

Senate Council Minutes
August 21, 2006

The Senate Council met on Monday, August 21, 2006 at 3:00 pm in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired.

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 pm.

Individuals present introduced themselves to new student member Josh Odoi.

1. Minutes from July 24 Special Meeting and Announcements

There being no changes to the minutes from July 24, they were approved as distributed.

The Chair reminded Senate Council (SC) members that there would be a breakfast with President Todd on August 31, from 8:30 – 10:30 am at Maxwell Place. The Chair also explained that agenda item number nine would be discussed at 4:45 pm, when the two invited guests were requested to arrive. Finally, the Chair asked for official SC input regarding the *Administrative Regulations (ARs)* section addressing the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees section he distributed via the listserv. He said no SC members had expressed concern about it to him. Michael asked about the phrase “faculties of the University.” Jones replied that the phrase was connoting that there are diverse colleges and diverse faculties and that the membership of the Joint Committee should have diverse representation across all areas.

The Chair asked for a motion regarding the proposed *AR* change. Lesnaw **moved** to approve the *AR* that the Chair distributed via the listserv. Baxter **seconded**. The motion **passed** with six votes in favor and one abstention.

The Chair said that because the language of the *AR* was completely consistent with the *Senate Rules (SRs)*, he was unsure if it needed be sent to the University Senate (SENATE) for approval. Given the time constraint of the matter (nominations due by the end of September) he suggested giving senators 10 days in which to offer input into to new *AR*; the Chair would send a synopsis of comments to the Provost.

Lesnaw **moved** to allow senators 10 days in which to offer input into to new *AR* on the Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees, after which the Chair would send a synopsis of comments to the Provost. Duke **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

The Chair shared that he would request that the faculty trustees be prepared to offer an update and a written summary after every Board of Trustees (BoT) meeting at the next SC meeting. The Chair then displayed the written comments submitted in advance by Dembo and asked trustee Yanarella to offer such an

update. Yanarella replied that all but two BoT members met at the Ball farm for a healthy and productive discussion. The President began with current topics, including the decision not to pursue locating a UK retirement community at Spindletop Hall; the enrollment numbers of freshmen being several hundred above what was anticipated; the larger than anticipated numbers of newly hired faculty; faculty salaries; and the timetable for renovation of the Boone Center. Lesnaw asked if the Boone Center plans were new. Yanarella said that he understood from trustee Dembo that the plans were the same as the original plan, but that the increased dollar amount reflected inflation.

In response to Duke, Baxter stated that the increased freshmen enrollment statistics were for the 2006 – 2007 academic year. In response to Lesnaw, Baxter said that in conversation with the Registrar, he understood that there was no housing problem with the increased freshman enrollment. Duke asked about diversity – Baxter replied that while diversity statistics were not at optimal levels, they were up and much better than in previous years. Duke asked how the students would be retained. Baxter said that more attention was being paid to that problem.

There was a brief discussion regarding various aspects of the proposed retirement community.

Yanarella shared that there had also been discussions at the BoT retreat regarding the process of the President's annual review. Yanarella felt BoT Chair Hardymon had sincerely tried to ensure a fair process.

Regarding to the summary provided by Dembo, the Chair said that there was one final item from the BoT retreat – that of the coming proposal to change the BoT's role as prescribed in the *Governing Regulations* from being required to hear all issues regarding employment appeals to that of being able to choose which cases to hear. Yanarella stated that both he and Dembo made it clear at the retreat that Senate bodies would need to review this particular matter.

The Chair then asked Jones, the Senate Council's Nominating Committee (SCNC) chair, to go over the SCNC's suggestions. Jones shared that the Extension Area Academic Advisory Committee needed two additional members. He explained that the SC could opt to select the paired names of non-extension faculty, since there was nothing in the regulations requiring a member to be extension title series and/or College of Agriculture faculty, or the SC could select the paired names of two extension title series faculty to compose the committee of only extension faculty.

Lesnaw expressed her strong support of choosing a non-extension title series faculty individual as a member. Baxter agreed.

Jones **moved** that the Senate Council send to the Provost the names of the non-extension title series faculty offered by the SCNC to fill the vacant slots in the Extension Area Advisory Committee. Yanarella **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

In response to a request by the Chair, Jones went on to offer names of individuals to serve on an ad hoc committee to hear a merit evaluation appeal case. Jones added that the individuals whose names were put forth were qualified to serve since all were either on an Academic Area Advisory Committee (AAAC) or had been recommended to the President for appointment to an AAAC. In response to Jones, the Chair clarified that he thought that four slots were open.

