

Senate Council Minutes
October 30, 2006

The Senate Council met at 3:00 pm on Monday, October 30, 2006 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were conducted by a show of hands unless stated otherwise.

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 pm, when a sufficient number of Senate Council (SC) members had arrived to attain quorum. The Chair noted that Baxter, Grabau, Greissman, Waldhart, and Yanarella each had let the Office of the Senate Council know that they would be unable to attend the day's meeting. The Chair noted that he would specifically abstain from all votes so that his vote would be reflected in the quorum.

1. Minutes from October 23 and Announcements

Randall noted that Waldhart should have been listed as present for the October 23 meeting. With that, the minutes were approved as modified.

The Chair announced that due to Jones' resignation from the SC, a new SC liaison to the Graduate Council was needed. Thelin confirmed that he was willing to serve, but noted that the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) also regularly met on Thursday afternoons, an appointment he had to continue to keep. Lesnaw **moved** that Thelin be appointed to as liaison to the Graduate Council. Odoi **seconded**. The motion **carried** with four in favor and two abstaining.

Regarding the discussion on the SC listserv about the use of leaf blowers on campus, the Chair shared that President Todd responded somewhat positively to the concern expressed in the letter and had sent the issue to Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration Frank Butler to look into. The Chair said that because he had been copied on the communication, he could respond in a variety of ways.

Lesnaw acknowledged strong feelings about the use of leaf blowers. She **moved** that the SC send a letter to President Todd affirming the concern of the Senate Council; supporting the views expressed in the original letter; and thanking the President for taking immediate, positive action by referring the issue to appropriate VP and Physical Plant Division individuals. The Chair interjected that he would be meeting with the President during the following week, if there was a desire that the issue be discussed in person. Lesnaw said she would prefer a letter so that it could be forwarded to the unnamed letter writer. Randall **seconded**.

In response to a question by Odoi, the Chair explained that he and Provost Subbaswamy had been carbon copied on a letter from a medical doctor to President Todd stating that using leaf blowers: caused a distraction from

teaching and research; increased allergens and animal fecal particles and other bacteria blown into the air; were not healthy; and used unnecessary energy. The Chair said the letter, which mentioned that two other major universities were taking steps to avoid using leaf blowers, asked President Todd to address the issue. Odoi then asked how the leaves would be disposed of. Lesnaw said that the leaf blowers did not eliminate leaves, but rather stirred up leaves and relocated them. She said she was astonished that a program such as the Wellness Program did not take advantage of the natural exercise involved in raking leaves. She said that removing leaf blowers from UK would probably result in more manual labor. Harley added that the larger tractors, even those with a catcher bin on the back, still blew debris into the air while it sucked the leaves up. Lesnaw said that it should only address leaf blowers, the concern expressed in the letter from the unnamed faculty member.

Theilin said that as an individual, he agreed that leaf blowers were an irritant. The SC, however, had to deal with a large number of items related to curricular and educational policy, those types of issues being of the utmost importance. He did not think an issue such as the use of leaf blowers fell under the SC's purview. The Chair added that Michael had expressed a similar sentiment on the SC listserv. Theilin said he did not think it appropriate for the SC to discuss, although he agreed with the sentiment. Randall said that it was necessary to prioritize issues to be addressed.

Randall **called the question**. Debate ceased. A **vote** was taken and the motion to stop debate **passed** with four in favor, one against and one abstaining.

The Chair called for a **vote** on the motion that the SC send a letter to President Todd affirming the concern of the Senate Council; supporting the views expressed in the original letter; and thanking the President for taking immediate, positive action by referring the issue to appropriate Physical Plant Division individuals. The motion **failed** with two in favor, three against and one abstaining. Randall said that the Chair could still mention the issue to the President at their meeting.

The Chair said that there was one last announcement, that of a search committee for a new dean of the College of Design. He said that he would write to that college's faculty council or equivalent and solicit names for possible membership on the search committee; he thought asking the entire Senate might be throwing the net a bit too wide. He said he could also ask the Design senator, but also requested suggestions from SC members. Harley said that the President's Commission on Women and the President's Commission on Diversity might be interested in making a suggestion. The Chair wondered if those two groups might be reached through the President, but said he could ask.

