

Senate Council Minutes - September 15, 2008

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, September 15, 2008 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a voice vote unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Randall called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:06 pm. The Chair noted that there were a couple of announcements. The first item was that of undergraduate certificates. It was noted that there were no guidelines for undergraduate certificates in the Senate Rules (SR). The Chair asked for input as to what should be done, noting that undergraduate certificates would not appear on a student's transcript. SC members engaged in a discussion and expressed concern about the proliferation of such certificates.

Wood moved that a report on undergraduate certificates be requested from the Undergraduate Council - the first issue would be a determination on the part of the Undergraduate Council if such certificates should be allowed and if so, the Undergraduate Council was further asked to include information on proposed structure and criteria for undergraduate certificates and a detailed explanation of how an undergraduate certificate would differ from a minor.

Piasek seconded. After some additional discussion, a vote was taken on the motion, which passed unanimously with seven in favor.

Additional announcements were postponed until later in the meeting.

2. Request to Waive Senate Rules 5.2.4.8.1 ("Common Examinations") - MA 110

The Chair invited Russell Brown, director of undergraduate studies in Mathematics, to explain his request. Guest Brown did so.

Wood **moved** to waive Senate Rules 5.2.4.8.1 so that a common examination could be offered for MA 110. Swanson **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously in a voice vote with seven in favor.

The Chair noted the need for nominees to serve on a few Provost-level committees. He asked Mrs. Brothers to explain. There was a brief discussion in which SC members suggested various faculty members for the committees.

3. Senate Committee Preferences

The Chair explained that the committee compositions in the handout had been put together by Mrs. Brothers, based upon new senators' preferences. There were a few questions asked and answered.

Wood **moved** to approve the committees as composed in the handout and direct the Office of the Senate Council to identify an appropriate chair for each committee. Chappell **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously in a voice vote with seven in favor.

The Chair asked Yanarella, faculty trustee to the Board of Trustees (BoT), to offer an update regarding the September 9 BoT meeting. Yanarella spoke about the proposed changes to 12-month faculty members' vacation policy. He said that he asked Provost Subbaswamy or Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration Frank Butler to bring a written statement to the next BoT meeting that would outline an exceptions policy. He said that the proposal was tabled by the BoT for one month.

4. Discussion on Academic Approval Work Group

The Chair referred SC members to the handout on the proposed Academic Approval Work Group. After some discussion, Chappell **moved** that the Senate Council approve the creation of the Academic Approval Process Work Group and request that the Office of the Senate Council provide a list of possible members and a draft charge, to be discussed at the September 22 Senate Council meeting. Aken **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** in a show of hands with five in favor, one opposed and one abstaining.

Because invited guests were present and waiting, SC concurred with the Chair's decision to rearrange the agenda.

7. Proposed New Center - Kentucky Center for Diabetes and Obesity

The Chair invited Lisa Tannock [Medicine/Internal Medicine] and Lisa Cassis [Medicine/Graduate Center for Nutritional Sciences] to share their information. Both guests spoke and answered questions from SC members about the Kentucky Center for Diabetes and Obesity (KCDO). The discussion primarily centered on the overall categorization of the type of center being proposed.

Tagavi noted that the KCDO was referred to in the paperwork by a couple of different names. He noted that using "for" sounded like obesity and diabetes were being promoted; using "on" would more clearly indicate that the KCDO conducted research to prevent diabetes and obesity.

There was a lengthy discussion about the KCDO's status - Wood opined that it was obvious it was a multidisciplinary research center and wondered why it was not being called such. She stated a number of times that her concern was not at all with the concept of the KCDO and that she supported its creation; her concern was with the categorization of the KCDO and the subsequent use of the appropriate approval procedure.

It was ultimately decided that the KCDO should be described as a multidisciplinary research center and would follow that type of approval process. SC members supported the Chair's pledge to move the KCDO through the approval process as expeditiously as possible. Drs. Cassis and Tannock then departed, with the SC's thanks.

5. Proposed Change to Senate Rules 1.4.3.2 - Composition of RWA Committee

The Chair explained that the change to the membership of the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee would bring the Senate Rules (SR) into compliance with current practice and the wishes of the committee. The individuals were regularly-attending members and routinely offered information beneficial to the retroactive withdrawal appeals process.

Ford **moved** to add one representative from the Counseling and Testing Center and one from the Advising Network as ex officio nonvoting members of the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee. Swanson **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

6. Proposed Editorial Revision to Health Care Colleges Student Professional Behavior Code

The Chair asked Provost's Liaison Greissman to explain the change. Greissman explained that Legal Counsel had determined that the Health Care Colleges Student Professional Behavior Code (Code) was not within the approval purview of the University Senate, although consultation with the Senate would be required prior to any revisions. Language clarifying that had been added to the Code. Greissman said that he wanted the SC to be aware of the change.

In response to Wood, Greissman explained that the position taken by Legal Counsel had to do with language in SR 6.3.0 in which the SR defined academic offenses as one of three things: 1. plagiarism; 2. cheating; or 3. falsification or misuse of academic records. Because of that language, every other behavior or action should be considered non-academic. Therefore, while the Senate would be consulted with respect to proposed changes to the Code, the Senate did not have approval authority. Wood was satisfied with Greissman's explanation.

The last agenda item was postponed until the September 22 meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 pm.

Respectfully submitted by David C. Randall,

Senate Council Chair

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

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guests present: Russell Brown, Lisa Cassis, Joe Quinn, Lisa Tannock.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, September 17, 2008.