

Senate Council  
February 22, 2016

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, February 22, 2016 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 2:59 pm.

1. Minutes from January 25 and February 1 and Announcements

The Chair reported that Mazur had requested a change to the minutes from January 25, but the discussion was not quite the way Mazur remembered it. A slightly revised edit was incorporated and sent to Mazur, who did not express any objections to the edit. There were no proposed changes to the minutes from February 1.

There being **no objection**, the minutes from January 25 (as amended) and the minutes from February 1 (as distributed) were **approved by unanimous consent**.

The Chair had a handful of announcements.

- The Chair happened to meet with Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration Eric Monday and passed along the suggestion that the yellow line associated with the campus core revitalization project be removed, as it did not offer anything useful to those discussions. The Chair reported that Monday thought that made sense; the Chair will ask for an updated slide that demonstrates removal of the yellow line.
- The proposal for a new honors college bypassed the SC office and went straight to Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC). The clerical review will take place in tandem with the SAOSC's review.

Bailey noted that the proposal did not contain any responses from deans or college faculty councils; he informed the contact persons that the SAOSC would not review the proposal until that additional information is available to review, also. Schroeder commented that the proposal had been mistakenly sent to the College of Education's curriculum committee, but it had subsequently been redirected to the Faculty Council, where it belonged. In response to McCormick's comment about reviewing without letters of support, Bailey explained that a major part of the review involved ascertaining faculty support – the SAOSC did not usually amend proposals – the SAOSC believes that if the faculty support the proposal, it is not up to SAOSC to review on its merits. The SAOSC feels it is very important to ensure faculty support for a proposal so without that information, it was rather pointless for SAOSC to review the proposal.

- The Chair met with Provost Tim Tracy recently and discussed his forthcoming meeting with Senate Council to suggest changes to the title series. The Chair said he would send out relevant Administrative Regulations for SC members to review prior to the meeting. Brown said that a senator had an extensive history on title series; the Chair said that if made available, he would be happy to disseminate to SC members.

Grossman offered an update on the recent Board of Trustees meeting and the budget proposal from Governor Bevin.

2. Old Business

a. Standard of Evidence in Academic Offenses - Proposed Changes to Senate Rules 6.4 ("Academic Offenses and Procedures")

The Chair noted that the agenda item was postponed so that students could be present for a vote. Given that no students were currently present, the Chair suggested moving to the next agenda item. There were no objections from SC members.

3. SC Participation in Sustainability Efforts - Lee Meyer, Co-Chair, President's Sustainability Advisory Committee

Guests Lee Meyer (AG/Agricultural Economics, co-chair President's Sustainability Advisory Committee), Ernie Yanarella (AS/Political Science, member, President's Sustainability Advisory Committee) and Shane Tedder (Sustainability Coordinator) spoke with SC members about how to jump-start an initiative to increase the sustainability-related coursework available to UK students. Meyer explained that it would be helpful to have a faculty leadership committee that can evaluate barriers to submitting those types of proposals as well as identify resources for increasing sustainability coursework. SC members and guests discussed the various options available for moving forward.

After discussion wound down, Wood **moved** that the SC charge the Senate's Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (SAPPC) identify three faculty senators to serve on a faculty advisory committee on sustainability, which will then be charged with recommending to SC on matters of curricular and research initiatives related to sustainability. Blonder **seconded**.

Brown asked for clarification regarding the purpose of the faculty advisory committee on sustainability. Meyer replied that there are curricular gaps that the advisory committee could identify, as well as offer opinions on whether or not UK has sufficient sustainability programming activities for students, identify possibilities for new certificate or degree offerings, and identify the resources necessary for faculty to successfully implement sustainability into class curriculums. Schroeder commented that she attempted to team-teach a sustainability –based course with faculty from the Colleges of Engineering, Education, Design, and Business and Economics, but there was not any support from UK to structurally co-teach or teach in a multidisciplinary fashion – she thought the advisory committee could address those sorts of concerns, too.

