

Senate Council Minutes

November 29, 2004

The Senate Council met on Monday, November 29, 2004 at 3:00pm in Room 103 Main Building and took the following actions.

1. [Approval of the Minutes from November 22, 2004](#)

The Chair asked if there were any corrections to the minutes. Tagavi asked if his comments from the listserv discussion could be attached to the minutes. The Chair agreed. Tagavi will forward the comments to Ms. Scott who will attach them. Otherwise, the minutes were approved.

2. Announcements

The Chair reminded the Senate Council members of the upcoming open house in the Senate Council office on Friday, December 10 from 3:00 to 5:00 and asked them to attend if possible. He noted that the December 1 breakfast with the Provost would be held at 8:00 instead of 7:00. The Chair reviewed briefly the Senate Council's previous discussion that the College of Medicine faculty performance review form was discordant with the University Administrative Regulations by prescribing that the only activity listed as Research on the form is obtaining extramural funding, where the University Regulations state that publication is the normal evidence of Research activity. Jones noted that after the previous Senate Council discussion he had met with David Watt to discuss this aspect, and his discussion with Watt on this topic had gone very well. Watt described that it was useful administratively to have publications, grant activity and the other items remain on the form, but that the particular current arrangement of headings and items on the form was more likely the result of a previous secretarial effort to get all information onto the form, and was not a purposeful effort to be in contradiction to the University regulations. Watt was amenable to the revision of the organization of the form in question to make the headings of activity and items under them be made more concordant with the University Administrative Regulations, and he welcomed that the COM Faculty Council would offer suggestions toward that end. Jones reported that he had

forwarded the matter to the COM Faculty Council and had now been informed that the Faculty Council had placed the matter on the agenda for its December meeting.

Saunier joined the meeting at this time.

3. Proposed revisions to AR

- [Proposal Overview](#)
- [Proposed changes to the AR](#)
- [Proposed changes to the GR](#)

The Chair introduced Ray and Martin and thanked them for attending. After the Senate Council members introduced themselves, Ray introduced the item and provided thorough background as to the origin and purpose of the proposal. She noted that SACS had concerns that the University budget should better reflect the goals of the University. She said the proposed AR integrated three separate AR's regarding planning, budget and assessment while also defining how frequently the institutions mission statement will be re-evaluated and adding a piece about the review of chief academic officers. Ray said she and Martin were ready to answer questions about the first two parts of the proposal and would address the third part at a subsequent Senate Council meeting.

Staben entered the meeting at this time.

Martin presented a thorough overview of the proposal, reiterating that the planning, budget and assessment cycle was more closely aligned from an operational perspective in the proposed AR. She noted some of the challenges the University faces in light of the responsibilities charged to it under House Bill 1 and the effort UK was making to stay in concert with the CPE regarding strategic planning, especially as the CPE began its own public strategic agenda open forum circuit.

Odoi entered the meeting at this point.

Martin went on to say the 2006-2009 strategic planning cycle will begin very soon and that the University is working to develop a business plan to determine how to best implement the strategic plan. She added that the budget was the tool through which the University's plans are implemented while assessment was the tool that provided information regarding the achievement of institutional goals and objectives.

Jones asked how the steering committee will be composed. Martin replied that the President appoints the steering committee and added that the academic subcommittee was heavily composed of faculty members. Martin added that the University had submitted its most recent mission statement to the CPE since that agency appeared to have an antiquated version.

The Chair asked if another round of revisions to the AR would be necessary if the business plan was to proceed and the advice of consultants be sought and acted upon. Martin replied that it was possible, though she stressed that the proposed AR was a description of how to operationalize the strategic plan. She doubted the six characteristics or many of the goals would change, but thought that perhaps some of the measures would be updated to reflect the progress already made by UK.

Jones asked Martin to elaborate on how endowments worked with relation to the rest of the University's budget. Martin replied that a three-year average of the market value of the endowment is calculated and then five percent of that amount is transferred to the University's restricted fund. She noted that approximately 95% of the University's endowment was designated for very specific purposes.

Cibull asked Martin to provide some examples of affiliated corporations. Martin replied that UK has nine affiliated corporations, including such entities as the UK Athletic Association and the UK Research Foundation

as well as many smaller corporations. She added that the Kentucky Medical Services Foundation is a non-affiliated corporation but that its finances are now being included in the University's financial statements.

Martin introduced the second part of the proposal, which refers to the bi-annual process of state appropriations from the perspective of the operating budget. She noted some of the limitations placed on the institution by the state regarding spending for capital projects and purchases, including information technology purchases. Martin noted that there are a few exceptions allowed for research, medical and scientific equipment, but noted those purchases still have to be reported to the state. She noted that during the last biennium the total spending authority for the state was \$325 million, including K-12 institutions and other higher education institutions in the state. She asked the Senate Council members to consider the cost of the proposed bed tower for the hospital, approximately \$250 million, to see exactly the sorts of limitations that the institution faces when asking permission to construct capital projects.

