

Senate Council Minutes  
April 26, 2004

The Senate Council met on Monday, April 26, 2004 at 3:00 pm in the Gallery of the W.T. Young Library and took the following actions.

1. Approval of the Minutes from April 19, 2004

Tagavi requested some editorial changes. Ms. Scott agreed to correct them. The minutes were approved, as were the minutes from April 5, 2004.

2. BSN specialty track for students with a previous bachelors

The Chair thanked the representatives from Nursing for attending. Ms. Scott explained the multiple errors that occurred in the processing of the proposal and apologized for not catching the errors sooner. The Chair explained there had been some consternation among the Senate Council members over the publicity the program received despite the lack of Senate approval. Cibull asked if a routing sheet accompanied the proposal. Chard agreed that a routing sheet should be required. Tagavi suggested the signature page was a type of routing sheet. Cibull suggested informing the program that a routing sheet was required.

The Chair introduced Dorothy Brockopp, Joanne Davis and Carolyn Williams from the College of Nursing. Brockopp said part of the problem in the lack of Academic Counsel of the Medical Center (ACMC) approval was a result of the short time-frame in which the new specialty track was proposed and approved and added Nursing did not consider the proposal to be a program change.

Debski noted that when the courses associated with the program changes were submitted the box regarding the applicability of the courses to a change in program should have been checked to effect a de facto program change. Debski suspected Nursing was under the impression that since the content of the courses in question had not changed then there was no program change. Brockopp agreed that perhaps Nursing had taken the definition of a program change too literally.

Cibull made a **motion** to approve the proposal and Chard **seconded** the motion. Debski noted there were some courses missing on the form posted on-line. Ms. Scott will find a higher quality PDF file and repost the form. Debski also noted the form contained the changes in question in addition to other program changes as well. Davis said she had attempted to include multiple changes on a single form. Debski expressed concern that the ACMC may not have been aware of that. Cibull suggested combining the approval of the two program changes. Debski said it should be noted somewhere that the approval was inclusive of two program changes rather than one. Brockopp asked the Council members of guidance on how to proceed.

The Chair suggested making the approval of the proposal as specific as possible to avoid further confusion. Debski suggested e-mailing the members of the ACMC to inform them that two program changes were on the same form. Chard and Cibull

agreed, and Cibull suggested the approval be circulated with references back to the recent and relevant course changes. Chard suggested approving the program change in acknowledgement of the associated course changes. Cibull reiterated the need to e-mail the ACMC members about this issue.

Tagavi asked if the faculty of the college had voted on the proposal. Williams replied they had voted on the proposal at a meeting. Brockopp added that the college faculty's approval had been unanimous.

Ms. Scott will post a corrected version of the proposal on the Senate web site, complete with an explanation that the approval of the proposal would stand as approval of both program changes and acknowledging the course changes have already been approved by the Senate. The Chair will e-mail the ACMC to inform them of the posting and their chance to object during the ten-day circulation process.

### 3. Web focus group

The Chair introduced Renee Siegel from the UK Development Office and thanked her for attending to seek faculty input on the redesigned UK home page. Siegel asked the Council members to indicate their initial reaction to the design of the page. The Council members provided Siegel with a variety of substantive and editorial suggestions. Siegel agreed to investigate, but suggested the comments would carry most impact if indicated on the survey forms provided to the Council members. After further discussion the Chair agreed to contact the chair of the committee in charge of web changes to determine if links to Service (inclusive of Agricultural Extension Services), Calendar/Bulletin, and Governance could be included somewhere on the home page, in addition to determining if the order of items on the navigation bar could be altered to de-emphasize athletics.

### 4. Reappointment of Academic Ombud

The Chair noted the recent receipt of a communication from David Royse indicating his interest to serve a second term as Ombud. Chard made a **motion** to recommend Royse as Ombud for a second term. Kennedy **seconded** the motion. The Chair asked how the Senate Council could obtain a realistic view of whether or not the incumbent Ombud had performed well, for future cases. Cibull noted the Council members had not heard complaints from students and should conclude the incumbent was doing a good job. The motion **passed** without dissent. If the Provost concurs, Royse will be appointed as Ombud for another term.

### Other Business:

The Chair described a petition to exercise a repeat option after graduation recently received by the Senate Council office and asked the Council members for direction. The Council members discussed the pertinent Senate Rules and notices in the Bulletin. Both the Chair and Edgerton noted precedent for denying this type of petition. After further discussion Kennedy made a **motion** to approve the student's petition. Bailey **seconded** the motion. Chard spoke against the motion, noting the inherent liability incurred by granting the petition in relation to other students whose petitions had

previously been denied. Two voted in favor of the motion, with seven opposed. Tagavi abstained and the motion **failed**. Kaalund suggested the existing rule is too liberal. Tagavi suggested the rule should be revised. Saunier suggested the Chair should write to the Deans and ask them to specifically state information about deadlines to file repeat option on the application for degree forms. The Chair agreed to notify the Deans of the recent situation, the precedent established by the Ombud's Office and the Senate Council, and to ask the Deans to help publicize the existing rules. The Chair noted the need to examine the pertinent Senate Rules to determine if any adjustments are necessary.

#### Announcements:

The Chair reminded the Council members and breakfast with the Provost the next morning and suggested enrollment management as a topic of discussion.

The Chair informed the Council members of a recent conversation between himself and Chair-elect Yanarella regarding the annual evaluation of the President. The Chair suggested asking the opinion of the faculty prior to the end of the semester. The Chair will use last year's commentary model to solicit opinions from the faculty via a broadcast e-mail.

#### Other Business:

Grabau suggested the proposed Graduate Certificate in Cognitive Sciences was complex enough to require the attention of the Senate Council. Ms. Scott explained that Grossman, chair of the Academic Programs Committee, had informed her that his committee would not meet again during the Spring semester. Grabau suggested inviting Sandy Goldberg, progenitor of the graduate certificate, to the next Senate Council meeting to discuss the proposal. Ms. Scott agreed to invite Goldberg.

Debski expressed concern for the continuing phenomenon of students being admitted to programs that had not yet received Senate approval. Debski asked if programs were provided with guidelines on how long the approval process might take. Ms. Scott explained that timelines were difficult to project since both college councils and Councils of the Senate sometimes take longer than expected to approve proposals. Kennedy reiterated his e-mail suggestion that students be informed by the programs in writing that they have been admitted to a program that had not officially been approved by the Senate. Debski suggested reminding departments that programs should be approved before the admission process begins. Cibull said the departments could begin admitting students to the programs, or advertising for admission, but that enrollment of students would not serve as an explanation as to why a program or college should be approved.

Kennedy suggested involving the Administration in the conversation in the hope that they would inform the Deans of the need to be more cautious on this front. Bailey hoped to find a solution that would avoid causing pain for the students. Jones said he understood the intention was to specific the situation to students in future cases, not the current Nursing situation. The Chair suggested discussing the situation during the upcoming breakfast with the Provost. The Council members agreed.

Jones informed the Council members of a recent e-mail he received from an irate faculty member who was upset that two of the recent recipients of the research professorship were leaving UK without fulfilling their final year of obligation to the University. Debski asked if the award could be revoked. Tagavi noted the awards had been used during the current academic year. Jones asked how they could be held to their last year of service. Tagavis suspected the might not be stopped from leaving short of the institution filing suit.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:39.

Respectfully submitted by  
Jeff Dembo, Chair

Members present: Bailey, Chard, Cibull, Debski, Dembo, Edgerton, Grabau, Jones, Kaalund, Kennedy, Saunier, Tagavi, Yanarella.

Guests present: Brockopp, Davis, Siegel, Williams.