

University Senate Minutes
February 13, 2006

The University Senate met on Monday, February 13, 2006 at 3:00 pm in the Auditorium of the William T. Young Library. Below is a record of what transpired.

Absences: Anyaegbunam*, Barker, Bartilow, Biagi, Black*, Bordo, Brown, Burchett, Calvert*, Caudill, Cibull*, Clauter*, Daniel, Deem, DeSimone, Diedrichs*, Draper*, Duffy, Duke*, Dwoskin, Eldred*, Ellingsworth, Fording, Forgue*, Gaetke*, Garen, Gargola, Gonzalez*, Greasley*, Hasselbring, Haven*, Hazard*, Heath, Hobson, Hoch*, Holmes, Houtz*, Hull, Jefferies *, Johnson, Kalim, Kim, Lindlof, Matthews, McCormick*, McKnight*, Portillo, Shaw, Shearer*, Smart, Smith*, Sottile*, Steltenkamp*, Straus, Stringer, Sudharshan*, Thelin*, Thompson*, Vasconez, Wise.

*Denotes excused absence.

Guests present: Doug Gould, Terri Kanatzar.

Senate Member Presenter: Kay Hoffman.

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 pm.

1. Minutes from December 19, 2005 and Announcements

Chair Yanarella was unable to attend the meeting, so as per the *University Senate Rules (Rules)*, Vice Chair Tagavi assumed the presiding officer duties of the Chair.

There being no changes to the minutes other than those previously incorporated, the minutes were approved as amended.

Although the names of the newly elected Senate Council members had been announced at the December University Senate meeting, VC Tagavi again named them for the benefit of senators who had not been present; Anthony Baxter (College of Engineering); Doug Michael (College of Law); and David Randall (College of Medicine).

VC Tagavi said that Chair Yanarella had wished Jones to read a personal statement of Yanarella's. Jones read the statement. In it, the Chair referenced the motion to suspend the *Senate Rules* regarding the two-year limit for one serving in the position of Senate Council Chair. He went on to write that on December 19, 2005, the Senate Council held elections and selected Kaveh Tagavi as Senate Council Chair and Larry Grabau as vice-Chair for the 2006 – 2007 term, beginning June 1, 2006. The Chair thanked his supporters and those who permitted his nomination to occur. He noted that he and Tagavi were united

in working toward the betterment of the University and its members, and congratulated Tagavi and Grabau.

2. Graduate Certificate in Anatomical Sciences

VC Tagavi provided brief background information on the certificate. The certificate was offered by the Department of Anatomy and Neurobiology. Coursework would consist of 12 hours, plus three hours of practicum. The certificate's goals were to provide for basic instruction in the anatomical sciences. Guest Doug Gould, from Anatomy and Neurobiology, explained there were few anatomical science programs that were graduating individuals prepared to teach that subject. The certificate could offer a stamp of capability in those graduates that were interested in instruction of that science.

VC Tagavi said the motion to approve from the Senate Council was with a positive recommendation. He asked for discussion. Since no senator raised their hands, VC Tagavi offered a suggestion to remove references to "program" and simply refer to the certificate. He also recommended language be changed in the "Curriculum" to allow a student to "earn a grade of B or better..." (underlined text added) instead of "B." Gould said he would incorporate those changes. There was no further discussion. A **vote** was taken on the motion from the Senate Council with to **approve** the Graduate Certificate in Anatomical Sciences. VC Tagavi said he would not call for abstentions. The motion **passed** unanimously.

3. Work-Life Faculty Survey

VC Tagavi explained the survey was to assess the responses of faculty members and that a high level of participation was desired, similar to or better than that of the staff employees for their complementary survey. He introduced Guest Kay Hoffman, the Dean of the College of Social Work and the Co-Chair of the Work-Life Advisory Council. Hoffman explained that this was the first survey of its type to be undertaken at UK. She said that the survey's purpose was to get an idea of what the organizational culture of UK was like, and its needs, in conjunction with what people see as strengths and weaknesses. She encouraged senators to introduce the topic among their colleagues and urge them to participate. Guest Terri Kanatzar added that over 100 faculty members participated in focus groups or personal interviews to help shape the survey questions, and that the survey was an opportunity for faculty to have their voices heard. She also mentioned the inclusion of such faculty-specific questions as delaying the tenure clock, academic mentoring, and support staff to assist faculty, among other issues. She stated the importance of every faculty member responding to the survey. Hoffman spoke to the importance of including responses from both woman and men.

