

Senate Council  
January 8, 2018

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, January 8, 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 3:04 pm.

1. Minutes from December 4, 2017 and Announcements

The Chair welcomed SC members back to their regular meeting schedule and welcomed new members Brion, Osterhage, and Spear.

The Chair reported that no edits to the minutes from December 4 had been submitted. There being **no objections**, the minutes from December 4, 2018 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair thanked SC members for identifying nominees to serve on the search committee for a new dean of the Gatton College of Business and Economics. She added that the search committee met with the search firm this past Friday and was moving forward. Tagavi asked if he could receive a copy of any email in which the Chair submits SC nominations for various committees. The Chair replied that that was feasible.

In regards to an action in December, she thanked SC members for their willingness to support her decision to change the University calendar for 2017-18 by extending the registration window. She asked Guest David Timoney, associate registrar for communications and publications, if he had any additional information. He indicated that at Ms. Brothers' recommendation, the new, longer registration window had been included in the calendars that were on the day's SC agenda. Guest Kim Taylor, registrar, noted that there were not many telephone or email inquiries over the winter break and that she looked forward to having the new, extended period announced to students in advance, for future years. She added that about 1,800 students did receive a voice mail or email message alerting them to the extended registration window.

There was a brief discussion about the search committee for a new dean of the College of Engineering. Some SC members expressed concern that a senior member of the President's Council had been appointed as a regular member for two current dean search committees. There was general consensus around the idea that the individual's input would be best leveraged if, instead of being a member of a search committee, the person met with a search committee at the beginning of the search process and shared their information and available resources at that time. SC members were supportive of the Chair carrying this message to President Eli Capilouto and Provost David Blackwell.

2. Old Business

a. Revocation of a Degree as a Sanction

The Chair reminded SC members that the issue came to SC's attention when the SC was reviewing the work of the ad hoc Committee on *Administrative Regulations 6:2* ("Policy and Procedures for Addressing and Resolving Allegations of Sexual Assault, Stalking, Dating Violence, and Domestic Violence"). She noted that Guests Nick Kehrwald (dean of students) and Marcy Deaton (senior associate general counsel) were present to help with the discussion, as needed. The Chair noted that the day's agenda was full and asked SC members to keep the time in mind. Deaton and Kehrwald offered some general information about UK's policy and benchmark universities' practices.

SC members engaged in a lengthy discussion with Kehrwald and Deaton. All SC members expressing an opinion were in agreement about the appropriateness of revoking a degree as a sanction for an academic offense, such as plagiarism or cheating. There were differing opinions, however, regarding the appropriateness of revoking a degree for a non-academic offense. [Some SC members did not participate actively in the discussion.] Some SC members were opposed to any revocation that came about as a result of a non-academic offense. Other SC members supported revocation due to a non-academic offense for cases in which the University was unable to complete the judicial process prior to the student's graduation and if the process had been completed prior to graduation, the student would have been expelled and therefore would not have earned any degree.

As discussion wound down, Cross **moved** that the SC endorse a policy change that would prevent UK from revoking a degree for non-academic reasons. Brion **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with six in favor and four opposed.

SC members then discussed the appropriate next steps regarding the motion. A few suggestions were offered, but the greatest consensus surrounded Wood's suggestion that the Chair share the SC's sentiment with President Capilouto and Provost Blackwell and then inform the University Senate about the action, not ask the Senate to discuss or vote on the SC's sentiment. In response to Bird-Pollan, the Chair said that she would also share the results of the vote with both the President and the Provost, as well as with the Senate.

### 3. Proposed Changes to *Governing Regulation IV* ("The University Senate")

Guest Deaton explained that she added the dean of the Lewis Honors College to the list of ex officio voting members and removed reference to the "associate provost for undergraduate education," as well as cleaned up some formatting issues. The Chair commented that the associate provost for faculty affairs was listed as having voting rights, although there were other associate provosts who were not included in the list. She wondered aloud if the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) would be willing to review the list of Senate's ex officio members. Wood [member of the SREC] explained that the SREC reviewed ex officio membership a few years ago and updated a few names. Cross noted that the Libraries Dean was listed twice in the handout and Deaton said she would correct the duplication.