After additional discussion, the Chair clarified that the Senate's role will be to have SAPPC solicit and provide three Senate nominees for the faculty advisory committee on sustainability; those faculty senators will operationalize the Senate's participation. Yanarella commented that creating a faculty advisory committee on sustainability, de novo, from SAPPC nominees and from nominees supplied by the President's Sustainability Advisory Committee could be premature, given that planning activities had yet to take place.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with four in favor, two opposed, and one abstaining.

4. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) - Scott Yost, Chair

i. Proposed New First-Year Engineering (FYE) Curriculum

Guest Scott Yost, chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), explained the proposal. Guests Kim Anderson (EN/Chemical and Materials Engineering, associate dean for administration and academic affairs), Janet Lumpf (EN/Electrical and Computer Engineering) and BJ Brandenburg (student affairs officer, College of Engineering) also participated in the discussion.

The Chair said that the **motion** from the SAASC was the recommendation to change the admissions and academic standards for all nine BS degree programs\* in Engineering, following the introduction of the new first year curriculum. The Chair noted that the motion was on the floor; because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

Grossman spoke against the proposal, saying that DEW rates double when students skip a semester between CHE 105 and CHE 107; he said it would be a disaster. Anderson acknowledged the scheduling and indicated that other changes as a result of implementing the Engineering First-Year (FYE) curriculum could allay those concerns. She acknowledged that FYE was a new idea and there were no guarantees that it would work perfectly. Anderson said Engineering was committed to reviewing any problems encountered and revising the curriculum when necessary.

Wood expressed concern with the use of the phrase “pre-engineering major.” Anderson said that section could have been worded better and Wood replied that she understood the overall intent. Wood suggested using “undeclared – Engineering” instead of “pre-Engineering”; Anderson was amenable to that change. McCormick added that as chair of the Senate’s Admissions Advisory Committee, the College of Engineering stood out as the College with the highest number of students changing majors; McCormick opined that the FYE proposal was a good idea and an effective way to deal with high numbers of students changing majors within Engineering.

When discussion wound down, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

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

i. New University Scholars Program: BA/BS English and MA English

Schroeder, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new University Scholars Program of a BA/BS English and MA English in the Department of English within the College of Arts and Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

Guest Jeff Clymer (AS/English, department chair) was present to answer questions. There were no questions or comments from SC members. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. New Graduate Certificate in Improving Healthcare Value

Schroeder explained the proposal and said the **motion** from SAPC was a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Improving Healthcare Value within the College of Public Health. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. Guest Jim Holsinger (PbH/Preventive Medicine and Environmental Health) was also present to answer questions. There were no questions from SC members.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. Holsinger offered his appreciation to Schroeder and to Ms. Brothers, thanking them for their support and help in getting a complete package ready for SC’s review.

---

\* Biosystems Engineering, Chemical Engineering, Civil Engineering, Computer Engineering, Computer Science, Electrical Engineering, Materials Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, and Mining Engineering.

iii. New Master of Public Financial Management

Schroeder explained the proposal and said that the **motion** from SAPC was a recommendation that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new MA in Public Financial Management, in the Martin School of Public Policy and Administration within the Graduate School. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

Wood asked about the major and degree listed on the new program form – the information for “major” and “degree” was present, but in the wrong fields. SC members discussed the issue of allowing a student to earn a certificate through completing the degree requirements for the associated graduate certificate. Hackbart confirmed that a student could start in the master’s program and leave before completion but after having earned the Graduate Certificate in Public Financial Management. He noted that a broader audience was expected for the Graduate Certificate in Public Financial Management. Earning the master’s degree, however, would supersede any value of having previously earned the Graduate Certificate.

There was brief discussion about the intersection between a graduate certificate and a degree program in the same field; Wood said that a student could earn a graduate certificate by virtue of starting coursework for a degree program but leaving prior to the degree being earned (but after having earned the graduate certificate). Wood also asserted that a program could use a graduate certificate as a feeder for a related degree program. What was as yet unclear was whether or not students in a degree program could also earn an associated graduate certificate.

