

Senate Council  
May 18, 2018

The Senate Council met in special session at its annual retreat on Friday, May 18, 2018 in Gatton Student Center room A330C ("SEC Conference Room"). Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council's vice chair, Jennifer Bird-Pollan, called the Senate Council (SC) retreat to order at 9:35 am, noting that the Chair, Katherine M. McCormick, was currently away on University business. Given the attendance of the new Student Government Association President Michael Hamilton, the Vice Chair suggested that all those present introduce themselves.

1. Arrivals/Continental Breakfast (9:00 – 9:30 am)

2. Minutes from May 3, 2018 and May 14, 2018 and Announcements (9:30 – 9:35 am)

The Vice Chair explained that the minutes from May 14 were not yet ready for review, but that the minutes from May 3 were sent to SC members on Thursday afternoon. She explained that because that special meeting was focused on the proposed changes to *Administrative Regulations 6:2* ("Policy and Procedures for Addressing and Resolving Allegations of Sexual Assault, Stalking, Dating Violence, and Domestic Violence"), it might be useful for the minutes from that discussion to be approved. Grossman **moved** to approve the minutes from May 3 and Schroeder **seconded**. There was brief discussion. Osterhage suggested an edit to the language describing her concern and there were no objections to her proposed edit. A **vote** was taken and the motion to approve, including Osterhage's edit, **passed** with none opposed.

The Vice Chair commented that it was likely the SC had seen a recent news article in the Lexington Herald-Leader about UK's intent to dismiss a tenured faculty member. She explained that the procedure will involve the Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure (SACPT), which is charged with making recommendations to President Eli Capilouto; if President Capilouto decides to terminate the faculty member, then the faculty member's appeal will be automatically heard by the Senate's Hearing Panel (Privilege and Tenure) (SHP(P&T)). The Vice Chair noted that the SHP(P&T) was intended to be comprised of a panel of 15 members, but there is currently one vacancy and one of the panel members is the SACPT chair. Therefore, there are actually only 13 faculty on the SHP(P&T) who could be chosen to serve on the SHP(P&T)'s Hearing Committee. (She indicated that she would solicit possible nominees to fill any vacancies on the SHP(P&T) later in the meeting, after Senate committee compositions were completed.) The Vice Chair explained that a faculty member essentially had two chances for groups of faculty peers to consider an issue. She noted that every recommendation by either body must go to the Board of Trustees at the same time as the President's decision if the President's decision was to terminate.

SC members discussed the SHP(P&T) and related matters. Wood opined that it was perhaps inappropriate for individuals to be appointed to the SHP(P&T) after charges have been publicized. Wood also noted that there was no way, now, to avoid the potential for or appearance of bias.

There was brief discussion about the self-authored textbook policy, requiring students to purchase a self-authored book, and whether or not the policy was easily accessible online and if faculty were well acquainted with it.

3. Senate Council and University Senate Activities (9:35 – 9:40 am)

a. Parliamentary Procedure in Meetings (9:40 – 9:55 am)

Senate Council  
May 18, 2018

The Vice Chair explained that she and the Chair wanted to give SC members a chance to talk about how meetings have been conducted. The discussion was an opportunity for SC members to discuss meeting proceedings.

Referring to the current policy about allowing committee chairs to serve as acting chair during committee reports to answer questions of fact, the Vice Chair asked SC member to explain how they felt about it. Were there aspects that needed to be reconsidered or done differently in the coming year?

Grossman said he thought it has worked well, although at the beginning he was skeptical that it would work better than the then-practice. He opined that it was useful to separate fact from arguments for and against. Tagavi said he did not think the process was working well at all and that the distinction between fact and opinion was totally blurred and often violated. He said the policy was akin to making a motion for the Chair to step down, which would be absurd.

Cross commented that it was not likely that anyone would move a motion to ask the Chair to step down and that there were procedures in Robert's Rules of Order (Newly Revised) (RONR) that could be used to appeal a ruling by the Chair. Cross said it was important, however, to avoid clunky parliamentary procedures, which was the impetus for creating the "committee chair serve as acting chair" policy, to expedite meeting proceedings. Cross said it was more convenient for the presenter to serve as acting chair and a *Senate Rule (SR)* could be created to codify that. Blonder opined that the "committee chair serve as acting chair" was okay at SC meetings, where proceedings were more informal. Cross said that the body could also approve a colloquy between a member and someone else. Blonder clarified that because University Senate (Senate) meetings are bigger and can become chaotic more quickly, the Chair should be recognized as the presiding officer and chair.

