

Senate Council Minutes
January 26, 2004

The Senate Council met on Monday, January 26, 2004 at 3:00 pm in the Gallery of the W. T. Young Library and took the following actions:

1. Minutes

Jones noted a change needed to the second paragraph on page six in which the amendment to the motion was not included in the motion as written. Ms. Scott will correct the error. Cibull **moved** to approved the minutes and Debski **seconded** the motion. The motion passed. Tagavi abstained.

2. Academic Calendar:

The Senate Council members expressed their desire to send the approval of the Academic Calendar to the Senate for a vote with the possible amendment of the Winter Session. Debski and Cibull suggested asking the Registrar's Office to insert the appropriate dates for add/drop periods. The Calendar will be included on the February Senate agenda.

3. Honorary Degree Candidates

The Chair described the three candidates to be presented at the February Senate meeting. Debski said that the names of the candidates were usually presented to the Senate Council members in closed session. Tagavi noted that a recommendation to approve or disapprove couldn't be made on the item unless the names of the candidates were known. Jones suggested approving the item for inclusion on the agenda with no recommendation. The Council determined by general consensus to place the item on the Senate agenda with no recommendation.

4. Proposed change to Senate Rule 5.2.4.2

Tagavi introduced the item and outlined the origination and discussion of the proposal at the committee level. Kennedy and Chard suggested that the definition of family as offered in the proposal as Item C be included as a footnote instead. Tagavi agreed. Cibull **moved** to approve the proposal. Yanarella **seconded** the motion. Discussion ensued regarding the differences between the terms "illness" and "serious illness" used in the original rule, the role of the Ombud in the appeal process, whether or not a Fraternity house could be defined as a household, and other related issues. Cibull offered the friendly amendment of using the word "significant" when addressing the illness of the student and "serious" for the illness of a household member. Tagavi agreed with the suggestion.

Cibull **moved** to accept the amendment as outlined above. Jones **seconded** the motion. The motion **passed**, with Tagavi and Bailey in the negative. None abstained. A vote was taken on the original motion to approve the item. The motion **passed** with no dissent.

5. Items from the Admission and Academic Standards Committee

The Chair introduced Walter Ferrier, Chair of the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee. Ferrier reported on three items. He began with the College of Pharmacy proposal to change its Academic Performance and Promotion guidelines and noted the Committee's unanimous recommendation of the proposal. The Senate Council members asked a variety of questions about the consistency in word choice, the definition of Pharmacy grade point average versus cumulative grade point average, and possible ambiguity in suspension policy. Ferrier said his committee had recommended a variety of changes to the proposal as it was written. Ms. Scott apologized for not providing a copy of the Committee's minutes in the Council members' packets.

The Chair suggested inviting the Dean of the college to a future Senate Council meeting to discuss the policy changes. Tagavi requested an underlined and struck-through version of the proposed policy. Ferrier said he would merge the proposal with the changes and will e-mail that document to Ms. Scott for e-mail dissemination to the Council members.

The second proposal recommended by the Committee was the GRE Admission Requirement, which was submitted by the Graduate Council. Jones noted the need to include language about the "approval of graduate faculty of the program", and said the Dean's signature on the bottom of an application would not constitute his or her approval of such a request, but would indicate that he or she was the person passing the request along to the Graduate School for consideration. The Senate Council members suggested other editorial changes: using the wording "program graduate faculty" throughout, changing "approved by the Dean" to "transmitted by the Dean", eliminating "before being submitted" and wording to indicate that the GRE is still required for fellowship applications. Jones made a **motion** to approve the proposal with the modified wording suggested by the Senate Council members. Tagavi **seconded** the motion. The Chair called for a vote on the proposed wording and the modifications presented by the Senate Council members. The motion **passed** without dissent.

The final item from the Committee was the College of Fine Arts, Arts Administration Program Proposed Admission Requirements. Ferrier said the proposal was essentially a selective admission proposal and had been unanimously recommended by the Committee. He noted the proposal's use of a variety of admission criteria. Bailey asked if a rule existed prohibiting the use of cumulative grade point average as a criterion for program admission. The Chair noted the rule pertained to using the cumulative grade point average as the sole criterion for program admission.

After further discussion it was **moved** by Cibull and **seconded** by Tagavi to approve the proposal. The motion **passed** without dissent. Debski abstained.

