

[University of Kentucky](#)**MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, September 28, 1998**

The University Senate met in special session at 3:00 p.m., September 28, 1998 in the Auditorium of the W. T. Young Library.

Professor Roy Moore, Chairperson of the Senate Council presided.

Members absent were: Sammy Anderson, James Applegate, Leon Assael, Anthony Baxter, Suketu Bhavsar, Jeffrey Bieber, Brian Biermann, Deborah Blades, Rachel Bomberger, Maria Boosalis*, James Brennan, Sharon Brennan, Jayson Brittain, Joseph Burch, Laretta Byars, Joan Callahan, Brad Canon, Charles Carlson, Ben Carr, Edward Carter, Michael Cibull, Jordan Cohen, Todd Curtis, Robert Dahlstrom, Inaas Darrat, George DeBin, Henri DeHahn, Eric Drake, David Durant, Juanita Fleming, Ray Forgue, William Freehling, Richard Furst, Hans Gesund*, Larry Grabau, Howard Grotch, Issam Harik, Patrick Herring, Kay Hoffman, James Holsinger, Blake Hornal, Mike Inmann, David Johnson, Jamshed Kanga, Alan Kaplan, Edward Kasarskis, Richard Kermode, Keith Kinderknecht, James Knoblett, Joachim Knuf, Philipp Kraemer, Thomas Lester, C. Oran Little, Marianne Lorenson, Donald Madden, Jason Miller, David Mohney, Robert Molzon, Margo Monteith, Phyllis Nash, Michael Neitzel, Jacqueline Noonan, Miles Osland, Claire Pomeroy, Thomas Pope, Shirley Raines, Dan Reedy, Thomas Robinson, Elizabeth Rompf, Michael Schlossberg, Robert Schwemm, Robert Shay, Steven Skinner, Sharon Stewart, David Stockham, Kaveh Tagavi, Thomas Troland, Henry Vasconez, William Wagner, Thomas Waldhart, Retia Walker, Charles Wethington*, Carolyn Williams, Eugene Williams, Emery Wilson, Ernest Yanarella.

* Absence Explained

The Chair stated that he hoped they would find this an informative meeting. It would also be informal with the chance for questions.

Chairperson Moore made the following remarks:

I would first like to talk about the Senate and what it does in rather broad terms. I would then like to talk about the Senate Council. Then I will ask the committee chairs to talk about their specific committees and also be available to answer questions.

The Senate is an elected body. The election process is not handled by the Senate Council, but is handled by the Registrar's Office, by Don Witt and Susan Caldwell. The Chair of the Rules and Elections Committee, Doug Michael is responsible for actually counting the ballots, votes and nominations. As far as the office that oversees the whole process, that is the Registrar's Office. I should also point out that Susan and Don sit down here and the proceedings are recorded. The minutes themselves are actually done by Susan and Don. The minutes are then turned back to me. A question has come up about what are the official minutes. Let me point out that there are two forms of minutes that are disseminated, one is what we call the longer minutes, which is a blow by blow account and has the names of people who ask questions and make comments. Those are still available. They are on the WEB. The reason those do not go out is because the Senate voted last year that those minutes would no longer be distributed because of all the trees that were being killed as a result. Anyone who wants those can come by the Senate Council office and pick up a copy. There is also the official minutes. Those are summaries of the various proceedings and are sent to all senators, administrators, and a group of other people

as specified in the Senate Rules. The minutes from the last meeting are already posted on the WEB.

The Senate itself, the larger group, which is around 114 members, is very much involved in determining overall academic policies of the University. That is specified in the rules and those of us who are Senate Council Chairs take that very seriously. It is also responsible for new academic programs, for curriculum, and new courses. Typically the way those work, for new courses in particular, is that it is simply a notice process. All senators and administrators get a notice when a new course is being applied for or whenever a course is being modified or deleted. That goes out and if there are no objections it then comes back to me for approval. The circulation for that is 10 days. If I do not see any problems I go ahead and sign off. When it comes to new programs, those have to go to the Senate Council and then on to the University Senate. As far as all the notices you get regarding new courses, those are not going to the Senate, other than just being circulated, those are not being voted upon as such by the Senate, unless someone has objections. In that case, there would be further discussion.

