

Senate Council  
April 19, 2010

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, April 19, 2010 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Dave Randall called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:03 pm.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair shared that Chappell and Swanson were absent, Kelly would arrive late, Jensen would be arriving late, if at all, and that Yanarella needed to leave early. The Chair then turned to Yanarella, to introduce the newly elected faculty trustee, whose term will begin July 1.

Yanarella said that Joe Peek (BE/School of Management – Finance) won a stunning victory in the first round of last week's faculty trustee election. He then shared information about Peek's academic background. Peek then offered comments to SC members about faculty governance in general, as well as his thoughts and ideas. After some additional dialogue, Peek departed for a student appointment.

The Chair then reminded SC members about the request from senators during the March Senate meeting that he request the privilege of attending Provost Subbaswamy's meetings with deans. He did so, and the Provost sent back a gracious email, but the answer was negative. The Provost said that meetings with deans was a private session between him and deans, and they preferred it remain that way. However, Provost Subbaswamy said he would be happy meet with the Chair in private at the Chair's desire. The Chair asked for guidance from the SC as to how he should broach the matter with the Senate. Provost's Liaison Greissman added that the Provost felt deans needed an unfiltered forum.

SC members discussed the matter, and it was determined that the Chair would ask the Provost to explain his response during his address to the Senate in May.

2. Revisiting Proposed Changes to *Administrative Regulations 4:9* ("Heidelberg Scholarship Committee")

Guest Marcy Deaton (Legal Counsel) reminded SC members that she had brought revisions with proposed name changes two weeks ago, and an SC member pointed out that a name change equivalency resulted in an odd situation. Deaton said that the current version presented to SC members had been reviewed by the *Administrative Regulations* Work Group. The revisions included different titles, as well as a better description of how the Heidelberg Scholarship Committee has been working for many years. SC members had no questions.

Anderson **moved** to endorse the proposed changes to *Administrative Regulations 4:9* ("Heidelberg Scholarship Committee") and send them to the Senate with a positive recommendation. Grossman **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Proposed Relocation of Graduate Center for Biomedical Engineering from Graduate School to College of Engineering

The Chair invited Jeannine Blackwell (Graduate School dean) to explain the proposal, which she did. Guest David Puleo (director, Graduate Center for Biomedical Engineering) also offered some comments.

The Chair stated that he had more than a passing interest in the issue, so he ceded duties of the Chair to Anderson.

Grossman **moved** to approve the proposed move of the Graduate Center for Biomedical Engineering from the Graduate School to the College of Engineering and Kelly **seconded**. There was no discussion.

A **vote** was taken on the motion and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The duties of the Chair returned to Chair Randall.

#### 4. Request to Waive *Senate Rules 5.2.4.8.1* ("Common Examinations") - HIS 371

The Chair explained that there were two sections of HIS 371 with exams scheduled for different times, and the instructor was realizing the difficulty of two similar exams being offered at separate times.

Grossman **moved** to waive *Senate Rules 5.2.4.8.1* ("Common Examinations") to allow one common exam time for HIS 371. Anderson **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 5. Preliminary Discussion on Proposed New Center for Interprofessional Healthcare Education, Research, and Practice

SC members engaged in a discussion regarding the proposed new Center for Interprofessional Healthcare Education, Research, and Practice. They remained concerned about the true need for the proposed new center; if its existence will change how faculty deliver their instruction; if its existence would truly translate into grant dollars, and if the expense associated with the proposed new center was appropriate in the current economic times.

#### 6. Dual Credit Courses

The Chair invited Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mike Mullen to explain the proposal, which he did. SC members asked a variety of questions and engaged in a discussion about the proposal.

It was ultimately determined that Mullen would look into the following issues and return to the SC the following week with additional information: necessity of charging full UK tuition to high school students; if admission requirements for dual credit courses were necessary to ensure a high school student was ready for a college course; and if and Fayette County's experience with similar programs.

#### 7. General Education Implementation Committee Nominees

Mullen directed SC members to the list of possible members for the General Education Implementation Committee (GEIC). Guest Mullen explained that the composition was representative based on college enrollments. Some of the names were new to the Gen Ed process, and others were familiar with the activities thus far, some were volunteers, and others were nominated.

Mullen went on to explain that the thought of having 160 proposed Gen Ed courses vetted through seven separate vetting teams seemed somewhat daunting, and he was interested in seeing a team work in parallel or in concert with the Undergraduate Council (UC), to provide oversight to the subgroups doing the vetting.

After brief discussion, it was determined that Mullen would return the following week with a draft charge for SC members to review. At that time, the SC would feel more comfortable sending the charge and list of nominees to the Senate for approval.

#### 9. Commencement Subcommittee Chair Replacement

The Chair explained that there was a vacancy on one of the subcommittees of the Commencement Committee. After brief discussion, it was determined that Mrs. Brothers would send a solicitation for a volunteer to the Senate.

#### 11. Search Committee Nominees - College of Medicine Dean Search Committee and Ombud Search Committee

SC members reviewed a list of possible nominees for both the Ombud Search Committee and the College of Medicine (COM) Dean Search Committee. One name was removed and one name was added to the list for the COM Dean Search Committee. SC members concurred that the names could be forwarded.

#### 10. Proposal for December Commencement

At the Chair's request, Greissman explained the proposal. He began by saying that if it seemed the proposal was at all controversial, discussion could wait until a later time. He offered information about the impetus, etc., and answered a few questions from SC members.

SC members were largely supportive of the three-year pilot. Grossman **moved** to send the proposal for a three-year pilot for December Commencement (in 2010, 2011 and 2012) to the Senate with a positive recommendation. Anderson **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 12. Revisiting the Proposed New Center for Interprofessional Healthcare Education, Research, and Practice

The Chair invited the guests to introduce themselves, which they did: Andrea Pfeifle (ME); Tony Hartsfield (PbH); Kelly Smith (PH); and Kevin Schuer (HS).

SC members engaged in lengthy discussion with those present about the proposed New Center for Interprofessional Healthcare Education, Research, and Practice (CIHCRP). SC members expressed continued concern with the following aspects: lack of documented contact with the deans of the Colleges of Law, Business and Economics, and Social Work; lack of documented support from the faculty of the colleges involved; perceived hyperbole in the description of UK's movement toward top-20 status and in other descriptions of UK's endeavors; and the requested budgetary monies. SC members were concerned about the status of the CIHCRP's director, and were assured by the guests that the director would be a faculty member.

Discussion continued for quite some time. The SC did not hold a vote on the proposed new center. The meeting was adjourned at 5:11 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Dave Randall,  
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Grossman, Kelly, Kirk, Randall, Steiner, Thelin and Yanarella.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guests present: Jeannine Blackwell, Patricia Burkhart, Tony Hartsfield, Joe Peek, Andrea Pfeifle, David Puleo, Kevin Schuer and Kelly Smith.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, April 22, 2010.