

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

April 17, 2017

* * * *

* * * *

KATHERINE MCCORMICK, CHAIR
ERNIE BAILEY, VICE-CHAIR
KATE SEAGO, PARLIAMENTARIAN
SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR
LISA GRANT CRUMP, COURT REPORTER

* * * *

* * * *

MCCORMICK: I'd like to call the meeting to order please. Welcome to the April 17th meeting of the University Senate. As you remember these are kind of rules of order. And I know that (inaudible), but I do encourage you to be civil in the conversation. Please talk, you know, say what's on your mind. We appreciate the opportunity for good, academic discourse. And then return the clickers to the table at the end of the meeting.

So we're going to start with the attendance slide and when the slide appears and the question is read, please vote. So are you here today, yes, no or is this the Senate meeting today? And most of you do suggest that you are here. All right.

Because we would like in getting you some documentation for the Honors agenda that's on the -- on the -- Honors

UKsenate4-17-17.txt

timeline on the agenda, I would ask that you weigh Senate Rule 1.2.3 to allow the Senate to consider the agenda, because the entire agenda and supporting documents were not sent out six days in advance. I would love to have a motion and a second to that. Joe McGillis makes the motion and --

YEAGER: Second.
BROTHERS: Name, please?
YEAGER: Kevin Yeager, A & S.
MCCORMICK: Kevin Yeager makes the second.

So our -- our recommendation is that the Senate weighs Senate Rule 1.2.3 to allow consideration of the agenda for today. We're voting to weigh the Senate Rule 1.2.3 to allow consideration, and you said yes.

There were no changes received to the minutes and so unless objections are heard here on the floor, the minutes from March the 20th will still approved as distributed by unanimous consent. So some announcements and then I'll move through these, because we have a very packed agenda.

So Jonathan Golding has kindly agreed to chair our Ombud search. We had a number of folks who were willing to help him; Michael Healy, our current Ombud, Bill Raines and Joe Labianca, the faculty members, and then the student are Jordan Potter, Kelsey Webb and Elizabeth Foster. They're going to begin their deliberations on Thursday, and we have left this open until Wednesday. And so if you are interested in this position or would like to nominate your colleague, please let Jonathan know and they'll begin to deliberate. Their meetings are already scheduled for this week.

The Lewis Honors College dean candidates have been on campus. I know that many of you have met with them. And the last open forum is for the fourth candidate and we're still on track for July 1 start date. I'm sure that (Inaudible) appreciates that opportunity. We've had recent -- recent campus visits for the candidates for the -- for the position of the Associate Provost for Student and Academic Life, and we expect an announcement regarding that position soon. And, again, we're on schedule for a July 1 start date.

This is an interesting announcement that comes to us from our Libraries. There is a new initiative called the Human Library, where people would provide information similar to the way books or other digital devices do. And so if you would like to be part of the Human Library, it occurs tomorrow, 12

to 6 in the multi-purpose room at the William T. Young library. So --

GROSSMAN: Are there fines if you're returning late?

MCCORMICK: I don't know. I'll have to ask. That would be a way for an increase in revenue, right? So on behalf of the Senate, the Senate Counsel did approve a change to the 2017-18 College of Pharmacy calendar and that was necessitated so that they could move forward. A number of faculty, Joe McGillis, Michael Kennedy, Joe Blazer and Al Cross, and I, went to a meeting that I've not attended before, the Coalition of Senate and Faculty Leaders, held last week at CPE and (inaudible) had a lot to say. Some of it was -- most of it was fairly broad, much of it about performance funding. He did mention the LEADS project that UK has begun and suggested -- he thought that many of our colleagues in this state would probably follow our lead on LEADS. And so we were well represented and we'll keep you informed of other outcomes from that.

The facility evaluation of the President is planned soon, very soon. And we wanted to send a large thank you to Connie Wood, who's really done this for us in the past and done a beautiful job. And so, again -- I thought I saw Connie; did she come in? There she is. So thank you, Connie. (APPLAUSE) She's done this work single handedly. Last year, the Board of Trustees asked for some more specificity, she replied, and so, again, we're really deeply in her debt. But we realize this isn't a process that should rely on a single person, even someone as fabulous as Connie, and so we're working on how to embed a process that might be more institutional so that she can provide consultation, but the work isn't necessarily on her back. And so we have spoken with the department chair in Statistics and they're willing to help us continue to use the Applied Statistics Lab, and now we just have to get some money to help them do that.

We are -- we've done that already. The search for Executive Vice President of Health Affairs is still ongoing. And the University Registrar, they're opening this search soon, as well as an Associate Chief Academic Officer for Information Technology.

We have approved the newly revised doctoral program form and it's available on the Senate's form site. And here you see a comparison of how well we're doing in that.

UKsenate4-17-17.txt

The election process for the faculty trustees, we're in our second round, we had three nominees. And remember that closes April the 26th. And the Blue Ribbon Committee report has begun their work. Many of you have already said you received a survey that came out today. They intend for this survey to run today and all the way up to May the 1st. So if you don't answer first, they have a plan for a second and a third reminder. So, again, hopefully everyone will get their names on board and their -- their opinions expressed in this survey. We really appreciate the work of this committee. Remember, it's -- it's chaired by Carl Mattacola and Brett Spears.

One more, we have an announcement that Davy Jones is going to make and so I'd like to ask Davy to come forward.

JONES: Well, again, I just -- you had sent some of us an announcement that there's been some further reorganization in the Provost's office relating to accreditation (inaudible) and I just wanted to say my personal opinion that, REDACTED, in that office has been invaluable to helping faculty navigate various accreditation processes and (inaudible) processes. She gave me her permission to invade her privacy and (inaudible) and say that into the record.

MCCORMI CK: Thank you. Ernie Bailey?

BAILEY: Nothing to report.

MCCORMI CK: So Ernie has received nominations for the Outstanding Senator award and he'll report that May 1. Kate? Bob and Lee.

BLONDER: We haven't had a Board of Trustees' meeting since our last set of meetings, so I don't have anything to report. The next board meeting is May 1st and 2nd, which also happens to be -- May 1st happens to also be the next Senate meeting, so we may be here for part of this meeting or we may go to the Board meetings that are occurring at the same time.

The only other thing that I wanted to mention is please vote and please encourage all of your colleagues to vote in the Trustee election. It's really helpful and important that the person that's elected has a strong mandate from the faculty, so please encourage voting. Thank you.

MCCORMI CK: So you have materials in your packets sent for -- by Sheila regarding this issue. We gave you the timeline, because we feel that it's important for you to -- to remember that this is work

that's been going on for a period time. It's been a collaboration among multiple units and so we just wanted to document that for you so that you have that in hand as Ernie begins his discussion.

BAILEY:

Yeah, so it's been a while. There is a timeline, I had to go over that because it's -- as we've had the discussion, some people have said, you know, "I'm new on Senate. I don't know what's going on." I'll just go over it very briefly what -- how we got to this point.

But what the subject is, is that there was a report brought by Phil Harling. It was a request that the Senate had made a year ago, that the transition committee be formed and address nine questions. And they have done that, and so that's -- that's the meat of what we're talking about today. But it -- it -- the main points on the timeline are that in August of 2015, there was a 22 and a half million dollar gift that was offered to the University to create an Honors College. And there was a contract that stipulated how much (inaudible).

In December 2015, the Board of Trustees accepted that and then immediately the development of a proposal was turned over to Associate Provost Ben Withers and -- and Diane Snow, who is the Interim Director of the Honors Program. And so they developed a proposal, they had a -- there was a series of meetings that -- that went on.

There was -- the Provost, I believe, appointed another committee which, I think, was advising them. There was lots of input and lots of ideas. And in the end, the proposal that Ben and Diane brought was -- it had lots of options and there wasn't really anything for us to vote and say, here is what we would like to do.