Debski asked if the Kentucky legislature had ever been presented with information regarding how other states address the agency bond authority issue. Martin said that all fifty states were investigated and noted that Georgia's policy was most restrictive while Kentucky's was second-most restrictive. Odoi asked if the University set aside separate funds to be spent on lobbying Frankfort. Martin replied that the University was restricted from contracting with lobbyists but noted the existence of the External Affairs department and named some key individuals who serve as legislative liaisons.

Jones asked if the proposed AR would move forward if approved by the Senate Council or if the recently-promulgated GR's must first be approved by Board. Greissman said the AR could move forward before the approval of the GR's and said the AR would go to the President's cabinet if approved by the Senate.

Staben asked which other groups beside the Senate had been included in the vetting of the proposed AR. Ray replied that it had been circulated to the business officers, the vice presidents, provosts, and deans. Jones suggested sending it to the faculty of the colleges for review as well. Ray noted it was currently on the Senate Council web site and the Chair agreed to send an e-mail circulating information on how to access the proposals to the various members of the full Senate.

Martin and Ray reiterated that the two parts of the proposal discussed by Martin were a combination of three AR's into one and contained very little new material. The Chair thanked Ray and Martin for attending and indicated the Senate Council's eagerness to continue the discussion during the January 10, 2005 meeting. Ray noted that the CAO review portion of the proposal will be discussed during that meeting. The Chair thanked them again and Ray and Martin departed.

4. Board and Senate degree list

The Chair underlined the fact that the Senate's approval of the degree list is an important responsibility of the Senate. He noted some concern regarding the joint Engineering program with Western Kentucky University and invited Jones and Tagavi to express their concerns.

Tagavi said he consulted the staff people in the College of Engineering to determine if there were supposed to be any graduates of the joint program this semester. Finding that two names had been inadvertently excluded from the list, Tagavi brought the names of the two students with him to the meeting and offered to provide them. Jones added that part of the problem was that the burden of degree audit for these joint students was on the Registrar at WKU instead of coming up through the regular channels through the Dean of Engineering at UK to the UK Registrar. Tagavi added that he was one of the joint degree program faculty members and was aware that these two names should be included, but that due to a communication problem between the College and the Registrar the names had been excluded. Jones noted that the Provost had asked if the names of the two students could be added during the Senate Council meeting, pending the certification of the Dean of

the College of Engineering and the UK Registrar, so those two names would be included on the list that would go before the Board and the Senate.

Cibull asked if any students from the Paducah program or UK's main campus had been left off the list. Tagavi relayed that the students from Paducah were included with the main campus students on the degree list. He suggested that not including the names of these students could create a politically charged issue.

Greissman offered the clarification that the names of the students on the degree list were merely candidates for degrees, that their degrees would not be awarded until the final certification had been completed. He spoke in favor of adding the two names, noting that since they were only degree candidates they would not receive degrees unless it was later determined that all their requirements had indeed been met. Staben asked if it was impossible for a student to graduate if his or her name was excluded from the list. Greissman affirmed Staben's assessment.

Tagavi provided the names of Nathan D. Clovin and Benjamin Kadic as being candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering joint degree program offered by Western Kentucky University and University of Kentucky. He made a **motion** to amend the degree list to include the two names, contingent upon the approval of the Dean of Engineering at UK and the UK Registrar. Jones seconded the **motion**, which **passed** without dissent.

Cibull made a **motion** to approve the degree list, with a **second** from Grabau. Saunier asked if LCC names would be approved by the Senate and the Board. Cibull suggested the Senate Council office investigate the issue. Bailey thought it would be inappropriate for the LCC degree list to go directly from LCC to the Board for approval. Cibull suggested that perhaps the LCC degree list would be approved by KCTCS before being routed to the Board. Jones agreed that it would make sense for the faculty senate of KCTCS to approve its degree recipients. Saunier noted that LCC students

still receive degrees from UK and that those degrees would most likely still need to be approved by the Senate and the Board. Debski suggested amending the motion to include language about the resolution of the LCC question.

The Chair said that approval of the list would not pre-empt the effort of the Senate Council to investigate the LCC degree issue. Debski noted that this sort of decision to take action usually required a motion and proposed a friendly **amendment** that the Senate Council will look into whether the LCC graduates should be added to the current list. Cibull suggested the wording “if it is found to be appropriate, the LCC students will be added to this list.” Debski accepted Cibull’s wording. Cibull accepted the friendly amendment and Grabau’s second stood. The amended motion to approve the degree list **passed** without dissent. It will be forwarded to the Senate for action at the December meeting.

