

Senate Council
January 31, 2011

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, January 31, 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 3:04 pm.

The Chair asked SC members to offer their perspectives on the past Friday's open forums on the next UK president, sponsored by the Presidential Search Committee. The majority of SC members had no comment, and the others offered a variety of comments. There was also a discussion about the confidentiality of the presidential search process.

1. Minutes from January 24, 2011 and Announcements

The Chair suggested Smith explain his announcement, which he did. He explained that the Student Government Association would be holding a weeklong event to assist students with studying during the end of Dead Week and the middle of Finals Week. He said that faculty participation was greatly desired, and that he or Kirk would send out additional information as it became available.

Smith also said that he was also aware of the idea of a forum with the mayor. SC members offered some suggestions for the format and for future such forums with other individuals. The Chair said that she would solicit information from SC members again via email.

The Chair said that she was interviewed by a Kernel newspaper reporter, and was asked to participate in an on-air interview on February 9 on the topic of the Think 2.0 initiative. She said she would be out of town, and asked if any of the SC members were able to go in her place. There being no volunteers, the Chair said that she would solicit volunteers again via email.

Turning to Provost's Liaison Greissman, she asked if he wanted to offer a few comments. Greissman did, and explained that, with regard to the faculty incentive retirement program, at the time of the SC meeting he thought that the required waiver for phased retirement only addressed a waiving of rights pertaining to age discrimination, not a waiver of all rights. That belief fueled his suggestion that the faculty incentive retirement program use the phased retirement waiver be used as a template. Greissman explained that he was embarrassed to say that the phased retirement waiver was for all future rights, not just those related to age discrimination. Regarding the issue of process and timing of input, Greissman demurred comment, and said that Provost Subbaswamy could answer questions from SC members when he attends the February 28 SC meeting.

Grossman **moved** that the faculty ask the Administration to change both the waiver for the phased retirement and incentive retirement program, to restrict the rights that are waived to just the right to sue based on age discrimination. Wasilkowski **seconded**. After brief discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Grossman suggested that the Chair also convey a sense of the discussion and the SC's rationale. The Chair said that she would circulate a draft to SC members prior to sending to Provost Subbaswamy and President Todd.

Grossman **moved** to approve the minutes from January 24, 2011 as distributed, and Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no discussion, **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

2. Old Business

a. Action Items

In regards to action item number 35 (“Inquire about openness in the president search process.”), the Chair said that she did email the chair of the Presidential Search Committee, Jim Stuckert, and carbon copied the chair of the Board of Trustees, Britt Brockman, and asked about the confidentiality issue. About action item number 41 (“Discuss with Provost the possibility of an automatic leave of absence in the event there is a finding of procedural error in a promotion/tenure decision.”), the Chair reported that the Provost said that leaves of absence were granted on a case-by-case basis.

The Chair said that she emailed the comments from the University Senate-sponsored faculty forums on the next president to the reporters at the Herald-Leader, which was action item number 49 (“Send faculty presidential search forum comments to H-L.”). Regarding number 51 (“Invite COM Dean Emery Wilson to attend SC meeting before Feb Senate mtg to discuss the COM reorganization, & if there is a metric used to determine how research space is allocated.”), College of Medicine Dean Emery Wilson will attend the SC meeting on February 7, and also bring Associate Dean for Research Alan Daugherty, to discuss the policy on space allocation. The Chair commented that she also informed the faculty of the biochemistry department faculty.

2. Preliminary Discussion on the Need for a Senate Assessment Committee

The Chair opined that the SC needed to consider a Senate committee on assessment. She said that the current processes regarding assessment were not faculty driven, but rather an administrative response to SACS (Southern Association for NAME). Due to the length of the day’s agenda, she suggested that the SC revisit the issue in the future **[AI]**.

3. Proposed Expedited Gen Ed Program Change Process

Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mike Mullen explained the proposed waiver of *Senate Rules 3.2.0*. Grossman **moved** to waive *Senate Rules 3.2.0* for the narrow purpose of allowing degree programs to convert from the old University Studies Program requirements to the new Gen Ed requirements. Kirk **seconded**. It was decided that an additional field would be added to the proposed form, to show where extra hours for the degree program go if there are credit hours left over.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee

i. Proposed Suspension of Minor in Agriculture

The chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), Wermeling, explained the proposal. Guest Larry Grabau also answered a few questions by SC members. Wermeling brought forward the motion from the SAPC to approve the proposal to suspend the Minor in Agriculture and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation. He noted that the committee approved the proposal unanimously. After some additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Teaching Nursing

