

University Senate
April 17, 2017

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, April 17, 2017 in the Athletics Association Auditorium of W. T. Young Library. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via electronic voting devices unless indicated otherwise. Specific voting information can be requested from the Office of the Senate Council.

Senate Council Chair Katherine McCormick (ED) called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:00 pm. The Chair noted that the Senate attempted to adhere to Robert's Rules of Order (Newly Revised) as much as possible and that conversation should remain civil.

The Chair called for an attendance vote and 53 senators registered their presence.

The Chair explained that *Senate Rules 1.2.3* ("Meetings") requires that minutes, agenda, and supporting documentation be sent to senators six days in advance, but the final version of the Honors timeline was not sent out until Thursday.

The Chair solicited a motion to waive *Senate Rules 1.2.3* to allow the Senate to consider the agenda, etc. because the entire agenda and supporting documentation was not sent out six days in advance. McGillis (ME) **moved** accordingly and Yeager (AS) **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

1. Minutes from March 20, 2017 and Announcements

The Chair explained that no changes had been received for the minutes from March 20, 2017. Hearing **no objections**, the Chair announced that the minutes from March 20, 2017 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

There were a handful of announcements.

- The Ombud search is underway and the deadline for nominations was extended until Wednesday at 5 pm. Members are Jonathan Golding, chair (AS); Michael Healy (LA); Bill Rayens (AS); Joe Labianca (BE); Jordan Potter (Pharmacy student), Kelci Webb (Business and Economics student); and Elizabeth Foster (Engineering student).
- Candidates for the Lewis Honors College dean position have been on campus recently. The last open forum, for the fourth candidate, was earlier in the day. The search committee is still on track for July 1 start date for that dean.
- There were recent campus visits for candidates for position of associate provost for student and academic life. This position is also on schedule for July 1 start.
- The Human Library will be held Tuesday from 12 - 6 pm in WTY Multipurpose Rm B108-C. Like with a book, guests can "check out" a human and chat about their life experiences for 10 - 30 minutes.

2. Officer and Other Reports

a. Chair

The Chair reported that on behalf of Senate, SC approved a change to the 2017-18 College of Pharmacy calendar. She attended a meeting of the Coalition of Senate and Faculty Leaders (COSFL) meeting on April 7. There was good discussion and UK was well represented.

Another faculty evaluation of the President is planned again for this year. The Chair offered many, many, many thanks to Wood (AS), who had done the majority of the work associated with the survey in the past – senators thanked Wood with a round of applause. The Chair said that the SC was working to identify a process that did not rely on the skills and generosity of one person. SC members Bailey, SC vice chair (AG), Cross (CI), and Mazur (ED) volunteered to serve on a small SC-composed group to oversee the survey. At the present time, the intent is to utilize UK's Applied Statistics Lab.

There are ongoing searches for an associate provost for student and academic life and for a new executive vice president for health affairs. Another search is beginning for a university registrar. The Chair explained that currently, Registrar Don Witt holds three titles and part of the structural reorganization in his area is to allow him to focus on one assignment ("associate provost for enrollment management"). The Chair is also serving on the search committee for an associate CIO for Information Technology.

The SC approved a newly revised "New Doctoral Program Form," which is available on the Senate's forms page (<http://www.uky.edu/universitysenate/forms>).

A focus of the Senate Council office this year was improving efficiency in the curricular approval process. Last year (2015-16), the processing of a course in eCATS took (on average) about 231 days. This year, productivity has improved with the implementation of Curriculog – processing a course in Curriculog takes, on average, only 144 days.

The first round of voting in the faculty trustee election is over. The second round will begin Wednesday, April 19 and close at noon on April 26. The three candidates that received the highest number of votes in the first round (allowing them to move to the second round) were Robert B. Grossman (AS); Patrick C. McGrath (ME); and Margaret Mohr-Schroeder (ED).

The Blue-Ribbon Committee on Graduate Education sent out a survey, which will be available until May 1, with plans for multiple reminders.

