

Senate Council Minutes  
January 23, 2006

The Senate Council met on Monday, January 23, 2006 at 3:00 pm in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired.

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 pm.

1. Minutes from January 9 and Announcements

Hobson noted that she should have been listed as present on January 9, and Jarvis should not have been. With that amendment, the minutes were approved.

The Chair informed the Senate Council members (Council members) that agenda item number six ("Graduate Certificate in Public Health Nursing") would be deferred until a future meeting.

Referring to the changes to the *Governing Regulations (GRs) Section XI*, the Chair noted that although a revised draft was scheduled to be discussed at the Board of Trustees (BoT) meeting on January 24, it was his hope and expectation that the revised version would accommodate differing points of view before the BoT made its final vote. Tagavi asked if the Senate Council (SC) would be able to review the version after the wording was finalized for the BoT. The Chair stated that it would return for review through action either by the Office of the Provost or by the Chair putting it on the agenda himself.

2. Board and Senate Degree List

The Chair asked Jones for a brief introduction of the degree list. Jones noted the circumstances surrounding the two names, which had been left off the list approved in December by the University Senate (US). Moore **moved** to approve the two names; Lesnaw **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

The Chair noted that this was Randall's first SC meeting, and welcomed him accordingly.

Dembo asked if there was anything he needed to report on behalf of the SC to the BoT for the meeting on January 24. In response to Jones, he stated the BoT would hear the first reading of the proposed changes to *Section XI* of the *GRs*, and that the Finance Committee would be in a closed session to discuss a donation. Moore added that the proposed name change for the College of Agriculture was not on the agenda. Dembo said it was due to scheduling issues.

3. Review of Non-Commissioned Ad Hoc Committees

The Chair stated his primary concern was with those committees that had not yet started their work, especially the Nominating Committee (NC). He noted Jones was the only Council member on said Committee. The Chair asked for volunteers. In response to Baxter, Jones explained that the SC regularly

received requests for names of individuals to serve on various University of Kentucky committees. He said the NC would be responsible for collating and bringing to the SC's attention possible names for submission.

Tagavi **moved** that the Nominating Committee be made up of Jones, Baxter and Randall and should provide the SC with a statement of charge as soon as is reasonably possible. Grossman **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

The Chair moved discussion to the Committee on Committees (CC). He explained that the impetus behind the motion to create the CC was that the present committee structure of the US might not be well aligned with new and developing issues at UK; the present structure could benefit from careful review. He noted no names had come forth despite calls, and said he was looking to the SC for direction. Jones asked if there was a way to involve current committee chairs. The Chair noted his approval of such an avenue. To clarify, he stated the CC would be expected to review the committee structure of the US. It was suggested that the US committee chairs be invited to discuss the possible membership of the CC.

Dembo noted four important reasons for the CC to begin its work: eliminating nonfunctioning or unnecessary committees; whittling the number of committees could energize remaining committees to play larger roles; ways could be found to ensure committees could have appropriate levels of Administration and student input to correspond to the committees' respective foci; and updating and modernizing the committee structure would ensure committees' charges are aligned with UK's administrative hierarchy.

In the absence of a motion on the floor, the Chair stated he would take the SC's suggestions and convene a meeting of as many University Senate committee chairs as possible. He planned to indicate to them the impetus and charge for serving on the team to decide on the membership for the CC. He asked about requiring a deadline. Grossman suggested the ideas be sent forth as they percolated up.

The Chair asked for clarification from Council members about the impetus behind the Senate Council Operations Procedures Committee (SCOP), since he was not present when SCOP was created. Grossman recalled that the purpose was to regularize and write down the operating procedures of the SC and offer guidelines on topics such as the issue of authority of opinions on the SC listserv. Jones agreed. Tagavi stated he had noticed that on websites for bodies (similar to the SC) at other institutions, handbooks are available. He noted that there were certain things the SC decides to do that never go to the US. He recalled when the SC decided, for example, that when input was solicited from the SC on *Administrative Regulations* or *GRs*, the US must also weigh in on the issue, if time permits. Tagavi opined that a SC handbook would not need to be approved by the US since the purpose would be to memorialize current procedures.

