

University Senate
April 14, 2014

The University Senate met in regular session on Monday, April 14, 2014 at 3 pm in the Auditorium of W. T. Young Library. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Lee X. Blonder called the University Senate (Senate) to order at 3:04 pm. She asked for a motion to waive *Senate Rules 1.2.3* to allow consideration of the agenda, because the agenda was not sent out six days in advance. Wasilkowski **moved** thusly and Smyth **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair reminded senators to:

- Sign in upon arrival;
- Give name and affiliation when speaking;
- Attend meetings;
- Respond to emails and web postings as appropriate;
- Acknowledge and respect others;
- Silence all electronic devices; and
- Communicate with their constituencies.

The Chair reminded senators of the importance of signing in upon arrival to ensure a quorum.

1. Minutes from March 10, 2014 and Announcements

The Chair reported that no changes to the minutes were received. Therefore, the Senate **approved** the minutes from March 10, 2104 as distributed by **unanimous consent**. There were a few announcements.

Faculty Trustee Irina Voro completes her term on June 30, 2014. The term for the newly elected faculty trustee will be July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2017. The nominating petition round is complete; next is the first round of voting. The top three vote getters in the preliminary round of voting will progress to the second and final round of voting. The Chair told senators to lookout for email announcements about the election. She urged senators to vote in the election and to encourage their colleagues to do the same.

The Graduate School recently informed the Senate Council (SC) of a change to the exam attendance policy for the Graduate School. The revisions clarify the procedures for remote participation in doctoral qualifying and final exams, and for master's final exam. The Graduate School also added language because it previously did not encompass master's final exams.

The SC recently reviewed language to expand UK's non-discrimination policy to include gender expression and gender identity. The SC endorsed the addition of the two new terms. Revised language will be placed on Senate agenda after being developed by Regulation Review Committee.

A revised "new undergraduate program" form being finalized. The form will be longer than in the past, in part due to incorporating questions from the Council on Postsecondary /Education (CPE); the intent is to capture all needed information from the outset.

The SC is again conducting a campuswide survey of faculty, to evaluate President Eli Capilouto and provide input to the Board of Trustees in their annual review of the University President. The electronic survey was emailed on Tuesday, April 8; the survey is available for three weeks and closes on Tuesday, April 29th. The Chair urged senators to complete the survey and also to encourage their colleagues to do the same. The response rate last year was about 32%; the desire was to achieve almost a 50% response rate to improve validity.

April being the month to recognize departing senators who will not return after the May meeting, the Chair asked them whose Senate terms ends to stand and be recognized. The Chair thanked them for all they do. Those departing stood and senators honored them for their University service with a round of applause.

2. Officer and Other Reports

a. Chair Report

The Chair said that Richard Greissman, Assistant Provost in the office of Faculty Advancement and Assessment, will retire from UK on June 30. Greissman very ably served as the Provost's Liaison to the SC from 2004 through 2013. Greissman performed an invaluable service to faculty via that role, and in his past and current positions. The SC will host a reception to honor him immediately prior to the May 5 Senate meeting. The reception will be in the W. T. Y. Library Gallery (meeting room adjacent to the Auditorium) at 2 pm on May 5. She asked senators to attend and to please also invite colleagues who worked with Greissman – non-senators welcome to attend. Greissman will also be honored during the May Senate meeting.

b. Trustee Report

Faculty Trustee John Wilson said he was present to give senators an opportunity to ask questions as well as offer a few comments about the last Board of Trustees (Board) meeting. He said much of the discussion pertained to the budget, Frankfort and the legislature, but trustees also discussed diversity, Dining Services and the [developing] Strategic Plan. He said there was a student demonstration from Students Against Sweatshops, as well as a presentation from an alumni trustee that highlighted some issues regarding Dining Services. The demonstration and the remarks addressed concerns that UK is not a bottom line corporation and that social justice issues matter. The two actions highlighted for trustees the importance of understanding the implications of any arrangement that is developed with Dining Services. Wilson said there was a simple vehicle for presenting and talking to the Board; he expressed surprise that it was not used more often. The demonstration, as documented on YouTube, was effective at raising issues, but he suggested that coming and talking to the Board.

Wilson also urged senators to fill out the evaluation of the President. He said the results of the evaluation will be shared with trustees and then publicly posted; the results were not a secret in any way, shape or form. There were no questions from senators.