Wermeling explained the proposal for a new Graduate Certificate in Teaching Nursing, and Guest Sherry Warden NAME? answered a question. Wermeling brought forward the motion from the SAPC to approve proposed new Graduate Certificate in Teaching Nursing and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation. There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iii. Proposed Suspension of Masters in Civil Engineering

Wermeling explained that there was no demand for the degree. He brought forward the motion from the SAPC to approve the proposal to suspend the Masters of Civil Engineering and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation. There was no discussion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iv. Proposed Suspension of Master of Arts in Distributive Education

Wermeling suggested that the contact person for the proposal to suspend the MA in Distributive Education. Guest Robert Shapiro explained that the department was eliminated in 1995, and there were no faculty or space in which to teach the courses. There being no substantive discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3.b. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee

i. Proposal to Create Undergraduate Certificates

It was explained that committee chair Alison Davis was out of town, but did not want to delay the proposal's forward movement. Since the Undergraduate Council did much of the work regarding the requirements for undergraduate certificates in spring 2010, Mullen agreed to explain the proposal to the SC, and he did so.

There was quite a bit of discussion regarding how a minor differs from an undergraduate certificate.

Grossman **moved** to recommend the Senate approve the proposed rule language regarding undergraduate certificates, and Steiner **seconded**. There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Grossman **moved** that the appropriate Senate committee be tasked with defining minors and undergraduate certificates and decide whether they should be distinct or overlapping definitions. Wasilkowski **seconded**. Steiner opined that the language of the motion was too vague. Wermeling offered a friendly amendment that the appropriate committee recommends definitions for a minor versus an undergraduate certificate. There were some additional comments, and Mrs. Brothers explained the history of the undergraduate certificate proposal.

Grossman **withdrew** his motion, with the approval of Steiner, who had **seconded** the motion. There were a few additional comments, including Mullen's statement that the Undergraduate Council had been looking at the issue of undergraduate certificates for quite some time, and could continue to do so if so charged by the SC.

Yanarella **moved** that the SC authorize the Undergraduate Council to continue to define and refine the distinction between an undergraduate certificate and a minor. Grossman **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed with none opposed**.

3.c. Senate's Academic Facilities Committee – John Rawls, Chair

i. Building Priorities Report

Guest John Rawls offered an extensive report on the recent activities of the Senate's Academic Facilities Committee (SAFC) and its participation in Provost Subbaswamy's request for input on the formulation of the biannual capital project request. There were a few comments.

Grossman **moved** that the SC accept the Senate's Academic Facilities Committee's report on UK's biannual capital project request, and forward the report to the Provost with a cover letter from the Chair. Nokes **seconded**.

Steiner suggested that the report be posted online **[AI]**. Kelly asked for clarification regarding what the SC hoped would happen upon submission of the report. During the discussion, SC members complimented and expressed gratitude toward the SAFC for its work. After some discussion, SC members offered the following ideas: invite Rawls to present the SAFC's report to the Senate in April as part of the State of Faculty Affairs; invite Board of Trustees members to attend, including Chair Britt Brockman; ask the Provost for information on how he used the SAFC's report; and spend time during the next summer retreat on strategic planning and the SC's strategic vision about UK's academic facilities **[AI]**.

After additional discussion, Rawls commented that the SAFC was acutely aware that their study of building priorities was rather superficial, due to the short time frame, so the SAFC felt somewhat soft about the actual building recommendations. The procedural recommendations were included because SAFC members had stronger feelings about those.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** that that the SC accept the Senate's Academic Facilities Committee's report on UK's biannual capital project request, and forward the report to the Provost with a cover letter from the Chair. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. Additional Charges to Senate Committees - Educational Policy

The Chair suggested that the chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, Davy Jones, explain the aspects requiring consideration by some body of the Senate, which he did. There were some questions and comments from SC members.

It was ultimately determined that the Senate's Academic Programs Committee and the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee would meet in the near future and invite Jones, who would offer background information and brief committees on the scope of the aspects requiring consideration. The two committees will then deliberate on how much they can reasonably accomplish, and the SC will develop a specific charge to each committee **[AI]**.

7. Proposed Changes to Senate Rules Pertaining to Honorary Degrees

Jones explained the proposed changes to various sections of the *Senate Rules* that pertain to honorary degrees. He said that there was no loss of any faculty control over the process. The essential changes are allowing conferral of honorary degrees at both the May and December commencements and the cap on the number of honorees will rise from three to five, with the proviso that not all five honorary degrees can be given at any one commencement. In response to Grossman, Jones explained that the proposed language came from the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, which was asked to show language about what the changes to honorary degree rules would look like.