And so at the time of the meeting about a year ago, what we -- the -- the Senate voted on, was that we recommended -- actually, I think that -- that's wrong. We recommended approval of creating a college -- or did we approve the college? Anyway, we approved the creation of a new college, an Honors College, but there was no real structure that was put in, so we also asked that Provost appoint a transition committee to go through and discuss what were -- were nine points. And shortly after that, Phil Harling was appointed interim chair of the college, and was also chair of the transition committee, and generated -- had -- had a committee that was formed

based on the recommendation that we also gave in terms of having faculty and administrators and (inaudible) on -- on this committee.

They deliberated, and Phil came to us last December, if you may remember, and gave us an interim report. I think they had basically concluded their deliberations, led a discussion at that time, then gave us a report that was dated December 9th, and that should be in the folder. And it has a response to all the -- it had a response to, I think, ten different questions. And -- and number one and number two -- number one was about the philosophy of the college and number two was about the curriculum. That wasn't something that our Structure and Organization Committee asked him about, but it certainly was important to the committee to have their -- that done.

The main points were, you know, who were the faculty, how was it going to be organized, how was it going to be funded? And that represented items two through nine of the request. Item one was to help find a new dean for the college, which I guess is concluding this week with -- with the people that have come in. So that -- that was the timeline, that's how we got to this point. Questions on that?

So what we did is we had met and we discussed the proposal that Phil had. Again, it's a complicated proposal, I think our committee asked a lot of questions. A lot of the committee members characterized it as probing questions. An awful lot of decisions are left up to the faculty of record for the college. There's going to be an Honors College faculty that will write a rules and procedure for the college that will dictate how things are done. That falls outside of the purview of the committee, and for us, this dictates for the college how the rules are going. But we looked at it and we felt satisfied that they responded in a very positive fashion to the recommendations that -- that we had made.

There's one point that -- that the (inaudible) brought up that was worthy of your discussions and that there is other things that you may find as you walk through and go about after this, and there's been a couple things that came up in the Senate Council.

But one point that diverged from our recommendation, a year ago what we recommended was that there be no faculty that had primary appointments in the Honors College. We were concerned about

two things, and one was that an Honors College that had lectures and (inaudible) that did not have tenured faculty, would not be governed very well. It would not -- it would not reflect faculty governance.

The second thing was that lecturers who were hired into an Honors College probably wouldn't be well served professionally. If you were an engineer and your appointment was in an Honors College, that wouldn't do well if you were applying to go elsewhere or if you were applying for grants. An engineer should be in an engineering college, physicist should be in a physics department, and so on.

So we had recommended not to have a primary appointment there. The committee came back, looked at it and said, we can't operate this way. We really would like to change this. We would like to have permission to appoint a group of lecturers in the college and have justification for it and we listened to it and we accepted that justification. Part of that was a strong sentiment that we're going to make sure that the faculty have a strong relationship to other departments that -- in their primary discipline. There wasn't any way to mandate it, but I would assume -- I would hope that in their rules of procedure, they would strongly encourage that the lecturers have -- have joint appointments, but that's between the -- the departments into how that goes.

The other had to do with the governance of it. And the faculty record for the -- for the college, there will 20 faculty members. There will be regular tenured track faculty, tenured or tenured track faculty from other departments. The number of lecturers would be a minority in the college. So the governance of the college is really going to be by mainline faculty from the rest of the college. So those -- those are the main points. And I guess I can entertain questions here. Actually, I won't entertain them as much as I will direct them to Phil.

HARLING:

Let me join you up here, Ernie. And before I entertain any questions, I just have a number of individuals to thank, chiefly Katherine and Ernie and Sheila, who have been very instrumental in making this process of deliberation a fully informed one. I think a lot of really meaty issue were fully ventilated over the course of the many months, years even, at this point, in which this proposal has finally come to fruition.

I want to thank the Honors Transition Committee, 17 members strong, faculty representing 10 different colleges here at UK. We met virtually weekly from July to December, last semester. (Inaudible) it seemed like we were able to accomplish a great deal. I want to thank the various vetting agencies who've done their work, on behalf of the University Senate, to make this the best proposal it can be, the Senate Academic Organization and Structure Committee, in which Ernie is the chair, the University Regulations Committee, the Undergraduate Council, which has been deliberating over just specific curricular proposals emanating from the Honors Transition Committee report that you have in your file for today. So a lot of people to thank and it's great to -- to be here this afternoon to field any questions that you might have.

BAILEY: Go ahead, Liz.

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S.

I appreciate the bringing us up to speed on the timeline and everything and -- and I understand the points in your committee differed from the report, but I -- I was actually hoping that we could have a little time devoted to summarizing the report.

BAILEY: Phil?

HARLING: Well, I mean, I'm pleased to -- I'm pleased to do that.

BAILEY: It's a -- it's a -- the only thing I would say, it's a long report and -- and we could go through whatever -- are -- are there particular questions or -- it was interesting, one of the things that they did was lump -- we had a series of questions about how the staffing would be and how the faculty would be, and we kind of lumped them together. There was a discussion --

DEBSKI: No, it just -- it just actually seems a little strange to me to -- so, basically, again, you know, I appreciate bringing this -- the time spent on bringing us up with the timeline, but -- but I thought -- thought that time might be better spent just telling us what the current report is. And -- and especially since we got these documents a little late and -- and, you know, I just -- just, you know, five minutes spent summarizing something --

HARLING: I'll be -- I'll be happy to summarize a couple of the main points that --

DR. DEBSKI: (Inaudible).

DR. HARLING: That's fine. I didn't want to waste any Senate time having given a very

full briefing of the report in December at the time when -- when we actually filed it. But I'm happy to -- to recap.

The essential point is our biggest remit was to bring the curriculum of the Honors program up from the current 21 credit hours to 30 credit hours, and that was something that Ernie's committee sort of asked that we do. We've -- we've gone about this as follows. And in doing this, the agreement is that we want to maintain the relative curricular flexibility of the current program, which is --

BAILEY: Phil? Phil, could I -- I just -- just want to talk --

HARLING: Yeah.

BAILEY: I just want to make sure. I think it's good that we spend time discussing it and that we advise them, because a lot of what has happened and a lot of the things that are going to happen are going to be what the -- the faculty of the Honors College do, and so I think giving them advice is -- is important.

I stopped him because what we were talking about was structure. The curriculum is not a purview of -- of our group. And so we did add that. It was a big part of his report, and Phil wants to talk about that because that is an important thing. But we can spend time talking about that if -- if that's a question that you had. That's why I said --

DEBSKI: That actually is a question -- -- it's a long report.

BAILEY: -- I have. That is one of the questions that I have, because, basically, you know, I read in the report that -- that going through the 21 to 30 wouldn't be a problem because these honor students come in with 29 credits on average, AP credits.

But I'm -- I'm wondering, you know, basically, well, you know, a lot of the students that I see are double -- are using those extra credits that they have to double major, you know, say Biology, Psychology, Neuroscience or Psychology, something like that, and I'm -- I'm -- so I'm wondering won't that interfere with -- with these student's ability to double major or has that been looked at?

BAILEY: Well, it's simply a matter that this is a curriculum, which I think it's going to come up --

MCCORMICK: It's already up. Curriculum change is on the web transmittal, and so if you have issues, remember that that's been our process to change a curriculum, not necessarily that has -- is a major

change. And so it's on, it went out today, the web transmittal, and so you have two weeks to respond to it, if you have issues around this change.

BAILLEY: So would -- let's -- let's come back to the -- before -- I mean the big thing, the main thing that we're voting on today is the structure and the faculty that are -- that are coming in. We, also -- a lot changing the Grs. That's the next issue, is changing the GRs, to allow primary appointments in the Honors College.

DEBSKI: You know, I'm a little frustrated because, you know, again, I've been given this report and I've read this report and -- and I thought -- I thought we were going discuss this report.

BAILLEY: That's what we're doing.

HARLING: (Inaudible) respond to your question, certainly, an issue that came up all last semester in the Transition Committee was this issue of maintaining the flexibility that would be needed for majors and credit intensive disciplines to continue to take Honors and still graduate in a timely manner with a second major.

And certainly this is something that I, as a humanist, wanted (inaudible) from my partners at STEM, where credit-intensiveness tends to be more of a (inaudible) within the major. And there -- there was certainly consensus within the committee.