The Chair, noting that no second was required on an item from a committee, called for a **vote** on the **motion** from the SCNC to put forth the eight paired names to the Provost as possible appointees to the ad hoc committee to hear a merit evaluation appeal. The motion **passed** unanimously.

2. Senate Committee Structure

The Chair explained that agenda items number two and three were both holdovers from previous SC meetings. He did not want them to disappear over time, but noted that the issues could not be resolved in one meeting. He asked for a motion to either table the matter indefinitely or for a specific period of time. He added that he had an idea regarding committee structure. He had had a couple of meetings with Provost Subbaswamy in which the Provost had expressed interest in more joint committees, as opposed to administrative committees with corresponding Senate committees. He noted that the University Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities was the first of such committees. The Chair asked if the issue should be tabled to wait on any possible forthcoming overtures from the Office of the Provost regarding joint committees.

Lesnaw spoke against tabling agenda item number two indefinitely. The reasons she gave were: the issue was first discussed a year ago; many Senate committees are dysfunctional; her committee had not met in the three-plus years she spent on it; and the various issues needing to be addressed by a committee, such as multidisciplinary issues. She referred to the suggestion from a year ago in which an ad hoc subcommittee would forge a framework to begin the discussion on the Senate's committee structure. Jones asked about the status of the suggestion for the committee chairs to work together on the issue. Yanarella replied that although Mrs. Brothers had attempted to get input and schedule meetings, it was never possible to get the committee chairs together to meet.

Jones concurred with Lesnaw. He also urged SC members to react cautiously to any shared educational policy committee with the Administration. Lesnaw said that as long as the final policy-making decision authority remained with the

Senate, joint committees could serve to put issues and proposals before the SC and Senate.

Randall opined that committees would function better if there was a thoughtful charge for each committee and a responsibility to report annually to the Senate and semiannually to the SC. The Chair reminded SC members that the issue was on the agenda solely to decide how to proceed, not how to fix the issue. He wondered if aligning the Senate committees (other than curricular committees) along the five goals of the strategic plan would be effective.

Lesnaw **moved** to not indefinitely table the issue of the Senate's committee structure, but rather that a mechanism be devised to reorganize the committee structure, including a review of each committee's charge and reporting process. Jones **seconded**. Michel offered a **friendly amendment** that the mechanism referred to in the motion be a request that the SC Chair to put together an ad hoc subcommittee of the Senate Council. Lesnaw and Jones **accepted**.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to charge the SC Chair to put together an ad hoc subcommittee of the Senate Council with a charge of reviewing the Senate's committee structure, recommending changes to the structure, and reviewing each committee's charge and reporting processes. The motion **passed** unanimously.

3. Definition of "Privilege" as it Relates to Appeals by Faculty Members and the Charge of SACPT

The Chair reiterated that the action sought on this agenda item involved how to proceed, not discussing the issue itself. Jones stated that during the review of the SRs, there was a hole left regarding the definition of privilege as it related to the Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure (SACPT). The Provost was concerned that there was no Senate definition, which made it very difficult for deans and others to protect the "privilege" of faculty members. There was a request to the SACPT to draft a definition of privilege, to be approved by the SC and Senate, but it was never done. Jones noted that the composition of the SACPT was now very different and wondered if the present membership would be willing to draft a definition.

Jones **moved** that the SC Chair should charge the new SACPT chair with drafting a definition of privilege. Lesnaw **seconded**. In response to the Chair, Jones replied that the SACPT should create a definition to be used for purposes of SACPT jurisdiction. Yanarella cautioned that any definition developed by the SACPT would be a first step, not a final statement. He said that many faculty have a larger definition of privilege than what the SACPT has entertained in the past, stymieing faculty members by a narrow definition.

The Chair stated that when he oriented the SACPT members he could also deliver the request, after the committee was formally constituted. He suggested

the SC formally direct him to do this at an orientation meeting, and wondered about bringing along another SC member. Lesnaw supported the suggestions by offering a **friendly amendment** to the motion, to ask the SC Chair to make this request at the first SACPT meeting. Jones **accepted**.

