

University Senate
February 10, 2014

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, February 10, 2014 in the Auditorium of W. T. Young Library. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hand unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Lee X. Blonder called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:00 pm. 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.

1. Minutes from December 9, 2013 and Announcements

The Chair reported that no changes to the minutes were received. Therefore, the minutes from December 9, 2013 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**. There were a few announcements.

- It is time for the annual exercise in identifying nominees for academic area advisory committees, etc. The Chair asked senators to expect an email solicitation from Ms. Brothers regarding nominees.
- The SC accepted the report of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Education Funding and sent the report to the following committees: Senate's Committee on Research and Graduate Education; Strategic Planning Committee on Graduate and Professional Education; and Provost Ad Hoc Review Committee of Graduate Scholarship and Fellowship Awards.
- At the December 16 SC meeting, Alice Christ (FA/Art & Visual Studies) was elected SC vice chair. The term runs June 1, 2014 – May 30, 2015.
- Due to a change in *Senate Rules* from May 2012, new minors are no longer reviewed by Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC). New minors are approved by lack of objection on web transmittals, along with course proposals and program changes.
- The SC approved the following minor calendar changes on behalf of the Senate:
 - Addition of recently approved April 15 deadline (for graduate students to apply for the early August degree list) to appropriate calendars.
 - Addition of dates of National Conference on Undergraduate Research (NCUR) and a note to contact Registrar for more information to 2013-14 calendar.
 - Addition of dates identifying percentage withdrawal refunds for College of Dentistry to 2014-15 calendar.

- The Chair approved three additions to the December 2013 degree list. She approved the addition of one undergraduate student and one graduate student, made necessary due to administrative errors. She also approved the addition of one graduate student, who appealed to be added because a personal hardship prevented the student from applying prior to the deadline.
- There will be a faculty trustee election held in the spring semester, with voting scheduled for April. Trustee Irina Voro is completing her term, which ends June 30, 2014. The term for the newly elected faculty trustee will be July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2017. After the eligibility list is determined; there will be a petition round followed by one or two election rounds, depending on the number of candidates.

2. Officer and Other Reports

a. Chair

The Chair reported that SC members participated in a faculty governance webinar and Senate committee chairs were also invited to attend. Following the webinar the discussion focused on the history of faculty governance, faculty versus university senates, and the status of contingent faculty. The SC will purchase a DVD of the webinar to loan out to those senators interested in viewing.

b. Trustee

Trustee John Wilson spoke about the proceedings of the last meeting of the Board of Trustees (Board). He said that the Board approved the next phase of dorm construction, as well as the demolition of certain properties. There was lively discussion prior to and during the Board meeting. The data trustees received stated that dorm construction was enormously successful in changing the environment for student numbers living on campus. In terms of freshmen living on campus who want to return to campus as sophomores, Wilson said that substantially more freshmen want to return to University housing as sophomores. As a teacher, he enjoys the vast expansion of the Living Learning Programs (LLP). The faculty community has stepped up to providing exciting opportunities for students.

Arthur asked a few questions about the residence halls, dining services, living learning programs, parking and the cost to students. Wilson said that he would not try to reconstruct all the data received by trustees, but that he would email links to the data to senators. Parking is a continuing problem across campus, but his understanding from trustee discussions was that while the University waits for a comprehensive parking plan to be developed (although one is in process), a new parking structure is part of the University's recent bonding request to the legislature. In addition, the Board approved the construction of 250 parking spaces behind the College of Education; it does not solve the problem, but is helpful. Regarding the cost of living in UK's residence halls, it was his understanding that UK is currently oversubscribed in terms of requests for housing. One item of discussion among trustees involved cost; one trustee in particular expressed concerns that the cost (to students) for the dorms will rapidly move beyond the means of students as time progresses. Along with that concern is the worry about the cost of higher education in general. However, UK is not responsible for filling the dorms; there is no minimum bed count that UK must guarantee. Filling beds is the responsibility of the private partner, who will likely be subject to market pressures to keep housing costs in line with other offerings in the area.

