

Senate Council Retreat  
July 10, 2006

**University Senate Committee Structure**

*Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Committee (SRWAC)*

(53 cases heard during 05-06 academic year)

Chair: Katherine McCormick

Chair McCormick requested:

- More members. There was a quorum at every meeting, but the possibility of not meeting the quorum number was worrisome for her.
- A responsible student member and/or a College of Pharmacy student as a standing member. The assigned student member from SGA never attended any 2005-2006 meetings, although she received all meeting time/date and student RWA information. In addition, Chair McCormick wished a Pharmacy student could be added to the membership to address the use of specific drugs, both prescribed and recreational.

Chair McCormick stated the committee is active and serves a vital function for the institution.

*Senate's Academic Programs (SAPC)*

(12 proposals reviewed during 05-06 academic year)

Chair: Bob Grossman

Chair Grossman stated that:

- The SAPC's work was redundant to that of the Graduate Council and the Undergraduate Council. The only thing it does that is somewhat novel is checking that the Routing form has been signed, which could be done by Senate Council Office personnel.

Chair Grossman opined that the SAPC should be dissolved.

*Senate's Admissions Advisory Committee*

Chair: Tony Baxter

Chair Baxter offered the following comments:

- The number of members and representation is sufficient. The only problem was that of getting the student member to attend, which he thought was a common problem.

Chair Baxter wondered if there was another committee evaluating readmission of students suspended from UK. If so, it is not clear that both committees are needed; both seem to be tasked with looking at students' performance and deciding whether the University should invest academic resources in a potential student. Is readmission drastically different from admission of transfer students?

*Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC)*

(9 proposals reviewed during 05-06 academic year)

Chair: Ernie Bailey

Chair Bailey offered the following comments:

- The diversity of representation was sufficient and added to discussions in a positive manner. Setting a standing time for meeting is preferable, with the understanding that it can be cancelled if there are no proposals to discuss. Routine proposals were dealt with via email, but physical meetings were held when necessary (presentation given or potential for controversy).
- The Senate Council (SC) needs to do a better job of communicating its deliberations on a proposal back to SAOSC, so the committee can do a better job of covering the questions considered important by the SC and/or Senate.
- In the past, the SC has not seemed to respect committee deliberations. During the last two years, Bailey thinks that approval of a proposal by the SAOSC has not been any type of predictor of its possible success at the SC. Furthermore, the SC appears to conduct its own de novo investigations of proposals without reference or consultation with committees. Considering that committee members have already investigated, talked with people and have an understanding of some of the underlying issues, the committee members could be a good resource for the Senate Council.

Chair Bailey believes the Senate Council appears to have assumed an excessive amount of the Senate authority and is in danger of being a bureaucracy that could impede faculty initiative. Ironically, the SC may damage faculty governance in the name of faculty governance.

*Senate's Academic Facilities Committee (SAFC)*

Chair: Ray Forge

Chair Forge, who has held that position for the past two years, offered the following comments:

- The SAFC met once during the past two years, but only to get to see each other face to face.
- The agenda for the SAFC was not clear to him. He assumed that the SAFC would be consulted when relevant topics came to the Senate. Perhaps none have arisen during the past two years, but he noted that facilities questions are decided all the time on campus. As an example, he explained that he was one of two faculty members who have served on an administrative committee making decisions about spending the \$1 million or so each year that is allocated for classroom improvements.

Chair Forge opined that perhaps the status quo is fine and that the Senate Council has had no issues for the Academic Facilities Committee to address

*Senate's Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (SAPPC)*

Chair: Mary Duke

Chair Duke offered the following comments:

- The SAPPC did not meet during 2005-2006, so there were no problems with the number and variety of committee membership.
- Due to the creation of the University Committee on Planning and Priorities (UCAPP), there appears to be little for the SAPPC to do, at least for the foreseeable future. She thinks UCAPP was formed as a "high profile" committee invested with the authority to translate the President's business plan into an academically sound plan for University faculty and administrators, which is what seemed to be needed.

Chair Duke does not know whether the Senate Committee on Planning and Priorities will have a role after the University Committee has completed its work.