A **vote** was taken on the motion that at the first SACPT meeting, the SC Chair should charge the new SACPT committee with drafting a definition of “privilege.” The motion **passed** unanimously.

4. BCTC Candidates for Credentials

In response to Michael, Jones replied that the Bluegrass Community and Technical College (BCTC) candidates for credentials would continue to be approved by the University Faculty until 2010. Lesnaw expressed concern that she had no criteria by which to judge the eligibility of the BCTC students and wondered if it would be appropriate for BCTC faculty to take over this task. Jones explained that he always contacted appropriate personnel at BCTC to confirm that the students on the list were eligible to receive credentials and also that BCTC faculty had approved the list, which alleviated Lesnaw’s concern.

Jones also noted that although the SRs stated that a student who enrolled in BCTC after 2004 and transferred to UK would not have their BCTC grades factor into their UK GPA, the Office of the Registrar had made its own decision and was allowing BCTC grades to be included in the UK GPA through the 2005 -2006 year, misinforming many students in the process. (The situation had since been resolved through the Registrar agreeing to no longer accept BCTC grades in the UK GPA, and making a correction to the Bulletin.)

Michael **moved** to approve the list of BCTC candidates for credentials from January 19, 2006 – May 4, 2006 and that it be submitted to the Senate at its September 11 meeting. Harley **seconded**. A **vote** was taken on the motion, which **passed** unanimously with a positive recommendation.

5. UK Degree List

Baxter reminded SC members that it was still the case that some on the list might not meet the ultimate qualifications for a degree – those on the list were there by virtue of having taken the appropriate courses and on the assumption of meeting the qualifications.

Jones **moved** to approve the list of August 2006 UK candidates for degrees. He added that there might be additions from the College of Medicine, which could be walked on to the list on the Senate floor. Randall expressed concern that there was a student on the list whose dissertation defense would be at the end of August. Jones reiterated that those individuals on the list were being approved to receive their degree pending a complete fulfillment of the requirements for being put on the list. Odoi **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

The Chair heard no objections when he suggested addressing agenda item number ten, next.

10. Planning for Reaction to Strategic Plan 2006 – 2009 (Provisional)

The Chair noted that there had been brief discussion on the SC listserv regarding how to proceed with a reaction on the [Strategic Plan 2006 – 2009 \(Provisional\)](#) (SP). He suggested SC members offer comments via the listserv, which would then be collated and formally approved at the August 28 SC meeting. That recommendation along with the plan itself would then be sent to senators for input prior to the Senate meeting on September 11. That would give senators the opportunity to offer comments. He noted that Provost Subbaswamy had asked for Senate Council and Senate input on the Strategic Plan and that he would be at the September Senate meeting, and that there would be four public fora at which employees could offer suggestions, etc. The Chair confirmed for Michael that the SP would be an item for discussion at the September meeting, not for approval.

There was additional discussion, including statements that the SP was made available to faculty and staff to review, and that the Provost had already incorporated some suggested changes. Michael supported a review of the document by all Senate Council members, but spoke against predigesting the SP and sharing SC comments with senators. He said that senators should be encouraged to read the SP and come prepared to ask questions at the September Senate meeting.

In response to Duke, the Chair said that there would be adequate time for questions and answers at the September meeting after the Provost's presentation.

Michael **moved** to forward the Strategic Plan 2006 – 2009 (Provisional) as an agenda item to the Senate for discussion and input at the September 11 Senate meeting. There was a brief discussion during which it was decided to put the SP on the September agenda without a formal recommendation. Lesnaw **seconded**. In response to Jones, the Chair confirmed that there would be efforts made to draw senators' attention to the SP. The Chair suggested an email be sent out in advance of the Senate meeting in which senators would be provided with a link to the SP, as well as a statement that the Provost would present the SP in September and have time for questions and answers, after which the Senate could offer a motion to reflect its consensus opinion.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to forward the Strategic Plan 2006 – 2009 (Provisional) as an agenda item to the Senate for discussion and input at the September 11 meeting. The motion **passed** unanimously.

7. Request to Solicit Input on [Domestic Partner Benefits](#) (Dembo)

The Chair noted that since Dembo was unable to attend the SC meeting, it would be best to address agenda item number seven at the August 28 SC meeting. The Chair added that he had received an email from Doug Boyd in which he was asked to send comments or resolutions on domestic partner benefits to Kim Wilson, Associate Vice President for Human Resources, and not the President. Lesnaw recommended sending any communication regarding domestic partner benefits (DPB) to the President, but with a carbon-copy to Wilson.