Grossman **moved** that the SC approve the proposed changes regarding honorary degrees the specific sections of the *Senate Rules* (Sections 5.4.0; 5.4.2.3.2.c; 5.4.2.3.C.1; 5.4.2.3.C.3; 5.4.5; and 5.4.5.A) effective fall 2010. Yanarella **seconded**.

Grossman explained that there were two extremely distinguished people coming to campus during the spring semester, but not during commencement. He said that the Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees proposed three nominees. If the Senate agrees that five is an appropriate number, now is an opportune time to have three nominees at spring commencement, and honor two other nominees during their visit to campus in the spring. If the Senate does not approve the changes, only the three nominees will be approved.

Thelin expressed strong concerns over the confidentiality of the honorary degree process, specifically why some SC members were aware of specific honorary degree nominees who were not selected by the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees (UJCHD). Greissman explained that the UJCHD sent the President a request that the two “other” nominees be recognized in some fashion, since they were not approved for an honorary degree, and suggested a presidential award. President Todd demurred, and contacted Provost Subbaswamy, who in turn passed the information on to Greissman. SC members and Guest Jeannine Blackwell (dean, Graduate School) engaged in a lengthy discussion regarding the proposed changes, as well as the two additional nominees.

After some time, a **vote** was taken on the motion that the SC approve the proposed changes regarding honorary degrees the specific sections of the *Senate Rules* (Sections 5.4.0; 5.4.2.3.2.c; 5.4.2.3.C.1; 5.4.2.3.C.3; 5.4.5; and 5.4.5.A) effective fall 2010. The motion **passed** eight in favor and one opposed.

8. Proposed 2011 Honorary Degree Recipients

Jeannine Blackwell, chair of the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees (UJCHD) shared the three nominees from the UJCHD. Included with the names were page-long biographies and the intended honorary degree type.

Grossman **moved** that the elected faculty senators approve the three honorary degree nominees, for submission to the Senate and then through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended three nominees to receive honorary degrees conferred by the Board. Kirk **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:17 pm.

[The action items are a part of the minutes, but fall at the end of this document.]

Respectfully submitted by Hollie I. Swanson,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Blonder, Grossman, Kirk, Peek, Smith, Steiner, Swanson, Wasilkowski, Wermeling and Yanarella.

Provost’s Liaison present: Greissman.

Guests present: Jeannine Blackwell, Larry Grabau, Davy Jones, Mike Mullen, Robert Shapiro and Sherry Warden.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, February 3, 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	
17.		Create web-based mechanism for faculty to offer input into the President's annual evaluation; evaluation process will occur during April. (8/16/10)	SC Anderson	
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	
27.		Send SC's spring evaluation of President Todd to all Board of Trustees members. Share SC's spring evaluation of President Todd with faculty members. Create numerical ratings for the Board's evaluation in early fall and submit those privately. (9/20/10)	SC	
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	
38.		Identify committee to review "graduate student/post-doc education and related issues." (11/15/10)	SC	
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	
43.		Send email to faculty, perhaps jointly with Provost, to explain the only circumstances under which a tenured faculty member can be dismissed as a result of reorganization (under KRS statutes, and in accordance with AAUP guidelines). (11/22/10)	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	
45.		Discuss the issues raised during the November 22 meeting regarding spring commencement ceremonies and whether college recognition ceremonies will continue. (11/22/10)	SC	
46.		Discuss election of officers, specifically who is eligible to cast votes. (12/6/10)	SC	

48.	Create a charge for a committee to review DL courses. (12/6/10)	Chair, SC	
50.	Ask Provost on 2/28/11 if there is a metric of square feet/funding used to determine how research space is allocated. (1/10/2011)	SC	
53.	Investigate "Quality Matters" WRT distance learning courses. (1/10/11)	SC	
55.	Collate and distribute SC members' responses to the Provost's response on cost-savings/revenue-generating ideas. (1/10/11)	Wasilkowski	
56.	Ask Provost how the funding from the bought-out tenure will be used on February 28. (1/24/11)	SC	
57.	Look into creating a Senate committee on assessment. (1/31/11)	SC	
58.	Post SAFC's report online; invite SAFC chair Rawls to offer the report during the April Senate meeting; query the Provost on how the SAFC's input was used. (1/31/11)	SC	
59.	Invite Board of Trustees members and chair to April "State of Faculty Affairs" address. (1/31/11)	Mrs. Brothers	
60.	Deliberate during summer retreat(s) on what the SC's strategic vision is for academic facilities. (1/31/11)	SC	