3. See tomorrow: Update on UK's Strategic Plan and Review of Recommendations - Provost Christine Riordan

Provost Christine Riordan offered a few lighthearted remarks to senators prior to giving a detailed presentation on the collaborative effort to create UK's 2014 – 2020 Strategic Plan, "see tomorrow." She gave an overview of the process and the six key initiatives guiding the discussions:

- Create a Vibrant Undergraduate Learning Community;
- Advance a High Quality Graduate and Professional Education Portfolio;

- Cultivate a Robust Research Environment;
- Develop a Strong and Sustainable UK Infrastructure;
- Create a Positive Work Environment for Faculty and Staff; and
- Have a Meaningful Impact on the Community and the Commonwealth

Provost Riordan also described the timeline for the strategic planning process; the depth of community involvement; the strengths, challenges and opportunities for UK; and how UK will facilitate further input and planning. When she was finished speaking, the Provost solicited questions from senators, but there were none. Provost Riordan then said all the information she had mentioned (and more) was available at www.uky.edu/strategic-plan. She said she invited the co-chairs from two high interest working groups to offer in-depth information about their activities and high-level principles. The Provost introduced the co-chairs from the 2014-2020 Strategic Plan Working Group # 1 (“Create a Vibrant Undergraduate Learning Community”): Kimberly Anderson (EN, Associate Dean of Administration and Academic Affairs) and Jane Jensen (ED, Associate Professor). Guest Anderson talked to senators about plans for the undergraduate community and then she and Guest Jensen answered questions.

Grossman asked about the state of advising and whether their work might shed some light on the balance between professional advisors and faculty advisors. Jensen commented that Grossman was referring to a change to advising structure, but what has been occurring nationally is a change in the purpose of advising. UK has systems to take care of the logistical aspects of traditional academic advising, so advising in the near future can concentrate more on self-discovery and experience a shift in what is done within the confines of advising.

Allison asked about the statistic given regarding the percentage of students who are unprepared for college. Anderson clarified that the figure of 8% of students being unprepared was a national number, but that it was similar to the number of unprepared students who arrive at UK. Pfeiffer commented on a suggestion that UK reach deeper into high schools, saying that UK really has no control over what happens outside of UK. He asked what can be done to prevent situations where graduating college seniors are unable to do simple math. Jensen said that reading down to high schools, as well as addressing remediation issues on campus is the best approach. UK is improving its ability to use analytics to recognize when a student is struggling. There is a vision for connecting all the various source/pieces of information to promote cross-communication.

Webb suggested improving the hand-off of students from one major (and college) to another college. Both Anderson and Jensen said that communication across campus needs to be improved. Hsain asked for additional information about internationalization and how it differs from the old model of just studying abroad. Jensen said that internationalization still involves study abroad, but also address things such as encouraging a professor in class to incorporate examples from the international community into the classroom. Internationalization also includes working to prevent self-segregation between local and international students. The working group wants to ensure that UK is more purposeful about internationalization.

Provost Riordan then introduced the co-chairs from the 2014-202 Strategic Plan Working Group # 3 (“Cultivate a Robust Research and Creative Environment”): Rodney Andrews (EN, Associate Professor and Director, Center for Applied Energy Research) and Lisa Cassis (ME, Professor and Chair of the Department of Pharmacology and Nutritional Sciences). Guest Cassis talked to senators about plans for research and a creative environment and then she and Guest Andrews answered questions from senators.

Lewis asked for the rationale behind a reference in one slide to “maintain a focus on the needs of rural Kentuckians.” Cassis said that the work group discussed the number and nature (health, economic, etc.) of problems in Appalachia. Guest Nancy Schoenberg (ME/Behavioral Science), a member of Work Group #3, explained that the focus is on all Kentuckians regardless of where inequities exist. However, UK is about 65% rural, so because of that alone the rural population warrants a great deal of attention. Andrews emphasized that it did not exclude other Kentuckians.

Hippisley asked if something like the best philosophy department in the world, which may not have a translational or community impact or rural Kentuckian focus, would continue to be a source of pride to UK, or if UK was not really interested in that type of research. Andrews said that individual metrics to track achievements in various disciplinary fields must be developed by the faculty in those areas. The metrics should measure excellence however excellence is measured. Cassis added that the working group had already expressed a desire for better data to better describe the impact of research. Hsain commented that with UK’s land grant mission, UK has an obligation to publicly offer its research to citizens of Kentucky. Sometimes wording in research contracts does not meet the spirit of free, public dispensing of ideas and research results. Cassis said his point was well taken. She said the work group tried to document that. Cassis suggested that when the initial draft of language comes out, Hsain should contact her if he does not think the issue was addressed well.