Provost Christine Riordan added that the University is changing the deadlines for the LLP was changing; UK is looking to a priority deadline of February 15 with a final deadline of April 15. The hope is to help colleges and faculty better plan for the numbers of students arriving. Things are a little off cycle this year

and all colleges may not yet have received all their LLP applications because the priority deadline is still a few days away.

Wilson encouraged senators to email him or call and he is happy to talk with faculty about any issues. He went on to say that while he was not in a position to judge architecture or fine arts, he was pained when he walked by the beautiful house [Hamilton House] on the Bluegrass Trust's list of buildings for preservation. The problem facing trustees is one of competing priorities and relative costs. He said the information he will send will include a drawing of what the north campus residential area will look like in the future. A lot of effort is going into repurposing a building in the middle of that quadrant and that is where the planners will use a lot of resources. Moving the [Hamilton] house would have cost about \$1 million, so the issue with that solution was finding the money to save the house. It was a cold reality that trustees had to face.

Grossman commented that the Herald-Leader had only talked to the Bluegrass Trust and did not explain UK's logic. He asked Wilson to explain the considerations and pros and cons. Wilson replied that "saving" any building would also involve the necessary cost of repurposing the space. The cost of moving a building is enormous, so difficult choices had to be made; it was not a cut and dried process. Wilson added that Dining Services was also part of the Board's discussions. It was controversial for many trustees as well as for parts of the campus community. The trustees as a group sent a strong message that the key aspects of Dining Services that have been important components must be retained, as well as concerns for the security of employment for those working for Dining Services. If the major goals of the Request for Proposals (RFP) are not answered by a private vendor, there would be considerable disappointment among the trustees. The devil is in the details, though and the situation will require monitoring over the much longer term. The need for places for people to eat was a big issue and needs to be addressed, particularly in terms of finding the money to pay for new dining facilities.

The issue of funding for dining facilities dovetails with the issue of the University budget and Governor Steve Beshear's proposed 2.5 % cut in state funding for UK. Faculty and the entire campus went through difficult processes over the past two years regarding budget cuts and the faculty stood up and said they wanted to be a larger part of the budgeting process. Wilson asserted that faculty needed to be just as involved again during the coming budget discussions. The 2.5% cut translates into approximately a \$7 million cut to UK's state funding. To make up the lost amount over time, UK would need more than a \$140 million endowment to make up for the \$7 million that will be lost annually, over time. Wilson said he hoped for a budget compromise, but it will depend a lot on the legislature and locally will depend on faculty and the administration.

3. Committee Reports

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

i. Proposed New Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies

Wasilkowski, chair of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC), explained the proposal for a new Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies. The Chair reported that the **motion** from the SC was a positive recommendation that the University Senate endorse the creation of the Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

Grossman asked about the graduate faculty in the Department of English and the proposed new department. College of Arts and Sciences Dean Mark Kornbluh responded that it was not an impediment. Dean Kornbluh added that the largest service courses (Communication and Composition)

will be housed in the new department; a large number of teaching assistantships are associated with those courses. Once the new department is established, a large percentage of the English assistantships will work in the new department and both department chairs will work together. There being no further questions, a **vote** was taken on the recommendation that the University Senate endorse the creation of the Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

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

i. Proposed New BA/BS Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies

The Chair explained that it came to her attention that some details of the proposal for a new BA/BS in Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies may need some revisions. The proposers preferred that a complete proposal come to the March Senate meeting. She solicited a motion to postpone a discussion and vote on the proposal until March. Hippisley **moved** to postpone discussion and a vote until March and Wasilkowski **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed New Master of Fine Arts in Creative Writing

Hippisley explained the proposal for a new Master of Fine Arts in Creative Writing. The Chair said that the recommendation (positive) from SC was that the Senate **move** to approve the establishment of a new Master of Fine Arts in Creative Writing in the Department of English, within the College of Arts and Sciences. 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.

iii. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Historic Preservation

Hippisley explained the proposal for a new Graduate Certificate in Historic Preservation. The Chair said that the **motion** from the SC (positive recommendation) was that the Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Historic Preservation, within the College of Design. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary.