Tagavi said that Blonder's approach had a serious flaw because whoever is presiding should be unbiased. The Vice Chair cautioned that Tagavi's comment assumed that committee chairs were not neutral; she opined that the Senate's committee chairs have been neutral and appropriately presented the views of their committees. Tagavi replied that he tested a chair one time by making a comment, not asking a question, and the committee chair commented "we discussed that as a committee" and that was enough to work against him. He said that the committee chair's response was the same as advocating and it was unfair.

The Vice Chair said that she was interested in hearing from everyone on at the table who had participated in SC or Senate meetings. She acknowledged that some members had already spoken, but suggested working around the room to solicit comments. She reminded SC members that she was, at this particular point, looking specifically for comments regarding the "committee chair serve as acting chair" policy.

Grossman stated that some of the ideas he had heard so far would make Senate meetings much worse. Having a committee chair stand up to present, then sit down, then stand up to answer a question, then sit down, etc. would not be an improvement. The Vice Chair asked him a clarifying question and Grossman said that the process that was used during the spring semester was better than the suggestions he had heard during discussion.

Blonder stated that the "committee chair serve as acting chair" policy worked okay in SC meetings, but that the Chair should maintain the floor during Senate meetings. She said she agreed with Tagavi's assertion that a committee chair was necessarily unable to be unbiased because they would be

advocating for a proposal by virtue of having previously approved it. In response to a question from the Vice Chair about whether the policy made things smoother or more efficient in SC, Blonder replied that at SC is less formal so the entire process is less cumbersome.

Wood said that she had not seen that the discussion had changed all that much. She said that the current policy was not overly cumbersome but it had not helped with the issues of advocating and bias that Tagavi had brought up. She said that sometimes in the past she had raised a particular issue and it was demeaning to hear a committee chair say that the committee had already reviewed the matter and decided it was not relevant. The Vice Chair asked for clarification and Wood clarified that stating a committee had already considered something was only useful if the committee chair also included the reasoning behind the decision; Wood objected to a committee chair being dismissive of a senator's concerns. The Vice Chair agreed that dismissing concerns was not okay, but she said she still was not sure why a committee chair describing a committee's deliberations would be considered opinion and not fact. She said she was trying to understand how much of a committee's activities and opinion was reportable as fact by the committee chair.

The Vice Chair reminded SC members that she was specifically looking for comments on how the process has worked; the next series of comments she solicited would pertain to how the process has not worked. Tagavi stated that nothing had worked. Spear said that he thought the "committee chair serve as acting chair" policy was going to be clunky but he thought it worked well. He said a committee chair would be most knowledgeable about a proposal and should be the one answering questions. Even if the committee chair was biased towards a proposal, it was acceptable to report how the committee reviewed it and came to a decision.

Cross said that the ability of a chair to report on a committee's deliberations was part of his rationale for suggesting a division of time between factual questions and debate. He said if a committee chair offered their personal opinion, it would be crossing a line. If a committee chair reported why a committee acted in such a way, it was a fact. He noted that the Chair had often relied on him in the past to determine what was factual and what was opinion, but said he preferred the Chair to make such decisions; the parliamentarian should advise the Chair, not do a lot of talking. He said he took Tagavi's points seriously but still thought that the current policy had expedited the work of the SC and the Senate. He also acknowledged Blonder's comment about using the "committee chair serve as acting chair" policy in SC meetings, but not in Senate meetings, but noted that any such decision would be up to the Chair as it was in the Chair's discretion.

Michael Hamilton, the new president of the Student Government Association, said he could not speak to any positives or negatives, but said there should be general concerns about maintaining equal order, because the chair ensures equal time for presenting and expressing concerns. Osterhage said she appreciated Blonder's comment about being more informal at SC meetings, while at the same time appreciating Spear's point about the committee chair being the most knowledgeable about what a committee was presenting. She opined that without the current policy, senators would ask the Chair a question and the Chair would likely just turn to the committee chair for an answer.

Schroeder, who noted that she had served as a committee chair for the past six years, said that the current policy worked fine and that she liked the separation of fact and opinion. She said that it made her job easier. She said that she personally believed it was important for a committee chair to state what the committee discussed and debated. Schroeder said she viewed a committee report as a report from a Senate body and the majority of Senate committees were comprised of senators. She said it was

important to share what a committee discussed and why, but concurred with Wood and Bird-Pollan that such information should be shared in such a way as to not be dismissive. She spoke against the scenario where a committee chair would not be allowed to answer questions, saying it would not be an improvement. She noted that she and the Chair had some challenges when trying to initially implement the policy, but that those issues worked out over time.

The Vice Chair then asked SC members to share what they did not like. She noted the reality that SC members come to meetings prepared for discussion, but it was not true that all senators would have reviewed all committee reports prior to a Senate meeting. She suggested one aspect of the issue was wanting to ensure that senators are aware of a committee's work and even when details are in a committee's report or the proposal itself, there is some value in a committee chair articulating what the committee did. She said that even if the SC did away with its "committee chair serve as acting chair" policy, it was important to ensure that a committee's deliberations inform Senate discussions, knowing that not all senators will have read all the proposals.