Moore added that it would be beneficial to keep the number of committees to a minimum. The Chair suggested SCOP would need, at a minimum, to go back and look at several years of minutes to find guidelines that have been codified in the minutes. Jones suggested past chairs Moore and Dembo and the current Chair (Yanarella) and the Chair-Elect (Tagavi) start the process. Michael suggested that instead of another committee being utilized, the Rules & Elections Committee (R&E) could address the issue. Tagavi stated he agreed with Moore and Michael's comments, and added that he would consider Michael's comments as a friendly amendment so that the R&E committee could send an email to the four individuals identified for a review of policies, and then the R&E Committee could incorporate those policies into the *Senate Rules*.

Tagavi **moved** that the Rules & Elections Committee solicit from appropriate Senate Council members the past practices of the Senate Council; codify and collate said practices; identify the areas in which the Senate Council should have a process in place; and submit these items to the Senate Council for review. Grossman **seconded** and suggested a **friendly amendment**, which Tagavi accepted, to dissolve the Senate Council Operating Procedures Committee. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

The Chair indicated the other committees on the list were somewhat different from the others just discussed. Grossman stated the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee had not met since the University Senate passed the policy. He added that there is an established committee of the Undergraduate Council that is now in charge of that curriculum. Grossman said the Academic Offenses Committee was essentially finished but suggested waiting to dissolve it until after the next US meeting. Tagavi said the issue of dissolving ad hoc committees was something that should be codified by the R&E committee.

Tagavi **moved** to dissolve the ad hoc Writing Across the Curriculum Committee. Baxter **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Tagavi noted his hope that the SC would not have to dissolve every ad hoc committee created. Grossman said that someone needed to declare when the committee's work is finished. Tagavi suggested that an ad hoc committee's creation would be accompanied by wording to allow for dissolution upon completion of the work.

The Chair moved to the issue of the Calendar Committee (CaC) and stated he wanted to reactivate it, since there was prevailing interest last semester to revise the University Calendar to expand the Thanksgiving Break to a full-week break.

Tagavi stated that he had received representatives from the Student Government Association (SGA) in his Ombud Office who presented to him a proposal to

change the way dead week and finals week are scheduled; he asked the Chair what to do with their proposal. The Chair stated it should be sent to him.

Grossman asked who initiated the proposal. Hobson explained the issue had arisen during the last SGA election and that it was a collaborative effort. In response to a question by Grossman, the Chair said the student member of the CalC had graduated. Grossman suggested Hobson serve. The other members of CalC were the Chair (Yanarella), Larry Grabau, Michael Kennedy and Don Witt.

Discussion then focused on the progress of CalC last semester. Moore stated the committee had made significant progress toward arranging for a full week's break at Thanksgiving, and doing away with the one-day break in October. The Chair added that the work stalled once the scope of concerns launched into the Spring and Summer calendars, but that CalC could focus on the Fall semester and build on that.

The Chair stated he would revisit the issue with Council members within two weeks regarding any need of the reconstituted committee. He suggested formally adding Hobson to ensure SGA representation. Jones so **moved**. Jarvis seconded. Discussion of the motion consisted of Grossman ascertaining from Hobson that she was willing to serve. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

The Chair asked about the status of the Enrollment Management Committee (EMC). Grabau agreed that the report had been submitted to the SC but thought it had yet to be presented to the US. After brief discussion, it was decided that the EMC could not be dissolved until the US had vetted the report and its recommendations. Baxter stated the issue would be up for discussion for the next decade and would not likely go away. Grossman suggested it could be a matter for the Committee on Committees to address.

There was a brief break while desired paperwork was retrieved.

#### 4. Nominees to the University Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities

The Chair referred to his handout and said he had been asked to provide six nominees from which three would be chosen by President Todd to serve on the University Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities (UCAPP). The Chair stated there was a fairly long list of names that had been put forth by Council members via the SC listserv. He encouraged Council members to pay particular heed to the charge of UCAPP, noting that it would be an important and strategic committee and support the implementation of the Top 20 Business Plan. He added that in addition to the US representatives appointed by the President, it was likely that there would be additional faculty representatives brought in to the domain sub-committees. Referencing the overlap between UCAPP and the US's Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (APP), the Chair stated that through

conversations with Interim Provost Smith and Vice President for Institutional Research Planning and Effectiveness Connie Ray, he understood that at a minimum, the chairs of the US APP and Research Committees would be involved in the domain sub-committees. UCAPP will be high-intensity, meeting regularly and being involved in high-level policies for which recommendations will be sought. The Chair opined that individuals put forth for review by the President should be able to speak their minds, have a significant measure of experience at UK and be concerned with faculty governance issues. He added that a degree of breadth across the University would be helpful.