5. ACMC Update

The Chair reported having received an e-mail from Blackwell who indicated her agreement to serve as chair of the ACMC for the Spring and possibly Summer, or until such time as the ACMC’s structure could be determined, whichever comes first. She noted that the Provost had agreed to fund a half-time temporary staff position to do the paperwork associated with this task. The Chair noted that Blackwell will assume the chair of the ACMC in January. The Chair asked the Senate Council members to consider how the issue should be decided, through which committee or council and on what timeline.

Cibull said he would like to include broad representation from among the colleges which would be more impacted by whatever action the Senate would ultimately take. He suggested asking the faculty councils of those colleges to nominate representatives to serve on a committee and added that the associate deans for curriculum from the various colleges should serve or nominate people to serve as well, since they have the interest of the colleges and the curricula at heart.

Tagavi said that since there is an extant committee structure then the ACMC should be responsible for making a recommendation regarding its own fate. Cibull noted that the composition of the ACMC does not necessarily have the information it would need in the broader institutional context to make this sort of decision. Jones and Cibull indicated interest in involving the Academic Organization and Structure Committee. Bailey agreed that his committee would seem the logical place, but suggested that input be sought from Nash, Blackwell and Kraemer, as well as others.

Cibull noted the issue was how best to resolve the problem and suggested that the committee include the people who are best able to judge how to get the work of the Medical Center done and moved out of the Medical Center to the Senate. Cibull suggested that the committee's recommendation should be forwarded to the AO&S committee which could interview Nash, Blackwell and Kraemer and then make its recommendation to the Senate Council.

Debski supported Cibull's suggestion and added that the ACMC should have representation on the committee as well. Duke expressed concern that there has been conversation about consulting the people who had knowledge of the institutional history but had not necessarily included the new people who were making decisions about the future of the University, like Perman and Karpf. She suggested including them in the conversation.

The Chair noted that the charge to the committee would need to be very specific to include such things as the appropriate function and role of the ACMC, whether it should continue at all, as well as the issue of its leadership. Greissman suggested sending a broadcast e-mail to the faculty from the Medical Center units to solicit information from them regarding this issue so the broadest possible net was cast to gain the necessary faculty input. Duke agreed and added that the administrators should be included as well. Cibull noted there was a difference between establishing a committee and soliciting input. He thought it would be part of the committee's responsibility to solicit the necessary information from the appropriate parties. Odoi suggested that the committee include student representation.

The Chair noted the daunting nature of the task and suggested that he begin a first draft of the committee's charge, which could then serve as a lightning rod for the thoughts of the Senate Council members in regard to how the committee should be composed. He offered to put a first draft on the listserv to which the Council members should respond. He suggested that he could compile their input into a draft that would then be discussed at the meeting on the following Monday. The Senate Council members expressed agreement with this plan.

Staben suggested including representation from the Graduate Council and Undergraduate Council since those two bodies would be shouldering the responsibility of vetting the ACMC's proposals if that body were to be abolished. Greissman suggested the committee be called a fact finding committee that would compile information for the AO&S committee to digest and discuss. Bailey clarified that the report would be submitted to the Senate Council, which would then route the report to his committee if need be. The Chair noted that the formation of the committee and whatever subsequent action was required must be vetted through the Senate. Ms. Scott indicated that there was still one more Senate Council meeting at which an item could be added to the December agenda, so no motion regarding the formation of the committee was necessary at the current meeting.

6. Senate Council Officer Nominations

The Chair noted the need to hold officer nominations during the meeting before the first meeting in December, at which officer elections are held. He then opened the floor for nominations.

Kaalund nominated Yanarella to serve a second term as Chair. Jones seconded the nomination.

Cibull asked if Senate Council Chairs have typically served two terms. Ms. Scott noted that since the rules were changed to allow for a second term all of

the Chairs have indeed been elected a second time. Staben asked if the Chair needed to be somebody who was continuing on as a member of the Senate Council. Bailey noted that even those members whose terms expired at the end of December were still eligible to run.

Cibull made a **motion** to close nominations with a **second** from Bailey. The motion **passed** without dissent.

Cibull nominated Bailey for a second term as vice-chair. Bailey noted his ineligibility since his term ends at the end of December and vice-chair nominees do need to be continuing members.

Jones nominated Tagavi for the office of vice-chair with a second from Cibull. Cibull made a **motion** to close nominations. Duke **seconded** the motion, which **passed** without dissent.

Other Business

Jones asked for an update on the status of the programming for the Senate Council elections. Ms. Scott stated that immediately before the start of the meeting she had been in communication with the programmer, who was ill and at home. She reported having seen a draft of the nomination web site, that the site was nearly ready for testing, and that nominations for Senate Council should begin within a matter of days.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:52pm.

Respectfully submitted by
[Ernie Yanarella](#), Chair

Members present: Bailey, Cibull, Debski, Duke, Grabau, Jones, Kaalund, Odoi, Staben, Tagavi, Yanarella.

Liaisons present: Greissman, Saunier.

Guests present: Martin, Ray.

Prepared by [Rebecca Scott](#) on November 30, 2004.