

Senate Council
November 17, 2008

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, November 17, 2008 in 387 Ralph G. Anderson Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a voice vote unless indicated otherwise.

Chair David Randall called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:07 pm.

1. Minutes from November 3 and Announcements

There was some discussion among SC members regarding the recently approved Kentucky Diabetes and Obesity Center. Afterwards, the Chair said he would entertain a motion to approve the minutes.

Piasek **moved** to approve the minutes from November 3. Anderson **seconded**. There being no objections, the minutes from November 3 were approved as distributed.

The announcement regarding planning for the discussion of the General Education Initiative during the December Senate meeting was postponed until the convener of the Gen Ed Steering Committee (GERSC), Susan Carvalho, arrived.

The Chair asked for an update from Michael (chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee) regarding the recent nomination round for candidates for SC. Michael said that about 20 senators had made nominations and that he was in the process of ascertaining willingness to stand for election during the second round.

2. [Proposal to Expand University Scholars Program](#)

The Chair asked Graduate School Dean Blackwell to explain the proposal. Guest Blackwell did so, noting that the first page of the proposal contained the actual edits to the Graduate School Bulletin language. After Dean Blackwell's explanation, she answered a variety of questions from SC members.

Wood suggested that the words "or professional" be removed from the language on the first page of the proposal – Dean Blackwell agreed. Wood also noted that language in an earlier version of the proposal (on page six) referred to something that "goes into effect in Fall 2007" – it was determined that the action had indeed taken place, so the tense of the wording should be changed. Dean Blackwell agreed to that change, as well. There were no further questions, so the Chair thanked Dean Blackwell for attending and she departed.

Swanson **moved** to approve the proposal to expand the University Scholars Program to doctoral students with both incorporated edits and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation. Aken **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** without dissent with six in favor.

3. Request for Rule Waiver: Senate Rules 5.1.8.5.A.2

The Chair explained that students were required to submit an application for a retroactive withdrawal to their dean's office within two years of the last day of classes for the semester for which the withdrawal was requested. The item before the SC was a request to waive that portion of the *Senate Rules (SR 5.1.8.5.A.2)* for student PB-80. There was some discussion among SC members regarding the request.

Piascik **moved** to waive *Senate Rule 5.1.8.5.A.2* ("two-year window") for student PB-80, so long as the case is heard by the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee by December 9, 2008. Anderson **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** without dissent, with six in favor.

There was extensive discussion after the vote. The Chair said that anyone who voted in favor of the proposal had an opportunity to change their vote if so desired. No one indicated a desire to do so.

4. Proposed Rule Change: Senate Rules 1.2.2.1 ("Elected Faculty Membership" - CTS Apportionment)

The Chair invited Michael to explain the proposed change. Michael explained that the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) codified the limitation on how clinical title series (CTS) faculty would be counted for apportionment purposes, up to 25%.

There was extensive discussion among SC members – some believed the proposed text meant one thing, and others believed the proposed text meant something different. The SC asked the SREC to revisit the proposed language to ensure it would be clear to everyone.

5. Proposed Rule Change: Senate Rules 5.3.1.2 ("Prohibition of Duplicate Credit")

Michael explained that the only change was deleting the word "successfully." He noted that the intent of "successfully" was to describe completion of the course and receipt of any grade, but that many other individuals had understood "successfully" to mean receipt of a passing grade.

Piascik **moved** that the Senate Council approve the proposed change to *Senate Rules 5.3.1.2* and send the proposal to the Senate for a positive recommendation. Anderson **seconded**. There was brief discussion as to whether or not the proposal required Senate review, since there was no change to the original intent as approved by the Senate. It was subsequently agreed that Senate review was unnecessary. Piascik **revised her motion** to move that the Senate Council approve the proposed change to *Senate Rules 5.3.1.2* on behalf of the Senate. Anderson **did not object**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** without dissent with seven in favor.

December Senate Meeting: Gen Ed Planning

SC members engaged in a discussion with the GERSC convener, Susan Carvalho, regarding how best to organize the second reading discussion of the Learning Outcomes. The collegial discussion lasted quite awhile.

Ultimately, SC members agreed that the Learning Outcomes (LO), incorporating any revisions as of the November 17 "first reading" before the University Senate, should be sent to senators in late November

(but prior to the normal distribution of agenda materials). Senators will be asked to send comments on the LO in writing to the Office of the Senate Council by noon on Monday, December 1. The SC will review the objections and determine if the LO proposal is ready for review by senators, or, conversely, if the LO proposal should be returned to GERSC for revisions before a second reading and vote before the Senate. If the SC decides that the Senate will review the LO, senators will receive a final version of the LO on December 2. Senators will also have access to rationales from GERSC regarding each objection, although it is possible the rationales will not be ready until the meeting date.

Wood **moved** to approve the plan as discussed. Aken **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** without dissent with seven in favor.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:57 pm.

Respectfully submitted by David Randall,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Aken, Anderson, Michael, Piascik, Randall, Swanson, Tagavi, and Wood.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guests present: Jeannine Blackwell, Joe Quinn.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, November 19, 2008.