Schroeder said the process was still a little clunky. She was not sure when the motion was supposed to be read and if she or the Chair should read the motion, noting that that detail was not settled initially. Eventually she, the Chair, and Cross had a discussion and she and the Chair moved to having the Chair read the motion, which would signify that the questions of fact were over. She said she understood the concerns about not letting a committee chair call on senators for questions, but that the current policy is smoother than the previous [lack of a] policy. Osterhage said she had no negative comments, although the term "acting chair" seemed a little odd and there might be a better term to use. Guest Hamilton said that once the motion was read, it was presented to the body. He said if a committee chair took over the position of chair and was biased, it might hamper the sharing of opinions of those with contradictory opinions.

Cross said that a colloquy could occur if the body authorized two people to have a conversation, perhaps when there was one person with a lot of questions and the committee chair was the logical person to answer questions. He said he thought meetings would be more productive if the Chair was more willing to make decisions on their own and less reliant on the parliamentarian. Spear said that he understood and appreciated the concerns that were raised. Once the Senate became accustomed to the current policy, things went well. He said it was most important to him for things to move along efficiently because it usually seemed when it was time for the meeting to end at five o'clock, there was often still work to be done. In response to a question from the Vice Chair, Spear clarified that he was referring to Senate meetings. He said it was the Chair's job to ensure that things move along and ensure there is sufficient time to discuss agenda items, even those at the end of the agenda, referring to the perceived rush around the discussion on a new fall break.

Tagavi said there was a third flaw in the process, which was the fundamental unfairness of a committee chair deciding who to call on. He said that sometimes he was not called on, or he was told he was speaking a second time. He wondered how that was fair, particularly when a biased committee chair was part of the proceedings. The Vice Chair asked him to clarify – would Tagavi's concern be addressed if the committee chair was not acting chair, but stood next to the Chair and the Chair called on people and referred questions to the committee chair? Tagavi said it would satisfy most of his concerns, but that in terms of appearances, the committee chair really should not stand with the Chair. Tagavi objected to Hamilton's suggestion about equal time for presentation and debate, stating that there absolutely should not be equal time for presentation and debate and that senators with raised hands should be given preference over a committee chair's comments. The Vice Chair asked for further

clarification – if there was a faculty question that the committee chair could answer, would it constitute “unfairness” if the committee chair answered the question? Tagavi wondered who, in the scenario, was deciding to allow the committee chair to speak. The Vice Chair said that if she were serving as Chair and she did not know the answer to a question from a senator, was it fair for her to turn to the committee chair and ask that individual to answer? Tagavi responded that he had no objection to that; if the Chair opted to give more time to a presenter, it was the prerogative of the Chair to be unfair or not.

Wood said she appreciate the attempt to address concerns about committee chair serving as acting chair, but said that she didn’t think senators really understood what was going on. Wood suggested that senators believed fact-finding to be part of the discussion and she added that in a review of meeting transcripts, there was almost no discussion after the motion was put on the floor. She said that was her concern. She said that it was important to want committees and committee chairs to be really involved. She said the committee chair could read the motion and then the Chair could state that the motion on the floor was open for debate. Wood said it was okay to continue to distinguish between discussion and points of information, but anyone could ask a point of information. She said that would be perfectly appropriate. Also, a committee chair could stand next to the podium, noting that she agreed that the Chair should be the one to maintain position at the podium. Wood summarized that she preferred to see the motion made, notice given that a second was not required because the item came from a Senate committee, after which time the Senate would know it could have debate and discussion. Under that format, if a senator had a point of order, the Chair would be in control.

Tagavi raised a point of information, asking if committee proposal motions are SC motions or committee motions and the Vice Chair responded that they would be motions from the committee. Blonder disagreed, saying that SC needed to keep in mind the structure of Senate meetings. As opposed to a research presentation at a conference, there would be a motion that the Chair has to put on the floor and that motion gets to Senate because SC puts it there. Once SC puts an item on an agenda, it would be the SC’s motion. She said the Chair should start by putting the motion (from SC) on the floor, after which the committee chair could present the proposal, then the committee chair would step aside and the Chair would open the floor for debate, not opening the floor for questions and answers.