There was brief discussion about associate provosts and voting rights. Wood **moved** to eliminate the associate provost for faculty affairs position from *Governing Regulations IV* ("The University Senate") and Cross **seconded**. In response to a question from Bird-Pollan, Ms. Brothers explained that the position of associate provost for faculty affairs no longer existed, although the position (in an earlier iteration) once included the responsibility for chairing the Senate's Health Care Colleges Council, which could explain why that position had voting rights when no other associate provost was included in the list of ex officio voting membership. By removing the title from the *GR*, the SC was merely removing reference to a position that was not current and that removal did not take voting rights away from an existing ex officio member. There was additional discussion.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. Cross then **moved** to endorse the proposed changes to *Governing Regulations IV* ("The University Senate"), as amended. Grossman **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Ms. Brothers asked for clarification about next steps. Wood stated that the SREC needed to review ex officio membership. Grossman suggested that the Senate review the proposed changes to *GR IV*, after

which the SREC would review the *Senate Rules* to determine if any changes were needed regarding ex officio membership.

4. University Calendars

- a. 2018 - 2019 Calendar
- b. 2020 - 2021 Calendar, Tentative
- c. 2018 - 2019 Winter Intersession
- d. 2020 - 2021 Winter Intersession, Tentative
- e. 2018 - 2019 Dentistry
- f. 2020 - 2021 Dentistry, Tentative
- g. 2018 - 2019 Law
- h. 2020 - 2021 Law, Tentative
- i. 2018 - 2019 Medicine
- j. 2020 - 2021 Medicine, Tentative
- k. 2018 - 2019 Pharmacy
- l. 2020 - 2021 Pharmacy, Tentative

The Chair presented the calendars to SC members. Wood **moved** to approve the calendars a – l as listed on the SC agenda and Bird-Pollan **seconded**. There was brief discussion, primarily regarding what calendars were approved at what time, as well as two queries about specific dates. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Committee Reports

- a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) – Margaret Schroeder, Chair
  - i. Recommendations for Significant Changes

Schroeder, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal, which described the circumstances under which a program change would be reviewed by the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC). Such changes would warrant additional review because of the magnitude of the change(s).

Schroeder said that a senator recently sent in a few suggested edits and asked Ms. Brothers to put the most current version of the proposal on the screen. Schroeder explained that she thought all the suggested edits (except one) would be acceptable to the SAPC. The lone suggestion that she was concerned about accepting (because she was not sure the SAPC would agree to it) was the suggestion to give the SAPC the responsibility for determining if a program change met the criteria for a “significant change” or if the program change should be placed on a 10-day web transmittal. She said that she revised the suggested language so that the SC would make that determination, not the SAPC.

The Chair asked about the effect of the change on the SAPC’s workload and Schroeder replied that she thought the change would result in three or four additional proposals, annually, for the SAPC to review. Grossman suggested that any proposed new track/concentration/specialization be considered a significant change. Schroeder explained that instead of describing specific changes that would meet the definition of a significant change, the SAPC opted to utilize the definition from SACS-COC (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools – Commission on Colleges [UK’s accrediting body]). She said that not all proposals for a new track/concentration/specialization warranted additional review.

Tagavi stated that it was not fair that the SC was being asked to review a proposal that was different from the version posted on the agenda. He said he could not see the changes on the screen and he did

not know what had changed. He asked for clarification about why the proposed *SR* changes included a reference to “twenty-five per cent increase” while the summary did not include it. Schroeder acknowledged that not all details of the *SR* changes were included in the summary. Tagavi then asked why the Office of Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (OSPIE) was listed in its own, numbered item, when it was an administrative unit. Schroeder explained that OSPIE is UK’s liaison to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) and to Kentucky’s Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE). Any proposal for a new or changed program must include a substantive change checklist, which is promulgated by OSPIE. Depending on the information given on the checklist, OSPIE can determine if the proposed change would be categorized as “substantive” by SACSCOC. Tagavi replied that OSPIE’s scope should be limited and that it should not have the same status as a college. Schroeder replied that the revised proposal on screen separated out OSPIE from departments, colleges, and Senate-related entities into a new bullet, but also included a new stipulation for OSPIE’s participation so that their input was limited to the meaning of “substantive change” as outlined in *Administrative Regulations 1:5* (“Substantive Change Policy”).

Tagavi complained that he had spent a lot of time reviewing the proposal that was included with the agenda and having a revised proposal under discussion was not conducive to good business. Schroeder explained that she received the revisions earlier that morning. Tagavi stated that he needed time to review proposals before discussing them. Tagavi **moved** to postpone discussion until the next SC meeting [January 22] and Cross **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with eight in favor and two opposed.

