

Senate Council  
April 2, 2007

The Senate Council met at 3 pm on April 2, 2007 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

The meeting was called to order at 3:08, although there was no quorum. The Chair said that he would offer announcements until additional Senate Council (SC) members arrived.

With regard to the Winter Intersession report, the Chair said that the SC would need to decide if it should also go to the Senate. He then asked for input regarding the annual evaluation of President Todd. The Chair reminded SC members that the SC met last year on June 5, 2006 to discuss the evaluation. Although the President's self-evaluation was not yet available, the Chair wondered if input from the University Senate (Senate) should be solicited sooner rather than later. He also asked if all faculty or only senators should be contacted. Aken noted that when the request for input was made last year to senators, she forwarded it to other Libraries faculty members and received input.

The Chair said that the request for input could be sent to both senators and college faculty councils. In response to the Chair, Dembo said that while he and then-trustee Roy Moore used a mass email to all faculty from UK Public Relations, it was not the best process. Aken said that if some senators did not forward the information, faculty input could still be received via input from faculty councils. Yanarella arrived, and said that a solicitation for input from senators and faculty councils was fine. The Chair said he would do so; he moved on to the next announcement.

The Chair shared that the Office of the Provost had arranged for individual interviews with all four candidates for the position of Vice President for Research (VPR). He asked for volunteers to attend, noting that the presence of at least one more individual (other than the Chair) would aid in comparing and contrasting the candidates. It was ultimately decided that Wood and Randall would attend all four. Dembo suggested, and the Chair agreed, that the chair of the Senate's Research Committee should also be informed and invited.

1. Minutes from March 26 and Announcements

When Lesnaw and Piascik arrived at 3:20 pm, a quorum was met. The Chair referred to the minutes from the last meeting. There being no revisions, the minutes from March 26 were approved as distributed. The Chair said that there were a number of announcements.

The Chair said he would entertain a motion to receive the WI report and send it to the University Senate. Piascik **moved** thusly. Randall **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

The Chair said that the upcoming evaluation of President Todd had been discussed briefly and offered a recap. He said the president would be evaluated based on the criteria established by the Board of Trustees (BoT) and that the president would later submit a self-evaluation on the same criteria. Last year, the consensus was that the timeline was too short; the request for faculty input occurred when many faculty were no longer on campus and was on very short notice.

Yanarella said that the timing was typically very late; it would cause undue delay in getting widespread feedback regarding the evaluation to wait on receipt of the self-evaluation. Even if faculty input was offered without the benefit of the self-evaluation, it would be preferable to waiting. It was also important to act to maximize a volume of input from faculty. Yanarella said since the input was used as a means of determining the president's bonus, it would behoove faculty to be involved as fully as possible with enough time for input as possible. He said the actions of the SC should not be tied to the timetable of the delivery of associated information, especially if it would shave away a considerable amount of time that could be better employed to mobilize faculty in the evaluative process. The Chair concurred.

In response to Aken, the Chair said the information would be very structured, similar to the exercise conducted in late spring 2006, with categories and percentages.

The Chair asked if either Lesnaw or Piascik wished to attend the VPR meetings. Due to teaching schedules, only Lesnaw thought she could meet, perhaps for the last one. Yanarella said that for this particular issue, he thought it would be beneficial to have two representatives from the SC in addition to the Chair attend the interviews. He also wondered if any other SC members had questions they would like to see posed. He said that there had been comments regarding the past research executive, both positive and negative, about certain segments of the university. He said that a new VPR position should be filled by someone with a catholic view of the university, who was receptive to advancing research agendas in the bench, social and humanities sciences, as well as championing the work of medical research. Yanarella said that there was persistent criticism that the foci tended to be skewed to medical and bench sciences, to the detriment of social and humanities sciences. He opined that if a candidate were identified to have a narrow agenda, SC members should be advised.