2. [Nursing Program Deadline Change](#)

The Chair said that the proposal was fairly simple and invited Joanne Davis to say a few words. Guest Davis said that a little over a week ago, an increase and doubling in the enrollment of the College of Nursing (CON) undergraduate program was approved and now ready to be announced. She said that the process of culling 250 applicants to 160 accepted students could not be done in a timely fashion if the May deadline remained.

The Chair apologized for not having introduced SC members. Those present introduced themselves.

Davis clarified for Odoi that the deadline would move from May 1 to March 1, moving ahead by two months. She said it would be effective immediately, for the Spring 2007 semester. Randall wondered how the new deadline would be announced. Davis replied that it would be posted on their website, and that 95% or higher of their applicants were from UK. She said that if they encountered a situation with a late application, they would work with the applicant. She said that such accommodation was done regularly, and would continue to be done so long as the interviewing process was still going on. Odoi asked why the deadline was being moved. Davis said that faculty members needed to be on site for the interviewing process, but as ten-month faculty, the majority left at the end of May, leaving insufficient Nursing faculty on campus to process applicants. Moving the deadline ahead would allow time in March and April for faculty members to interview and select applicants.

Randall **moved** that the Senate Council authorize the College of Nursing to move their deadline for applications to the undergraduate program from May 1 to March 1, with the proviso that exceptions to the deadline be made to applicants as appropriate, effective immediately. Harley **seconded**. Odoi said that it was important that students be appropriately informed of the change. Davis said that upon approval of the change, the information would be placed on the CON website, which was the primary source of information about the Nursing program, as well as in print materials. Dembo asked how the doubled enrollment would be accommodated. Davis said that it was being worked on: teaching sections would be doubled, larger classroom sizes were being negotiated; modifications to the process of placing students at clinical sites were being developed; and faculty were being recruited. She noted that it had created quite a bit of activity in the college.

A **vote** was taken on the motion that the Senate Council authorize the College of Nursing to move their deadline for applications to the undergraduate program from May 1 to March 1, with the proviso that exceptions to the deadline be made to applicants as appropriate, effective immediately. The motion **passed** with five in favor and one abstaining. A discussion among SC members and Davis began regarding the importance of a timely approval for the CON and the appropriate method of official approval. The Chair said that the proposal could: be approved by the University Senate (Senate) at the regular meeting in about two weeks; be

approved by the Senate via a 10-day web posting; or be approved by the SC acting on behalf of the Senate. Davis shared that Dean Kirschling was waiting to send out a press release to announce the doubled enrollment until the deadline was officially changed. The weightier part of preparation involved printed material, although posting the information on the website would also need to be done. Lesnaw said that two weeks of additional time to learn about the changed deadline would be better for students.

Lesnaw **moved** that the Senate Council, finding the matter urgent enough to waive the *Senate Rule*, acted on behalf of the Senate to approve the deadline change from March 1 to May 1 for applications to the undergraduate nursing program, with the proviso that exceptions to the deadline be made to applicants as appropriate, effective immediately. Odoi **seconded**. Randall expressed a reluctance to act on behalf of the Senate unless the situation was urgent. Odoi said that students needed to be given as much time as possible to learn about the date change. Dembo pointed out that given the concerns raised in the past about lowered nursing enrollments, the Senate would likely approve a deadline change, which would support increased enrollments. In addition, there would not truly be a waiver, since the *Senate Rules (SR)* stated that the SC could act on behalf of the Senate in curricular matters. (The motion was then amended to reflect that authority.)

A **vote** was taken on the motion to state that the Senate Council considered the matter of deadline change to be urgent enough to act on behalf of the Senate, so long as the Senate would be notified of the approval at the next meeting. The motion **passed** with five in favor and one abstaining. Mrs. Brothers said she would carbon copy Davis in the email alerting the Registrar to the changed date.

