

Senate Council Minutes

December 6, 2004

The Senate Council met on Monday, December 6, 2004 in Room 103 Main Building from 3:00 to 5:00 and took the following actions.

1. [Approval of the Minutes from November 29, 2004](#)

The Chair asked if there were any corrections or changes to the minutes. There being none, the minutes stood approved as written.

2. Announcements

The Chair noted that he had investigated some questions regarding the rule of 65 in response to a request from Dembo to do so. He said the Chief of Staff had replied that the rule of 65 as the mandatory retirement age did not apply to associate provosts. Therefore, Dr. Yopp's appointment does not need to be re-evaluated in the next few years for that reason.

The Chair said he would attend a meeting of the Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure the following Wednesday. He said he had consulted with the Legal Office to determine if that committee could determine itself in close session in regard to a current case. He will report the results of the discussion on the listserv once a resolution is reached. Cibull requested that the Chair investigate whether the committee has heard the case of Dr. Ahmed. The Chair agreed. Kennedy suggested the committee act more expeditiously to hear and decide its cases. Debski wondered if the committee's workload may be partially responsible for the delay.

Jones asked the faculty trustees to provide an update on the Nursing Dean situation. Moore said that since Dean Williams will be turning 65 the AR's require her retirement, but that the Provost wished to extend her appointment by two years for a variety of reasons. He reported that he and Kennedy had queried the Nursing faculty regarding the desirability of a reappointment and

had received responses from thirty of the approximately fifty faculty members in that college, most of which were favorable. He noted that he and Kennedy insisted that some mechanism be put into place that would alert the Administration to upcoming 65th birthdays for Deans in the future and requested a two-year advance notice so the appropriate dean search may be initiated. He said the Provost agreed and said he had already investigated the ages and upcoming birthdays of the other Deans. Moore added that he and Kennedy will have breakfast with the Provost on a monthly basis in the future to further the causes of communication and information sharing.

Cibull asked if it was a good idea to define a person's ability to serve by their age. He spoke in favor of enforcing existing rules but suggested that perhaps the Senate Council should make a recommendation that the rules be re-evaluated or possibly changed. Moore agreed.

3. Lexington Community College degree list

The Chair introduced the item and said the list had gained the approval of the LCC faculty. Jones said he was concerned that this list came from the LCC administration with a statement that it would come through the UK Senate and Board for two years while the MOU has language that suggests differently. He also expressed concern that the MOU speaks of the role of the University Senate without that body having been consulted. Jones said he was investigating the situation.

Saunier said she spoke with Sandy Carey about this issue. She reported that Carey had suggested the need to somehow get the degree list to the Board and was trying to follow procedures that had previously been in place to accomplish that goal. Saunier noted that the MOU pertaining to the transfer of LCC to KCTCS was copied word for word from the 1997 MOU which transferred the other community colleges. Ms. Scott reported on a conversation with personnel in the President's Office who said the list was always received from the KCTCS President's Office. Jones speculated that perhaps the list had come up from the KCTCS faculty senate for approval of both the KCTCS Board and the UK Board.

Tagavi made a **motion** to approve the LCC degree list for Fall 2004. Jones **seconded** the motion, which **passed** without dissent. The degree list will be forwarded to the full Senate for its consideration at the December meeting.

4. ACMC review committee charge and structure

The Chair provided a first draft he had compiled based on the input and instruction provided by the Senate Council members at a previous meeting. He noted clear differences of opinion among the Senate Council members on a variety of issues and hoped that some consensus could be reached. He noted that Dembo had volunteered to serve as the chair of the review committee, should it be the Council's pleasure to ask him to serve in that capacity.

The Senate Council members turned their attention to the formation of a motion to create the committee. After considerable discussion and input, the Senate Council members jointly proposed the following motion, which was cobbled together from various suggestions from around the table:

“Create an ad hoc committee to recommend the composition, role, functions, scope and leadership of the Academic Council of the Medical Center in light of the migration of the University from a two-Chancellor system to a Provost model.”

Cibull noted that any motion approved by the Senate Council will also have to be approved by the Senate, since the Senate had already voted favorably for a different proposal. After further discussion, Kennedy made a **motion** to approve the statement quoted above. Odoi **seconded** the motion, which **passed** without dissent.

The Senate Council members turned their attention to the question of the committee's charge. Staben offered many substantive and editorial changes

to the draft wording. Cibull suggested including consultation by faculty and administrators not located in the Medical Center—e.g., the Provost. Bailey suggested the chairs of the Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council should also be consulted. Kennedy suggested including the committee's reporting deadline as part of the charge. The Chair said he was increasingly being persuaded that the proposed April 1 deadline was too late in the semester to allow for adequate Senate consideration and action before the summer break. Jones suggested March 1 as an alternative. The Chair noted that while Dean Blackwell had agreed to serve as Chair of the ACMC during the summer months if needed, he would very much like to settle the situation before summer begins. Cibull agreed and suggested that the question of finances and staffing be included in the committee's analysis.

