

Senate Council
April 4, 2011

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, April 4, 2011 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Hollie I. Swanson called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:07 pm. The Chair suggested that the SC first handle the agenda items for which guests had attended and then move to the other agenda items. There were no objections.

3. Committee Reports

Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) – Dan Wermeling, Chair

a. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Public Health Management

James Holsinger (Public Health/Preventive Medicine and Environmental Health) expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to talk about the proposed Graduate Certificate in Public Health Management. Guest Holsinger added that it had been wending its way through the approval process for about two and a half years, but that the delay had not been in the Office of the Senate Council. The Chair explained that the SC had been looking into the curricular approval process recently and invited him to offer any feedback he would like.

Holsinger said that he was chair of the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) in the College of Public Health (PbH) and as such, saw all the proposals in PbH. He said that the AAC purposely set up meetings to they occur one week before PbH's faculty council meeting, and as a consequence things move quickly through the Health Care Colleges Council (HCCC). He said that the biggest problem is having to call one person after another to find out where a proposal is. The day's proposal, however, had sat between the AAC and faculty council for a year. In February of 2010 he was told that the proposal was at the Graduate Council (GC). Holsinger received a call in December 2010 about a GC meeting for the graduate certificate, and after it was approved by the GC in February, it moved expeditiously through the Office of the Senate Council to present. Holsinger added that he worked closely with Wermeling on questions from the SAPC on the proposal and incorporated the requested information.

Holsinger opined that there could be a use for not having to send a proposal to both the HCCC and GC – perhaps there would be some [health care colleges] proposals only reviewed by one council. He thought there was some redundancy in the system. When he began the process of creating the Graduate Certificate in Public Health Management and courses, some faculty were loathe to start due to the long time it takes to receive final approval.

Anderson commented that the SC was working on a curriculum tracking system, with an expectation of implementation for fall. It would digitize and automate some aspects of the curricular approval process. There were a few more comments about the matter.

Holsinger then explained the proposal for a new Graduate Certificate in Public Health Management and answered a question.

The Chair stated that there was a **motion** on the floor from the Senate's Academic Programs Committee to approve the Graduate Certificate in Public Health Management with a positive recommendation, pending resolution of the three clarifications. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Lean Systems

Guests Arlie Hall (EN) and Phil Marksberry (EN) were introduced. Hall explained the proposal for a new Graduate Certificate in Lean Systems.

The Chair commented that the proposal came before the SC during the prior year, and asked for additional information. Hall explained that the year before, the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Lean Systems was to be housed in the Center for Manufacturing academic unit. The day the center was done away with was almost exactly the day the SC reviewed it. Hall said it would have been inappropriate to vote on the graduate certificate when its home academic unit was no longer an academic unit. The faculty of the Department of Electrical Engineering unanimously voted to be the home academic unit for the Graduate Certificate for Lean Systems. After a few questions, Hall and Marksberry departed.

Wasilkowski asked about review by the SAPC – he is a member of the committee and did not recall seeing it. Mrs. Brothers explained that the SAPC reviewed the proposal during the 2009-2010 year, and sent it forward with a positive recommendation. After the SC approved it to be sent to the University Senate (Senate), EN called and asked that it be tabled. When the issue of the home academic unit was resolved, it came back to the SC for a final review before being sent to the Senate.

Provost's Liaison Greissman offered a clarification about the Center for Manufacturing. He said it lost its faculty, and was being reinvented. It had never been permissible for a center to be the home academic unit of a graduate certificate.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion from the SAPC to approve the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Lean Systems, and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

It was agreed that both proposals will be effective fall 2011.

2. Old Business

f. Proposed Changes to Administrative Regulations 6:10 ("Hazing")

The Chair reminded SC members of the process explained the previous week by Marcy Deaton (Associate General Legal Counsel). In response to the Chair, Guest Deaton said that she was presenting the proposed changes to *Administrative Regulation 6:10* to solicit comments from SC members. In response to Grossman, she explained that the language had been changed from its last version in response to concerns that it was overly broad in some areas. Guests Keith Ellis (assistant dean of students) and David Lowe (Interfraternity Council) answered questions along with Deaton. Wasilkowski pointed out a missing "to" in *AR 6:10 V.C* (should read "...is expected to report the activity...") and suggested the removal of "through the University's procedures" in *V.E*.