The Chair called upon D. Jones (ME), who prefaced his comments by describing them as personal in nature. He offered some kind words for a staff employee whose position had been eliminated as a result of an administrative reorganization. He said that she had been an invaluable resource, helping faculty navigate the planning and processing requirements for new degree programs. He said he was sorry to see her go.

b. Vice Chair

Bailey (AG) had no report. The Chair relayed thanks for nominations received for the Outstanding Senator Award and that it would be awarded at the May 1 Senate meeting.

c. Parliamentarian

Seago (LI) had no report.

d. Trustee

Blonder (ME) said that there had not been a Board of Trustees meeting since the last trustees' report. She said the next Board meeting somewhat conflicted with the May 1 Senate meeting, so the trustees may attend Board committee meetings instead of the Senate meeting on May 1. Blonder encouraged

senators to vote, saying it was helpful and important for the next faculty trustee to have a strong mandate from the faculty.

3. Committee Reports (New Business)

a. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) – Ernie Bailey, Chair

Bailey, chair of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC), reported on the response of the Lewis Honors College Transition Committee charged (by the Senate on May 2, 2016) with addressing 10 points. His report began with a presentation of a timeline for Lewis Honors College-related activities, beginning with the gift to establish the college and development of a proposal. The timeline concluded with information about the Senate's May 2016 vote to recommend creation of the College, which also asked Provost Tim Tracy to create a transition committee to address 10 specific issues.

Bailey reported that SAOSC was satisfied with the responses from the Honors College Transition Committee (HCTC) and recommended accepting the report. However, one item deserved special mention. Last May, the Senate recommended against having faculty with primary appointments in the Lewis Honors College. The HCTC considered this but disagreed and offered a persuasive argument that the Lewis Honors College would function better with six to seven lecturers with primary appointments in the College; providing them with joint appointments in colleges that matched their discipline would benefit their professional development, along with the appointment of 20 faculty of record with primary appointments in other colleges, would ensure faculty control of the Honors curriculum. After Bailey explained the recommendation of the SAOSC, Guest Phil Harling (interim dean, Lewis Honors College) offered additional comments and thanked various individuals for helping him navigate the process.

Debski (AS) asked about the likelihood of hearing a summary of the Honors College Transition Committee (HCTC) Report from December 9, 2016. Bailey commented that it was a lengthy report to summarize entirely but that taking questions on points of concern would be more appropriate. Debski expressed concern about the curricular changes to the Honors Program; Bailey responded that the SAOSC focused on structure and, while the report of the HCTC included a lengthy discussion of curricula, this was not part of the 10 questions the SAOSC had been charged with addressing. The Chair added that the Honors Program change was currently on a web transmittal and that it was customary to process program changes through transmittals. Bailey further clarified that the main topic of discussion for Senate was the College's structure, faculty, and whether or not to change the relevant regulation to allow for primary appointments in Lewis Honors College. Debski repeated her desire to discuss curriculum, expressing concern that the increase in the number of required credit hours would make it harder for students in biology and the sciences to participate in Honors. Harling said that the HCTC discussed the need for flexibility for students majoring in credit-intensive disciplines. He acknowledged that it would be more challenging for some students than for others, but that the increase would not pose insurmountable obstacles for students in the sciences.

There were questions from senators, many of whom prefaced their queries by thanking Harling and members of the HCTC for all their hard work. Below are the questions that were posed to Harling and Bailey; either Harling or Bailey, or both, responded to all of the questions.

- If Honors intends to provide close contact with experienced faculty members, what is the benefit to having their foundational course taught by lecturers, who are almost completely precluded from conducting research? Why would you not want tenure-track faculty involved in teaching the foundational seminar? Harling responded that tenure-track faculty would provide

a large part of the educational activity in the Lewis Honors College but that some of the classes were introductory for the Honors College or for orientation and would not necessarily require the participation by faculty from other colleges, especially in a student's first year. However, the majority of the classes offered in the program would provide Lewis Honors students with favorable contact with faculty from diverse colleges.

- What are the mechanics for the appointment process of lecturers? How will the members of the lecturer's core discipline department participate in hiring decisions? Harling responded that search committees will include faculty members from the discipline under consideration for hire. Furthermore, the college rules of procedure will encourage faculty hires in the Lewis Honors College to obtain joint appointments in departments of their discipline.
- Will Honors be used to home interdisciplinary programs without a specific college home, similar to what Undergraduate Education used to do? Both Bailey and Harling indicated that the only goal for the Lewis Honors College is to administer the Honors program.
- Will lecturers be hired with an intention of keeping them on permanently and promoting them to senior lecturer? Harling anticipated that some would see this as a long-term career activity while others might see it as a step toward other career options.
- Is there a plan to keep quality lecturers who are hired for the Lewis Honors College? [see above]
- Could the monies used to hire lecturers be used to incentivize regular participation of tenure-track faculty? Harling reported that this had been considered, however the funds were not sufficient and the complexity of funding faculty positions in other colleges to serve the Lewis Honors College made this option unattractive.
- Do you know, rather than suspect, that there will not be enough tenure-track volunteers to staff the foundational course? Harling stated that it was not known, but based on experiences elsewhere and in UK's Honors program, this seemed likely.