I believe that there are some committee members here today, I welcome them to chime in and say, if they wish, that we're maintaining the degree of flexibility necessary for students to take a very robust program course of study here, including a double major.

It will be probably more challenging for some than others, depending on where they end up matriculating within UK. But there was certainly general agreement, within the committee, that the addition of these -- of these credits was not going to be something that would pose an insurmountable obstacle to our best students who want to pursue the Honors program here at the University.

BAILLEY: Next, yes? And then -- yes.

SANDMEYER: Bob Sandmeyer, A and S.

I have a question -- first of all, I just want to begin by commending you all on your great work. But my question has to do with faculty participation. So in the -- and -- and the lecturers in particular and the -- and the -- and the stipulation that you need to hire lecturers for the

foundational courses.

So it states that the term of the faculty will be between one to three years. And the reason why -- let me just preface why I'm asking this question, because I'm a little uncomfortable with the idea that we have some of the best and brightest coming to the University of Kentucky to do honors work and then to have their foundational work be done with lecturers, rather than with full faculty of the University, who, when they're working at this very beginning level, might develop a rapport with faculty members that they would want to continue to do research, but then would be, in essence, precluded because they're working at the level of the foundation, rather than at the higher level work. And so -- so that's the preface.

And really I just wanted to get a sense of why you all thought that you wouldn't be able to -- I mean, it seems a quite competitive position to be accepted as an Honors faculty. Why you couldn't stipulate that Honor's faculty would be engaged in foundational teaching, in addition to the other work, that would then allow more of the teaching of the foundations classes by regular faculty members rather than the need to hire lecturers.

HARLING:

Yeah, thank you for that, Bob. Really a lot of it stems from the -- the peculiar history of the Honors program/college here at UK. As many of you know, for -- for much of it's history, forty plus years, it was an incredibly really tiny program, which was chiefly taught by full-time faculty members who held joint appointments. That model worked well in a lot ways. I think one thing it probably didn't do so well, is to expose the broader faculty population of UK to instruction within Honors.

And I can tell you that over the last decade or so, since we've gone from that really small, (inaudible), sort of clustered program to a much more (inaudible), broadened, dispersed, much bigger program, it's been really difficult for my predecessors and -- and I, to recruit the kind of tenured faculty that we would like for every section within Honors.

Now having said that, under the -- under the new curriculum we're proposing, 27 of -- of a student's 30 credits within Honors, would be taught by regular -- in almost all cases, regular faculty members. So the faculty at UK will own -- will own the Honors program,

right?

We need additional instructional help for this foundational course. What we all agreed on the committee was -- was sort of a crucial abstinence of the current Honors' curriculum, was one curricular experience that all of our students had in common. This is something that's very typically found in Honors' College at universities like UK's.

We thought it made a lot of sense to try to -- to work that here. So immediately the discussion turned to how best to staff that course. Our hope, my fond hope is that I and my successor will -- will be able to recruit enough good faculty members like you to make sure there's a significant regular faculty presence even within the foundational seminar.

Having said that, I'm a fairly pragmatic person. It's going to be really important that we staff the multiple sections necessary so they can (inaudible) work in a smooth and predictable manner, hence the need for some sort of regular instructional talent that the Honor's program, the Honor's College can take for granted will be there, semester in, semester out.

We talked about this for a long time, and ultimately the Transition Committee decided that with the small handful of lecturers, no more than seven, we might be able to get by with even fewer than seven, we would be able to staff this foundational seminar. And crucially enable these lecturers to teach occasional courses within their core disciplines, because we thought it was going to be critically important for them to establish a relationship with the regular faculty within their core disciplines so that they aren't strictly seen as -- as Honors' instructors, that they have ties to the rest of the University. And that hopefully, we can leverage those ties to sort of lend the lecturers to their core disciplines, those -- the departments that represent those disciplines in return for, you know, a tenurable faculty member coming in and teaching an Honors' seminar, maybe a foundational seminar, maybe something that's more within their own academic specialty.

So my hope, our hope, as a committee, is that we can use this as a kind of leverage to actually broaden, and deepen overall, regular faculty participation within Honors at UK. Does that begin to answer your question?

SANDMEYER:

If I could just follow-up with

one very quick question, which is, did you consider rather than lecturers, STS faculty rather than RTS faculty?

HARLING:

Yeah --

SANDMEYER:

And the reason, again, it seems to me if we have a new Honors College, that this should be the preeminent teaching faculty of the University at all levels, including the foundational level, and therefore we shouldn't have non-tenured, but tenured faculty at all levels --

BAILEY:

If I could -- if I could -- I mean, the thing that impressed our -- our committee during this discussion, this -- this was probably the biggest point that came up, was that there were several members of the Transition Committee who are presumably going to be part of the faculty of record. And their -- what they basically were saying was this is a big job, there's a lot of students coming in, we can't do it all on our own, you know, with our own resources. We need the assistance of lecturers who will -- will participate. And so it -- it -- we didn't come away with the sense that this is going to be done, all the students are going to see is lecturers at the beginning. There should be a heavy involvement of faculty from all over, all over the campus. That was -- that was why I think -- that was what was persuasive for us. Unless somebody has some -- there was a fellow down here that had a question. Yeah?

FARRELL:

Herman Farrell, College of Fine Arts.

So just getting to this question, Phil, about -- about the -- the -- the primary appointment in Honors, but with an opportunity for these new lecturers to teach (inaudible) core discipline. I was reading through the document and I didn't really see it, and maybe I missed it, but what are the mechanics for -- for that appointment process? What I'm really asking about is the core discipline faculty or the chair or the department educational unit, how are they involved in the actual hiring decision? And then I also -- I guess I have a question about what is the length of the term of the lecturer? Is it -- is there a finite --

HARLING:

It is -- it is two years renewable before promotion, and once they're promoted to the rank of senior lecturer, it's a -- it's a three year renewable appointment.

FARRELL:

But the -- the hope, I guess, for many individuals applying for this job would be that they might be able to

then segue into the core discipline at some point, I assume.

HARLING: Well, not -- I mean, not necessarily. I mean, what -- what I hope to see, and I think we will see, are young, really highly qualified people, who want some intensive teaching experience, particularly with some outstanding undergraduates who -- who remain ambitious to -- to look for tenurable work, not necessarily at UK.

I don't know that they're -- certainly, their experience as -- as lecturers within an Honors College wouldn't preclude them from applying for tenured track appointments that were advertised here on campus.

BAILEY: Phil, (inaudible)

HARLING: I wouldn't want -- I wouldn't want to sort of indicate to them one way or another whether that's going to be part of, you know, what they can expect. What I would want to do is to get the -- the core departments -- I'm looking for interested departments who want to work with Honors to bring in this pool of instructional talent, which will benefit us, and hopefully, at least in some modest measure, benefit them as well. So the vision I have, which I certainly want to share with the incoming dean, once that person is named, is an idea that you get core discipline -- you get a sense of who is interested on campus. You would enter discussions with the chairs of those departments. You would get representation from the core disciplines on the search committees that are going to need to be appointed in the process of hiring these lecturers. And then you would -- you would -- you would quickly move to -- to provide joint appointments for any lecturers appointed within Honors within those core disciplines, so that they establish a kind of relationship, where they get to know folks in those disciplines where those departments have some say, by (inaudible) of the fact that there's a joint appointment. And in the evaluation in -- in providing mentorship, both formal and less formal, to lecturers so that we don't wall off the lecturers from the rest of the university.

BAILEY: We also talked about having members -- for example, if you're hiring somebody with a discipline in physics, you would have people from the physics department on the search committee.

HARLING: Yeah --

BAILEY: So that there would be some buy in (inaudible) --

HARLING: That's going to be critically important. We want to have departmental

representati on there from the get-go. So
does that begin to answer --

FARRELL: Yeah, it does.
HARLING: -- your question?
FARRELL: It does, thank you.
BAILEY: I'm sorry, I don't recall who
was next. Davy?
JONES: Davy Jones, Toxi col ogy.
Can you talk a little bit about
how crisp are the edges of the Honors
College? Is there a difference between
the Honors College and the Honors
Undergraduate College? Is there a
mission creep built into this?