The Chair said that he would send a solicitation for questions to the SC listserv and would share submissions with Randall and Wood.

Wood expressed appreciation for Yanarella's comments, but said they raised another concern for her. She asked if anyone knew what physical structure and monies would be made available to the VPR; she had heard rumors of substantial changes regarding use of UK Research Foundation (UKRF) funds. Wood hoped funding and possibilities for the VPR would be shared with SC members. She said that many things referred to by Yanarella were the result of fiscal policies, not necessarily the lack of a wide-ranging view.

The Chair thought he could ask Provost Subbaswamy for a job description for the VPR. He would also ask the Provost for information about any changes in the disposition of UKRF funds. Grabau arrived during the discussion. Lesnaw said that knowing if there was an expectation of an appreciation for research versus a need to land huge NIH grants was also important.

Moving to the next item, the Chair said that he had sent an email to the listserv regarding a special Senate meeting, but received no input. He said that if the SC were so inclined, the meeting could be held on May 7, which, coincidentally, was the day on which grades were due to be entered into SAP. He said that if that date were not acceptable, it could also be called for May 8 or May 14, which would be the last day before the end of the contract date for many faculty members. He noted a motion and vote were needed to call a special Senate meeting.

Randall asked if there was urgent business to attend to. The Chair said that there were some curricular items that could not yet be placed on the Senate's April meeting agenda, along with others. He said the Office of the Senate Council was aware of what had been sent to committee for review and was still pending. In addition, when faculty submitted proposals in September, there was an expectation that it would be approved during the same academic year.

Randall **moved** that the Senate Council call a special meeting of the University Senate for Monday, May 7. Aken **seconded**. Dembo initiated a brief discussion on other possible dates for a special meeting. In response to Liaison Greissman, the Chair said that if the May 7 special meeting were approved, he would ask Provost Subbaswamy to give his address at the May special meeting.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to call a special University Senate meeting for Monday, May 7. The motion **passed** with five in favor and one against.

The Chair said that the Office of the President requested two additional names of faculty to serve on the Employee Benefits Committee. A discussion followed during which SC members discussed possible nominees. It was ultimately decided that the Chair would put his name forward, along with that of the senator mentioned by Wood. The Chair noted that it was likely that only one person would be chosen from the two offered.

The Chair shared that after the discussion at the last meeting about the Make the Difference (MTD) suggestion, College of Arts and Sciences Dean Steve Hoch had suggested further internal vetting by colleges prior to further consideration. The Chair said he wanted SC members to know that college input would be solicited, and then asked if the MTD proposal should go to colleges and the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SA&ASC) in parallel or sequentially.

In response to Grabau, the Chair said that Dean Hoch was concerned that the Arts & Sciences Educational Policy Committee had not yet weighed in. Yanarella said that the proposal should first go to colleges, since there may be a discovery of great variation within colleges. In response to the Chair, Yanarella opined that it was acceptable to wait until colleges weighed in before sending the MTD proposal to SA&ASC, so long as the approval process continued to move along.

In response to Chair's query, SC members agreed that the agenda should be reordered to accommodate invited guests.

#### 7. New Minor: Sustainable Agriculture

The Chair invited College of Agriculture Professor Mark Williams to share information about the proposed new minor in Sustainable Agriculture. Guest Williams said that the overview in the handout was representative of the College of Agriculture's increased and ongoing opportunities to learn more about sustainability and sustainable agriculture, in particular. He said the creation of the minor would allow a connection with students outside the college. He said the minor would present an overview of the subject. Through classroom experience and SAG 397, an apprenticeship in sustainable agriculture at UK's Horticultural Research and Education Center, students would be involved in a sustainable farm operation. Students will be able to apply real farming techniques in a farming situation, to complete the educational circle. The minor would integrate concepts of economic profitability, environmental stewardship and social responsibility. Williams said an effort was made to be upfront about prerequisites and offer students a chance for a broad overview. The Chair added that a letter of administrative feasibility was received for the proposal.

