

Senate Council
January 13, 2020

The Senate Council met in regular session on Monday, January 13, 2020 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 Jennifer Bird-Pollan called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:03 pm. The Chair welcomed those present and suggested that everyone in the room introduce themselves.

1. Minutes from December 2, 2019 and Announcements

The Chair reported that no edits were received for the set of minutes from December 2, 2019. There being **no objections**, the minutes from December 2, 2019 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair announced that the College of Fine Arts is voluntarily withdrawing from program level accreditation from the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD). The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) has been notified. The Chair will notify Student Government Association President Michael Hamilton. After a concern was raised by Grossman about student input, the Chair suggested that she and Vice Provost Larry Holloway could ask the College of Fine Arts to announce the change to students.

The Chair reported that the honorary degree approved by SC was awarded to P.G. Peeples at the December graduation commencement.

The Chair reported that a new laptop has been purchased for the SC Office. New clicker systems options are being investigated, but the existing system may work.

The Chair reported that Assistant Provost for Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Annie Weber was unable to attend the meeting, but asked the Chair to share some announcements with SC. The Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) is unlikely to change the policy about advertising unapproved programs as soon as we had hoped. Provost Blackwell explained that this policy change is on hiatus until a program review policy is developed. Paid advertising for new degree programs that are not yet approved by the CPE is not allowed, but carefully worded, factual statements about the approval status of a new degree program (e.g. "Senate approved a proposal for new degree XYZ, which is subject to CPE approval") was probably fine. The Chair will keep everyone updated with any changes.

2. IP Policy and Recording Policy – Provost David Blackwell and Associate Provost of Teaching, Learning, and Academic Innovation Kathi Kern

The Chair informed SC that there is no current policy about recording in classes, but there is an existing *Administrative Regulation (AR)* about Intellectual Property (IP). The Chair welcomed Provost Blackwell and Associate Provost Kern to share current thinking about the policy and hear SC's feedback about the possibility of changing the current *AR* about IP.

Provost Blackwell explained that the conversation was spurred by the growing number of online programs and courses and the proliferation of technology among students. The SC Chair, Associate Provost Kathi Kern, and the Legal office have been working together to revisit the language in the *AR*. Currently the *AR* does not include wording that allows UK to request access to those materials. An example would be if a faculty member goes on sabbatical or medical leave and UK would like to access their course notes so the class can continue to be taught. Another example is if a faculty member departs from the University and the program would like to preserve continuity of the course for a period of time. The current *AR* appears to prohibit this request. This issue has been discussed with the Provost's

Council and the Provost asked SC for their input. He then turned the conversation over to Kern and SC Chair.

Kern explained that the IP Policy has not been modified since 1992, prior to UK's online growth. Without diluting faculty's ownership of materials, they would like to develop a policy with more flexibility. After benchmarking other universities, they found a wide range of IP policies.

The SC Chair sent a draft of the IP Policy to the chair of Senate's Technology Committee, Mark Lauersdorf (AS) and the chair of Senate's Distance Learning and e-Learning Committee, Roger Brown (AG) for their input. Brown was unavailable for the meeting but sent his comments. The Chair reported that Brown believes the draft is an improvement over the current rule, and notes it is especially important that faculty are given notice in advance and the opportunity to decide if they will share their materials. Lauersdorf commented that the draft focuses on teaching materials and intellectual property, but there are other considerations that should be spelled out more clearly, like data that has been curated for classroom projects/discussions.

Grossman (AS) commented that the proposal is very humane and realistic. He liked that it protects the University without harming the interests of the faculty but recommended that the policy be clearer about adjuncts.

Provost Blackwell then addressed the second issue, the recording policy. Concern was raised about students' privacy being violated by other students recording personal class discussions and then sharing them online. Another concern is if faculty know they are subject to being recorded, it could squelch classroom discussions. There is also concern about students making money by posting lectures online. It was noted that there are circumstances when recording is appropriate, for example, for a student with a disability or an excused absence.

Kern informed SC that they have been benchmarking policies of other universities. She recommends that any policy change include language that recordings cannot be made available to anyone outside of class. The current *Administrative Regulations (AR)* allows faculty to determine the appropriate use of technology in their classroom.

There was discussion around the room about digital citizenship, healthcare code of ethics, and legal team recommendations. Discussions about IP and recording policy will continue taking place with different groups around the university. The Provost thanked SC for their input.

Provost Blackwell updated the Senate Council on the procedural status of a currently ongoing tenure dismissal case.

3. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) – Aaron Cramer (EN), Chair

i. Proposed New Undergraduate Certificate in Digital Media Design for Educators

Cramer described the proposal. The Chair solicited questions of fact from SC and there were some. The Chair stated that the **motion** on the floor was a recommendation from the SAPC that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new Undergraduate Certificate: Digital Media Design for Educators, in the School of Art and Visual Studies within the College of Fine Arts. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. The Chair asked if there was debate on the proposal. There was none. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Telehealth

Cramer described the proposal. The Chair solicited questions of fact from SC and there were some. The Chair stated that the **motion** on the floor was a recommendation from the SAPC that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate: Telehealth, in the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders within the College of Health Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. The Chair asked if there was debate on the proposal. There was none. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iii. Proposed New MS in Supply Chain Engineering

Cramer described the proposal. The Chair solicited questions of fact from SC and there were some. The Chair stated that the **motion** on the floor was a recommendation from the SAPC that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new MS degree: Supply Chain Engineering, in the Department of Mechanical Engineering within the College of Engineering. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. The Chair asked if there was debate on the proposal. There was none. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iv. Proposed New BS in Biomedical Engineering

Cramer described the proposal. The Chair solicited questions of fact from SC and there were some. The Chair stated that the **motion** on the floor was a recommendation from the SAPC that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new BS degree: Biomedical Engineering, in the F. Joseph Halcomb III, M.D. Department of Biomedical Engineering within the College of Engineering. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. The Chair asked if there was debate on the proposal. There was none. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. Senate's Research and Graduate Education Committee (SRGEC) – Susan Cantrell (ED), Chair

i. Memo of Support for Recent Graduate Education Findings

Cantrell explained that the SRGEC met in the fall to review the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon panel and the report of the Implementation Team. SRGEC agreed with all recommendations and urged swift implementation. They are concerned about attracting an outstanding Dean candidate given funding issues surrounding the Graduate School and recommend doing a benchmarking study to see what an appropriate funding amount for the Graduate School would be. The SRGEC has crafted a memo to the Provost and would like for the SC to endorse it before sending it to him.

The Chair opened the floor for discussion. Grossman made a **motion** to endorse the memo from SRGEC and send it on to the Provost. Brion **seconded**. There was discussion about asking the University Senate to endorse the memo as well. Grossman **moved to amend the motion** that SC recommend to Senate that it endorse the memo and send it on to the Provost. Brion **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

c. Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) – DeShana Collett (HS), Chair

i. Emeritus Voting Membership on SREC

Collett reported that the SREC requests the Senate Council to reconfirm that Davy Jones, who retired on January 1, 2020 and is now an Emeritus Professor, continues to be a voting member of the SREC. SC members discussed expanding the interpretation to clarify that emeritus faculty are eligible for voting membership on all Senate committees. Grossman made a **motion** to endorse the SREC's interpretation regarding membership of Davy Jones as emeritus voting member of the SREC. Brion **seconded**. After

Senate Council
January 13, 2020

discussion, it was determined that the SC did not need to approve an SREC interpretation, but it would be appropriate to affirm Jones' voting rights on the SREC. Collett said that the SREC would deliberate on the appropriate language to add to the *SRs* regarding the issue of voting rights on Senate committees for emeritus faculty. Brion and Grossman **withdrew** the motion and second.

Brion then **moved** to formalize the membership of Davy Jones as an emeritus voting member of the SREC and Grossman **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Request for Interim Guidance Regarding Dead Week in Compressed Courses

Collett gave SC some background information concerning the interpretation of dead week for compressed courses. SC Chair introduced Kent Ratajeski (AS), who has concerns about dead week for a compressed course he is teaching.

Ratajeski explained his concerns about having enough time for the compressed course projects and exams during dead week. SC discussed and clarified dead week rules and suggestions were made about scheduling of course projects and exams. As discussion wound down, in response to a question from the Chair, Ratajeski confirmed that the discussion had helped and given him the information he was seeking.

4. Tentative Senate Agenda for January 27, 2020

The Chair went over the tentative Senate Agenda for January 27, 2020 and there were suggestions to add the SRGEC committee report and a possible report from the Philanthropy Office. Grossman made a **motion** to approve the agenda with added reports. Collett **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Jennifer Bird-Pollan,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bird-Pollan, Brion, Cantrell, Collett, Cramer, Grossman, Hall, Sout, and Vincent.

Invited guests present: Sheila Brothers, Fazleena Badurdeen, David Blackwell, Marty Henton, Davy Jones, Kathi Kern, Mark Lauersdorf, Joneen Lowman, David Pienkowski, Kent Ratajeski, and Mitzi Vernon.

Prepared by Stephanie Woolery on January 29, 2020.