HARLING: Could you -- could you elaborate
on that, Davy? I'm -- I just want to
make sure I understand you.

JONES: Well, there's -- and I'm not
advocating what I'm about to say here,
but you know there's a discussi on going
on about inter-di sciplinary undergraduate
programs, you know, where to park them.
We don't have anything at UK like
(inaudi ble) programs. Is this -- is this
going to be in the mission of Honors to
become a place to solve that problem or
you don't see that on the plate? Does
there need to be another soluti on to
that?

HARLING: It could potentially be one, but
I think it would be premature for me to
-- to -- to say anything reassuring as of
one way or the other. It would need to
be the topic of fairly deliberate
discussi on, I think. It certainly wasn't
seen as part of the remit of the
Transiti on Commi ttee.

Having said that, you know,
we're -- we're all there for -- for
(i naudi ble) undergraduate
interdi sciplinary. So I know that
doesn't really give you a great,
defini tive answer, but it's certainly
something that we need to continue to
discuss, both as a faculty and perhaps as
an Honors faculty, as well.

BAILEY: There's -- there's --
HARLING: I'd include that as a
possi bility --
BAILEY: I can say --
HARLING: -- but I'd like to see it as a
natural evolution, if, in fact, it moved
that way at all.

BAILEY: Phil -- Phil is a good volunteer
on doing this stuff, but there's been
very informal discussi ons about
interdi sciplinary undergraduate programs
and it's not really well formed. But
making that a home in the Honors College
has not been part of that discussi on at
all. So, I mean, that's --

HARLING: It certainly hasn't been part of
our remit this year.

UKsenate4-17-17.txt

BAILEY: Phil's agreeable to be helpful,
but it's not -- it's not been --
HARLING: And -- and we certainly
underline the value of interdisciplinary
as such.

BAILEY: Back here.
VISONA: Monica Blackmun Visona, College
of Fine Arts.

So, essentially, you are -- you
are envisioning these lecturers as very
bright, very talented faculty who will be
recruited to the University, knowing that
this is a temporary appointment and will
then be going elsewhere, either to
another department, should an opening
happen in one of those departments where
they could join a tenured track and leave
Honors, or else going to another
institution. So this is going to be a
chance to have lots of really bright
people come to the University and then
leave.

HARLING: Is that a statement or a
question?

VISONA: That -- is that the way you
envision this program?

HARLING: Well, let me give you a
statement in the response. I think what
we're going to find is a real mix of --
of ambitions among the folks who actually
come and decide they want to take on this
job. I'm not trying to suggest that
we want to train people up to leave. I'd
be foolish to do that. I want -- I want
UK to benefit and the Honors program to
benefit from the best instructional help
we can find.

Having said that, I also want us
to hire the best qualified people that we
can. You know, I've been -- I've been an
UK faculty member for close to a quarter
of a century now, and over that time I've
very happily seen the evolution of the
lecturer's status on our campus to being
one with a great deal more dignity, with
a recognized status, with a recognition
of the kind of instructional expertise
that many long term lecturers bring to
the table. I've seen the lecturer
position evolve into a feasible career
for people on our campus, based -- based
-- based on the evolution of a more
robust kind of compensation package. So
I wouldn't want to assume that all of the
lecturers we hire, or even the lion's
share, will depart in short order.

It will be our happy task to try
to make this the kind of position that
good folks want to remain in, so that we,
and our students, can benefit from their
instructional and service talents and
other research talents to a significant
degree, for the foreseeable future.

VISONA: But, again, we're looking at second tier faculty. These are faculty that do not have a permanent long term investment in the University. And you're happy with the Honors program, essentially, attracting talent without necessarily attracting people who have the permanent relationship with the college?

HARLING: The possibility of a permanent relationship is certainly there in the terms of -- of appointment or --

VISONA: But they will not be hired --

BAILEY: Let's -- let's take -- I -- I think that's -- that's -- that's been answered. Over here?

SOULT: Allison Sault, A and S.

It seems to me the assumption is that lecturers are temporary, very short term people. Myself and other co-members in the Department of Chemistry have been here for years and year and years, and some of us longer than many of our tenured track faculty, who came and got tenure or choose to leave even with tenure offer.

So to imply that lecturers are not long term commitments to the University is somewhat of a dig on those of us who are lecturers and have a long term relationship and have built long term relationships with students, even if they aren't in our class.

So I'm hoping that you are -- I mean, I guess I just want to (inaudible) is the plan to hire short term lecturers as more of a temporary position as opposed to a permanent position?

HARLING: Again, we're looking for lecturers who want to stay here, who want -- we already benefit within the Honors program from the fruitful labors of lecturers who have been here at UK for many years. I would like to see a staple core of instructors serving in this capacity.

I think -- I think what we will probably see, in reality, is -- is -- is some mix of the above. I would like to see that stability; it's certainly something that from an instructional capacity, it would benefit us as an institution. I, you know, have many lecturer colleagues with whom I work very closely over the years and I would hate to see them go. I don't want that to happen. I wouldn't want that to happen within the Honors College either. So I certainly don't want to create -- create the misapprehension that we're -- that we're looking at short term as --

BAILEY: Someone had a question --

HARLING: Some of them will leave, but

we're hoping that most of them will stay.
BAILEY: That's -- that's covered.
UNIDENTIFIED: That's part of the role.
BAILEY: Question here?
YEAGER: Kevin Yeager, A and S.

So, Phil, not to have a dig against anyone, but I have a follow-up with what Bob was saying. It sounds like there's a lot of interest in having, insofar as possible, as much interaction between the Honors College students and regular tenured line faculty as can be.

So when you talked about seven lecturer positions, that would be essentially permanent, servicing the curriculum of the Honors College, that's a sizeable continuing investment. So did you all consider using those resources to incentivize the participation of regular tenure lined faculty in the Honors College to meet the obligation?

HARLING: To a certain extent. And we -- and we actually happened upon and -- and the Provost's office has been agreeable to this, part of our vision is to establish a so-called faculty fellows program, which is in the -- which is in the Transition Committee report, that would bring up to nine tenurable faculty members in as fellows on staggered terms, where 50 percent of their instructional responsibilities and some of their service responsibilities would reside within the Honors College during that period. Now, that's a fairly expensive undertaking to -- to keeping going on a recurring basis. We have guarantees from the Provost's budget office that we're going to be able to meet that obligation. But even if you factor those new folks into the equation, there's still going to be the need to staff these foundational courses on a reliable, consistent basis. Hence, the number of six or seven lecturers.

Having said that, we are getting an infusion of regular faculty who are going to be directly participating in Honors in a much more robust way than any of us do currently.

YEAGER: So I guess what I'm asking is, you know, do -- do you really know whether or not that there wouldn't be "enough" regular lined -- tenure line faculty interested in helping to deliver the courses in the Honors College to necessitate hiring (inaudible) lecturers?

HARLING: My best guess is that we'll get -- we'll be able to get a small handful of regular faculty on board to teach the foundational course. And the main reason why I think that's heavy lifting, because it's -- it's going to fall pretty far

outside the kind of academic expertise that they bring to the table. And certainly my experience in recruiting regular faculty into Honors, is that it's a discussion that folks really like to have. Usually it revolves around the way that they -- they've been -- exposed our best undergraduates, our most highly motivated undergraduates, to -- to their own research expertises. There's some twist on that. That it's a little bit more difficult for them to teach regularly within their own departmental offerings.

So it's really sort of my sense in building next year's schedule and based on experience that I've had in the past, being very fairly closely associated within -- with Honors as a regular faculty member, in -- in getting a critical mass of -- of faculty members to sign up for a course that they couldn't necessarily bring back home to turn into a regular offering within their own department. Certainly, we want regular faculty to see the Honors program as an incubator for those who are (inaudible) curricular ideas, instructional ideas that they can bring back home, ultimately, so it isn't a zero sum game.

BAILEY:
MCCORMICK: There -- there was a lot -- It might be -- excuse me, it might be helpful to talk to them a little bit about the course that you intend for these lecturers to teach and how many students and how many sections would be required each semester, so that -- that's part of, as I understood, the prerequisite or the rationale for lecturers rather than trying to find enough regular titled faculty to teach those.