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

iv. New Graduate Certificate in Public Financial Management

Schroeder explained the proposal and said the **motion** was a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Public Financial Management, in the Martin School of Public Policy and Administration within the Graduate School. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair commented that 14 learning outcomes was a lot to have to assess every year. Schroeder commented that a smaller number of learning outcomes was originally submitted to SAPC, but because the submission to the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) included 14 learning outcomes, it was best to have the learning outcomes in the proposal reviewed by SC match the learning outcomes submitted to CPE.

There being no further comments or questions, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Proposed Changes to Administrative Regulations 3:2 ("Phased Retirement Policy and Program")

Guest Marcy Deaton, associate legal counsel, gave the history of *Administrative Regulations 3:2* and explained proposed changes to the regulation. SC members had a variety of questions.

There were no objections to the revised regulation as presented. In addition, those expressing opinions supported the idea of an FAQ with more detailed information about benefits and particulars of the phased retirement process. SC members had a handful of issues that could be addressed more fully in an FAQ.

- How being on phased retirement affects an employee’s ability to access the Employee Education Program and Family Education Program.

- Adding language clearly stating that while the maximum duration of phased retirement is five years, the current norm is a maximum duration of three years.
- Clarifying whether time spent on phased retirement can be counted towards earning a sabbatical.

The Chair noted the time and said he would entertain a motion for endorsement. Schroeder **moved** to endorse the proposed changes to *Administrative Regulations 3:2* and the creation of an FAQ to address, at a minimum, access to the Employee Education Program and Family Education Program and other benefits; maximum possible duration (five years) versus typical duration (three years); and if being on phased retirement counts toward a sabbatical, and to send the proposal to the Senate with a positive recommendation. Bailey **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 6. Communicating with KY General Assembly about Effect of Proposed Budget Cuts

The Chair led SC members in a discussion about the most effective way of communicating with Kentucky's General Assembly regarding Governor Bevin's proposed cuts to institutions of higher education in KY. The Chair noted that he communicated with Assistant Vice President for University Relations Steve Byars, who noted that phone calls were the most effective means of communication; Byars also offered suggestions to the Chair regarding written communications, which the Chair passed on to SC members. After discussion, the Chair said he would draft a letter to send to various legislators and would send it to SC members for them to edit freely.

#### 7. Nominations for Senior Vice Provost Carlson's Diversity and Inclusivity UK Core advisory committee

The Chair explained that Senior Vice Provost for Academic Excellence Charley Carlson requested nominees to serve on an advisory committee to look into ways to improve diversity and inclusivity issues in the UK Core curriculum. There was some confusion among SC members, who did not understand why an advisory committee would look into any issue regarding UK Core – the UK Core Education Committee (UKCEC) is the appropriate body to evaluate UK Core programming, not an ad hoc advisory committee.

SC members declined to consider or suggest nominees for the advisory committee, but opined that if either Provost Tim Tracy or Senior Vice Provost Carlson had suggestions for UKCEC regarding diversity and inclusion, either one of them (or both) could ask to address UKCEC. The Chair commented that he would send that message to the Provost and to Senior Vice Provost Carlson as the SC's consensus, unless he heard objections. There were no objections from SC members.

Given the time, the chair suggested a motion for adjournment; SC could consider the last agenda item ("Senate Meeting Roundtable (Time Permitting)") at the next meeting. Wood **moved** to adjourn and Brown **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:12 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Hippisley,  
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bailey, Blonder, Brown, Grossman, Hippisley, Kraemer, McCormick, Porter, Schroeder, Wilson, and Wood.

Senate Council  
February 22, 2016

Invited guests present: Kim Anderson, BJ Brandenburg, Jeff Clymer, Marcy Deaton, Merl Hackbart, Joe Labianca, Janet Lumpp, Lee Meyer, Joey Payne, Shane Tedder, Ben Withers, Ernie Yanarella, and Scott Yost.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, February 24, 2016.