The Senate is also responsible for the University calendar. For example, this Friday none of you are supposed to be teaching. If you are, you are violating one of the Senate Rules. This Friday is what some people would call a dead day, a break. That was debated in the Senate, and the rule was changed so that there is a fall break of one day, a Friday. That was a change that was made by the Senate. When it comes to the calendar that comes from the Senate.

The Senate makes recommendations, but does not have a final say regarding creation, changes or the abolishment of academic units. As far as I can see by looking at previous minutes, the President takes that very seriously and does usually take the Senate's recommendation. The Senate is responsible for advising the President on planning and physical facilities--also on the appropriate committees. For example, if you want to know how you got on an area committee, it is because the Senate Council recommends names and then forwards them to the President, who makes the final decision.

Finally, I will point out that the Senate makes decisions regarding admission policies. There are a few changes this year in the Senate. There are nine new senators from Lexington Community College. There is a transition team, headed by David Durant and on which I also serve, which is looking at how we can go about merging all the rules including the appeals board and how we can better bring those into alignment because there are some major differences between the rules of LCC and the University Senate.

The Senate Council is the smaller body. It is made up, of under the rules, nine members that are elected from the larger group. The Senate does elect the Senate Council. There are two members from the student body, elected by the student membership of the Senate. There are three nonvoting members; members of the Board of Trustees, the Student Government Association president, and the immediate past chair of the Senate Council.

One question that often comes up is what constitutes a quorum for the Senate and the Senate Council. The Senate Council meets every Monday, except the second Monday when the Senate itself meets. In order for the Senate Council to be able to properly conduct business, six voting members must be present. Just as with the Senate, Senate Council members serve three-year terms. There are three faculty members elected each fall with their terms beginning on January 1st and going through December 31st. The student members are elected for one-year terms. There is a chair and a vice-chair. That is a change this year. In the past, there has been a

chair and a chair-elect who acted as a vice-chair. As of this year, we have no chair-elect. We will elect a chair-elect in December and that person will be elected from among the current members of the Senate Council, by the Senate Council. As far as the Senate itself goes, a quorum of the Senate requires 45 voting members. There is no voting by proxy. You cannot give your vote to someone else by proxy. If you can not be here, you can not vote. In order for there to be a roll call, where people individually have to give their vote, twenty-five percent of the members or one-fourth of the members present have to ask for the roll call. The chair can also ask for a roll call vote. The roll call can not be debated.

We do have a secretary to the Senate, which is the Registrar, Don Witt. We also have a secretary to the Senate Council, Cindy Todd. We have a parliamentarian, Gifford Blyton. The parliamentarian is there to advise, not have the final say, but simply advises the chair regarding rules and procedures. We do follow Roberts Rules of Order unless there is a conflict, in which case the Senate Rules prevail. There are two sergeant at arms. I would encourage you to look at the rules. They are quite long.

You will note that much of the policy making is delegated to the Senate Council. However there are issues, particularly maybe a proposal for a new degree or new program, or issues regarding tenure, and those, of course, would come before the full Senate.

How do you get something to the Senate Council? The simple way is get someone on the Senate Council to do it for you. There are other ways. One is a written recommendation which can be made to either a committee or to the Senate Council itself. The Senate Council would have to act upon that recommendation. The Senate Council may decide it does not want to forward that recommendation to the full Senate. There are three choices that the Senate Council has when it comes to forwarding proposals to the full Senate. The Senate Council can say no, we reject the proposal, and not forward it. There are some procedures by which the proposal could be introduced on the floor of the Senate, but I will not go through those now.

