

Senate Council
April 20, 2009

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, April 20, 2009 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired.

Due to a lack of quorum, the Senate Council (SC) members who were present discussed various aspects of the day's agenda, but conducted no formal business. The Chair asked that SC member hold on to their handouts for the next meeting.

1. Minutes and Announcements

Provost's Liaison Greissman and SC members discussed [the proposed changes](#) to [Governing Regulations VII](#). Everyone present affirmed that the SC had seen the proposed changes previously, albeit in a different format, and there was no issue with stating that the SC endorsed the proposed changes.

7. [Update on Administrative Regulations II-1.0-1 \(Combined Version\)](#)

Greissman went over the proposed changes again with SC members. It was agreed that the proposed changes are ready to be reviewed and perhaps endorsed by senators at the May 4 Senate meeting. There was a brief discussion about what would happen under the revised regulations if a dossier were stopped between the time that the department chair solicits letters and the time that the dean receives it. There was disagreement between the SC and the Provost, as represented by Provost's Liaison Greissman, regarding the matter of tenure review. The SC reiterated its support for a change to the proposed language to allow an early tenure review dossier to be stopped at some point and not be considered the one comprehensive review. Greissman reported that Provost Subbaswamy was not inclined to change the language to allow that type of stop.

In addition, there was a general consensus that it was acceptable to continue the current practice of updating a dossier with new information during the period the dossier was being reviewed, such as a letter noting the award of a grant, etc.

8. [Strategic Plan 2009-2014](#)

The Chair asked Greissman to share information about the Strategic Plan 2009-2014 (SP). Greissman said that 28 pages of responses had been received. The input received will be discussed at the next UCAPP (University Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities) meeting (April 21), and will also be discussed at a UCAPP retreat on May 5. It was acknowledged that the UCAPP retreat discussion will occur one day after the Senate reviews the SP, but there was a general sense that it was unlikely that the document would change very much post-Senate meeting.

Steiner raised concerns about the need for increased facilities for the College of Arts and Sciences. Those present agreed that it would be appropriate to consider such language for inclusion in the SP. Greissman requested that Steiner send him some language that could be inserted in the SP and Steiner agreed.

9. [Planning for Senate Council Retreat](#)

Steiner reiterated his concern for additional resources for the College of Arts and Sciences. Greissman noted that the position of associate provost for undergraduate education would likely be permanently filled by July 1 – he suggested it would be appropriate to invite the person in that position to a discussion during the SC’s annual July/summer retreat.

Those present thought there should be an overall discussion of the undergraduate academic experience, which the Chair agreed to.

There was brief discussion regarding the Athletics Association and the amount of money donated by the Athletics Association to UK’s general scholarship fund.

Respectfully submitted by Dave Randall,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Aken, Anderson, Randall, Steiner, Tagavi and Yanarella.

Invited guests present: Doris Baker, Stephen Browning, Kim Campbell, Richard Kryscio, Marta Mendiondo and Sharon Stewart.

Provost’s Liaison present: Greissman.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, April 22, 2009.