HARLING: Right. So part of the issue is that we want them to take this foundational seminar early in their matriculation at UK, as a kind of cohort building exercise, as a -- as a way of developing community within Honors. We talked about making it open to freshman only, but we realized that that was going to be really difficult, particularly for credit intensive majors who have a very prescribed freshman year, first year curriculum. So what we're suggesting is that they take this foundational seminar at some point before the end of their second year. So that's going to necessitate our having to build a couple -- couple of dozen sections, probably, per semester.

It will be no mean scheduling feat to pull off and we do need some

dedicated instructional help to make sure that we can build the sections that are going to be necessary to make this happen. The course is basically a variation on a fairly common theme within Honors colleges across the country and beyond, and that is a relationship between the individual and society, a way to assign both classic books and quite interesting thought provoking material within different branches of academic knowledge.

And the idea is that this course would introduce students to, among other things, particularly ways of viewing the world across the three traditional divisions of academic knowledge, so the natural sciences, the social sciences and the humanities.

We want to build in evening lecturers offered by some of our star UK faculty, to kick off each unit as -- as -- as a way of sort of exposing students to a particular way of looking at the world and the relationship with the individual to the world. So that's kind of what we have in mind as a nutshell; it's a fairly common model in the Honors community. I've talked to several of my colleagues at other institutions, it seems to work for them pretty well.

BAILEY: Question in the back. Leon?
SACHS: Yeah, I may have missed --
BAILEY: Name and the college.
SACHS: Leon Sachs, Arts and Sciences.

I just wanted to add to what you were saying, and I may have missed it because I had to step out, but that there's a spring retreat at which the curriculum of this foundational course is revisited by all of the instructional faculty, so it's an important moment (inaudible) lecturers, that we were just discussing, have an important voice in the shaping of this course themselves. I think that's an important --

HARLING: Yeah, they'll be asked to participate and claim some significant measure of ownership over it under the guidance of senior faculty and the leadership of the -- of the Honors college. So we see this as an organism that hopefully will evolve in exciting ways as -- as we -- as we move from one year to the next.

MCCORMICK: Leon, thank you for speaking up. Leon was -- was one of two Senate nominated representatives on this search committee and Bruce Webb was (inaudible). So thank you, Leon, for your work (inaudible).

BAILEY: Other questions? Liz, you going to ask about curriculum. She said we can

have another five minutes.
MCCORMICK: I said we can have another five minutes?
BAILEY: Yeah.
MCCORMICK: Oh.
BAILEY: No?
MCCORMICK: No, that's okay. Never mind. We also have --
BAILEY: You wanted --
MCCORMICK: -- to vote on the --
BAILEY: You wanted to ask about curriculum.
DEBSKI: You know, again, I guess I -- I think on -- on the bigger issue, I mean, I understand your points, but I don't actually see data here, you know, and -- and so I -- I'd just like some sense that, you know, you have explored, basically, you know, how many Honor students are double majors, for example, right now. And, again, how adding to the curriculum -- because if we keep adding and adding, might affect them. So that, basically, it seems at some point they have to decide whether it's -- you know, it's more valuable to go into a Honors college or it's more valuable to double major.
HARLING: I think the Honors College curriculum even under the robust -- more robust model is tenable for the double major. To me, the more (inaudible) question is whether it's tenable to a triple major with two minors. And (inaudible) uber special -- hyper specialization that we do see a little bit of among some of our most -- sort of ambitious undergraduates.
We did talk about that in a fairly robust way within the committee and we felt that while this curriculum wouldn't be a deal breaker for double majors -- I mean, it could be in some cases for a triple major. And I think there we have to talk about where we're at philosophically and I think, to a person really, to -- to a person really, the committee felt that the value added by the more robust curriculum is something that speaks for itself, and students will ultimately need to make that decision for themselves.
We'll give them an enormous amount of advising help to get them to where they need to -- to be to graduate by -- by -- by the time their fourth year is over. I'm not quite sure what more I can say to that issue --
DEBSKI: I'm just saying that as a scientist I just -- I just (inaudible), you know, I felt -- what we felt, I think, I would just -- I would just like, you know, some numbers, basically, or

some idea that the committee looked at some numbers and did more than just, you know, give their opinions about this, just actually look at data (inaudible)

BAILLEY: One -- one of the things that --
HARLING: Did you want --

BAILLEY: When we were discussing this, we -- we -- one of the difficulties, and we had this last year, this is why we said if we can't come up with this, have the Transition committee give us specific answers to these nine questions. Guess what? We didn't get the specific answers, did we? But in a discussion with them, they were thoughtful about them, and we had good discussions with -- with -- Leon came to our meeting groups, Bruce Webb came to the meeting. And what we came away with confidence that, you know, a goal is to have the students have an interaction, a quality interaction with tenured faculty in there.

Last year we very strongly said that we did not want lecturers. They've come back this year and said in order to accomplish our mission, we want to do it and -- and -- and they talked about it. Specifics were tough to come by, because the program is going to be put together, and what they'd like to do is to have it be successful. We came away with the feeling that -- that there's going to be probably some change in the programs and in the faculty that are involved and their experience with the students. And what we have to -- what -- what's -- you can't mandate a lot of this. I came in saying I'd like to see us mandate that all these different lecturers -- I mean, I'm concerned about the lecturers, all the lecturers have to have joint appointments some place, and you can't really do that. I mean, that's between the departments and -- and (inaudible) individual thing. That's going to have to be part of the culture and part of the rules of procedure that they're encouraged to do it. So we have to leave a lot of it up to the faculty of record, I think.

HARLING: One -- one thing that I will underline is that the current 21 hours is Honors light by -- by -- by any comparison with Honors Colleges that -- at state universities such as UK. It's very -- the current -- the current curriculum is -- is a really fairly modest curriculum relative to what you see out there. Probably one of the great Honors colleges in the country is South Carolina, 45 credit hours. Now that's on the extreme end of heavy, of credit-intensive. Twenty-one is sort of at the

other end of the spectrum. Putting us at 30 is about, you know, a little -- a little short of the middle of the pack, for what that's worth.

I -- you know, I hesitate to say it's just right, but it's a step toward that kind of vital center of where most the Honors colleges that look like what we're -- what we have here. (Inaudible) you know, what they look like.

MCCORMICK: So I give -- I'd like to give a moment for the members of that committee. There were fourteen faculty plus the two that the Senate recommended. If you have comments, I'd love to hear -- we'd love to hear those. And, also, thank you so much for the hard work. I don't know if Phil mentioned this, but they met every week for a long period of time, so we owe them a great debt for their (inaudible). Vanessa?

JACKSON: Vanessa Jackson, College of Agriculture, Food, and Environment. As a member of that committee, I'd just like to say that we did an extreme -- a large amount of research for every part of the proposal. And we -- meeting week to week, you know, each of us picked something that was really important to us and spent a lot of time researching it, so we really did not use our personal opinions or -- we tried to take that out and if someone tried to do that we -- you know, we worked really hard. And I think we -- we know that everything -- it may not be perfect, but we did our very best. And in the end, thinking about our students, and not what we think is the right thing.

MCCORMICK: Any others? Yes?

BLONDER: Lee Blonder, Medicine.

I -- I'd just like to ask, is there something that you want us to approve about the curriculum or this discussion? Or is -- what is the ultimate intent with respect to a motion?

MCCORMICK: Thanks, Lee. So we would like for you to endorse the Honors College Transition Committee report, which includes both the lecturers as well as the curriculum. They are working on the approval of the course that Phil mentioned. It's not quite ready, but it'll go through the normal curricular process. And so the committee voted on the -- the -- the report and all of its components and they recommended that you endorse this. This comes from a committee, it doesn't need a second. We've had discussion. Is there any discussion remaining?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, trustee. I just -- I believe the Senate Council endorsed

it also and also recommends that the Senate --

MCCORMI CK: Thank you, Bob. Yes.

GROSSMAN: -- endorse it.