SC members discussed the proposed changes to *AR 6:10*, as well as whether or not the Senate should also see it for comments. After answering questions, Deaton, Ellis and Lowe departed.

Grossman **moved** that the SC recommend that the Senate endorse the proposed changes to *Administrative Regulations 6:10* and Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair commented that there had been instances in which discussions amongst the SC on the listserv had been forwarded to individuals not on the listserv. The Chair added that if it happened again, she would not use the listserv in the future. There was a brief discussion about the listserv and its membership. Mrs. Brothers explained that all SC members were subscribed to the listserv, including the faculty trustees and student representatives. She said that neither she nor Greissman were subscribed.

Turning to the celebration of President Todd's presidency, the Chair asked Kirk to explain the festivities and Kirk did so.

5. Discussion on May Commencement: Summer Graduates and College Recognition Ceremonies

The Chair offered some background information on the semi-recent changes to commencement, including the new December commencement. Those present introduced themselves.

Jeannine Blackwell, dean of the Graduate School and head of commencement activities, offered SC members some information on the upcoming spring Commencement. She and Pat Whitlow (AFFILIATION) answered a few questions.

The Chair suggested Guest Ken Troske (BE/Economics) explain his rationale for attending, and he did so. Essentially, the Division of Economics has always been able to give students who will graduate over the summer with a PhD the opportunity to participate in commencement activities in the spring, before actually completing the degree. He said that had changed this year, and he was unable to discover the rationale behind it, either in the Senate discussions on changes to commencement, or in UK's regulations. Faculty in Economics want to continue their tradition and would like to know from whence came the directive that prevents them from hooding doctoral students under the expectation that they will be completing in a few months. The Chair opined that perhaps the question that SC members needed to answer involved who would have the authority to make such a decision.

SC members at length discussed the symbolism of hooding, the need (or not) for a uniform policy, and the pros and cons of allowing the hooding of doctoral students who had not yet completed their requirements, but were expected by the faculty to do so over the summer.

Grossman **moved** that the SC recommend strongly that the PhD candidates (or other candidates for degree conferred by the Graduate School) who have either successfully defended their dissertation or those who receive permission from the majority of their graduate committee members be allowed to participate in hooding ceremonies. Wasilkowski **seconded**. There was additional discussion among those present. If approved, the policy would be made effective immediately. Grossman **revised his motion** to include the phrase that "a student should only be able to proceed through a graduate ceremony only once for each specific degree." Wasilkowski **agreed** to the amendment.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** that the SC recommend strongly that the PhD candidates (or other candidates for degree conferred by the Graduate School) who have either successfully defended their dissertation or those who receive permission from the majority of their graduate committee members be allowed to participate in hooding ceremonies and that a student should only be able to proceed through a graduate ceremony only once for each specific degree. The motion **passed** with one abstaining.

After a few additional comments, the Chair thanked Dean Blackwell for her work on the commencement ceremonies.

1. Minutes and Announcements, continued

The Chair commented that the Old Business items b (“Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 1.3.3.A* (“Senate Council Chair”)”) and c (“UK Athletics Association - General Discussion”) never seemed to be taken up during SC meetings, and suggested that they be taken up during one of the summer retreats. There were no objections from SC members.

d. Senate Award

Anderson offered information about the new Outstanding Senator award.

e. Evaluation of the President - Wasilkowski

SC members discussed the annual evaluation of the president. Wasilkowski said that his colleagues would like to see another evaluation of President Todd conducted. Grossman opined that since President Todd as leaving as of June 30, another evaluation was not productive. Other SC members expressed their opinions on the matter.

Wasilkowski **moved** that the SC conduct an evaluation of President Todd by the entire faculty. The motion **died** for lack of a second.