The next option is to send the proposal forward with a recommendation for approval. That is the most common way. If you notice when you get the proposal, it will have at the bottom a statement that says this proposal was recommended for approval by the Senate Council. The last option is to forward a proposal without recommendation. It does not mean that the Senate Council approves or disapproves. It simply means the Senate Council wishes to have the proposal forwarded to the full Senate to be debated and discussed and let the decision be made by the Senate.

The Senate meetings themselves are the second Monday of every month, when there are classes in session. However special meetings can be called. Special meetings can be called one of three ways: 1) if 10 voting members of the Senate sign a call for a special meeting, 2) the President of the University calls for a special meeting, or 3) the Chair of the Senate Council makes the call.

How does the agenda get determined? It is primarily the Senate Council which does that. The Senate Council meets for two hours every Monday. The Senate Council looks at lots of issues, sort of as the filtering body that basically determines those issues that will go forward to the full Senate.

All meetings, both the full Senate as well as the Senate Council, are open at anytime to anyone who wishes to attend. The only time a meeting is closed is whenever there is a call to go into executive session. If there is such a call, it requires a majority vote of those present. If there is not a majority vote, there can be no executive session. If there is an executive session, the open meetings and open records law requires that there be a notice as to what the purpose of the executive session is. After the executive session is over, a vote may be taken. No final votes

may be taken in executive session. If there is a vote, it must be confirmed in public.

At this time I will introduce each of the committee chairs that are present for them to talk about their committees.

Senate Academic Planning and Priorities Committee - Kim Anderson, Chemical Engineering.

This is my second year as Chair of this committee. These are the members of the committee: William Freehling - History, Behruz Abadi - Oral Health, Ellen Hahn - Nursing, Walter Abbott - Sociology, Jim Norton - Medicine, Susan Mains - Student, Graduate School, Eric Drake - Student, Allied Health, and Mike Nietzel - ex officio.

Their charge is identifying major academic problems likely to be faced by the University in the foreseeable future. To formulate and recommend to the Senate plausible academic goals for the institution. To develop procedures and criteria for recommending priorities.

They also are to recommend to the Senate a means for increasing the University's effectiveness and establishing and implementing academic policies.

To serve the Senate and the Administration as a source of faculty information and opinion concerning academic planning and priorities.

Based on that, I had a meeting with Roy Moore and talked about possible focus areas for this committee for 1998-99. I have not met with committee members yet, so these are open for discussion with them.

First of all, student retention and graduation rates are a very important issue that this committee should look at. I have heard more than once that the Council on Postsecondary Education is actually looking at these tuitions as far as distribution of the money. We feel that this is a very important area that this committee should focus on and provide some information.

Second of all, when there are faculty working on academic issues, there is a question, especially for those untenured, about rewards for these services. I would like this committee to look at rewards for participating in undergraduate education--not just necessarily look at promotion and tenure.

Finally, there is some question about our computer facilities. I have heard some people say that we are starting to max out on the facilities that we have available and how are we going to continue to provide facilities if our student population continues to increase? I would like to bring the issue up to this committee to discuss the possibility of having the students buy computers.

Also any other issues that you or the other committee members would like to recommend.

As far as how we plan to run the process this year, I will probably set up a monthly meeting with the committee. They will meet at a standard time and will prioritize the areas of focus and choose one or two to concentrate on this year.

Chairperson Moore said that all the committee meetings are open and anyone can attend. If you want to know when the committees meet, just call the Senate Council office. Also there is a bulletin board outside the Senate Council office in the basement of the Administration Building, Room 10.

The agendas for the committees and the Senate and the Senate Council will be posted there. The committee minutes can also be made available. All the committee chairs know they are supposed to send out an agenda and keep minutes.