Grossman asked why the proposed new certificate was to be homed in the college, instead of the Department of Historic Preservation. Hippisley explained that the certificate really should be homed in the department, which could be done with amendment to the motion. Hippisley said that was a good point, and **moved** to amend the proposal such that the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Historic Preservation will be homed in the Department of Historic Preservation. Grossman **seconded**.

There was brief discussion about whether or not the Department of Landscape Architecture was involved in the creation of the certificate. Guest Allison Carl White, the contact person for the proposal, explained that the chair of the Department of Historic Preservation has a joint appointment in Historic Preservation, was involved in the discussions and voted in favor of the proposal. There being no further discussions about the amendment, a **vote** was taken on the amendment to place the certificate in the Department of Historic Preservation in the College of Design, rather than in the College of Design. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

A **vote** was taken on the revised **motion** that the Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Historic Preservation, within the Department of Historic Preservation, within the College of Design. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

iv. Proposed New University Scholars Program: BA/BS Philosophy and MA Philosophy

Hippisley explained the proposal for a new University Scholars Program of a BA/BS Philosophy and MA Philosophy. The Chair said that the recommendation (positive) from SC was that the Senate **move** to approve the establishment of a new University Scholar's Program for a BA/BS and an MA in Philosophy in the Department of Philosophy in the College of Arts and Sciences. Grossman commented that the name of the program was not possessive, so the apostrophe should be removed from the motion. Parliamentarian J. S. Butler indicated that no amendment was necessary to make that correction and senators agreed.

There being no further questions, a **vote** was taken on the motion to approve the establishment of a new University Scholars Program for a BA/BS and an MA in Philosophy in the Department of Philosophy in the College of Arts and Sciences. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

v. Proposed New Undergraduate Certificate in Health Communication

Hippisley explained the proposal for a new Undergraduate Certificate in Health Communication. The Chair said that the recommendation (positive) from SC was that the Senate **move** to approve the establishment of a new Undergraduate Certificate in Health Communication, in the Department of Communication, within the College of Communication and Information.

College of Health Sciences Interim Dean Sharon Stewart commented that Health Sciences has several undergraduate degrees in health sciences and that she saw possibilities for lots of interactions between both colleges, although Health Sciences had not been invited to participate in the development of the proposed new certificate. She lamented the lack of interaction between the two colleges. Guest Elisia Cohen explained that those involved in the development of the certificate were looking primarily for courses that were broadly assessable for students. She said she had been under the impression that the courses in Health Sciences did not have medical-related prerequisites, which makes it easier for Communication and Information students to take such classes.

McCormick suggested that more communication might be necessary. She **moved** to table the recommendation until such time as the impacted colleges have an opportunity to talk. Wasilkowski **seconded**. Grossman spoke against the motion, saying that the discussion can take place after the certificate was approved and that there was no need to table the proposal. Dean Stewart said that talking was fine – she simply wanted a discussion about possibilities. Watkins commented that his college dean (Public Health) had positively signed off on the certificate.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to table the proposal and the motion **failed** with 13 in favor, the majority opposed, and two abstentions.

There being no further discussion or questions, the Chair returned to the original motion for establishment of a new Undergraduate Certificate in Health Communication, in the Department of Communication, within the College of Communication and Information. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with a majority in favor, three opposed and four abstaining.

c. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) - Greg Graf, Chair

i. Conditional Admissions for International Undergraduate Students (Proposed Revision to *Senate Rules 4.2.1.1.G*)

Greg Graf, chair of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee was not in attendance and arranged for committee member Armando Prats to present the proposed revisions. Prats explained that the (federal) Department of Homeland Security has advised institutions to codify pathways to

admissions for international students, which have developed in recent years. On a pilot basis UK conditionally admits international undergraduate students pending English language training. The four individual parts of the proposal regarding Bulletin changes are not what the Senate will vote on, however; according to Davy Jones, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, the Senate does not have the authority to change the Bulletin so what the Senate will approve are the changes to the *Senate Rules*. Prats noted that the proposed processes, etc. are a codification of current standards.