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

i. Proposed Change to MSW (Army)

Guest Herman Farrell (FA/Theatre), chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), explained the proposal to offer the MSW program at an extended campus site (Fort Sam Houston, San Antonio, TX), to be delivered by individuals in Texas, who will be vetted through UK’s typical faculty hiring processes. Guests Chris Flaherty (SW) and Janet Ford (SW) also participated in the SC’s discussion. SC members asked a variety of questions about the proposal. SC members expressing opinions were generally supportive of the proposal but asked for more information regarding the appointment of faculty for the program, specifically those faculty members’ title series. Grossman **moved** to postpone discussion on the proposal until the next SC meeting [January 22] and Cross **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair suggested that if there were other questions or comments about the proposal, it would be useful to raise them so Flaherty could address those concerns in his revised proposal. There were no additional comments from SC members.

The Chair asked if SC members wished to review the nonstandard course calendars associated with the MSW (Army) or if that should also be postponed. Wood **moved** to postpone discussion on the proposal until the next SC meeting [January 22] and Grossman **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

7. Update on Single Summer Term - Associate Registrar for Communications and Publications David Timoney

Guests David Timoney (associate registrar for communications and publications) offered SC members an update on the first single summer term, for summer 2018. He explained that the process originated in 2011 or 2012 with the formation of a SC ad hoc committee on calendars. In 2014, another SC ad hoc

committee was created to follow up on the first group's report and subsequently recommended institution of a single summer term; the Senate approved that proposal on May 2, 2016. Timoney said that over the last year and a half, the Registrar's office had been working with various campus partners to work out any unintended consequences regarding a move to a single, 12-week summer session. Timoney added that the Registrar's office had also been informing colleges and departments that this change is coming. He said he was very pleased with the progress thus far and the Registrar's office had developed an FAQ on their site with a variety of topics related to the single summer term. From early September to mid-October, units had the ability to build out a schedule of classes for summer 2018. In December 2017, the Registrar's office published the summer 2018 Schedule of Classes. Timoney said that the most recent count indicated that about 2,200 course sections will be offered in summer 2018.

Timoney noted that the Registrar's office wanted to provide some standardized time frames in which to offer summer courses, to promote a more organized structure. The Registrar's office suggested three separate four-week time frames, two six-week time frames, and two eight-week time frames. Timoney said he was happy to report that 83% of the course sections did follow one of the times frames recommended by the Registrar's office. He wrapped up his comments by saying that he and others in the Registrar's office continue to work with different departments and offices to work out any issues that may arise. He said that they met the previous month with the International Center about an issue they reported, pertaining to credit hour amounts for full-time international students. He said the Registrar's office would continue to research that issue and others as they arose and would be in touch with SC if there was a need for a change.

Grossman asked about the courses that would not follow one of the Registrar's standardized time frames. Timoney explained that the vast majority of them were courses that had already been approved by SC to offer a nonstandard course calendar, which was different from any of the Registrar's standardized time frames. Osterhage asked about the possibility of a student taking 13 credit hours over the summer. Timoney said that sort of course load would be difficult and he had discussed the matter with the advising leadership team. The Registrar's office has been working with the Advanced Analytics team to try to identify those students, although based on research on past summer sessions, Timoney suggested there would be a very small number of students who would carry that sort of course load in the summer. Once the student is identified, the Registrar's office then reaches out to the student's advisor. In response to a question from the Chair, Timoney said that in past years, students with a high credit-hour course load over the summer typically dropped one or two courses. Tagavi suggested that students should not be allowed to register for that many credit hours and Timoney replied that in working with Advanced Analytics, it became a matter of resources. After determining how many students could be affected, the issue did not seem to be something that warranted extensive effort. He added that with 2,200 course sections spread out over 12 weeks, and depending on the program that the student was in, it would be difficult to identify 12 credit hours to enroll in. He added that he and others in the Registrar's office would keep this issue in mind moving forward.

There were no further comments or questions from SC members. The Chair thanked Timoney for attending and giving the report.

#### 8. December Senate Meeting Roundtable

The Chair asked SC members for their thoughts about the December meeting. There were no substantive comments from SC members.

Senate Council  
January 8, 2018

Given the time, the Chair suggested that adjournment was in order. Cross **moved** to adjourn and Wood **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 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: Marcy Deaton, Chris Flaherty, Janet Ford, Nick Kehrwald, Kim Taylor, and David Timoney.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, January 10, 2018.