Hulse asked if the work group gave any consideration toward strengthening areas that are currently weak, in addition to strengthening the clusters of excellence, as mentioned in the presentation. Cassis explained the work group opted to use the metrics that were available and there are examples of areas that have succeeded. As an institution, UK needs to look at investments and the return on its investments. She said they were trying their best to develop transparent processes for programs of excellence.

Provost Riordan wrapped up the presentation with a few closing remarks. Christ asked if the timeline, which included implementation in June, was going to take place while nine-month faculty members are away from campus. The Provost assured her that given the pace of work now, and the necessity for some vacations in June and July, it was probable that she would send invitations to an implementation team in June or July with intent to begin the conversation anew in August.

4. Committee Reports

a. Senate’s Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) – Davy Jones, Chair

i. Proposed Change to *Senate Rules 5.1.8.5.A.3* (“Retroactive Withdrawal”)

Jones explained that the Senate’s Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee (SRWAC) used to petition the Senate Council (SC) on a regular basis to waive the Senate Rule pertaining to the time period within which a student must file a request for a retroactive withdrawal (two years from the last day of classes of the semester for which the withdrawal is requested) for particular students. After the SC became accustomed to ad hoc approval of those requests, the SC opted to delegate to SRWAC for one-year a standing delegation of a waiver to the rule. The Senate’s Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) thought it best to simply change the Senate Rules to permanently give SRWAC the authority to vote to waive the rule.

The Chair said that the recommendation (positive) from SC was that the Senate **move** to approve the change to Senate Rules 5.1.8.5.A.3 to add the phrase, “, unless the SRWAC votes to waive the two-year time limit.” Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. Charnigo asked for

some examples or situations involving waivers of the two-year rule. Neither Jones nor the Chair was able to provide him with any; Jones commented that it did not happen very often. Jones confirmed for Yost that the language did not affect a student's inability to request a retroactive withdrawal after graduation.

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

b. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) - Andrew Hippisley, Chair

i. Proposed New Undergraduate Certificate in Innovation and Entrepreneurial Thinking

Hippisley explained the proposal for a new Undergraduate Certificate in Innovation and Entrepreneurial Thinking. The Chair said that the recommendation (positive) from SC was that the Senate **move** to approve the establishment of a new of Undergraduate Certificate in Innovation and Entrepreneurial Thinking in the College of Communication and Information. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary.

Grossman asked for clarification about the proposed membership in the faculty of record. After some discussion between Grossman, Hippisley and Guest Derek Lane (CI), Grossman suggested that the answers implied that the deans who serve as members of the program faculty are acting as individual faculty members, not by virtue of their dean title. Christ spoke in favor of the interdisciplinary nature of the program, but the proposal was a shell for what could otherwise be a good interdisciplinary program. She added that there were a couple problems with courses from her department which were added, and removed (due to no longer being offered). She wondered why the College of Communication and Information (CI) was the only place where a student could learn entrepreneurship. Webb commented that within the College of Agriculture, Food and Environment (AG), there were some particular concerns within the Community and Leadership Development areas. Ultimately, the sense is that the certificate structure is broad enough to support the addition of AG courses in the future. In response to Christ, he clarified that AG was not currently involved in the proposed new certificate, but would be in the near future. Christ suggested voting against the motion to approve.

Wasilkowski also expressed concern about housing the certificate in CI, wondering if another college would be a more appropriate home unit. Lane said that work on the certificate began some time ago, by virtue of the National Science Foundation. The guiding principle was development of a program that could be famous for UK. He said the certificate included probably more faculty than any other multidisciplinary certificate. It could have been housed in Undergraduate Education, but the easiest way to move it forward was to house it in CI.