4. UK May 2011 Degree List

Grossman **moved** that the elected faculty senators approve UK’s May 2011 list of candidates for credentials, for submission to the Senate and then through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Yanarella **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair offered another announcement – the Board Chair discussed with her the possibility of Presidential Search Committee members being allowed to participate in the Board of Trustees’ final deliberations on a new president. The Board of Trustees did ultimately vote to approve such an arrangement.

There were additional comments about an evaluation of the president. The Chair suggested that the SC develop metrics for faculty input into the president’s performance during a retreat **[AI]**.

6. Tentative Senate Agenda for April 11

The Chair explained that the presentation on the faculty perspective would be first, and then the Board Chair will have about 10 minutes for a presentation on “The Presidential Search.” There were a few comments about the proposed agenda.

Grossman **moved** to approve the tentative Senate agenda for April 11 and Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. SC members then agreed to some additional reorganizing of the agenda.

There being no further business to conduct, the meeting was adjourned shortly after 5 pm. [The Action Items are a part of the minutes, but fall at the end.]

Respectfully submitted by Hollie I. Swanson,

Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Blonder, Grossman, Kelly, Kirk, Peek, Randall, Swanson, Thelin and Wasilkowski.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guests present: Jeannine Blackwell, Marcy Deaton, Keith Ellis, David Lowe, Arlie Hall, Jim Holsinger, Phil Marksberry, Ken Troske and Pat Whitlow.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, June 14, 2011.

#	√	Item	Responsibility	Completed
5.		SC subset to examine and revise the description of the administrative coordinator's job duties with a view towards increasing compensation. (7/14/10)	Grossman, Chair	
20.		Charge Senate's Academic Programs Committee with creating processes for substantive change issues (teach-out, contractual/consortium process, off-campus sites, how to reopen a suspended program). (8/23/10)	SC	
26.	√	Query VP IRPE Connie Ray about number of administrators at UK vs. benchmark institutions. (9/20/10)	Mrs. Brothers	2/1/2011 & 3/28/11
31.		Ask the Provost to submit a statement of financial and administrative feasibility for proposals prior to the proposals being sent to cmte. (10/4/10)	Greissman/SC	
36.	√	Send solicitation for Commencement Cmte Co-Chair to college associate deans. (10/18/10)	Mrs. Brothers	04/2011
40.		Draft changes to <i>Senate Rule</i> language on Senate meeting attendance policies for review by SC. (8/30/10 & 11/15/10)	Chair, Steiner	
42.		Discuss with the Provost the method of allocating resources from distance learning courses. (11/15/10)	Chair	
44.		Create ad hoc committee (perhaps with VPR and Provost) to look at what constitutes an administrative or an educational unit, and if there is a continuum or a sharp difference. (11/22/10; 12/6/10)	Chair, SC	
46.	√	Discuss election of officers, specifically who is eligible to cast votes. (12/6/10); Solicit opinions from the Senate. (2/28/11)	SC	05/2011
48.		Create a charge for a committee to review DL courses. (12/6/10)	Chair, SC	
53.		Investigate "Quality Matters" WRT distance learning courses. (1/10/11)	SC	
57.		Look into creating a Senate committee on assessment. (1/31/11)	SC	
59.	√	Invite Board of Trustees members and chair to April "State of Faculty Affairs" address. (1/31/11)	Mrs. Brothers / Chair	03/2011
60.		Deliberate during summer retreat(s) on what the SC's strategic vision is for academic facilities. (1/31/11)	SC	

62.		Determine how to address the issue of the proportionate representation of appointed Board of Trustees members. (2/7/11)	SC	
63.		Invite UofL employment ombud to SC meeting after joint ombud cmte visits the University of Cincinnati. (2/21/11)	Mrs. Brothers	
65.		Invite Associate Provost for Undergrad Ed to offer "State of Undergraduate Education" address to Senate. (2/21/11)		
66.		Invite Associate Provost for Academic Affairs about distance learning courses. (2/21/2011)	Mrs. Brothers	
65.	√	Query Connie Ray to explain use of CIP codes for courses and faculty. (2/28/11)	SC	03/2011
66.		Develop metrics for faculty input into president's performance during summer retreats. (4/4/11)	SC	