

Senate Council
April 25, 2011

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, April 25, 2011 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Hollie I. Swanson called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:02 pm.

The Chair noted that the first item of business would be discussion of the faculty trustee election. Both candidates (Dan Wermeling and Irina Voro) left the room during the discussion on the trustee election. Once they left, the Chair called on Davy Jones, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), to explain the situation.

Guest Jones stated that the faculty trustee election begins with a nomination period, and then a first voting round, and, sometimes, a second, runoff voting round. The email that went out for the nominations stage was intended to reach all full-time faculty members, who are eligible to nominate. Two petitions were received, and the election went directly to a runoff voting round. During the runoff voting, Jones became aware that the initial petition announcement did not reach all full-time faculty – chairs and deans, among others, did not receive the email. He asked Mrs. Brothers to forward the initial notice of voting to deans, and ask them to disseminate to their chairs and associated deans, which she did. Since that time, all full-time faculty have received emails about the election, not just those eligible to vote. Jones went on to say that he received a forwarded email from College of Agriculture dean emailed him approximately one hour prior to the SC meeting, suggesting that there was a flaw, in that deans and chairs who may have wanted to nominate someone were not informed of the process. Jones ended by saying that the current question was whether or not that was a sufficient flaw in the process to warrant stopping the election and restarting it at the nomination stage. He asked SC members to keep in mind that faculty on nine-month appointments would be leaving campus in mid-May.

The Chair then opened up the floor for comments. It was clarified for SC members that while there was some dissatisfaction with which faculty members are and are not eligible to vote in the faculty trustee election, that matter is not something that can be changed during the SC meeting, due to existing University regulations. The issue for SC discussion is whether or not the election should be restarted, not whether or not deans and chairs can/should be able to vote. Jones clarified for Kelly that the window for nominations was closed prior to recognizing the problem.

There were a few comments from SC members. In response to a question about potential time frames from Blonder, Jones replied that nominations could be re-opened, through Friday. If any additional nominees were identified, the election could be restarted, with the final round being completed by May 15 if a runoff election was necessary.

SC members discussed the issue at length, and a variety of opinions and statements were offered. The comments below were offered.

- If someone should have had the opportunity to nominate yet did not, that should be rectified, but how?

- Although faculty on nine-month appointments will leave soon, most people have access to email.
- The SC should keep the discussion on the election process, not the eligibility rules regarding voters.
- SC should consider fairness to the two candidates of reopening the nomination process/election. Opening up the nomination process to everyone is partially unfair.
- The SREC is the final arbiter of matters pertaining to the faculty trustee election.
- The SREC wants to know the SC's view on the matter, prior to rendering a final decision.
- The communications about the election were also posted on the University Senate's web site, but if someone did not know about the election, it could not be assumed that the person would just know to check the web site. Thus, "reasonable notice" was not given.
- Having the information posted is not the same as being sent an email.

Yanarella **moved** that the SC strongly urge the SREC to reinstate the nomination process in a way that allows the election process to be completed by May 15. Steiner **seconded**. Steiner asked for and received confirmation that the current two candidates would not need to engage in the second nomination period – they are already nominated. Kelly asked that the candidates be informed that the concerns of the day had nothing to do with the quality of the candidates, but reflected a sense of a lack of fairness.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstaining.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair introduced incoming Student Government Association President Micah Fielder. Guest Fielder expressed his pleasure at the prospect of representing students and working with the SC in the coming year.

SC members decided there was no need to place an ad in the KY Kernel during Finals Week.

The Chair reported that on behalf of the SC and University Senate (Senate), she approved the change in degree type (to a BS Topical Major) for a student who began his collegiate career in 1959.

Moving to budget issues, the Chair commented on the morning's presentation to campus by Vice President of Financial Operations and Treasurer Angie Martin. SC members expressed interest in hearing a similar presentation during the next SC meeting.

SC members discussed nominees for the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees (UJCHD), as well for the Faculty Performance Review Appeals Committee (FPRAC). They selected one faculty member for the UJCHD, and four faculty for the FPRAC.

SC members then discussed the use of closed book exams in distance learning courses. It was ultimately determined that the SC did not wish to weigh in on the issue formally, but understood that the instructor and reviewing academic council would ensure an exam's integrity is protected.

2. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee – Dan Wermeling, Chair

Proposed New Masters of Music in Music Therapy

Wermeling, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal. The Chair wondered if the proposal needed review by the Health Care Colleges Council.

After brief discussion, Wermeling said that the SAPC recommended approval to the SC. The Chair thanked Guest Gooding for attending, and Gooding departed.

Proposed New Minor in Chinese

Proposed New BA in Chinese Language and Literature

Wermeling then explained the proposed new minor and new BA. Guest Matthew Wells also contributed to the explanation. All SC members' questions were answered satisfactorily.

After brief discussion, Wermeling said that the SAPC recommended approval of both the minor and BA to the SC. The Chair thanked Wells for attending, and he departed.

Wermeling reported that the **motion** from the SAPC was to approve the proposed new Masters of Music in Music Therapy, and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Wermeling reported that the **motion** from the SAPC was to approve the proposed new Minor in Chinese, and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Wermeling reported that the **motion** from the SAPC was to approve the proposed new BA in Chinese Language and Literature, and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

There was additional, brief discussion about the lack of input from the health care colleges into the Masters of Music in Music Therapy.

3. Interim General Education Oversight Committee Policy Statements

The Chair invited Guest Bill Rayens, chair of the Interim General Education Oversight Committee (IGEOC) to share the reason for his attendance. Rayens explained that during the process of vetting courses for the new General Education, IGEOC has encountered some thorny issues, which may be alleviated with the adoption of their suggested policies.