The Chair said that the recommendation (positive) from SC was that the Senate **move** to approve the language on conditional admissions for international undergraduate students as well as the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 4.2.1.1.G*. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There being no questions or discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and two abstaining.

d. Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) - Davy Jones, Chair

i. In Memoriam Posthumous Degrees

Jones, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), explained that it takes an action by the elected faculty senators to create a new category of honorary degree. Occasionally UK has experienced the tragic death of a student; if the student has completed the requirements but dies prior to commencement, the degree list sent from the Registrar's office includes the student's name because the student completed the requirements and the transcript shows the degree was awarded, although there is a note it was awarded posthumously. If a student dies prior to completing the requirements for the degree, there is currently no degree or honor UK can bestow. Jones explained that President Capilouto talked with Senate leadership and would like a mechanism to allow him to provide a grieving family with formal condolences from the University, as well as mark the inclusion of the student into the campus community.

The proposal in front of senators will be a recommendation for a new category of honorary degree, an in memoriam posthumous degree. This honorary degree will not have the same requirements as the existing honorary degrees (service or relationship to KY, etc.), but rather will be used for a student who dies prior to completing degree requirements. Under the new language, if a student dies prior to completing degree requirements, the college will confirm for the Registrar's office that the individual was indeed a student, was enrolled in a degree program, and was in good academic standing. If those conditions are met, the Registrar will include the student's name on the regular degree list, but under a separate heading of "In Memoriam Posthumous Degree." When it reaches the Senate for action by elected faculty senators, the new *Senate Rules (SR)* language includes a clause for the Senate's hands to be constitutively on the posthumous degree – if the student dies while conducting a heinous act, the Senate can decline to send that student's name forward to the Board of Trustees (Board) for a posthumous degree. That type of denial would happen in only the rarest of cases, but the Senate will have the authority to deny awarding a posthumous degree in those cases.

Jones showed senators [via the PowerPoint presentation] a sample diploma that would be given to a deceased student's family. He said it illustrated a gesture bestowed upon the surviving members of the student's family to commemorate the student having been part of the UK community. Jones said that if the Senate adopts the proposed language and the Board approves, the Senate will then have the responsibility to look at the wording for the diploma. When a UK student left campus to serve in World War I, if the student was killed in action the student was awarded an honorary degree. That provision expired at the end of World War I, but Jones said the intent was largely the same. Also, the *Governing*

Regulations recognize the authority of the Senate to recommend not only names for new degrees but also policies for the same.

The Chair said that the recommendation from the SC was that the elected faculty senators **move** to approve the proposed new *Senate Rules* language regarding posthumous degrees and forward it to the Board of Trustees for final approval. Because the proposal came from committee, no **second** was necessary.

Jones confirmed for Grossman that the language presented to the Senate will be inserted into the *Senate Rules* in the logical place. Debski asked about a time limit; Jones said that the policy would be in effect going forward, not retroactively. At Debski's request, Jones agreed to clarify that the policy is forward looking.

Butler stated that the purpose of the proposal was obvious, but expressed deep concern with the prospect of trying to determine student guilt. He said that if the military asserted that a student died in action, the circumstances of the death were determined by appropriate military records. Under the current wording, however, the Senate was being asked to charge students under certain circumstances and find them guilty when the student is not able to defend themselves. He said that was unfair. Butler's comments led to an extensive discussion about the appropriateness of the Senate being placed in a position to determine a student's guilt or innocence of a heinous act. Among those voicing an opinion, senators were in agreement with the need for a vote to approve or disapprove the posthumous degree, but were opposed to the vote to approve/disapprove being tied to a heinous act.