3. Process of Approval of Curricular Items

The Chair asked for the guidance and counsel of SC members regarding how curricular items should be approved. He said that for the past several years, the practice had been that if an item was routed to a Senate committee, it would then go to a live Senate meeting. If the item did not go to a Senate committee, it would be placed on a web transmittal for a 10-day review. The Chair asked SC members to determine which should be followed: the current practice, as described; or the strictures outlined in the *SR*. The issue could also be sent to the SREC to review. Mrs. Brothers shared that late in the Spring 2006 semester, a Senate transmittal was posted with a broken link. A query was made about the broken link long after the end of the 10-day Senate review time frame, indicating that no senators had looked at the item with the broken link.

After being invited to share past experience, Dembo said that he and Ms. Scott, the previous Administrative Coordinator, had looked into similar concerns. Dembo wondered if revising the process so that the Senate was not involved in the final approval of certain items would be giving away the responsibility and authority for review, or if it would merely reflect a realistic assessment of the lack

of Senate-level review of web transmittals. Odoi asked about current practice. The Chair said that for the past few years, if a proposal was reviewed by a Senate committee, it would then go to a live SC and then a live Senate meeting. Otherwise, it would be approved via a “lack of objection” from a web transmittal.

Randall **moved** it should be sent to the SREC for review. The Chair said that the SREC would need to be told if the request was for an interpretation of the current practice, or if they should offer a proposal and codify it. Randall stated that the SREC should offer a recommendation regarding what process should be followed. Odoi **offered an amendment** to state that the SREC should codify current practice. Randall **did not accept** the change. Lesnaw **seconded**. Randall said that the current practice was not effective and that it should not be used as a guideline. He said the SREC should come up with a procedure that effectively meets obligations for curricular reviewers.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to ask the Senate’s Rules and Elections Committee to create a proposal for a *Senate Rule* regarding the process of approval of curricular items. The motion **passed** with five in favor and one abstaining. The Chair said that current practice would be followed until the SREC put forward a proposal for change.

The Chair said that the Graduate Certificates (grad certs) on the agenda were all leftovers from Graduate School Dean Blackwell’s recent visit. A few more proposals were found and were being presented to the SC.

4. Historical – [Graduate Certificate in Orff-Schulwerk](#)

The Chair explained that the grad cert had been approved by the Graduate Council (GC), but never by the SC or Senate. Technically, the proposal had been sent by the GC and might not need a motion for approval, but the Chair requested a motion for approval to be on the safe side.

Randall **moved** to affirm the Graduate Certificate in Orff-Schulwerk and send to a live Senate meeting with a positive recommendation. Odoi **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with five in favor and one abstaining.

5. Historical – DISCUSSION ONLY – Graduate Certificate in Developmental Disabilities

The Chair said that the Graduate Certificate in Developmental Disabilities was [approved by the SC on 8/13/01](#). As was the then-current practice, the approval was announced at a subsequent Senate meeting. In order to obtain official Senate approval, though, the grad cert should be sent to the Senate. There was a problem with the original proposal transmitted from the GC, though – it was far too brief to be considered a complete proposal ready for review.

The Chair inquired as to the appropriateness of offer a more complete proposal to the Senate for approval, which could be [found on the Graduate School’s](#)

[website](#), instead of the very brief, one-paragraph description originally sent by the GC. Odoi **moved** thusly. Lesnaw **seconded**.

In response to a question from Randall, the Chair shared that during Blackwell's first visit to the SC on 8/28/06, the SC had voted to affirm all the grad certs in which students had been and currently were involved. Any actions taken would not affect past or current students working toward a grad cert.

A **vote** was taken on the motion that the Senate review for approval not the original transmittal from the Graduate Council on a Graduate Certificate in Developmental Disabilities, but rather the complete proposal currently on the Graduate School website. The motion **passed** with five in favor and one abstaining.

6. Historical – Graduate Certificate in Reproductive Laboratory Sciences

The Chair explained that the grad cert had been [approved by the SC on 4/1/02](#), but did not receive Senate approval, similar to the explanation given about the Grad Cert in Developmental Disabilities.

Lesnaw **moved** that the Senate review for approval the Graduate Certificate in Reproductive Laboratory Sciences as outlined in [the description of the certificate on the Graduate School website](#). Harley **seconded**. There was a brief discussion about the content of the guidelines on the Graduate School site. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with five in favor and one abstaining.