MCCORMI CK: So we're endorsing the report from the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee, that we endorse the Honors College Transition Committee report, and that was dated December the 9th, 2016, and its contents and recommends endorsement by this body, from the Senate Council as well. All right, all in favor, opposed or abstain? It's time to vote. Ready? Sixty-two to eight and seven, motion passes. Thank you. Thank you, Ernie, Phil.

And so in the -- as part of that, then, we bring you the second motion that does come from the Senate Council (inaudible) the small changes, editorial, frankly, to the motion made by the Senate Academic Organization and Structure Committee, regarding the rules responsible for -- that would codify this change.

If you remember, after our conversation last year, we changed the Honors structure in the -- in the governing regulations, and so now this requires another change. Marcy's here with me to respond to any questions that you have regarding that. You received that as part of the PDF with the changes included.

One of the things that you'll notice is -- is that we made this change in two places so that it's consistent with the other parts of the rules. So, again, this -- so this is the motion from the Senate Council that we recommend that Senate endorse the proposed changes to the Governing Regulation VII to allow the inclusion of the lecturers as part of the Honors College.

BLONDER: Katherine?

MCCORMI CK: Yes?

BLONDER: Can we see the change --

MCCORMI CK: Yes.

BLONDER: -- to the proposal?

MCCORMI CK: Thanks, Sheila.

BROTHERS: Voting has started, so I -- well, it's -- it's -- it was in the handout as what was sent out on Tuesday, so it's unchanged from what was sent out a week ago.

MCCORMI CK: That passes, 57 to 8 to 4.

Okay, thank you.

HARLING Thank you very much.

MCCORMI CK: Thank you members of the Transition Committee. Good luck. Dr. Schroeder is going to be now with us for awhile. When the Baroque Trumpet proposal came to Senate Council, we

actually had a serenade, but I don't know if he brought his trumpet today.

SCHROEDER: Did you bring it today?

DOVEL: I did not.

GROSSMAN: Can you do a mouth trumpet?

SCHROEDER: Yes, so this is a motion 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.

The committee did have one question about the number of students. You'll notice that the number of students per year is one, that's on purpose because that's what the college and faculty felt they had the capacity for. This is a niche that UK would fill that is not offered elsewhere in the region. Are there questions regarding the proposal?

MCCORMICK: All right, this is a motion that comes from the committee. It doesn't need a second. The Senate -- the motion is 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. I'll provide this again for you and you may begin voting. Congratulations.

SCHROEDER: Next one, this is a proposal to approve the establishment of a new University Scholar's program, a BA Social Work and MA Social Work within the College of Social Work.

This is a typical university scholar's program. There wasn't anything funky or weird about it. It was, again, to -- you never know. This was to increase the number of undergraduate students staying at the University and getting their master's degree. Are there any questions. Yes, ma'am?

COSTITCH: Julia Costich, Public Health. Shouldn't that be a Master of Social Work?

SCHROEDER: Yes, you are correct. It is that way on the paperwork and on the proposal that was submitted, so it should be BASW in Social Work and MSW in Social Work. Thank you for catching that on the slide, I appreciate it.

BROTHERS: Did you say BASW in Social Work?

SCHROEDER: Yes.

GROSSMAN: Well, while we're waiting, does the CPE have any special position on funky and weird?

SCHROEDER: They did come out with new program approval process and our committee is looking at that tomorrow.

GROSSMAN: So you'll get back to us about it?

SCHROEDER: I will get back to you about

that.
MCCORMICK: We have a question.
SCHROEDER: Oh, sorry. Yes, sir?
TAGAVI: Can you show us the proposal,
especially like the number three? Kaveh
Tagavi, Engineering.
BROTHERS: I'm sorry, you need the proposal
on the screen?
TAGAVI: Yes.
BROTHERS: Okay, it's --
TAGAVI: Item number three on the
proposal.
BROTHERS: It's the same proposal that was
e-mailed out on Tuesday.
TAGAVI: Correct.
SCHROEDER: What's your question? I have it
pulled up here.
TAGAVI: So I think that either A or B,
the answer is no, but when I read the
title of the question, it implies those
are the rules. How can --
SCHROEDER: There can be an exceptions
to the rules and so they asked for an
exception to the rule. That was their
explanation --
TAGAVI: Where does it state there could
be an exception to the rules?
SCHROEDER: I do not have the rules in front
of me, so I do not know the answer to
that question.
BROTHERS: Which question specifically was
it?
TAGAVI: Number three.
SCHROEDER: It's 3B. It says
undergraduates must have satisfied all UK
core requirements prior to applying the
proposals marked no --
BROTHERS: If you look in the Senate rules
about University Scholars Programs, the
language in the Senate Rules says
undergraduates should have satisfied. So
the question on the form was change to be
a must and if they answer no, then that's
allowed in the Senate Rules because
Senate Rules indicate should, not must.
SCHROEDER: So their explanation was while
most applicants will have completed the
UK core, there may be one or two who have
a remaining class. I do not anticipate
this happening frequently. That was what
was written in terms of 3B. SAPC felt
that satisfied the requirements for the
University Scholars programs.
MCCORMICK: Other questions? So the motion
from the committee is that -- it doesn't
need a second -- that we approve the
establishment of a new University
Scholars Program of a BASW in Social Work
and an MASW in Social Work within the
College of --
BROTHERS: Yes, the language on this slide
is wrong, but it will be the BASW and
MASW.

WOOD: It's a bachelor of Social Work.
BROTHERS: Yes, my apologies. I only changed it on the first slide and not this slide, but dually noted.

MCCORMICK: Thank you, Connie. All right. I assume you're voting. Motion passes.

SCHROEDER: So this for another University Scholars Program. It is for both the BA and BS. I'll talk about them both together, but they will need to be voted on separately since they are a -- Connie, you're shaking your head?

WOOD: (Inaudible).

DR. SCHROEDER: We're going to vote on them separately today, how's that? Okay? This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new University Scholars Program, BA Linguistics and MA Linguistic Theory and Typology within the Department of Linguistics within the College of Arts and Sciences.

MCCORMICK: We don't need a second. Conversation, discussion? One of the members of the Linguistics Department is here in case you have a question other than for Margaret.

And here's the motion, that we approve the establishment of a new University Scholars Program with a BA in Linguistic (inaudible) -- the BA in Linguistics and the MA Linguistic Theory and Typology within the Department of Linguistics within the College of Arts and Science.

UNIDENTIFIED: So I'm sorry, we're voting for both of these?

SCHROEDER: We're going to vote on them separately, yes.

MCCORMICK: Just the first one.

SCHROEDER: This is just the first one; the BS with be the next motion.

MCCORMICK: This passes. All right, the second motion.

SCHROEDER: The recommendation is that the University Senate approve the establishment of the new University Scholars Program, BS Linguistics and MA Linguistic Theory and Typology within the Department of Linguistics in the College of Arts and Sciences.

MCCORMICK: Thank you.

SCHROEDER: Okay. So this is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the suspension of admission into an existing graduate program, Clinical Research Design in the Department of Preventative Medicine and Environmental Health within the College of Public Health. So as you saw from the rationale, this program has perpetually

low enrollment. There are three students currently in the program, two, they hope will graduate this next month, and then one the following year. If the suspension is approved students will be notified they have five years to complete the program before the program is closed. This came out of an analysis that the College of Public Health did on all of their programs.

MCCORMICK: There's no second. Discussion?

TAGAVI: Can you please show the -- the proposal on the screen so I can ask a question? I recall somewhere it says, Katherine, that a student will be told they have to finish in five years otherwise the program will shut down.

SCHROEDER: It's closed. The program was closed.

TAGAVI: I said shut down, my apology. So I think that's one of the rule, that you could finish your master's in eight years, and even then you could ask for an extension of, maybe, two years. I'm speaking totally from memory. If that is correct, I don't think we could shut it down or close it down in five years. It has to be at least eight, perhaps ten.

MCCORMICK: So I know that Margaret had Mia Alexander Snow, who represents the (inaudible) on the committee. Do you recall this discussion?

SCHROEDER: Yes. When a proposal or when a program is suspended, according to SACS and CPE definition, the program becomes closed if there's no admissions in five years.