Grossman said that the SC is authorized to put a proposal on an agenda, but the original motion comes from committee. He reminded SC members of a comment from the Vice Chair, earlier in the discussion – many senators, if not most, do not come to meetings particularly well prepared, so there is a lot of need for discussion, presentation, and establishment of fact. He said that while it was sometimes difficult to organize the discussion to put questions of fact first, followed by debate, but he said that that improved as time went on. Grossman added that he thought the process would continue to improve as senators get used to the current “committee chair serve as acting chair” policy. He ended by saying that Tagavi’s and Blonder’s comments would work well only if senators came prepared, but all senators usually do not come well prepared.

The Vice Chair noted that the discussion had taken more than the 15 minutes allotted, but asked SC members to send her their thoughts if they had further comments. She said she would return to SC in August with some plans. Tagavi disagreed, saying that he thought the Vice Chair [soon to be Chair] and Cross [parliamentarian] should resolve the issue and that motions that go to Senate are SC motions. The Vice Chair said that issue would be addressed, too.

#### 4. Shared Governance Rights of Faculty on Phased Retirement (10:30 – 10:45 am)

The Vice Chair welcomed Guest Davy Jones (ME/Toxicology and Cancer Biology, Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) chair). The Vice Chair summarized for SC members that faculty on phased retirement can vote in faculty trustee elections and in a college's elections for Senate, but are not eligible to stand as a candidate in either election. She explained that the purpose of the day's discussion was to determine if SC was satisfied with the current policy or if it was something that SC wanted to consider changing.

Jones explained that one of the handouts was a one-page file that summarized current state law and definitions describing a faculty employee. He said that Kentucky's office of the Attorney General had walked through definitions of being a "staff" or "faculty" employee and that state law (Kentucky Revised Statutes, or KRS) leaves up to each institution's governing board the authority to interpret both definitions. Jones said that UK's Board of Trustees had codified state law into UK's *Governing Regulations (GRs)* regarding employment and also added the stipulation for regular, "full time" employment. UK's *Administrative Regulation (AR)* governing phased retirement was an AR that required Board approval and it documents that phased retirement involves reduction to part-time. As a result, the *Senate Rules (SRs)* have also reflected the GR- and AR-dictates that a regular employee is also described as "full-time," which has resulted in the current practice of faculty on phased retirement being prohibited from serving as a faculty trustee or college senator, although he noted that college faculties can choose to grant departmental voting rights to faculty on phased retirement. Jones then described the second handout, which showed phased-retirement policies at other universities.

The Vice Chair thanked Jones for the information contained in the handouts, noting that there would certainly be rules to consider changing if the policy were to change. If any rule changes were necessary, she said she would work with Jones over the summer to create wording to describe a changed policy for faculty on phased retirement. As the Chair opened up the floor for discussion, Jones departed.

Grossman spoke in favor of changing the current policy, so that faculty would be allowed to participate as candidates in faculty trustee elections and in a college's Senate elections. He said that the concept of phased retirement likely developed after the regulations were approved. Grossman stated that individuals in phased retirement were valuable members of the community and had a lot to contribute. He said that if a faculty member did not want to be represented by a faculty member on phased retirement, the faculty member could make their sentiments known through their vote. Grossman **moved** to ask the SREC to write a proposal to allow faculty on phased retirement to retain all the privileges that faculty not on phased retirement, of the same rank, would have. Osterhage **seconded**. The Vice Chair solicited arguments.

Tagavi said that the wording of the motion implied that SC had already agreed to allow faculty on phased retirement to participate as candidates in elections for the faculty trustee and for a college's elections for Senate. He asked if there would be time to discuss the merit of the idea. The Vice Chair replied that if SC members thought the idea to lack merit, that sentiment could be expressed by voting against the motion for the SREC to develop a proposal. Tagavi said that he did not have any merit-based objection to the motion, but said he was worried about opening a can of worms whereby other faculty, like those with part-time appointments, or who are voluntary, or who are in research, might also have expanded rights in elections. Blonder spoke in favor of the motion, stating that it was discriminatory to prohibit faculty on phased retirement from standing for election, even though the faculty member was still required to fill out a distribution of effort (DOE) form. The Vice Chair reminded SC members that there would be another opportunity to discuss a changed policy, when the SREC brought forward their proposal.

Wood spoke in favor of the proposal, saying she had a personal interest in changing the rights of faculty on phased retirement. She said the fact that she could not serve a full term had really affected some of her decisions over the past year – it was not right to put her name forward for a full term if she could not commit to serving for the entirety of the three-year term. Tagavi commented that the term for a faculty trustee and for a college senator was three years, the same as the standard length of time for a period of phased retirement. Tagavi wondered if changing the policy would result in an increased need to conduct elections more often, in the event that faculty on phased retirement who were serving in elected positions might step down prior to the end of their three-year term. The Vice Chair commented that it might be prudent to also ask the SREC to think about the consequences if a faculty trustee on phased retirement chose full retirement and vacated the position. There were a few final comments about the proposal, as well as about UK's current phased retirement policy. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Vice Chair noted that time still remained until an invited guest arrived. She said that the next issue about which she would like clarity pertained to voting rights for the SC chair.