SC members and Rayens discussed the suggested policies, and what type of oversight was appropriate while allowing IGEOC to function as charged.

After discussion, Yanarella **moved** that the SC take this proposal up and render its judgment on the guidelines by September 15. There was lengthy discussion following Yanarella's motion. There was no second, and Yanarella **withdrew** his motion.

Grossman **moved** that IGEOC be allowed and encouraged to formulate policies during its term, that it report such policies to the SC, and that at the end of its term, propose to the SC and Senate which of its interim policies should be codified as part of the *Senate Rules*. Yanarella **seconded**. There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The Chair noted she would announce it to the Senate in May. It was agreed that the policies would be of an interim nature, as is IGEOC, and that IGEOC would be responsive to faculty concerns about a policy, if that situation arises.

4. c. Old Business - Gen Ed Naming

Kirk said that there was not much email response from students about the proposed names. He opined that "Gen Ed" was a sufficient name for the program. Yanarella objected, and said that the name should be tied to the basic thrust of the general education curriculum. Kyle added that the preferred ranking of names was "CatsCore," "UK Core" and "The UK Core: 21st Century Studies."

After additional discussion, Grossman **moved** that the names "UK Core," "The UK Core: 21st Century Studies" and "Building Leaders Through Undergraduate Education (BLUE)" be presented to the Senate for a vote. A **vote** was taken on the motion, and the motion **failed** with four in favor, four opposed and two abstained.

Grossman then **moved** that the names "UK Core," "The UK Core: 21st Century Studies" and "CatsCore" be presented to the Senate. Yanarella **seconded**. During discussion, some SC members expressed a preference to not choose three of the four finalist names for Gen Ed, but rather to allow the Senate to choose among the four.

Grossman then **amended his motion** so that all four names ("UK Core," "The UK Core: 21st Century Studies," "Building Leaders Through Undergraduate Education (BLUE)" and "CatsCore") be sent to the Senate and that there first be a vote on all four, and striking the name receiving the fewest votes. (A vote will be held on the remaining three names, striking the name receiving the fewest votes, and then a final vote will be held on the remaining two names.) Yanarella **agreed to** the amended motion.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with nine in favor and one opposed.

5. UK August 2011 Degree List (first)

Grossman **moved** that the elected faculty senators of the Senate Council send UK's (first) August 2011 degree list to the Senate for approval, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. b. Old Business – Proposed DELETION of Master of Arts in Distributive Education

It was explained that because the Master of Arts in Distributive Education was so outdated, that it could be deleted instead of suspended.

Grossman **moved** that the Master of Arts in Distributive Education be deleted, as per the recommendation of the Vice President for Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness and be sent to the Senate with a positive recommendation. Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. d. Old Business – Reconsider, Prior to Summer, Proposed Changes to Senate Rules 1.3.3.A (“Senate Council Chair”)

The Chair referred SC members to the proposed language about the SC chair election. (Underline denotes added text, and strikethrough denotes deleted text.)

~~The Senate Council shall elect its Chair in December preceding the academic year during which the Chair shall serve. All nine of the elected faculty representatives then serving on the Senate Council shall be eligible for election to the position. The incumbent Chair, if in his or her first year as Chair, shall also be eligible for reelection.~~

Given that the chair of the Senate Council is also chair of the University Senate, the Senate Council chair shall be elected by a majority of a voting quorum of elected faculty members of the University Senate. The election shall be held in the December preceding the first academic year during which the Chair shall serve. Members of the Senate may nominate current members of the Senate Council by notifying the chair of the Rules & Elections Committee at least one month in advance of the election date. The chair of the Rules & Elections Committee shall ascertain the nominees’ willingness to serve. Candidates will be required to write a short description of their views of the role of Senate Council Chair. This information will be posted on the Senate web site at least two weeks prior to the election date. The term of the Senate Council chair shall be two years. The Senate Council chair is eligible to run for a second consecutive term. A Senate Council chair is not eligible to run for a third consecutive term. After a Senate Council chair steps down, he or she is not eligible to serve as Senate Council chair again for two years.

Steiner opined that the proposed language had general support in the SC, and that it should not wait until the summer for additional discussion.

Grossman **offered an amendment** to approve the proposed wording, and add language to include a statement that if there is only one candidate, the vote can take place in a Senate meeting. Nokes **seconded**. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with one opposed.

Randall expressed misgivings about the proposal, primarily due to the length of time that a faculty member would be away from duties of teaching, research and service.

A **vote** was taken on the **motion** from SC to approve the proposed revised language, including language that if there is only one candidate, the vote can take place in a Senate meeting. The motion **passed** with five in favor and four opposed.

4. a. Old Business – Six-Week Update on Status of Pending Courses

The Chair said that she would sit down with Grossman during the week and go over the spreadsheets. The SC then discussed the issue pertaining to the funding of the scoreboards. After considerable discussion, Bob Grossman **moved** that the Senate Council, on behalf of the University Senate, strongly opposes the lending of money from the University to the University of Kentucky Athletic Association and asks the Board of Trustees to vote it down². Yanarella **seconded**. The motion **passed** with 7 in favor and none opposed. Additional discussion regarding the circulation of a petition addressing the scoreboard issue then ensued.

The meeting was adjourned shortly after 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Hollie I. Swanson,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Blonder, Kelly, Kirk, Grossman, Nokes, Steiner, Swanson, Thelin, Wasilkowski, Wermeling and Yanarella.

Invited guests present: Gail Brion, Micah Fielden, Lori Gooding, Davy Jones, David Pienkowski, Bill Rayens and Connie Wood.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, April 28, 2011.