In response to Wood, Mrs. Brothers explained that there was a note missing from the handout that said there was currently a moratorium on inclusion of any new course (SAG 101, specifically) into USP. Williams added that the moratorium was not in place when the idea was proposed; the idea was to create a class to reach out to UK students to increase interest in outreach and extension activities. The Chair said that if the proposal were approved, the request for inclusion in USP would be stricken.

Lesnaw **moved** to send the proposal for a new minor in Sustainable Agriculture to the Senate, with a positive recommendation. Wood **seconded**. Aken asked if any action had been taken within the college to ensure that there were sufficient

Libraries' databases, journals, books, etc. to support the degree, in terms of resources. She said that there was currently a review going on in Libraries over purchases of resources, so any requests should be made very soon. Williams thanked her and said he would do so.

There being no further comments, a **vote** was taken on the motion to approve a new minor in Sustainable Agriculture. The motion **passed** unanimously.

#### 6. [Clinical Title Series Discussion: Six Questions](#)

The Chair said that after each of the six questions was posed on the SC listserv, he created a summary of those answers that were directly related to the questions posed. However, even in aggregate, those comments could not be considered an official SC opinion. The Chair asked for guidance as to how an official position could be communicated to Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Heidi Anderson. Lesnaw said that the SC had raised certain issues, so responses to those issues should be forthcoming before any continuation of discussions.

The Chair said that based on input gleaned from the listserv, he did not send the compilation of responses to Anderson. He said he suggested bringing a summary of the responses to the six questions to the SC for approval, disapproval, revision, etc., after which they could be sent to Anderson. Aken wondered if there was any core agreement on the matter.

After a brief discussion, the Chair said that he would send to Anderson the six questions and the summary of responses by SC members. He added it would include a caveat that any new title series would require that the faculty member in it held a terminal degree in their discipline. The next step would be developing recommendations on how to address the CTS now, to be followed by a proposal for a new title series. The Chair thanked Anderson and SC members for a good discussion.

Those present introduced themselves for the benefit of guests and members alike.

#### 8. [New Major: International Studies](#)

The Chair noted that there was one course closely associated with the new major in International Studies (IS) that needed to be approved before the Senate could approve the new major – the proposed new major could be approved contingent upon approval of that course. He invited College of Arts and Sciences Associate Dean for Research and Academic Programs Leonidas Bachas to offer background information on the proposal.

Guest Bachas shared that such a major was becoming standard among many universities. In response to Wood, Bachas said that the Foreign Languages and International Economics (FLIE) program would co-exist and continue unchanged,

although there would be a similar option within the IS major that was less intense than FLIE.

Aken expressed doubt that the Library had enough materials to fully support the new major, although there were pockets of resources available that happened to exist because of a similarity between the proposed major in IS and existing resources. She asked if anyone in the college had talked to Library personnel. She noted that the Library was currently buying for the coming academic year, so any such conversations should be had very soon. Bachas replied that there was as yet no faculty member to serve as director or advisor, but once those positions were established, such a discussion would take place.

Lesnaw asked how this content of the new major would be different from, for example, what a student majoring in European history would learn after taking an economics course. Bachas replied that a major in IS would force a student to think internationally for longer than the duration of just one course. A student majoring in IS would need to advance further in the area of foreign languages and would also concentrate in one area of the world through the thematic area.

In response to Lesnaw's question about additional required resources, Bachas explained that there was some desire to increase the offerings of courses in certain areas, such as Southeast Asia and the Middle East. If selective admissions were not used, it would merely be a shifting of resources from one area to another. A faculty advisor will need to address the issue of how a senior thesis should be done; understanding that the College of Arts and Sciences has made a commitment that there could be some exemption from coursework due to a thorough thesis. There still remained the need for a faculty member to coordinate the IS major. The ratio of advisor to students would be 285:1, although it could go even a little higher.