Senate Council and University Senate Activities (9:35 – 9:40 am)

b. Other Aspects of Meetings (9:55 – 10:15 am)

The Vice Chair explained that during the tenure of the current Chair [McCormick], she [McCormick] did not regularly vote but only did so in some specific circumstances. The Vice Chair said she wanted the *SRs* to be clearer about when the chair has a vote and when the chair does not.

Cross stated that a chair of SC is the leader of the faculty and as such should not be denied voting rights, although discretion would be necessary. He said it was a good procedure to have a chair cast a final vote, to assist with breaking a tie. Cross said he was in favor of a SC chair having the same voting rights as anyone else, as the individual had been chosen by the faculty and SC to make decisions. Blonder said that many bodies have a rule that allows a chair to vote only to break a tie. She said she supported a SC chair's right to vote only when it is necessary to break a tie, noting that a chair is supposed to remain neutral. Guest Michael Hamilton, the new Student Government Association president, suggested that if voting rights were not clarified in the Robert's Rules of Order (Newly Revised) (RONR), a chair could only vote in cases of a tie vote. Cross responded that it was his understanding that RONR offered suggestions to different types of bodies regarding a chair's voting rights.

Tagavi posed a series of rhetorical questions about the possibility of a SC chair signaling to members how they might vote, or a SC chair possibly speaking in favor of a motion, both of which would mean a SC chair was not being neutral. Wood spoke in favor of a SC chair being allowed to vote only if it was needed to break a tie. She offered her personal opinion that the morale of the SC was helped if a SC chair remained neutral except in the case of a tie. Wood commented that another important consideration was determining if a SC chair counted towards the SC's quorum. She said it did not make any sense for a SC chair to not count towards quorum, but be allowed to vote on ties – she said that issue needed to be decided, too. Spear commented that a SC chair would be sharing their opinion about an issue if asked to vote to break a tie, so it was difficult for him to come to the conclusion that a SC chair should vote on some things and not on others. He supported a SC chair being able to vote on all issues, rather than just ties. Blonder said she wanted a SC chair to be allowed to vote in elections, but not on regular matters; in response to a question from the Vice Chair, Blonder clarified that she was supportive of a SC chair voting in any election, regardless of whether or not a SC chair needed to break a tie.

Grossman opined that a SC chair should be able to vote on anything a SC chair felt strongly compelled to vote on. He noted that many votes are strongly one-sided, anyway, so it would not be a problem. Grossman noted that as a member of Senate, and as elected by SC members, a SC chair should certainly be allowed to vote, although a SC chair could choose whether or not to exercise that right to vote. Cross **moved** that the policy of the SC be that a SC chair can vote whenever a SC chair deems it advisable. Grossman **seconded**. Cross confirmed for Tagavi that the motion specifically pertained to SC meetings and the motion was therefore revised to “that the policy of the SC be that a SC chair can vote in SC meetings whenever a SC chair deems it advisable.” Grossman did not object to the clarified wording.

Hamilton suggested that a SC chair only be allowed to vote on primary motions. Both Cross and Grossman accepted the suggestion as a **friendly amendment**, so the motion became “that the policy of the SC be that a SC chair can vote on main motions in SC meetings whenever a SC chair deems it advisable.” Blonder stated that she was totally against the motion and opined that a SC chair should remain neutral and should not vote. In response to a question from the Vice Chair, Blonder acknowledged that she still supported allowing a SC chair to vote in cases of a tie. Tagavi said he agreed with Blonder and said that allowing a SC chair to vote would hurt the character of a SC chair and the relationship between a SC chair and the SC. He said it would be bad if a SC chair got into the petty discussions that some SC members get into. Cross commented that the restrictions (in SC, only on main motions) was an attempt for balance.

A **vote** was taken with Spear, Osterhage, Schroeder, Blonder, Wood, Tagavi, and Hamilton participating; the outcome was unclear. Some SC members felt the motion had failed, with four votes in favor and four opposed, because Hamilton voted in opposition. Other SC members believed the motion passed, because the SGA president’s term on SC begins on July 1 and it was still May.

There was lively discussion regarding whether or not Hamilton was a current member of SC or not, which would affect his eligibility to vote. Tagavi said that he objected to the possibility that Hamilton’s vote would not count. Grossman queried Tagavi, wondering why a guest would ever vote. Wood asked when SC’s composition was reconstituted and the Vice Chair stated that elected faculty members of SC have terms that end in December. Ms. Brothers checked the *SRs* and read aloud the text of *Senate Rules 1.3.1.2.B.1* (“Purposes and Functions of the Senate Council,” “Composition,” “Elected Student Membership”): “The two elected student members of the Senate Council and the President of the Student Government Association shall serve terms of one (1) year commencing July 1 following their election and continuing until their successors are elected and certified.” Given the vehement assertions from the elected faculty members who voted against the motion that Hamilton was a current member, the Vice Chair’s ruling was that the motion **failed** due to a tie, with four votes in favor and four opposed.