I have had some questions about the ten-day notice rule. The ten-day notice rule is a requirement under our rules that, anytime a proposal is to be voted upon by the Senate, it must be circulated to the voting senators at least ten days in advance. It can be waived by a majority vote of the Senate. If you are trying to get something before the Senate, you need to keep in mind when the Senate meets and that it has to be on the agenda and that there is a requirement of a ten day notice. The Senate can put an item on the agenda for discussion only. It will always say for "Discussion Only." If it is for discussion only, it can not be voted upon at that meeting, even if there has been a ten-day notice. Amendments can be proposed, but they can not be voted upon. It can be discussed and debated but no formal vote can be taken if an item is for discussion only. The Senate Council determines if an item is for discussion only.

Rules and Elections - Douglas Michael, College of Law.

We codify and interpret Senate Rules. As the name of the committee indicates, we are in charge of the rules and elections. The Senate Rules are the rules governing the academic affairs of the university as it relates to students and faculty. Basically, it is everything that it is in that little book that is called Student Rights and Responsibilities that the students all get. Plus a couple of other sections about the organization and functioning of the Senate itself.

The rules are not perfect, and issues always arise under them for interpretation. Normally, I suggest strongly that you take those questions to Roy first and then he will decide how to dispense with them. Sometimes he will decide it should go to the Rules Committee. Nonetheless, sometimes we will decide it is not a matter we are comfortable with interpreting and will send a proposal to change the rule back to the Senate Council. Sometimes we will issue an interpretation binding until the Rules Committee decides otherwise. We try to be deferential. If it is all unclear, we will send it back for the full Senate to act upon.

The other exciting thing we do is count ballots. Susan and I regularly count ballots for senators and for faculty trustees. Anyone is more than welcome to come help do that.

The committee is pretty much reactive. I do not have an agenda. We codify things as they are done by the Senate. Things are passed, and we decide if they are to fit in the Senate Rules and where they best fit in. Sometimes that requires changing the rules. For example, last year the Senate decided that credits given for advance placement should be given the grade of CR. When they went to codify that, there was nowhere in the Senate marking system a grade called CR. So they had to provide for one.

Basically, you will come to the Rules Committee if you have questions of academic matters that are not covered in the rules. We meet on a reactive basis when enough of those things have come up, enough things to codify or enough questions for interpretation. If you are on that committee, we will meet sporadically at the whim of the chair, which is usually every month or so.

Last year, there was the infamous plus/minus system or the lack of it which came in several iterations. When it was finally done, we had to sit down and calmly codify that, which required chasing down a couple of little pieces of plus/minus rules that were in the plus/minus rules but they were

not sure they should remain there. It was very difficult to decide how to do that. If you push the rules in one place, you will discover another rule that has impacted another one here. If there are three or more of them, then you have to decide what to do with them.

Every now and then the Senate acts on things without codifying them. The Senate will pass a paragraph, and they are not sure how to fit it in the rules and not sure who is responsible for interpreting these words that are not the same words that are in the rules.

The question was asked where they would find the rules interpretations?

Professor Michael said that the rules committee interpretations fall under the relevant Senate rules. If there is an interpretation, it will follow the rule and be notated RC.

Library Committee - Michael Lach, Information Systems

The Library Committee is charged by the Senate with the responsibility for recommending to the University Senate policies to promote the educational interests of the University as a whole with respect to the libraries and for consultation and advising with the Director of Libraries on such matters as are referred to it by the Director or other University personnel which pertain to improving the usefulness of the libraries of the University of Kentucky.

That basically means that if you do not like something that is happening in the library, you come and ask us to take a look at it and see what sort of rules and regulations the library has and to look into it and see if there is logic and see if other universities are doing things in that direction.