In response to Grabau, Greissman explained that the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) was involved so that initial discussion and approvals were not moot if there were unmet equal opportunity goals that prevented moving forward with a new program. The Chair confirmed for Grabau that the course requiring approval (that was mentioned at the beginning of the discussion) was currently on a posted web transmittal.

Yanarella asked about the administration of the program and its director. Bachas said that it would not be run out of any existing department. He understood that the Department of Latin American Studies was going to cease offering their degree through their department and instead offer it through an IS major and thematic concentration. A group of faculty would serve as an advisory board and a director of the degree would have a significant role and liberty to make decisions. An advisor was already in place and Bachas said he assumed that there would be a person in the role of staff support for the future director. He said that when the level of enrolled students reached about 200, it could be

reevaluated. (Grabau left the meeting at this time.) Piascik asked if the modest enrollment projections were a function of the newness of the IS major. Bachas replied that he expected numbers to grow quickly – the information in the table supplied in the proposal might be conservative.

Wood **moved** that the Senate Council approve with positive recommendations both the proposal for a new major in International Studies and the new minor in International Studies, contingent upon approval of the involved course (INT 495). Piascik **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with five in favor and the Chair abstaining.

#### 4. May 2007 UK Degree List

The Chair asked if there were any questions about the May 2007 UK degree list. Wood **moved** to send the May 2007 UK degree list to the Senate for approval. Harley **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with five in favor and the Chair abstaining.

#### 10. March 2007 List of KCTCS Candidates for Credentials

The Chair asked if there were any questions regarding the March 2007 list from the Kentucky Community and Technical College System (KCTCS) for Bluegrass Community and Technical College students receiving a UK degree. There being none, he requested a motion.

Aken **moved** to send the March 2007 list of KCTCS candidates for credentials to the Senate for approval. Piascik **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with five in favor and the Chair abstaining.

The Chair apologized to Guest Marcy Deaton that the agenda item for which she came would be postponed until the next week, due to the lateness of the hour. He added that the agenda for the coming Senate meeting had to be approved before adjournment.

#### 11. [Tentative Senate Agenda for April 9](#)

After some discussion, SC members voted unanimously to approve the following unordered agenda items: Raymond Betts Memoriam; UK May 2007 Degree Candidates; Winter Intersession Report; Discussion on Extending Winter Intersession Pilot; Winter Intersession Calendar; USP Reform Steering Committee Progress Report; Change to *Senate Rules 5.1.8.5.A.2* (“Two-Year Window”); Provost’s Address; and March 2007 List of KCTCS Candidates for Credentials.

The Chair said that he wanted to give Dembo (as he did with Yanarella during a previous meeting) the opportunity to make any statement regarding the recent change to the advance posting of Board of Trustees (BoT) agendas. Dembo stated that the BoT was not told about the change in the policy, nor was input

solicited. He happened to find out about the change when he spoke with a Herald-Leader reporter.

Dembo said that immediately after he left the meeting he was in, he sent an email to BoT Chair James Hardymon and carbon copied President Todd, Jay Blanton (Office of Public Relations) and the head of the BoT's University Relations Committee and outlined the reasons why the change was not a good one. Dembo ended by saying that he still received the BoT agenda a week ahead of time and that he had no objection to letting individuals know what was on the agenda, regardless of official policy.

Yanarella agreed that the BoT as a body never had the opportunity to address the matter and said that until such a deliberation took place, he would refrain from offering an opinion. He added that he had profound reservations about paternalism and the appropriateness of making such a decision without any real BoT input.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh Tagavi,  
Senate Council Chair

Senate Council members present: Aken, Dembo, Grabau, Harley, Randall, Tagavi, Wood and Yanarella.

Provost's Liaison present: Richard Greissman.

Non-Senate Council members present: Heidi Anderson, Leonidas Bachas, Marcy Deaton and Mark Williams.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, May 3, 2007.