Schroeder **moved** that the SC direct the Vice Chair [who would become the SC Chair on June 1] to bring a proposal to SC in August regarding the voting privileges of a SC chair. Tagavi stated that it was an invalid motion and Cross disagreed, saying it was perfectly valid. Tagavi then said it was not a meaningful motion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with one opposed.

##### 5. First-Year Initiatives – Associate Provost for Student and Academic Life Greg Heileman (11:00 – 12:00 pm)

The Chair welcomed Guest Greg Heileman, associate provost for student and academic life. Heileman thanked SC members for inviting him and said he prepared some slides to share information with them regarding first-year initiatives, designed to align student life with academic success. Heileman shared

Senate Council  
May 18, 2018

information with SC members for about 15 minutes and then answered questions. At the end of the conversation, SC members thanked Heileman with a round of applause.

6. LUNCH (12:00 – 1:00 pm)

SC members adjourned at approximately 12:10 pm, for lunch.

Senate Council and University Senate Activities (9:35 – 9:40 am)

b. Other Aspects of Meetings (9:55 – 10:15 am)

c. Curricular Approval Process (10:15 – 10:30 am)

When the meeting began again around 1:10 pm, the Vice Chair noted that there were some issues on the morning's agenda that had not yet been discussed, such as the possibility of using electronic voting devices in SC meetings, content and order of agendas, and aspects related to the curricular approval process. She asked SC members to next offer their opinions about aspects of meetings other than voting rights. She suggested SC members go around the table and offer their comments one at a time, beginning with Schroeder.

Schroeder opined that SC and Senate meeting agendas were clear and orderly and that the slides used in Senate meetings were fine. She noted that the slides in Senate meetings were almost essential because many senators do not prepare for Senate meetings and without the slides would not know what they were voting on, or about. Schroeder said that voting by a show of hands in SC meetings was working well and did not need to change; the smaller size of the SC allowed Ms. Brothers to literally count hands in votes, which was not feasible in Senate meetings. Regarding the curricular approval process, she said she had raised questions in the past about the role of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), which she chaired. She said she liked to think that the SAPC was a helpful voice for SC and Senate, but she still sometimes felt as though the SAPC was a clean-up crew; the SAPC receives a lot of proposals that are not in good condition. Schroeder noted that if the proposals were presented to SC without the benefit of SAPC review, many of the proposals simply would not be heard by the SC. She said she had continuing concerns about the work of the Graduate Council (GC), where a lot of the hold-up occurs. Schroeder commented on proposals that were misplaced by the GC, which frustrated colleges, and said she thought that there still might be a proposal out there that was last seen at the GC, which a college was still looking for. She said the Undergraduate Council has greatly improved and will continue to do so. Schroeder expressed appreciation for better overall coordination of curricular proposals and the improved communications with colleges.

The Vice Chair commented that part of the impetus for the discussion was the recent passage of the state's biennial budget, which included language about budgets, programs, and the possibility of loss of tenure due to financial exigency. Schroeder noted that the Office of Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness had created a committee to review the program review process across the University; Schroeder explained that the Council on Postsecondary Education had promulgated new procedures and rules for the program review process. She said that it will be critical to understand the new process, to understand the implications for UK.

Osterhage said that agendas for both SC and Senate meetings were fine. She did say that when SC members were asked to identify nominees for University committees it was hard to come up with names, especially for newer faculty. She said it would be easier if she were provided with electronic access to a spreadsheet of faculty to review. Grossman agreed, but noted that he preferred a hard copy. Regarding curriculum, Osterhage expressed some frustration that a proposal she shepherded through the process had to be revised at every step. She thought it might be easier when programs are put into

Curriculog, where tracking changes would be easier and simplified. She wondered what different review bodies ask for, noting that her college's curriculum committee also required changes. Cross said that he did not see the need for electronic voting in the smaller-sized SC. Regarding curriculum, Cross said that the process was sometimes naturally clunky and that all bases needed to be touched; it was Senate's responsibility to ensure, from a central location, that all bases are indeed touched.