In response to questions about the origin of UCAPP, the Chair explained that Ray had chaired a committee involved in responding to the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) call for a University action plan. Out of the discussions involving faculty and administrators, there was interest in continuing the life of the committee, especially with respect to broad issues of planning in relationship to the Top 20 Business Plan. Out of discussions between the President and Provost, UCAPP was formed. Due to the heavy stress on academic planning and related issues, an effort was originally made to keep the size of the main committee to 10-12 with significant representation of the faculty. The Chair thought that the creeping expansion of the committee's size occurred as it underwent various revisions in the President's Executive Cabinet.

Tagavi suggested the SC Chair could be included as an ex officio, in part to serve as a liaison between UCAPP and the SC. He stated that it could be awkward for a UCAPP member to be asked to inform the SC of the actions of UCAPP. The Chair agreed with the suggestion.

Tagavi **moved** that the Senate Council respectfully request that the Senate Council Chair be added to the University Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities as an ex officio member, separate from the six names put forward for review by President Todd.

Grossman thought it might not be approved by the President, and suggested identifying one (of the three members appointed by the President) individual to be officially designated the SC liaison. Discussion commenced about this idea.

Grabau questioned language in an email sent out by the Chair, referring to specific qualities of potential nominees ("young" and "energetic"). The Chair clarified by saying it was stated in one or more forums that the President would look to younger faculty with fresh perspectives among those faculty appointments to the committee that he made. Grabau also wondered about an official definition of "faculty development" included in the handout.

Jones **seconded** Tagavi's motion. Randall offered a friendly amendment to insert the wording "or the past Senate Council Chair." There was discussion on the suggestion. Baxter offered a friendly amendment to allow the SC to

designate someone as an official liaison to the SC. After some discussion, Randall rescinded his friendly amendment.

Lesnaw wondered why the names put forth to be discussed were not all US members, stating that by putting forth non-US members, the SC was relinquishing its right for representation. Tagavi stated that an individual who was not designated as an official liaison might feel improper discussing UCAPP matters with the SC. Lesnaw replied that it was incumbent upon the Chair to require the liaison to report to the SC. In response to Tagavi, the Chair stated that while he would feel uncomfortable doing so, he would be ready to require the liaison to make reports to the SC. The Chair stated that if Tagavi's motion passed, but was rejected by the President, a liaison person would necessarily need to be identified for fluid communication.

Michael **called the question**. A **vote** was taken on calling the question and the motion **passed** unanimously. A **vote** was taken on Tagavi's motion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

Lesnaw began discussion regarding the specific names to put forward to the President. Tagavi suggested choosing approximately two individuals from each college and then asking the Chair to find one from each college to serve. Discussion commenced regarding whether the President was looking for University Senators to serve or if he was requesting the names come from the SC, on behalf of the University Senate. The Chair offered his inference, that the President was requesting six names of faculty members put forth by the SC, from which the President could choose three. It was decided that the Chair would offer all the names of individuals willing to serve, since the request had stated the President would choose three individuals, from "at least" six names.

Discussion commenced on the names to put forward, and the names agreed upon were: Boyd Haley; Sandford Goldberg; Mary Arthur; Timothy Sineath; Debra Harley; Douglass Kalika; Ron Pen; Jane Peters; Tom Garrity; Ken Calvert; Robert Lawson; and Christopher Schardl. The Chair stated he would contact all these individuals and would forward on to the President the names of individuals expressing availability and a willingness to serve.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Ernie Yanarella  
Senate Council Chair

Members present: Baxter, Dembo, Grossman, Grabau, Jarvis, Jones, Hobson, Lesnaw, Michael, Moore, Randall, Tagavi, Yanarella.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on January 24, 2006.