating Violence, and Domestic Violence") was promulgated by President Capilouto but necessary consultations with faculty and staff representative bodies did not occur, although they should have. There was also a question as to whether or not the proposed changes were vetted by the Regulation Review Committee. Wood also commented that language in *AR 1:6* ("Formulation and Issuance of University Governing Regulations and Administrative Regulations") was not clear regarding who stakeholders are and suggested that language also be revised. Grossman commented on an additional problem – the changes associated with *AR 6:2* included a change so sexual misconduct appeals will go to a special sexual misconduct appeals board, not to the University Appeals

Board (UAB), which is a violation of language in the Governing Regulation that says the UAB has appellate jurisdiction over non-academic appeals.

Grossman summarized the problems with the revised *AR 6:2*: neither the SC nor Senate nor Staff Senate nor Student Government was consulted; there is a question as to whether or not the Regulation Review Committee reviewed the changes to *AR 6:2*; the sexual misconduct appeals board process appears to contradict the GR that requires a student be able to access the UAB for appeals; and the revised language includes reference to a faculty disciplinary policy that has not been officially approved by the Board. There was extensive discussion among SC members about how to proceed. It was ultimately determined that the Chair should ask for information about when the Regulation Review Committee vetted the proposal. Mazur **moved** that based on the recommendation from the SREC, the Chair should draft a letter to President Eli Capilouto with a courtesy copy to Provost Tim Tracy and General Counsel Bill Thro articulating the SC's concerns about the lack of faculty review of *Administrative Regulations 6:2* and inviting all three individuals to a SC meeting as soon as possible to discuss remedies going forward. McCormick **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

7. Tentative Senate Agenda for December 14, 2015

SC members reviewed the tentative Senate agenda for December 14. The Chair noted that one agenda item (agenda item for New Graduate Certificate in Next Generation in Teaching & Learning) was inadvertently included twice, so one of the references would be removed. Watt **moved** to approve and Bailey **seconded**. There were a few additional comments. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

8. Review of Senate Committee Structure (Discussion, Time Permitting)

The Chair said that due to the time, the item on committee structure would need to be discussed at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:21 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Hippisley,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bailey, Brown, Gower, Grossman, Hippisley, Kraemer, McCormick, Mazur, Porter, Watt, Webb, and Wilson.

Invited guests present: Charles Carlson, Pat Mooney, John Nash, Margaret Schroder, Keiko Tanaka and Connie Wood.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, December 16, 2015.