MCCORMICK: So suspended and then closed.

SCHROEDER: It's not actually deleted yet. That's actually another process.

TAGAVI: So perhaps there's a difference between suspending admission and suspending this program. I appreciate SACS rule (inaudible), it's not in front of me. I am familiar with UK rule. UK says eight years. There -- there could be a student right now who needs an absence, a legal absence, they're not taking courses. Having been told that you have eight years to finish this --

SCHROEDER: That's not the --

TAGAVI: -- that seems to be in contradiction with the five year.

SCHROEDER: That's not the case for this one student or either of these three students, but --

WILLIAMS: Sir, I am one of the directors of Graduate Studies for the MPH program, which is identical, so I just wanted to clarify the --

BROTHERS: Your name, please.

WILLIAMS: Corrine Williams, Director of Graduate Studies, College of Public

Health.

The graduate school indicates that the students have up to six years, and beyond that point, the extensions are at the discretion of the director of Graduate Studies to start that process. And so we only have to allow the student six years, given they're already in one that's five years, will take that student through the full time that's allocated to that by University rules. Just to clarify those graduate school rules.

MCCORMICK: Yes?

TAGAVI: I'm sorry. So there are three students who are currently enrolled. How many students are not currently enrolled?

SCHROEDER: I do not know the answer to that question.

MCCORMICK: That's the motion, we'll vote. Senate approve the suspension of admissions into the existing MS in Clinical Research Design in the Department of Preventative Medicine and Environmental Health within the College of Public Health. All right, motion passes.

SCHROEDER: I'm making sure this is the right one. All right, this is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the suspension of admission into an existing graduate certificate program, Clinical Research Skills within the Department of Preventative Medicine and Environmental Health within the College of Public Health.

There are -- have never been any students admitted to this graduate certificate. So, again, this came out of their analysis of their programs and there was communication with the College of Medicine to insure that they weren't deleting a program that would be of interest to College of Medicine students or that would be of interest for College of Medicine to host. So it was determined there was none. Having no students in the graduate certificate program, they're asking to suspend admissions into it.

MCCORMICK: Any discussion? Hearing none, you're free to vote. Senate approve the suspension of admissions into the existing graduate certificate in Clinical Research Skills. This motion passes.

SCHROEDER: This is our final item for old business. This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the suspension of admission into an existing undergraduate program, BS Philosophy in the Department of Philosophy within the College of Arts and Sciences.

This was a clean-up from a few

years ago in terms of changing or when the reforms in general education (inaudible) by 120 hours happened. Very few majors have ever pursued the BS, most opt for the BA. The BA option still exists. So this is, again, a clean-up. Questions?

MCCORMICK: This needs no second. I'm hearing no discussion. Move to vote that the Senate approve the suspension of admissions into the existing undergraduate program, BS in Philosophy in the Department of Philosophy in the College of Arts and Sciences. This passes.

And I appreciate those of you who were on the agenda -- two meetings -- two meetings ago. That's why these are old business, because we brought them to you earlier, but we did not have a chance to get to them. So thank you, Margaret, and thank you, faculty, for coming back.

UNIDENTIFIED: Cultural (inaudible) and Linguistic graduate certificate?

BROTHERS: It's underneath of this.

BROTHERS: I think you skipped (inaudible). This is (inaudible). If you want to talk about it, I'll build a slide.

SCHRODER: Okay. We have lots of programs today. Next on the agenda is the graduate certificate for Teaching in Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Classrooms. This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new graduate certificate, Teaching in Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Classrooms in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction within the College of Education.

I failed to provide a rationale for the program and I terribly, deeply apologize. So I will briefly describe it. It's the student population and people of educational settings is changing rapidly and classroom teachers must adapt to meeting the learning needs of increasingly diverse students they teach.

The program wants to develop teachers competencies for working with culturally and linguistically diverse students and families. And the certificate will help answer the call through district schools and individual educators to increase their preparation.

The courses and experience take a comprehensive approach to supporting English learners and other historically under-represented populations by addressing aspects of cultural and linguistic diversity across the curriculum within a regular classroom context.

UKsenate4-17-17.txt

It's a 12 credit hour program. And the faculty of record is drawn -- it's an interdisciplinary effort with faculty of record drawn from the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Modern and Classical Languages, Literatures and Cultures, and Educational Policy and Evaluation. This is posted online on the agenda, so if there is any questions. . . .

- MCCORMI CK: Any discussion?
- NOLAND: Is this different --
- BROTHERS: I'm sorry, name, please?
- NOLAND: Melody Noland, Education. Is that different in -- than teaching a program in Teaching English as a Second Language?
- SCHROEDER: Yes.
- NOLAND: It is different?
- SCHROEDER: Yes.
- MCCORMI CK: There's the motion. You're free to vote. Senate approve the establishment of a new graduate certificate in Teaching in a Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Classroom. (Inaudible). Motion passes.
- UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible).
- MCCORMI CK: Yes, this comes from Margaret's department and so the motion from the committee is that the Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the deletion of an existing Bachelor's Education, Secondary Education, Science Education in the Department of STEM Education within the College of Education. This comes from the committee. It needs no second. Discussion?
- GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Trustee. Is there a rationale for deleting a degree in Science Education?
- SCHROEDER: Yes, the rationale is attached on there. But this is an old program that didn't lead to anything. There was no certification. And we have an undergraduate certification program that is actually a double major in Education in the content area such as Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Math, Science, et cetera. So this is a program that, again, did not lead to anything, students would have to go and take an additional (inaudible) master's degree program to get a certificate and our students did not want to do that.
- MCCORMI CK: Any other questions? So you're free to vote on the Senate's (inaudible) for submission to Board of Trustees, deletion of an existing program, the Secondary Education, Science Education in the Department of STEM Education within the College of Education. Looks like everybody's voted. (Inaudible) motion

passes.

The second is that the University approve, for submission of the Board of Trustees, the deletion of an existing program in Secondary Education, Mathematics Education in the Department of STEM Education within the College of Education. And I'll ask the proposer to share the rationale for (inaudible).

SCHROEDER: Same thing, (inaudible) mathematics.

MCCORMI CK: Any others? I'll ask you to vote on this motion, that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the deletion of a program in Secondary Education, Mathematics Education within the Department of STEM Education within the College of Education. And it looks like this one passed.

SCHROEDER: All right, this is a recommendation that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new MS degree, Sport and Exercise Psychology in the Department of Kinesiology and Health Promotion within the College of Education. The rationale is attached. It's a popular field that's growing rapidly and this addresses that need.

MCCORMI CK: Discussions? Do they have interdisciplinary support?

SCHROEDER: The College of Public Health is aware of this, in support of this as well.

MCCORMI CK: Discussion?

UNIDENTIFIED: College of Health Sciences.

SCHROEDER: College of Health Sciences, I apologize.

MCCORMI CK: You're free to vote that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new program, Sports and Exercise Psychology. (Inaudible). It looks like you voted, 72-2, the motion passes.

SCHROEDER: We've been very busy on our committee. This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the suspension of admission into an existing graduate program certificate in Maternal and Child Health in the Department of Epidemiology in the College of Public Health. Again, this comes out of a college wide program review that they had, and this certificate had continuous low enrollment and there are limited resources for offering it. So they're asking to suspend its admissions.

MCCORMI CK: Admission?

SCHROEDER: Admission into, thank you.

MCCORMI CK: Discussion? You're free to vote the University Senate approve the

suspension of admissions into the existing certificate in Maternal and Child Health. This passes, 72-2.

SCHROEDER: This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the suspension of admission into an existing graduate program, Master of Mining Engineering in Mining Engineering in the Department of Mining Engineering in the College of Engineering. The program is not currently being used. There are no students in the program. They currently use their MS, so there is still a tract for their students to get a master's degree, and that's the most accepted tract in their field.

WOOD: It won't fit on the transcript.

GROSSMAN: I do have a question. Did I hear you just say Master of Mining Engineering? Is that different from an MS or should this be an MA?

SCHROEDER: No. It is actually an MME.

GROSSMAN: MME? Okay.