Bailey **moved** to amend the motion so that the language in the proposed SR was changed as follows¹:

The elected Faculty Senators shall vote to approve or disapprove the recommendation.
The elected Faculty Senators shall forward the request by the degree list process to the University President for transmittal to the Board of Trustees for final action. ~~However, if the student's death was in connection with the student committing a heinous act, then the elected Faculty Senators may vote to disapprove forwarding the recommendation.~~
~~In such rare cases, the elected Faculty Senators will provide, through the Senate Council, a written justification of the disapproval to the President (Chair of the Senate).~~

Christ **seconded**. Discussion followed. Grossman commented that the language had been formulated a specific way because the President wanted a process that was almost automatic; the proposed language does not say that in the vast majority of cases the posthumous degree will be approved, but rather that only in extraordinary circumstances the degree will not be approved. The majority of senators voicing concerns were not comfortable with the prospect of deliberating and determining if a heinous act had been committed by a deceased student or not.

Johnson **moved** to substitute the language below in place of what Bailey proposed, so that the language would read as follows:

If approved, ~~the~~ elected Faculty Senators shall forward the request by the degree list process to the University President for transmittal to the Board of Trustees for final action. ~~However, if the student's death was in connection with the student committing a~~

¹ Underlining denotes added text and strikethrough denotes deleted text.

~~heinous act, then~~ The elected Faculty Senators may vote to disapprove forwarding the recommendation. In such rare cases, the elected Faculty Senators will provide, through the Senate Council, a written justification of the disapproval to the President (Chair of the Senate).

Christ and Bailey **accepted** the amendment. A **vote** was taken on the motion to use Johnson's language in the proposal on in memoriam posthumous degrees and the motion **passed** with four opposed.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion to change the proposed motion so that the language in the proposed SR was changed as follows:

If approved, ~~the~~ The elected Faculty Senators shall forward the request by the degree list process to the University President for transmittal to the Board of Trustees for final action. ~~However, if the student's death was in connection with the student committing a heinous act, then~~ The elected Faculty Senators may vote to disapprove forwarding the recommendation. In such rare cases, the elected Faculty Senators will provide, through the Senate Council, a written justification of the disapproval to the President (Chair of the Senate).

The motion **passed** with five opposed.

5. Two Honorary Degrees - Jeannine Blackwell, Graduate School Dean

Jeannine Blackwell, dean of the Graduate School and chair of the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees (UJCHD), shared information about two nominees for honorary degrees, to be conferred during the May 2014 Commencement.

The recommendation from the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees and the SC was that the elected faculty senators **move** to approve HW, as the recipient of an Honorary Doctor of Letters, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended recipient of an honorary degree to be conferred by the Board. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. The Chair reminded those present that only elected faculty senators may vote on proposed recipients of honorary degrees. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The second recommendation from the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees and the SC was that the elected faculty senators **move** to approve PC, as the recipient of an Honorary Doctor of Letters, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended recipient of an honorary degree to be conferred by the Board. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. In response to a question from Durham, Blackwell confirmed that the honorary degree nominees were considered confidential until after they are approved by the Board of Trustees. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

There being no further business to attend to, Wasilkowski **moved** to adjourn and Brown **seconded**. There were no objections so the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Connie Wood,
University Senate Secretary

Absences: Adams, Andrade, Atwood, Bailey, Ballard, Bellot, Birdwhistell, Blackwell, J., Brennen, Brion, Bugg*, Charnigo, Childs, Box*, Crampton*, Day, de Beer, Deep, Dickson, Eckman, Evans, Feist-Price, Firey*, Fox, Graf, Gross, Harris, Hazard, Jackson, Kaplan, Kirschling, Knutson, Larson, Lee*, Lewis, Martin, A., McCulley*, Mehra, Mock, Odom, Palli, Rabel, Richey, Riordan, Rogers, Smyth*, Spradlin, Steiner, Tick, Tracy, T., Tracy, J., Tracy, S., Turner, Van Wie, Vasconez, Voro, Walz, Wiseman, Withers, Witt, Wyatt, Yelowitz and Yost*.

Invited guests present: Allison Carll White, Susan Carvalho, Don Helme, Brandon Look and Roxanne Mountford.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, March 4, 2014.

* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.