Spear said he thought current voting practices in SC and Senate were appropriate. He said the curricular approval process was clunky. As former co-chair of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Graduate Education, he recalled that one constant refrain he heard from faculty was the length of time that proposals took to be reviewed and approved, as well as the number of groups that are required to offer input. He said he would like to see how the course and program approval process could be streamlined, to improve the speed at which items are approved. In response to a question from the Vice Chair about specific improvements, Spear suggested that some reviewing bodies do not necessarily understand different types of proposals – he said when he worked on a new program proposal it was reviewed and approved by the Health Care Colleges Council (HCCC) but the next reviewing body said the HCCC did not review it properly. He added that the reviews conducted by the Graduate Council were indeed an issue.

Blonder said that if the SC moved to a system where a SC chair could vote in SC meetings, it would be beneficial to use the electronic voting devices in SC, so SC members would not know how a SC chair voted. Other than that possibility, she said she did not see the need to use voting devices at SC meetings. Blonder indicated that she preferred the prior PowerPoint design, as it was brighter and easier to see. Ms. Brothers explained that the design could change from one year to the next, particularly if a new SC chair did not like the prior format. Osterhage commented that some research indicated that people paid more attention when a background was dark and the lettering was light, but Cross cautioned that it was tiring to see a long succession of slides with that design. Blonder said she thought meeting agendas were fine. She said that the login button for Curriculog was very difficult to locate, although she doubted that it would be simple to change. She said one problem she experienced in Curriculog was needing to revise a proposal when the proposal was not at her step – she said she would like to have a chance to review a course proposal prior to moving it on to the next level.

Grossman said it was not clear to him how to access web transmittals, specifically the paths to take to review courses and to review programs. He said that he had long thought that some of the Senate's work could be consolidated into fewer committees, in general. He noted that the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) was needed as a check to ensure that the Undergraduate Council (UC) and Graduate Council (GC) appropriately reviewed proposal, which was an unfortunate use of time. He said it would be better if the SAPC spent their time working on policy, not fixing messes that earlier reviewing bodies either created or did not catch earlier, but given the length of time that this has been a problem, he was not sure what the solution could be. He said he had suggested in the past that the UC and GC document what they were looking for in curricular proposals, although the current format of Senate forms has certainly helped proposers understand what is required for a proposal. Grossman said that the UC had suffered from overreach in the past, particularly regarding requests for extremely detailed syllabi. Osterhage commented that the most recent UC chair had addressed that concern and that the UC no longer spent so much time on syllabi.

As Grossman finished his comments, he did express a hope that SC chairs would stop reading the information on slides during Senate meetings. Ms. Brothers explained that it was her understanding that if the information on the slides was not read aloud, it could not be included in the minutes. Cross stated that it was his understanding that the minutes could contain any information that was presented to the

Senate [whether provided verbally or on a PowerPoint slide]. Grossman said that it was important to read the motions, but that other information did not need to be read. Blonder wondered why a SC chair would not read the information on the slides – would a SC chair instead just stand there while senators read the text on the slide? Grossman responded that if a SC chair planned to say it, it didn't need to also be part of the PowerPoint presentation.

Cross said there needed to be a better way to deal with amendments to motions at Senate meetings, noting that it appeared to be challenging to do it through the software associated with the electronic voting devices. Grossman wondered about preparing an amendment slide for every proposal, just in case it was needed, although he acknowledged that that could be administratively cumbersome. Cross suggested use of a template amendment slide, which could be quickly edited, noting that the full text of the amendment was not necessary or required to be on a slide.

The Vice Chair thanked SC members for their comments and suggestions and said she would be happy to continue to receive ideas about improving SC and Senate meetings. She said she would return to SC in August with ideas about implementing SC members' suggestions.

#### 7. Senate Committee Compositions (1:00 – 1:30 pm)

SC members discussed Senate committee compositions and made recommendations regarding membership and, in some cases, regarding committee chairs. Ms. Brothers explained that college election results had been received from almost all the colleges and the proposed compositions were based on each newly elected senator's committee preferences. For the individuals who had not yet returned their preference sheets, Ms. Brothers indicated that SC could review the compositions again in August, or authorize the Chair to identify committee memberships for senators who had not yet sent in committee preference sheets, as well as authorize the Chair to identify committee members to serve as chair. During discussion, Osterhage, chair of the Senate's Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (SAPPC), noted that she was very willing to put the SAPPC to work, if there was an issue about which the SAPPC could meet. Also, some SC members asked that the Senate's Advisory Committee on Diversity and Inclusion be made aware that concerns have been expressed by some Asian and Asian-American faculty that they are not well represented on campus diversity committees.

When discussion wound down, the Vice Chair summarized the SC's wishes that the Chair: identify chairs for the committees that needed chairs; make committee assignments for those senators who had not yet sent in committee preferences; and pay special attention to the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) and Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), both of which needed members from Fine Arts or Communication and Information. SC members concurred with her summary.