Senate Rules 4.2.5 GRADUATE SCHOOL and the proposed 4.2.2.14 COLLEGE OF FINE ARTS will be forwarded the University Senate with a positive recommendation from the Senate Council. Upon Senate approval they will be forwarded to the Rules and Elections Committee for codification.

Other Business:

Bailey requested that the Chair provide an update on the Honorarium issue discussed at the end of the Fall 2003 semester. The Chair said he had conversed with the EVPFA about this issue. Bailey requested the Chair share information about the issue with the Senate. The Chair will seek the EVPFA's approval to do so. Jones reminded the Senate Council members that the Provost will attend the next Senate meeting and may be prepared to address this issue. The Chair will ask the Provost if he plans to address this issue.

6. University Senate Agenda

The agenda items were approved by the Senate Council members without a vote, with the small modification of removing the Pharmacy proposal.

7. LCC/SACS Update

The Chair updated the Senate Council members on the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) meeting which had taken place the preceding Wednesday. Kennedy said a draft resolution to cause the transfer of LCC to KCTCS was being drafted by the UK Legal team and suggested the Senate Council members give the draft a careful read. The Chair noted the AAC's interest in obtaining the Administration's help in drafting the resolution. He called the Council member's attention to the meeting notes in their packet which were drafted by Ms. Scott. The Chair called the KCTCS' Board of Regents resolution the "confounding factor" when considering the LCC Task Force's report and noted the disposition of the real property of LCC's current campus location was a source of contention between President Todd and President Kerley.

Saunier reported on a specially called LCC faculty meeting the preceding Friday. She said a quorum was present and a brief resolution voted upon and passed which made it clear to the Board of Trustees that the faculty of LCC wished to remain part of UK with separate accreditation. She noted the resolution asked the Board "to instruct Dr. Todd to do what was necessary to make that happen". Saunier also reported that another resolution addressing LCC's various concerns about moving into KCTCS had been presented, but the faculty had chosen to not discuss it, believing that to do so would weaken their position of opposition.

Kennedy noted that, no matter which action the Board took, no reorganization would occur without legislative action. Kennedy suggested that moving LCC to KCTCS might be the only means by which LCC can remain accredited.

The Chair noted President Todd's statement at the AAC meeting that he would negotiate with McCall to secure in writing a statement effectively undoing the portion of the Board of Regent's resolution pertaining to the transfer of faculty, staff, students and assets to KCTCS. Jones reminded the Council members that President Todd had still not accepted the Task Force's report and remained open to input.

Kaalund expressed concern that faculty and staff voices had been heard via a poll taken last semester but that the student opinion had not been sought. He suggested obtaining the students' opinions on this issue.

Yanarella asked Saunier if LCC faculty believe it is feasible for it to remain with UK as a separately accredited body. Saunier replied the faculty discussion had not involved feasibility or implementation of the faculty's first choice. Saunier explained the necessary demonstration of autonomy that must occur in order for SACS to be satisfied but added that she did not have an inventory of "all the issues".

Yanarella hoped that President Todd would indicate his decision soon so that the parties involved could determine their next appropriate course of action. Saunier, Jones and Kennedy speculated that President Todd will more than likely accept the Task Force's report. Edgerton suggested President Todd might be delaying his announcement in order to improve his bargaining position with the other institutions involved.

In response to procedural questions from Saunier about the possibility of submitting another LCC faculty resolution to the Board, Jones indicated Alice Sparks' interest in attending a Senate Council meeting to "hear any input" on this issue so the LCC faculty would be aware of this particular conduit to the Board.

The Chair asked the Senate Council members for input on how they'd like to proceed on this issue. Jones suggested inviting Sparks, Chair of the AAC, to a Senate Council meeting. Cibull suggested that such a meeting would need to be very carefully orchestrated, but added that the Senate Council should facilitate such a meeting. Saunier expressed concern on the part of the LCC faculty for language contained in the Administration's resolution that was not part of the language in the state law in 1997. Kaalund reiterated his request to have the student's opinion sought and considered. The Chair will recommend that a student survey take place.

The hour being late, the meeting adjourned at 5:07. Unaddressed items will be considered at a future meeting.

Respectfully submitted by
Jeffrey Dembo, Chair

Members present: Bailey, Chard, Cibull, Debski, Dembo, Edgerton, Grabau, Jones, Kaalund, Kennedy, Saunier, Tagavi, Yanarella.

Prepared by Rebecca Scott on January 28, 2004.