Grossman suggested that if a senator was opposed to the administrative home, it would be more appropriate to move to table the proposal as opposed to voting it down. He said it seemed like there was a sentiment that the proposal could use a few fixes, not that it was a disaster. College of Education Dean Mary John O'Hair spoke in favor of approving the proposal, saying it was supported by a number of colleges, including faculty in ED. Wood asked Lane to explain how courses would be added or removed from the certificate. After a brief exchange between Lane and Wood, Grossman commented that the given response should have been that changes in required courses would be approved by a vote of the program faculty. A vote by the program faculty is also the way to admit new faculty to the faculty of record.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 31 in favor and 23 opposed.

ii. Proposed Suspension of Graduate Certificate Public Health Nursing

Hippisley explained the proposal to suspend the Graduate Certificate Public Health Nursing. The Chair said that the recommendation (positive) from SC was that the Senate **move** to approve the suspension of the Graduate Certificate Public Health Nursing. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. Grossman asked how long the certificate would be suspended. Hippisley responded that it was his understanding that any suspension over five years means it is automatically deleted. There being no further questions, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iii. Proposed Suspension of Graduate Certificate in Nursing Studies

Hippisley explained the proposal to suspend the Graduate Certificate in Nursing Studies. The Chair said that the recommendation (positive) from SC was that the Senate **move** to approve the suspension of the Graduate Certificate in Nursing Studies. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There being no discussion or questions, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

c. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) - Greg Wasilkowski, Chair

i. Proposed Transfer of the MS in Manufacturing Systems Engineering from the College of Engineering to the Department of Mechanical Engineering, within the College of Engineering

Wasilkowski explained the proposal to transfer of the MS in Manufacturing Systems Engineering from the College of Engineering to the Department of Mechanical Engineering, within the College of Engineering. The Chair said that the recommendation (positive) from SC was that the Senate **move** to endorse the proposal to transfer of the MS in Manufacturing Systems Engineering from the College of Engineering to the Department of Mechanical Engineering, within the College of Engineering. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There was a brief discussion about the inability to know the rationale for "no" votes regarding the transfer of the degree, due to secret ballots. There being no further discussion or a question, a vote was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Annual "State of the Libraries" Report - Dean of Libraries Terry Birdwhistell

Libraries Dean Terry Birdwhistell gave an in-depth report to senators regarding the current state of UK's libraries. Afterwards, he answered questions from senators with the assistance of Senior Associate Dean for Collections and Technical Services Mary Beth Thomson. Christ asked about digital access to media that is currently in the form of tapes or recordings or transparencies. After a brief exchange, Dean Birdwhistell suggested they talk in more detail after the meeting.

Debski asked about what future library models will look like. The Dean responded that one way forward is through open access; the current model involves universities who hire faculty to teach and produce academic work for placement in academic journals that sell it back to the universities. Birdwhistell said the issue was not easily solvable. DeSantis asked if Libraries had experienced a reduction in cost due to reliance on digital resources over print resources. Thomson explained and summarized that costs have not gone away, but merely moved elsewhere in the model.

Nagel asked about models that involve setting aside money to help researchers cover the costs of paying to have research published. Thomson replied that some places have created open-access funds to offset the open access publisher fees, sometimes through grants and through other mechanisms. She said that UK's UKnowledge resource is an open access resource without any fees attached. Bailey said it was important for senators to understand the difference between open access and online access. Open

access involves self-pay by researchers, whereas online access was free. There being no further questions, the Chair thanked Dean Birdwhistell for his presentation.

Due to the time and there being no further agenda items, Wasilkowski **moved** to adjourn and Wood **seconded**. The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 5:03 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Connie Wood,
University Senate Secretary

Invited guests present: Kim Anderson, Rodney Andrews, Lisa Cassis, Jane Jensen and Derek Lane.

Absences: Adams; Andrade; Atwood; Bailey; Ballard; Bayliff; Bellot; Blackwell, D.; Brennan; Brion; Bugg; Capilouto; Conners¹; Crampton*; Day; de Beer; Deep; Dickson; Doolen; Eckman; Evans; Feist-Price; Firey; Fox; Graf; Gross; Hazard*; Jackson; Kaplan; Kilgore; Kirschling; Kornbluh; Lowry*; Martin; McCamy; McCormick; McCulley*; Mehra; Mock; Noonan; Palli; Prats; Rabel; Rey-Barreau; Richey; Rogers; Spradlin; Stewart; Tick; Tracy, T; Tracy, J.; Tracy, S.; Turner, S; Valentine; Van Wie; Vasconez; Voro; Walz; Wiseman; Witt; Wyatt; and Yelowitz.

* Indicates an absence explained prior to the meeting.