The Vice Chair noted that the Senate Hearing Panel (Privilege and Tenure) (SHP(P&T)) was short one member. In addition, one members of the SHP(P&T) was also on the Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure, and some of the members of the SHP(P&T) held administrative positions. SC members discussed how many additional nominees to provide to President Capilouto and if fully tenured faculty should be the only names sent forward. During discussion, Cross noted that he was not participating in the deliberation of names because he and the faculty member who might be accessing the SHP(P&T) had their appointments in the same college.

Grossman **moved** that the SC direct the Chair to forward the discussed list of names to the President for him to identify new members for the Senate Hearing Panel (Privilege & Tenure). Schroeder **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstained.

## 8. Big Issues

### a. 2017-18 Recap (1:30 – 1:40 pm)

The Vice Chair noted the accomplishments and activities undertaken by the SC and the SC office. She explained that the italicized information pertained to activities specifically undertaken by the Chair.

### b. 2018-19 Possibilities (1:40 – 2:00 pm)

Blonder asked for a regular schedule of what meetings President Capilouto will attend. She asked about the possibility of having a special SC meeting with the President and with the chair of the Board of Trustees. She asked also if Provost David Blackwell could attend SC meetings on a monthly basis. Schroeder suggested that it would be useful to know what Senate's role will be in the *Our Path Forward* initiatives begun by the President, specifically what sorts of proposals will be forthcoming. She opined that the details of the financial aid/attendance proposal discussed at the May 14 SC meeting were not available until the last minute, which hampered SC's ability to be more efficient.

Grossman concurred with Schroeder's comments, but cautioned that Senate should think carefully if there were proposals to change the *Senate Rules (SRs)* as part of *Our Path Forward*. He added that any directives from the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) should be carefully considered; UK has its own procedures to follow if a program must be closed, but Senate should be aware of how that process would work so it can be done in an orderly fashion because the language in the *SRs* about program closure may not have ever been used. Grossman also asked that the Senate's Committee on Committees review the Senate's committees and possibly consolidate the committees that do not even meet on a yearly basis. He said that some of Senate's committees were intended to oversee issues that are now overseen by the administration, but maybe some committees could be combined so that when an issue arises, there are [fewer] standing committees that could assist. He suggested putting more senators on the more active Senate committees, to help share the workload.

The Vice Chair thanked SC members for their comments and encouraged them to send her additional thoughts and ideas.

## 9. Items from the Floor (2:00 – 2:15 pm)

The Vice Chair reminded SC members of the May 14 discussion on financial aid and attendance and the plans to have a temporary policy in place to comply with federal requirements when faculty return in August. She noted that the SC did not take any formal action, but in the interim the Vice Chair was made aware of concerns by some Senators about the lack of SC action. Because the issue and resultant policy will have some obvious academic aspects, there were worries that SC (and Senate) were ceding some academic responsibilities to the Provost by not expressing approval of the Provost's plan of action. The Vice Chair explained that she was given some possible wording for a motion to assist SC in drafting a formal motion: consider endorsing the existence of a new academic policy requiring an academically related activity in every class by a particular date, to comply with federal requirements.

SC members discussed the possibility of such a motion, as well as some related considerations, such as financially related deadlines for students. Schroeder **moved** that the SC endorse the existence of a new academic policy requiring an academically related activity in every class by the relevant week, to comply with federal financial aid guidelines. Osterhage **seconded**. Grossman suggested that the SC also act on

Senate Council  
May 18, 2018

Senate's behalf and Schroeder and Osterhage **accepted** that change to the motion as a **friendly amendment**. SC members discussed the motion.

Blonder expressed concern that it was inappropriate to act on behalf of Senate and moved to amend the motion by removing "on behalf of the Senate" from the amended motion. Hamilton [incoming SGA president] **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **failed** with two in favor and four opposed.

A **vote** was taken on the motion that the SC, on behalf of the Senate, endorse the existence of a new academic policy requiring an academically related activity in every class by the relevant week, to comply with federal financial aid guidelines. The motion **passed** with five in favor and one abstained. The Vice Chair said she would notify Provost Blackwell and she was also asked to notify senators. There were some concerns that students would be caught unawares and not understand the importance of participating in the "academically related activity." Grossman suggested that Hamilton engage the Provost to learn more about how students will be notified.

Grossman **moved** to adjourn and Osterhage **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 2:44 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Jennifer Bird-Pollan,  
Senate Council Vice Chair

SC members present: Bird-Pollan, Blonder, Cross, Grossman, Osterhage, Schroeder, Spear, Tagavi (departed shortly after lunch), and Wood (departed shortly after lunch).

Invited guests present: Greg Heileman and Davy Jones.

Additional individual present: Michael Hamilton.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, June 13, 2018.