Several Senate Council members offered proposed wording and suggested changes to the edits previously offered by Staben. After much deliberation the following charge was crafted with help from various Council members:

“The committee will prepare a report to the SC that explores the above issues. The committee will solicit information from appropriate individuals, both within and outside the medical center, including past and present Academic Council of the Medical Center chairs, members, and staff, the Provost, chairs of the Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council. The committee is encouraged to use such information as broadcast emails, individual interviews and written statements elicited from interested parties. Consideration should span the full range of possibilities from abolishing the ACMC to fortifying and expanding its present structure and responsibilities, and should include consideration of staffing and other resources. The alternatives to be considered are limited only by their fit within the new Provost administrative model and their need to consider the implications of proposed changes for the responsibilities of the Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council and Senate Council. The committee may recommend a specific solution but it is also encouraged to assess the advantages and drawbacks of the alternatives seriously explored over the course of its deliberations. The committee's report will be due by March 1, 2005.”

Having accomplished the task for forming the charge, the Senate Council members next considered the issue of the committee's membership. Jones suggested that the chairs of the faculty councils from each of the six colleges of the Medical Center should serve on the committee. Cibull disagreed, noting that the academic deans who coordinate the curricula for each of the colleges would be most interested in insuring the quality and simplicity of course and program evaluation processes in the Medical Center. Jones suggested that perhaps the membership could consist of the chairs of the faculty councils or their designees and added that the various faculty councils could elect their own representatives. The Chair suggested keeping the committee small to facilitate the ease with which they could meet and communicate. Bailey suggested the membership could be hand-picked since it may take the faculty councils too long to elect their representatives. As an alternative, Bailey suggested that a nominating committee consisting of Cibull, Duke, Yanarella and Dembo, with Dembo as chair, could hand-pick the suitable committee members from among the appropriate areas.

Staben suggested having at least one person on the committee who is outside the existing process so that a fresh perspective on how best to do business could be offered. Odoi spoke in favor of having a student member on the committee. Cibull suggested that such service would not be the best use of a student's time, since the function of the ACMC is to conduct business, but noted that students have membership on the various curriculum committees and have a voice through those bodies. Odoi said that if it merely addressed business matters then there was no need to include a student.

Cibull spoke against having such a small committee and suggested that if the representative from each college didn't attend each meeting some important information may be excluded from the decision-making process. Ms. Scott suggested that each college send forward one member plus one alternate to serve in the event of the member's absence. Cibull agreed and asked who the outside member on the committee should be. Jones suggested Dean Blackwell or her designee. Cibull asked how a student member, if deemed necessary, would be selected for committee membership. Odoi replied that the SGA Senate would nominate and elect a member from among the Senators from the Medical Center colleges. Cibull agreed to those terms.

Bailey expressed concern that the faculty councils may not meet again until February. Jones suggested setting a target date for the appointment of the committee. Cibull suggested vesting that responsibility in the committee chair and asked if any of the Council members suggested any other nominees for the chairpersonship of the committee other than Dembo. The Council members indicated a consensus that Dembo should chair the committee.

Cibull made a **motion** that the committee will be chaired by Dembo and will be composed of one regular and one alternate member from each of the colleges of the Medical Center, which will be selected by the faculty councils of each college, one student member of the representative colleges from Student Government Association, and Dean Blackwell or her designee. Kaalund **seconded** the motion. The motion **passed**, with seven members voting in favor of the motion and Bailey voting against.

5. [Approval of the December 13, 2004 Senate agenda](#)

Tagavi suggested rearranging the order of the agenda to put the Provost's update last in the hope of retaining a quorum. Ms. Scott left to determine the Provost's availability. Upon her return she announced that the Provost agreed to present his annual address at 4:00pm. The agenda was approved by consensus. The two action items will be presented first, followed by the Ombud's address and the Provost's presentation.

6. Senate Council Officer Elections

Yanarella, the only candidate for the office of Chair, and Tagavi, the only candidate for the office of Vice-Chair, departed. Bailey asked for a vote on the office of Chair. Yanarella was elected unanimously. Bailey asked for a vote on the office of Vice-Chair. Tagavi was elected unanimously. The two candidates returned to the room and were congratulated.

Other Business

Kennedy suggested that ex officio voting members of the Senate who do not attend two meetings should be converted to ex officio non-voting status and the number needed to form a quorum be dropped appropriately. Debski suggested that the number needed to constitute a quorum simply be changed. The Chair suggested that it was appropriate to address the larger question, since the problem was the loss of the LCC Senators. He suggested that this issue be discussed during the break over the listserv.

Tagavi suggested changing the number to 40 from 45 for the remainder of the year, since his committee has not yet had a chance to examine this issue. He noted though that it would be corrected once the apportionment of Senate seats was addressed. Kennedy made a motion that the number needed to convene a quorum be changed from 45 to 40 for the remainder of the academic year. Bailey seconded the motion, which passed without dissent.

In other business, the Chair noted that the refreshments which were provided were to call attention to the departure of three Senate Council members who had dutifully fulfilled their terms. The Chair gave thanks to Debski, Staben and Bailey, though he noted that due to Bailey's role as Vice-Chair he would remain on the Senate Council as a non-voting member until May, and complimented them on their excellent service.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:12pm.

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

Members present: Bailey, Cibull, Debski, Jones, Kaalund, Kennedy, Moore, Odoi, Staben, Tagavi, Yanarella.

Liaison present: Saunier

Prepared by [Rebecca Scott](#) on December 15, 2004.