Debski wondered if the HCTC reviewed data or if the group merely offered opinions about the curriculum change. The Chair asked if any of the HCTC members in the audience wanted to offer comments. Guest Vanessa Jackson (AG/Retailing and Tourism Management) explained that as a member of the committee, she could say that the HCTC did an extremely large amount of research regarding all aspects of the proposal. They met weekly and each member identified a topic that was really important to them, which they spent a great deal of time researching; members did not rely on personal opinions. Jackson stated that the HCTC recognized that the entirety of their work might not have been perfect, but the members each did their best and tried to think about what would be the best for students.

Blonder (ME) asked the Chair if there was any formal action that Senate needed to take. The Chair responded that the purpose of the discussion was for Senate to endorse the HCTC report. The SAOSC voted on the report and the **motion** from SAOSC was a recommendation that the Senate endorse the Honors College Transition Committee report (dated December 9, 2016) and its contents. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. Grossman (AS) added that the SC also endorsed

the report and recommended Senate do the same. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 62 in favor, eight opposed, and seven abstained.

The Chair reported that the next step was to vote on the proposal to revise *Governing Regulations VII* ("University Organization"), to allow appointment of lecturers in the Lewis Honors College. The **motion** from SC was a recommendation that Senate endorse the proposed changes to *Governing Regulations VII* ("University Organization"). Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 57 in favor, eight opposed, and four abstained.

A majority of senators greeted the vote results with a round of applause.

4. Old Business

a. Committee Reports

i. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) – Margaret Schroeder, Chair

1. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Baroque Trumpet

Schroeder (ED), chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Baroque Trumpet, in the School of Music within the College of Fine Arts. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions from senators.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 70 in favor, two opposed, and two abstained.

2. Proposed New University Scholars Program: BA Social Work and MA Social Work

Schroeder (ED) explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that Senate approve the establishment of a new University Scholars Program of a BA Social Work and MA Social Work within the College of Social Work. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. Costich (PbH) offered a correction to the proposed motion, suggesting that the degrees should be a BASW and MSW Social Work. Schroeder concurred and the motion was changed accordingly. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 69 in favor, two opposed, and one abstained.

3. Two Proposed University Scholars Programs: BA Linguistics to MA Linguistic Theory and Typology & BS Linguistics to MA Linguistic Theory and Typology

Schroeder (ED) explained that the single agenda item included two separate University Scholars Programs – one for the BA and one for the BS. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the Senate approve establishment of a new University Scholars Program of a BA Linguistics and MA Linguistic Theory and Typology within the Department of Linguistics within the College of Arts & Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 72 in favor and three opposed.

Schroeder then presented the second proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that Senate approve establishment of a new University Scholars Program of a BS Linguistics and MA Linguistic Theory and Typology within the Department of Linguistics within the College of Arts & Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions from senators. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 72 in favor and three opposed.

4. Proposed Suspension of MS in Clinical Research Design

Schroeder (ED) explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the suspension of admissions into the existing MS in Clinical Research Design in the

Department of Preventative Medicine & Environmental Health within the College of Public Health. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There was a series of questions about students enrolled in the program and their ability to complete the degree. When there was no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 70 in favor and two opposed.

5. Proposed Suspension of Graduate Certificate in Clinical Research Skills

Schroeder (ED) explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the suspension of admission into the existing Graduate Certificate in Clinical Research Skills in the Department of Preventative Medicine & Environmental Health within the College of Public Health. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions from senators. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 74 in favor and one opposed.

6. Proposed Suspension of BS Philosophy

Schroeder (ED) explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the suspension of admissions into the existing undergraduate program BS in Philosophy in the Department of Philosophy within the College of Arts and Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions from senators. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 71 in favor and one opposed.