In response to a question from Anderson, Hoffman said she too wished the survey had included questions about partner benefits, as previously discussed elsewhere. Hoffman said the survey was intended to focus on organizational

structure, and not the benefit structure. She encouraged comments on the topic of benefits for partners and other issues not specifically addressed in the survey be written in the final question, a text box for participants' individual comments. Hoffman added two short surveys were being prepared, one of family structure and the other a benefit survey. Wood asked if there were plans to make the survey process recur. She thought the survey leaned heavily toward family and children issues, and said she wished questions dealing with exercise facilities or weekend hours for buildings, etc. had been included. She asked for those topics to be addressed. Hoffman responded that the survey would offer a baseline, and said she would try to use the survey results in a positive manner. Kanatzar added that respondents could use the open-ended questions to offer input via specific comments and suggestions.

VC Tagavi stated that if mass emails were be given less attention than they deserved, colleague-to-colleague interactions might more effectively cause faculty members to respond to the survey.

4. SAP Update from Phyllis Nash

Due to a scheduling conflict, the SAP Update would be postponed.

5. Academic Offenses

By way of background VC Tagavi explained that at the December 19, 2005 meeting, the main part of the academic offenses proposal came to the University Senate. The Senate Council thought one item was somewhat controversial, but did not want to see the entire proposal voted down due to a smaller issue. While the main part of the proposal was discussed and voted on at the December meeting, the other part was tabled.

VC Tagavi said the second part was the issue of petitions to remove from the transcript the notation of an academic offense. He noted that the current *Senate Rules* allowed for a notation to be removed after three years for suspension and dismissal, while expulsion remained forever. The main proposal, which the Senate approved, recently made permanent the notation for almost all offenses, except for penalties of "E" or less. The portion tabled would allow students to petition to remove the notation of an academic offense from the transcript. VC Tagavi stated the Senate Council had originally recommended against allowing petitions, and subsequently has asked the Senate to allow the proposal to be withdrawn altogether.

As chair of the Academic Offenses Ad Hoc Committee (AOC), Grossman asked to offer some background. The original proposal from the AOC included a provision that mandated a minimum penalty of an "XE" for a second offense. Some AOC members expressed concern that others might consider that overly harsh, so the ability to petition was included. At the level of the Senate Council, the minimum penalties were changed to an "E" for a second offense and suspension for a third offense. Due to the decreased penalties, the rationale for

including the petition process was thereby somewhat diminished. Grossman concluded by saying the Senate Council unanimously voted to request permission from the University Senate to withdraw the petition portion of the proposal.

In response to a request for clarification from Berger, VC Tagavi stated the Senate Council was requesting withdrawal of the portion that was tabled, and nothing more. He asked for further discussion. There being none, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** from the Senate Council to request permission from the University Senate to withdraw consideration by the University Senate the tabled motion affecting the portion of the academic offenses proposal addressing sunsets on petitions (for removal from the transcript. The motion **passed** unanimously.

6. LCC/KCTCS Degree Candidates

VC Tagavi stated that originally two individuals were to be approved, but immediately before the University Senate meeting, an email from Mike Binzer, chair of faculty at the Bluegrass Community and Technical College (BCTC), offered additional information. The student whose name began with "W" had been approved by BCTC faculty and had fulfilled the requirements as set forth by KCTCS and UK to receive an appropriate degree. The other student did not meet the degree requirements despite her having applied to graduate. Jones said approval at this University Senate meeting was the last step prior to final UK Board action.

VC Tagavi stated the motion from the Senate Council was to approve the addition of one name to the degree list. Jones **moved** to approve. Anderson **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion, which was **passed** unanimously by the elected University Faculty Senators voting; there was not any objection from other Senators present.

7. Nunn Center Proposal

VC Tagavi introduced the proposal as a request to rename UK's Oral History Program to honor former Governor Louis B. Nunn, and become a "center." He added that the interpretation by Senate Rules & Elections Committee (SREC) chair Jones was that the College of Libraries was not an educational unit. Therefore, approval by the University Senate would be of the nature of collegial courtesy and general support. Guests Terry Birdwhistell and Jeff Suchanek were present to answer questions.