SCHROEDER: Yes.

GROSSMAN: And that's different from the MS?

SCHROEDER: That is different from the MS. I verified it twice myself.

MCCORMICK: Any further discussions? You're free to vote to approve the suspension of admission into the existing minor, Masters of Mining Engineering and Mining Engineering in the Department of Mining Engineering.

SCHROEDER: So College of Public Health has been very busy. This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new University Scholars Program, BPH Public Health and MPH Public Health within the College of Public Health. It passes.

Again, they did a college wide review. This came out as something that they felt strongly in that could help increase the numbers in their program and something that they -- they wanted to do and have the resources to do. So questions about that one?

MCCORMICK: Doesn't need a second.

Discussion? All right, you're free to vote on the establishment of a new University Scholars Program in Public Health within the College of Public Health. This passes as well.

SCHROEDER: All right, last one. This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new BA Dance in the Department of Theater and Dance within the College of Fine Arts.

So this was kind of a fun one in seeing it grow from grassroots. They created a minor several years ago. It's

increased rapidly in terms of the number of students enrolled. They had enough interest from their students that they created a BA, and they anticipate that it will grow rapidly to 50 dance majors in two or three years -- two to three years.

The program is purposely set up to allow for a double major, as many of their students like to couple the minor in dance and they wanted to -- the ability to double major if they wanted to do the major. So it was purposely created that way.

MCCORMICK: Nancy's here in case there are questions? Discussion? Okay, you're free to vote on the submission to Board of Trustees the establishment of a new BA Dance in the Department of Theater and Dance within the College of Fine Arts. It looks like we have approved this motion. We'll carry it forward to the Board of Trustees. All right, Scott.

YOST: Thanks, Margaret, for --
MCCORMICK: Warming up the audience?
YOST: Warming up the audience. So we

have a couple proposals before the Senate. The first one is some changes in the Ph.D. program in Economics. It had some curricular changes that -- you saw the rationale of the committee. They changed the admissions from the qualifying (inaudible).

Just to give you the overview, they also changed some courses with the economics, kind of, going more towards (inaudible) and quantitative issues that they wanted to change a few of the classes and -- to address the shift in the discipline. And then more specifically, when it comes to the qualifying exam, they wanted the flexibility. They have six programs (inaudible) and they wanted the flexibility for some of the programs to go beyond just having a qualifying exam, written exam. They wanted to have the ability to require a field paper from the students as well.

And so within six areas, there was one area that all the faculty would like to have that done, another area didn't want to have papers involved, which is why it's an option and not a requirement across the program.

The committee was concerned about different standards, so certainly they're aware of that, but, in general, the committee felt that it's their program and they can try to ensure the uniformity of standards, certainly, within an area. And then outside the area, but within the program, they are just going to do what they can do.

MCCORMI CK: This is from committee, doesn't need a second. Discussion? I'm hearing no discussion. You're free to vote. The Senate approved the changes to the committee (inaudible). Motion passes by majority.

YOST: So the second item (inaudible) the second item is a proposal that comes from the (inaudible) College and Engineering, and that is given the -- the background is given the CPE mandate (inaudible) 120 hour maximum credit hours for graduation, with a few programs that are allowed a 128 hour exception, and certainly in some of the STEM areas where we have an increasing upward pressure on the number of credit hours per -- towards graduation, most notably in the College of Engineering, we have some programs that, I mean, varies from 128 to 135, I believe. The majority of them have more than 128, so the request was given the mandate from the CPE and the constraints of our accrediting agencies, that the free elective that is now one of the four graduation requirements become -- free elective be an option rather than a mandate. And so you still have the four components in the graduation requirements, but the fourth component being defined as free elective as now just defined as elective.

So the free elective can still be satisfied -- we can still satisfy that, but the programs would have a mandatory elective somewhere. It could be a directive elective or a restrictive elective, but they do have an elective. So I can't think of other than that, so I guess questions --

MCCORMI CK: I would share that Associate Dean Anderson met with the other associate deans on January the 25th. They were all unanimous agreement that (inaudible) so she had support of her peers (inaudible).

YOST: I do have to say one thing though, that the Senate Council made a change to this and it wasn't from the amendment. But do we -- does this -- technically coming from Senate Council rather than committee, so it would need a motion and a second. Because there was a minor edit on dealing with the definition.

BROTHERS: It was the last sentence of the --

DR. YOST: Yeah.

BROTHERS: Do you want me to change this?

MCCORMI CK: Yes. And what you sent out has that change, right?

YOST: It has the change. What you -- what you have in front of you has the

complete recommendation, plus the Senate Council fingerprint change. And so since the -- so now that we need a motion and a second (inaudible) so that -- okay.

MCCORMICK: Kaveh?
DR. TAGAVI: So we used to have free elective and free elective was defined in the glossary and I hope you could show that proposal so everyone could see. Now we don't have free elective anymore, we have elective, but ironically, in the glossary, we have free elective. You are not defining elective, so this is just a minor technicality. You need to change the glossary from free elective to elective.

YOST: No, we -- we still have the -- we still have free elective in the Senate rules.

TAGAVI: You don't.
YOST: We do. Actually, in 5.4.3.4, where we have -- it was defined as free elective. In there we said it's elective, but within that description -- because many programs have the word free elective in their program curriculum outline, and so in there they say, the free elective may still be used to satisfy this elective and the free elective is defined in the Senate rules. So --

TAGAVI: Elective is not. An elective is one of the options now.

YOST: Yeah. Well, elective is never defined, but we could add a definition if you wanted.

TAGAVI: That's what I'm saying.
YOST: Do you have a proposed wording for the added definition?

GROSSMAN: Could I suggest that he provide that to you by e-mail?

YOST: Okay.

MCCORMICK: Is that satisfactory? Any further discussion? You have the change (inaudible). You're free to vote. The motion passes.

YOST: The last item we have here is a proposal from some changes in the BS in Human Health Sciences, a little bit of clean-up, a little bit of adding some tracks. So, basically, what they're doing is because of some of the changes in Statistics, I think -- Connie, corrected me last time, I think they dropped STA 296 and they wanted to add the different STA's that are actually now available in a particular track. They also added three tracks, (inaudible), Occupational Therapy, and Optometry. In table two it -- it shows the structure of the requirements and the electives and what classes are which for the different tracks and so that was the

fundamental changes, I think.
(Inaudible) you wanted to add here?
Anything else you wanted to add here?

UNIDENTIFIED: No. Those are the major changes.

MCCORMICK: (Inaudible) needs to be. I think you've been present for a number of these meetings for this work, thank you. You're free to vote. Motion passes.

UNIDENTIFIED: Is somebody's button switched that we have to have one or two all the time?

MCCORMICK: So this is an opportunity, we seldom have this opportunity to ask if you have any agenda items that you'd like to raise on the floor and that you're dying to discuss. Remember that we don't vote on these. These are not part of our agenda, but we (inaudible) or I'll entertain a motion to adjourn. Yes, Davy?

JONES: Actually, in the Open Meeting's Law (inaudible) that we cannot act unless it's on the agenda, only in the cases of special meetings.

MCCORMICK: Thanks, Davy. Other comments?

YEAGER: Motion to adjourn.

MCCORMICK: There's a motion to adjourn, a second?

MCGILLIS: Second.

MCCORMICK: Let's vote. I think I got your vote. Thanks so much and see you in May.

* * * * *

The meeting adjourned at 4:37 p.m.

* * * * *

C E R T I F I C A T E O F S E R V I C E

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY)
COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

I, LISA GRANT CRUMP, the undersigned Notary Public in and for the State of Kentucky at Large, certify that the facts stated in the caption hereto are true; that I was not present at said proceedings; that said proceedings were transcribed from the digital file(s) in this

UKsenate4-17-17.txt

matter by me or under my direction; and that the foregoing is a true record of the proceedings to the best of our ability to hear and transcribe same from the digital file(s).

My commission expires: April 6, 2019.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 4th day of June, 2017.

LISA GRANT CRUMP
NOTARY PUBLIC,
STATE-AT-LARGE
K E N T U C K Y