

Senate Council  
October 6, 2008

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, October 6, 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 3:07pm. He noted that there was not yet a quorum, but opted to begin with announcements.

1. Minutes from September 22 and Announcements

The Chair reminded SC members of the Stakes Reception, held jointly with the Staff Senate for the Board of Trustees. The reception was scheduled for Tuesday, October 14. (Woods arrived at this point, thereby achieving quorum.)

Regarding the minutes from September 22, Yanarella **moved** to approve them; Chappell **seconded**. There being no objection, the minutes from September 22 were **approved** as distributed.

There was some discussion about the Senate's Library Committee and a possible chair. This was followed by the Chair informing SC members of the consent agenda guidelines that were to be adopted by the Undergraduate Council. The Chair stated that if there any concerns, it would be appropriate to bring them up at the present time; SC members had no major objections to the guidelines.

The Chair reminded SC members of the proposal to create a new center, the Kentucky Center on Diabetes and Obesity (KCDO). He said there would be a request at the November 3 SC meeting that the SC waive review of the KCDO by the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC). In response to Aken, Provost's Liaison Greissman explained that the deliberate haste was due to a \$10 million grant that had already been awarded to the researchers in the center – there was an eagerness to be able to announce both the grant and the formation of the KCDO at once. He confirmed for Wood that the KCDO was being presented as a multidisciplinary center.

Greissman explained that it would be exceedingly difficult to find time for review by the SAOSC – the proposal was scheduled to be reviewed by faculty in the College of Medicine in mid-October, and the Health Care Colleges Council (HCCC) would be putting the KCDO on a 10-day review on October 22. Because there was a strong desire to see the KCDO approved by the Board of Trustees (BoT) at its December meeting, it would require Senate review at the November 10 Senate meeting. That meant there would be insufficient time between the end of the HCCC 10-day review and the November 10 Senate meeting for the SAOSC to conduct a traditional review. (Yanarella departed during the discussion.)

Wood expressed some concern that the KCDO could be perceived as only having had a thorough vetting on the medical side of campus; there would be no “main campus” review if deliberation by the SAOSC were to be waived.

It was determined that Greissman would provide the SC with an updated version of the proposal, which could be shared with the SAOSC. SAOSC, in turn, would be asked to conduct its review in parallel with that of the College of Medicine’s Faculty Council and the Health Care Colleges Council. The concurrent review would allow for a November 3 review by the SC, followed by a November 10 review by the University Senate (Senate) and review by the BoT in December.

There was additional discussion among a few SC members regarding what happened if a center was not functioning well and was nearing its end. Chappell commented that it would be beneficial for future proposals for centers to include information about evaluating the success of a center, which would help identify when a center was failing. In response to Greissman, Chappell made it clear that he did not wish for any additional information on KCDO, but explained that his comments were general in nature.

## 2. [Proposed Change to Human Resources Policy and Procedure 4.0 \(information only\)](#)

The Chair explained that the proposed change to Human Resources Policy and Procedure (HRP&P) 4 pertained to the formal classification of employees at UK as either “staff” or “faculty.” According to university regulations, if a faculty member spends more than 50% of his/her time in administration [as classified on the Distribution of Effort form (DOE)], that person is classified as “staff.” Additionally, the percentage of time attributed to administrative efforts on the DOEs of department chairs varied widely from department to department. The Chair explained that the proposed revision to HRP&P 4 would classify faculty with greater than 50% administration on their DOE as faculty employees, but would prohibit them from serving in the Senate or voting in faculty trustee elections.

Greissman explained that UK uses the Commonwealth of Kentucky’s definition of “faculty administrator” – faculty administrators are defined as those faculty employees at the level of department chair and above. He said that Provost Subbaswamy thought faculty serving in administrative positions should still be classified as “faculty,” yet it would not be appropriate for faculty in elected and representative positions to also have a responsibility of reporting to the administration.

SC members engaged in a lengthy discussion of the proposed changes. Comments were also made about UK’s current department chair system, and some areas’ possible adoption of an appointed departmental head system. Toward the end of the discussion, Greissman asked for some idea as to the SC’s opinion on the proposed change.

It was ultimately decided that Piascik, Swanson and Wood, along with Guest Jones, would convene as a small group to look into considerations of the proposed changes to HRP&P 4. The Chair asked that they report back to the SC on October 20 with their thoughts on the matter.

## 3. [Request for Rule Waiver: Senate Rules 5.1.8.5.A.2](#)

The Chair explained that a student who requested a retroactive withdrawal had done so outside the “two-year window” outlined in the *Senate Rules*. He directed SC members to the handout, which contained an explanation of the student’s situation. A brief discussion took place.

Chappell **moved** that the Senate Council waive *Senate Rule 5.1.8.5.A.2* (“two-year window”) for student PJ, as long as the case was heard by the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee by December 9, 2008. Aken **seconded**. There being no further comments, a **vote** was taken and the **motion passed** without dissent.

#### 4. September 2008 KCTCS Candidates for Credentials

The Chair requested a motion for SC approval of the September 2008 list of KCTCS Candidates for Credentials. Piascik **moved** thusly. Chappell **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** without dissent.

#### 5. Motion from SREC Chair – College of Agriculture Senate Elections

The Chair reminded SC members that as a result of an action by the SC during the spring semester, colleges had been given until September 30 to conduct their Senate elections. However, the College of Agriculture had not yet completed their election, but was prepared to do so in the coming days.

The Chair asked for a motion to allow the College of Agriculture until November 1 to complete its Senate elections. Anderson **moved** thusly and Piascik **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** without dissent.

#### 6. [Tentative senate Agenda for October 13](#)

SC members discussed the proposed Senate agenda for October 13, including the time that could be allotted to individual items. SC members had no objection to the proposed agenda, so the Chair determined it to be acceptable.

There being no further business to attend to, the meeting was adjourned at 4:26 pm.

Respectfully submitted by David Randall,  
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Aken, Anderson, Chappell, Piascik, Swanson, Wood, Yanarella.

Provost’s Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guest present: Davy Jones.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, September 16, 2008.