In talking with Roy and the Director of Libraries, given this new facility and the fact that they have combined four libraries into one, they have moved over a million volumes to compact shelving. The fact that we now have classrooms, seminar rooms, faculty studies, graduate studies, as well as the state of the art auditorium we are in now we thought that it would make sense for our committee to consider the policies and procedures that have been created for the W. T. Young Library. These four different libraries have different rules for circulation of books and journals. There are rules about how many times you can sign out a classroom. Who gets a faculty study? How long do you get a faculty study? Essentially, none of this has been reviewed by our faculty. My proposal is that over the period of this year on a monthly basis we begin to review all of those rules and regulations and make sure that they are consistent with what we need to promote the educational interests of the university as a whole with respect to libraries.

Admissions and Academic Standards Committee - Ray Cox, Mathematics

The Admissions and Academic Standards Committee is more or less what the name implies. It is their function to examine and recommend to the University Senate changes in admission requirements, grading rules, standards of grading, standards of granting academic credit, probation, suspension, degree, and graduation requirements. They are basically a reactive committee to handle proposals from colleges and programs within departments in terms of their admission requirements. We were involved last year in the plus/minus grading scene. This year, aside from the normal issues that come before us they will be looking at what impact the Kentucky Educational Excellence Scholarship or KEES will have on admissions and the university procedures. Also, they will be looking at distance learning. There are a lot of courses now being offered through distance learning. They will be looking at the criteria for granting credit,

examinations, and how the courses are taught and graded.

Academic Organization and Structure Committee - Cliff Hynimann, College of Pharmacy

This is my second year as chair of this committee. The charge is to review proposals and recommendations concerning priorities for new academic units, the abolishment or merger of academic units, or major changes in organization and structure of academic units.

Last year, we were pretty reactive in dealing with issues as they came up. However, there are a couple of agenda items that suggest we should be more proactive. One is to look at recommendations for the creation or abolishment or change in organizational structure of academic units--in other words to do this without necessarily receiving proposals.

Finally, to study and report on matters relating to faculty size, strength, and student enrollment. We did not address that at all last year. Last year we just looked at three areas: the Center for Health Services Management and Research, the School of Public Health, and the name change in the Department of Geological Sciences. This year, however, we are going to become more proactive, and one of the suggested areas was that we look at some of the reviews that have been done by the University on colleges, external or perhaps university reviews to see if there are issues there related to organization and structure or perhaps even issues related to our final charge of faculty size and strength that perhaps we should address within the committee. We did also recognize last year that there is an inconsistency between the guidelines document from the Senate Council for looking at new proposals and an Administrative Regulation which deals with Centers and Institutes. We may also take a look at that and see if they can bring the two of those things in line.

Research Committee - David Hamilton, Department of History

I was appointed to this committee three years ago, and the only action the committee took that year was to disband itself. It was no longer necessary because of the inadequate guidelines. This was a time when research at this University was coming under greater scrutiny because of what was happening in Frankfort. It seemed to me a bizarre decision to disband at a time when the Governor and the University were investigating this the way they were. I suggested to Jim Applegate and he thought it was a great idea that they continue.

This committee has an open-ended agenda--more than perhaps some of the other committee charges have suggested. Last year, the obvious thing was to discuss, debate, and consider the results of the Reedy Task Force to consider how the decisions were implemented and carried out. It seems to me that the Senate can get bogged down at times concerning various policies, and that we as a body ought to be engaged in what I think are some of the really vital aspects of our university community. Certainly, research is one of these; a research climate or environment is something that a University Senate needs to consider. One of the issues we took up last year in our meetings were the effects of the new programs regarding Tier 1 and Tier 2. One of our concerns was what to do about the overall research climate of the University, as opposed to simply support for programs that were identified as Tier 1 and Tier 2. I think that the committee felt very strong that we define ourselves and establish our collective identity by how they encourage, facilitate, and honor research and that they will continue to address these issues.

I have been waiting for the latest documents regarding the matching endowment programs before meeting. I am hoping to distribute these to the

committee members to discuss what this will mean for programs in the University. I hope that we can continue to pursue these topics throughout the remainder of the year. Certainly, this is a topic in which we all have a strong interest. If anyone has a suggestion for an issue, a concern that comes under the rather broad definition of research, please get in touch with me.