Jones asked about how much the Librarian Faculty had been involved in the renaming discussions. Birdwhistell stated the Librarian Faculty had been informed of the proposed name change and that the item was on the agenda for their February faculty meeting. VC Tagavi indicated there was a **motion** on the floor for the Senate Council to approve the change from the "Oral History Program" to the "Louis B. Nunn Center for Oral History" and to thank Dean

Diedrichs for the courtesy of consulting with the Senate. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion, which **passed** unanimously.

8. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules, Section I* (“The University Senate”)

VC Tagavi said Senate Rules & Elections (SREC) Chair Jones would offer information regarding the criteria by which the *Senate Rules (Rules)* were revised. He added that he hoped there would be time to review all four sections before adjournment.

Jones referenced the separate handout (“Summary of Updating Revisions to University Senate Rules – Section I”), which served as a distilled version of the changes to *Section I*. Jones explained there was a ripple effect caused by actions of the Board of Trustees (BoT) in June 2005 when the *Governing Regulations (GRs)* were updated. This was the impetus for the SREC to revise the *Rules* – to be in conformity with the GRs.

The overarching reasons for revising the *GRs* included the “new” Provost system and the separation of LCC from UK, which also had a major effect on the *Rules*. Jones explained that there were seven areas of attention during the updating exercise: conversion to Provost System terminology; conversion to *GRs*’ definitions on “faculty” status and membership in faculty bodies; conversion to definitions of the internal organizations of the University Senate; and the various roles of the President of the University of Kentucky as Chair of the Senate. Provisions for LCC programs were removed, but an archival copy will be maintained. Senate committee charges were updated to reflect current practices. Language was clarified to more clearly provide for the intent, and grammatical and editorial improvements were made. Finally, electronic voting was codified as the preferred method for voting in Senate-run elections.

Jones stated that the SREC members kept themselves very closely focused and made no substantive changes, only those types of changes as previously stated.

Jones went on to explain specific details about the revisions. Terminology appropriate for the Provost System was substituted for the out-dated “Chancellor” language. References to new Assistant and Associate Provosts and the three titles held by Don Witt, University Registrar (University Registrar, Director of Undergraduate Admissions, and Assistant Provost for Enrollment Management) were added, while old “Sector” terminology was deleted.

Also inserted were specific definitions (as given in the *GRs*) for educational units, the College of Libraries and membership of faculty bodies. The various pieces of information regarding the President’s relationship to the Senate as its Chair that were otherwise scattered throughout the *GRs* were helpfully brought into one place in the *Rules*. The role of elected University Faculty Senators for several statutory functions (e.g. degree list, Honorary Degrees, graduation conditions for Degree Honors, etc.) was also updated to reflect the *GRs*.

Jones said changes were made to the Senate committee charges, and used the Senate Admissions Advisory Committee (SAAC) as an example. Language addressing the SAAC's charge was consolidated in *Section I*, while language involving policies on specific criteria were moved together to *Section III*. There were also references throughout to "Council" that did not appropriately indicate which Council the *Rules* were referring to, and were revised thusly. The portion addressing the voting status of alternates on several Councils of the Senate was also revised so that intent became clearer.

Jones concluded the overview by adding that the election process by which a faculty representative is named to a President Search Committee was codified to become an electronic election, modeled after that of the process by which senators are elected to the Senate Council. Jones reiterated that the SREC studiously avoided making substantive changes. A number of "great ideas" to be pondered by the Senate Council were segregated for review by the Senate Council. He said the review brought to the Senate was mechanical, although very thorough.

In response to an inquiry from VC Tagavi, Jones stated that a request went out to all current committee chairs asking if the current charge for their respective committee in the *Rules* was compatible with current practice.

It was clarified that only *Section I* would be voted on. VC Tagavi asked for additional questions or suggestions, stating the changes came with a positive recommendation from the Senate Council. Waldhart expressed her appreciation of the Summary handout, and said it was very helpful.

Jones thanked the members of the SREC, and noted the SREC had kept up a brutal pace in drafting the revisions. As there was no indication that further discussion was desired, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to approve the changes to *Senate Rules Section I*, as outlined by Senate Rules and Elections Committee Chair Jones. Senators voted unanimously to **approve** the motion.

9. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules, Section V* ("Honorary Degrees")

SREC Chair Jones introduced the changes to *Section V*. The section was revised to correspond to the revisions of the *GRs*. The Honorary Degree Committee (HDC) was originally established by the Senate in the 1930s. During the 1970s-1980s, the HDC was managed in such a way so as to make it unclear whether the HDC was functioning as a Senate Committee or an administrative committee, and to make it unclear as to whether the Senate was limited to only considering candidates recommended by the HDC. Given the new *GRs*, the HDC was negotiated by the Senate Council and President/Provost to become the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees (UJCHD), of which half membership will be named by the Senate Council and half will be named by the President.

The UJCHD will forward recommendations to the University Senate apparatus, within which only elected University Faculty Senators will vote on the recommendations. The ability for the Senate (i.e., elected University Faculty Senators), in rare circumstances, to put forth a name that did not come from the UJCHD was also codified in the new *Rules*. Jones stated the current review of the *Administrative Regulations (ARs)* would result in a new *AR* on the UJCHD that cross-references the *Rules*, and that the *ARs'* intent could be described as explaining what happens about that part of the process that is external to the Senate. The *Rules* address what procedurally happens when the recommendations of the UJCHD reach and come through the internal Senate apparatus.

Jones pointed out the new *Section 5.4.2.3.A*, which explained the role of the UJCHD, and that the "XXX" in the text would be changed to reflect the appropriate cross-reference in the *ARs* when the *AR* review was completed. The text in *Section 5.4.2.3.C* was taken verbatim from the website of the Graduate School, which had until recently been the headquarters of the HDC. Jones explained further that current practices had been incorporated into *Section V*, especially with regard to the list in *Section 5.4.2.3.D*, which reflected the specific names of Honorary Degree titles awarded over the past twenty years.

Jones noted that *Section 5.4.3* was not modified at this time, even though it was a part of the new jurisdiction limited to the elected University Faculty Senators; its current language turned out not to be in any direct conflict with the new *GRs*. Jones suggested that changes to this section could be addressed in the future if necessary.

When the BoT further clarified that elected University Faculty Senators were responsible for the content of information on the diploma, *Section 5.4.5.A* was updated to mirror that. Because Honorary Degree recipients receive a diploma attesting to that degree, the SREC found it necessary to expand this section and bring it into accordance with current practice on diploma content. In the future, the elected University Faculty Senators can address potential substantive changes from current practice. Jones finished his introduction of changes to *Section V 5.4.5.A* by stating the SREC had worked closely with University Registrar Don Witt (also an SREC member) to ensure that what was codified was a reflection of current policy on diploma content.

VC Tagavi added that the changes came with a positive recommendation from the Senate Council. Michael asked for clarification about *Section 5.4.3*. Jones stated no action was taken to revise that portion of the *Rules* because its current language turned out not to be in any direct conflict with the new *GRs*.

A **vote** was taken on the **motion** with a positive recommendation from the Senate Council to approve the changes to *Senate Rules Section V*, as outlined

by Senate Rules and Elections Committee Chair Jones. Senators voted unanimously to **approve** the motion.

10. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules, Section VIII* (“Printed Schedule of Classes and Bulletin”)

Jones said edits in this short section included changing the description of the schedule of classes or Bulletin from “printed” to “published,” to allow for distribution via the Registrar’s web site.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** with a positive recommendation from the Senate Council to approve the changes to *Senate Rules Section V*, as outlined by Senate Rules and Elections Committee Chair Jones. Senators voted unanimously to **approve** the motion.

11. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules, Section II* (“Calendar”)

Jones stated the various changes to *Section II* were editorial and self-evident, as shown in the handout. Burkhart said she had no question regarding the mechanics of the review, but wondered if any discussion took place regarding the recommendation that the Thanksgiving Break possibly be extended. VC Tagavi shared that the Ad Hoc Calendar Committee (AHCC) was addressing that issue, and also that the Student Government Association had put forth a proposal for consideration regarding the structure of dead week and finals’ week. The recommendation by the AHCC had not yet come forward.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** with a positive recommendation from the Senate Council to approve the changes to *Senate Rules Section II*, as outlined by Senate Rules and Elections Committee Chair Jones. Senators voted unanimously to **approve** the motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:04 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh Tagavi
University Senate Vice Chair

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on February 14, 2006.