3. Committee Reports (New Business), Continued

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

i. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Teaching in Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Classrooms

Schroeder (ED) explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the establishment of a new Grad Cert in Teaching in Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Classrooms, in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction within the College of Education. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. In response to a question from Noland (ED), Schroeder stated that the graduate certificate under discussion was indeed different from certificates relating to teaching English as a second language. There were no further questions. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 72 in favor, one opposed, and one abstained.

ii. Proposed Deletion of the BAEd in Secondary Education - Science Education

Schroeder (ED) asked the Chair to present the proposal because the proposal came from Schroeder's own department. The Chair explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the deletion of an existing BAEd in Secondary Education - Science Education, in the Department of STEM Education within the College of Education. Schroeder responded to a question regarding number of students currently enrolled. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 74 in favor and one opposed.

iii. Proposed Deletion of the BAEd in Secondary Education - Mathematics Education

The Chair explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the deletion of an existing BAEd in Secondary Education - Mathematics Education, in the Department of STEM Education within the College of Education. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 67 in favor and one opposed.

iv. Proposed New MS in Sport and Exercise Psychology

Schroeder (ED) explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new MS in Sport and Exercise Psychology, in the Department of Kinesiology and Health Promotion within the College of Education. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 72 in favor and two opposed.

v. Proposed Suspension of Graduate Certificate in Maternal and Child Health

Schroeder (ED) explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that that the Senate approve the suspension of admission into the existing Graduate Certificate in Maternal and Child Health, in the Department of Epidemiology in the College of Public Health. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions from senators. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 72 in favor and two opposed.

vi. Proposed Suspension of Master of Mining Engineering in Mining Engineering

Schroeder (ED) explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the suspension of admission into the existing Master of Mining Engineering in Mining Engineering in the Department of Mining Engineering in the College of Engineering. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. In response to a question from Grossman, Schroeder confirmed that the Master of Mining Engineering was an MME degree and was utterly separate from the MS Mining Engineering. There were no further questions. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 72 in favor and one opposed.

v. Proposed New University Scholars Program: Bachelor of Public Health (BPH) and Master of Public Health (MPH)

Schroeder (ED) explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the establishment of a new University Scholars Program of the BPH Public Health and MPH Public Health within the College of Public Health. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions from senators. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 71 in favor and two opposed.

vi. Proposed New BA in Dance

Schroeder (ED) explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new BA in Dance, in the Department of Theatre and Dance within the College of Fine Arts. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 69 in favor and two opposed.

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

i. Proposed Change to PhD Economics

Yost (EN) explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the changes to the PhD Economics. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions from senators. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 61 in favor and three opposed.

ii. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 5.4.3* (“Requirements for Graduation”) and *Senate Rules 5.4.3.4* (“Free Electives”)

Yost (EN) explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the changes to *Senate Rules 5.4.3* and *Senate Rules 5.4.3.4*. Because the motion came from

committee, no **second** was required. There were a small number of questions. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed Change to BS Human Health Sciences

Yost (EN) explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the proposed changes to the BS Human Health Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Items from the Floor (Time Permitting)

The Chair noted that it was unusual for Senate to end prior to 5 pm, but there was plenty of time for a senator to raise an issue for discussion. No senator suggested any items for discussion.

Yeager **moved** to adjourn and McGillis **seconded**. Given the mass exodus, it can be presumed that the motion was approved. The meeting was adjourned at 4:37 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Ernie Bailey,
University Senate Secretary

Invited guests present: Kalea Benner, Geza Bruckner, Marc Cormier, Marcy Deaton, Jason Dovel, Phil Harling, Nancy Jones, and Corinne Williams.

Absences: Allen; Anyaegbunam; Arnett; Bada; Bailey, A.*; Birdwhistell, M.; Birdwhistell, T.; Blackwell; Bondada*; Brennen; Buck; Capilouto; Cassis; Caudill*; Cheng; Clark; Cofield; Cox; Danner; de Beer; DiPaola; Donohue*; Effen; Escobar; Flaherty; Folmar; Ford; Guy; Harris; Healy*; Hippisley; Huja; Jackson; Knott; Koher*; Kurczaba; Kyrkanides; Lee*; Lee-Post; Lephart; Martin, A.; Martin, T.; Mazur; McMahon; Mills; Mitchell; Murray; Nichols; Peffer*; Reid; Richey; Royster; Sogin; Sokan; Stekardis; Summey; Thamann; Thompson; Troutman; Valdez; Vernon; Vosevich; Whitaker; Wilson, K.; Witt; Woods.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, April 27, 2017.

* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.