Academic Facilities - Mary Molinaro, University Libraries

Our committee generally is dealing with all types of space on campus, including classroom space, departmental offices, computer labs, and the like. I had talked to Roy several weeks ago about the direction and the focus for this committee for this year, and we agreed that one of the big tasks that was needed was an assessment of facilities. I know that none of you probably teach in substandard classrooms, but we may want to address that generally and look and see exactly how good our classrooms are, how questionable some are, and how really bad some of the others are and make recommendations on how those facilities could be made better. So it is a big task ahead.

The question was asked if they would be also looking at the equipment within the room.

Professor Molinaro answered, "yes". They were not looking at just if there is chalk in the chalk rack. I know that the University is putting in a lot of smart classrooms. We want to know how smart they are. There is a wide range of issues on classroom space.

Nate Brown, President, Student Government, said that there was something on the WEB that has pictures of every classroom and a rating scale. How often is that looked at?

Professor Molinaro answered she did not know. Are the ratings accurate? If that is the case, then all the classrooms with a four are probably great. That is the type of issue that they are looking at and delving into. Looking at the rating scale; it may actually have chairs, but they want to know are they functional?

The question was asked, would they be involved with scheduling?

Professor Molinaro said absolutely not. Last year, they did talk about some scheduling issues. They will be working with the Registrar's Office.

A Senator said that one thing that had come up in their Committee B discussions for the undergraduate initiative is the lack of informal space where student teams can get together or faculty and small groups of students can get together. There are no vacant classrooms available, and there is no place to meet with a small group of students.

Professor Molinaro said that was probably the reason she was asked to be chair of the committee because of her involvement with the library. They do have a lot of those types of rooms. They will need to look at those campus-wide. While they have a lot of rooms that will meet that need, in the library it is not enough for the whole campus.

The Chair said that this committee last year had a report that was presented to the Senate Council on the scheduling of academic facilities. You will be getting that report with your packet for the next Senate meeting.

Institutional Finances and Resource Allocation Committee - Craig Infanger, Agriculture Economics.

I just finished my second term as a senator. In my first term, several years back I was on this committee and it never met.

Our committee started some real functioning last year and most of the committee is holding over from last year. We have six members and two students representing five different colleges.

Our basic charge is to examine the overall picture of University finances and resources--not getting engaged in anything about an individual college or individual departments. You will also notice if you take a look at the chart on the WEB site, that the focus is on budget reductions, which I guess reflects the mentality of the time that the charge was written. We are currently trying to schedule a meeting with Joan McCauley to talk about the UK budget process, and they will be meeting with the Chancellor of Lexington Campus and Medical Center to talk about the implications of all the new research trust funds and what impact that is going to have on the academic function of the University. Last year we had a meeting with the Chancellor of the Lexington Campus concerning the Lexington Campus reserves for fiscal year 1999. Most of you would describe it as the Chancellor's tax. The Chancellor went over line by line of every one of the allocations that had been made. This represents I think the first time the faculty was permitted to see that type of information. We are trying to build on that this year and create an expectation on the part of the Administrators of the Lexington Camps and Medical Center that they would like to talk about it and know what the criteria are. You are more than welcome to come to our meetings.