7. Historical – Graduate Certificate in Environmental Sciences

The Chair said that this grad cert required both SC and Senate approval. The description of the grad cert in the transmittal from the GC was insufficient for review purposes, so he was requesting that the current guidelines as posted on the Graduate School website be used.

Harley **moved** that the Senate Council approve the Graduate Certificate in Environmental Science [as described by the Graduate School website](#). Odoi **seconded**. The motion **passed** with five in favor and one abstaining.

8. Extend Tenure Clock for Adoption/Birth DRAFT – Judy Lesnaw

The Chair invited SC member Lesnaw to offer information about the agenda item. Lesnaw shared that Dean Hoch, College of Arts and Sciences, put together a committee to address issues of concern to women in the college. The Women Faculty Advisory Committee, College of Arts and Sciences (WFAC) subsequently began work on a proposal to extend the tenure clock for faculty for birth and adoption of a child. She said that the policy was purposely not restricted to females to aid in competitiveness in hiring. Lesnaw said that women, particularly, were at a tremendous disadvantage when it came to taking care of a new child and working toward tenure. She said that many benchmarks offered a voluntary one-year extension of the probationary period of the tenure clock. It was

discovered, though, that requiring faculty employees (at other institutions) to request the extension caused concern that the request for an extension would be held against them, so the policy was not taken advantage of. Princeton University and the Universities of Michigan and California enacted automatic extensions, to remove the stigma of having to request the extension.

Lesnaw said that the WFAC brought this proposal to the SC for suggestions – the ultimate goal was a change to the *Administrative Regulations*, but the WFAC desired SC input before the proposal was finalized and ready for review. In response to the Chair, Lesnaw said that if SC members desired, they could discuss or offer input at a future time. The tenure clock extension would give UK a tremendous competitive edge in recruiting faculty.

Harley said that one possible omission pertained to individuals with legal guardianship rights, such as grandparents having been named the legal guardian of a grandchild, while the mother or father still held parental rights. Lesnaw acknowledged the omission and said it should be added in. Randall expressed some concern about the potential for abuse. He suggested requiring that the request should be made within one month of birth or adoption, and that it could not be taken advantage of during the terminal appointment year. Lesnaw said that language regarding the terminal appointment year was already in the proposal, but that a time frame was purposely not included. Randall said that in the current draft, someone could “use” the birth of a child three years previously to take an extension three years after the birth.

The Chair noted that according to the proposal, the faculty member did not have to be on leave in order to have their “tenure clock” extended. He opined the proposal would be improved if it stated that the parent of a new or adopted child, who was on leave, could be granted the extension. Lesnaw wondered if the faculty member would want to be on leave for the entire year’s extension. The Chair said that current *Governing Regulations* addressed various leaves. He also wondered if a male faculty member, who was married to a stay-at-home mom and has two children, would be eligible to take the extension if a third child were born. Randall said that he understood the stigma involved in requesting an extension; he said he disagreed with the extension being granted merely upon request – a confidential review of the request by a chair or appointed committee would be better.

Lesnaw said that the WFAC had indeed thought of loopholes. The desire was primarily to help women with children in their quest for tenure, but also applied the policy to males in the interest of fairness. She said that if both parents were faculty members at UK, only one would be eligible for the extension. She said she could not imagine requiring a one-year leave of absence for all the many individuals this would affect. The intent was that the faculty member would be relieved of teaching duties for semester, but still be held responsible for advising and research. She said she would bring the concerns raised back to the WFAC.

The Chair added that the proposal should apply also to librarian title series faculty. He also suggested rephrasing the text addressing the extension for twins or other multiple arrivals to improve clarity. Harley said that children who were born with exceptionalities might not exhibit those characteristics until after the month window for requesting the extension was past. She said the proposal could be strengthened with a less constrictive time constraint.

There being no additional discussion, the Chair said he would entertain a motion for adjournment. Lesnaw **moved** to adjourn and Odoi **seconded**. The motion **passed** with five in favor and one abstaining. The meeting adjourned at 4:24 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh Tagavi,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Dembo, Harley, Lesnaw, Odoi, Randall, Tagavi, Thelin.

Non-SC members present: Joanne Davis

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on October 31, 2006.