Admissions Advisory Committee - William Cohen, Biological Sciences

The charge of the Admissions Advisory Committee is to be responsible for recommending admissions policy within general guidelines established by the Senate. We work closely with Don Witt, the Registrar, and Pat Herring, the Director of Admissions. I met with them initially two weeks ago and our committee has already met. Some of you may be aware of the fact that our rough numbers for admission for the freshman class this fall were about 200 higher than fall 1997. Part of that was because the actual admissions process extended over a relatively long period of time, fall through spring. One thing that we wanted to do with our full committee meeting was to get the admissions process going earlier this year, particularly with regard to the so called automatic admit pool, which is the 80% pool, and set the overall high school GPA and composite ACT scores, and the committee has already approved the numbers. They are, in fact, the same as for Fall 1997. The idea in general is to have the process occur early, admit students earlier and establish the freshman class early on. The other 20% is the review part where students who do not meet with automatic criteria can be admitted by special talents. One of the charges of the committee is to provide recommendations to the Director of Admissions with regard to criteria, which are in addition to just overall high school GPA and composite ACT--for example, looking at areas as perhaps an academic core type GPA. We are looking at other ways, particularly as Ray Cox mentioned from the committee, dealing with the so called KEES scholarships if, in fact, several years from now there is an explosion in terms of respective enrollments at the University. We are indeed interested in trying to establish some more complex criteria other than the two simple ones which have been used in the past for automatic admissions. Also, Pat is working on some increased enrollment service ideas to share on Preview Nights.

A lot of what we do is to advise and be a sounding board. We are waiting for Pat Herring to do some additional analysis so we can see some of the correlations he has made and decide whether those should be added to the existing set of admission criteria. Needless to say, a simple change from overall GPA to an academic core GPA would probably set off lots of noise in

the state, but it is going in the right direction.

Nate Brown asked if there was a student on the committee. He was told, according to Senate Rules, there could not be a student on the committee because of conflict of interest.

Professor Cohen said it was a good idea to have a student on the committee.

In some discussion they have had of Advanced Placement classes, the value of those classes, and when students take them, Rob was extremely useful. The student insight to the process is important.

The Exceptions Committee - Fred Danner, College of Education.

Their committee is a three member committee of the Senate that deals with appeals for people who have been denied automatic admission or admission by the regular criteria. Anyone who has been denied admission can appeal in writing. They have a limit to the number they can bring in under the exceptions. I believe it is less than 10% of the freshman class can come in under essentially waiving the standard criteria. The standard criteria are basically GPA and ACT scores. People sometimes feel that is not a good measure of their potential. They write letters to the committee. They get hundreds of such appeals a year. They have to make informed judgments or guesses. Whether someone who was just over the line, their last two years they pulled themselves up, they messed up the first couple of years at some junior college, were immature and did not take it seriously and now they show a couple of years of solid work somewhere else and want to come and have been denied because they did not quite meet the GPA standard. We are basically the committee that handles appeals.

Ad Hoc Committee on Minorities - Lionell Williamson,

This is the third year I have chaired the Ad Hoc Committee on Minorities. I assume that the reason that I have been encouraged to chair this committee for the third time is perhaps that maybe the third time we will get it right. By right, I mean we will finally get a series of meetings going and get some things accomplished.

The committee has the charge of looking at the economic, social, and political status of minority faculty and staff on the campus.

When they began to meet two years ago, the staff was in the process of going through a major reclassification. They decided to look at the status of minority faculty on this campus. One of the reasons that they decided to do that is because they believe that somewhere between September 1st and May 15th something happens each year to minority faculty and they lose a good number of their faculty. They thought after a series of meetings and deliberate discussion to do something really ingenious and that was to survey those minority faculty who left over the past five years with the intent of finding out why they may have departed the University. There were some faculty they were not in a position to interview because of some legal activities by the University. That is over now and we can go ahead and survey those faculty. We identified a list of faculty who departed the University over the past five years, and each one of us selected from that list individuals we would contact and do a telephone survey of them to determine perhaps why they left and use that as a basis for making recommendations to the Senate as to how they might better retain minority faculty. They would like to find out the reasons for these faculty members leaving. Our committee will be reporting to the Faculty Senate this year a recommendation in terms of how we can retain minority faculty. There are eighteen recommendations that came out of a 1990 report by this committee approved by the Faculty Senate looking at the overall status of minorities on this campus. We are prioritizing the eighteen recommendations because

we will not be able to look at all eighteen. We will be looking at those this year. My objective is to meet at least monthly.

Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee - Scott Kelley - College of Business and Economics

This is the first year for this committee. Basically, our charge is to evaluate student appeals for retroactive withdrawals, as the name implies. Without going into too much detail about the criteria, it can be up to a year, serious injury, illness, serious personal or family problems, serious financial difficulties, or permanent disability. Those are the criteria we are working with. We had our first meeting last Wednesday and the first thing we realized after about fifteen minutes of discussion was that it was going to be real important for them to have a standardized form. They will probably work from the Arts and Sciences model. The committee will meet monthly and the main reason for that is the rule states the students should have an answer within 30 days.

The question was asked what is the composition of the committee?

Professor Kelley said that the committee is made up of five faculty members, four alternates and two ex officio members. There is to be a student, which will be appointed.

The Chair said that this committee was created by a committee, which he headed last year. You may know that up until this committee was created, any retroactive withdrawals involved the Senate Council Chair waiving the Senate Rules in order to grant such a withdrawal. Jan Schach, who was the Chair of the Senate Council, did not feel that was a good way to do that, because there was no way of determining what is fair or unfair. She asked him to chair the committee, and recommendations from the committee were then adopted by the Senate Council and by the Senate.

Chairperson Moore said that there were two committees that were not represented. The first is the Academic Programs Committee chaired by Tom Troland. That committee looks at new academic programs, and there are three permanent subcommittees: the Graduate Program Subcommittee, The First Degree Programs Committee, and the Professional and Preprofessional Programs. When new programs are requested, those subcommittees investigate and look at the proposal and then make a recommendation to the full committee, which then makes its recommendation to the Senate Council and then to the full Senate. That committee deals only with new academic programs.

The other committee is the Ad Hoc Committee on Women chaired by Joan Callahan. That committee is to look and make sure the University is complying with the rules and policies that were established by the University Senate in 1990 with regard to equity goals that were set. It is also charged with investigating the economic, social, and political status of women employees and students at UK and to identify problems and to recommend new goals and programs as necessary.

There is one other committee, a task force chair by David Durant--The Lexington Community College Transition Force Committee. That committee is looking at how we can better integrate LCC into the University of Kentucky.

Professor Moore said that the charges for all the committees are on the WEB site. What he had hoped to do was to arrange it so that they would have the e-mail addresses of the chairs so all they will need to do is click on the chairs' address. In the meantime, everyone should have a copy of the list that includes the e-mail address and phone numbers of all chairs.

William Maloney, Chair of the Committee on Student Evaluations, made the following remarks.

I have been working for the last year with the Teaching and Learning Center on a three-year program taking a look at how we evaluate teaching, last year setting up the criteria for evaluating teaching. This year, starting this Friday, they are having a workshop on the Evaluation of Teaching with Bill McKeachie from the University of Michigan, who is a national expert on teaching evaluations. Then we are going to look at how they can actually employ it.

The question was asked that when the Rules Committee makes rule interruptions, how much they relied on the knowing or understanding the original intent of the Senate when they pass the rule?

The Chair said that he had been chair of the committee for two years. They certainly went back and looked at the minutes of the meeting to see what the discussion was and try to make some judgment as to what the intent was.

When there was a question, instead of making an interpretation, they sent it to the Senate Council to clarify or amend the rule. Certainly, an important function is to go back and look at the minutes. In some cases they talked with the people who were originally involved with the proposal to see what they had in mind. It is not a scientific process. That is why any interpretation can be overridden by the Senate Council.

Chairperson Moore said he hoped that the meeting been informative. It is the first time they have done this. There are refreshments in the Alumni Gallery.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Donald Witt
Secretary, University Senate

You are visitor Unable to open config file for reading since November 18, 1998

Return to [University Senate Page](#)

Return to [University Senate Minutes](#)

Last Updated: Friday, November 20, 1998 (Prior revision: 11/18/1998)