Lesnaw expressed concern that efforts to enact DPB were overshadowing the likely decrease in retiree health benefits. Lesnaw **moved** that the Chair request an update on the status of the retiree health benefits proposal. Jones **seconded**. Michael opined that any discussion of benefits at the SC level was inappropriate and not in line with the SC charge. Although there was no lack of response from various SC members, the Chair requested, in deference to Dembo, that the issue of DPB, how to solicit faculty input on the issue and a discussion on the relevance of the issue being before the SC, be deferred until August 28.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to direct the Chair to request an update on the status of the retiree health benefits proposal. The motion **passed** with seven in favor and one against.

Randall **moved** to postpone any discussion on DPB until Monday, August 28. Odoi **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

6. Senate Council Member Liaisons to Councils

Jones volunteered to serve as [liaison to the Graduate Council](#) (GC). Lesnaw **moved** to accept Jones' offer to volunteer to serve as liaison to the GC. Michael noted that Jones' service in this capacity could continue even after his term on the Senate Council ended in December. Michael **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Lesnaw volunteered to continue to serve as SC [liaison to the Health Care Colleges Council](#) (HCCC). Jones **moved** to accept her offer. Baxter **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

There was a brief discussion about whether or not Grabau was the [liaison to the Undergraduate Council for 2005 – 2006](#). Lesnaw **moved** that the Chair contact the current SC liaison to the UC and assess that individual's willingness to serve for another year. If that person was willing, he could be officially named as the SC liaison to the UC. If that person was not willing or able, a decision would be made via the SC listserv. Jones **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

8. Term of University Senate Committee Chairs

The Chair stated that the *SRs* were somewhat vague in regard to the term of committee chairs. Lesnaw **moved** that the ad hoc committee appointed to look into, among other things, the restructuring of the Senate's committee

organization also address the issue of the term of Senate committee chairs. There was a question about the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) offering an interpretation, but since there was little in the *SRs* about committee chair terms, there would be nothing to interpret. Jones asked about past precedent. In response to the Chair, Michael thought his term as SREC chair had been for one year. Harley **seconded** the motion, which **passed** unanimously.

9. [Rule Waiver Request for Retroactive Withdrawal](#)

The Chair introduced Katherine McCormick, chair of the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Application Committee (SRWAC), and Adrienne McMahan, the College of Arts and Sciences' Assistant Dean for Student Affairs. Those around the table introduced themselves.

Guest McMahan stated that a student had requested a retroactive withdrawal (RWA) for the Fall 2003 and Spring 2004 semesters. The student, however, suffered from a debilitating emotional situation and by the time the student was well again and able to file RWA paperwork, more than two years had passed. Statements were presented to the SRWAC that the situation was debilitating for both semesters. The rule waiver being requested was for the particular student described in the synopsis, for the Fall 2003 semester. The RWA for the Spring 2004 semester had already been granted by the SRWAC.

Guest McCormick added that the opinion of the SRWAC was that the condition was pervasive and prevented the student from filing the RWA paperwork within the timeframe set out in *SR 5.1.8.5.A.2*. The committee felt that it was arbitrary to force the student to keep failing grades for one semester when the case was such that the problems lapsed across both semesters for which RWAs were requested.

The Chair clarified that the request was to waive *SR 5.1.8.5.A.2* for this one student, and that the SC was not obliged to discuss the particulars of the case – the agenda item was for the purpose of deciding the merits of whether or not to hear the case. McMahan added that it took a lot of effort on her part and others to convince the student to request the RWA, who was reluctant to share very personal information with various committee members.

Michael **moved** that the Senate Council waive *Senate Rule 5.1.8.5.A.2* on the recommendation of the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Application Committee for the specific individual mentioned in the synopsis, due to extraordinary circumstances. Lesnaw **seconded**.

There was a discussion regarding *SR 1.1.0.C*, the waiving of any *Senate Rule*. It was finally agreed that the SC did have the authority to waive the rule in question, as long as it was reported to the Senate at the September meeting.

In response to Randall's request for assurance that the student in question would be able to succeed academically, McMahan shared that the student currently was carrying a 4.0 GPA. McCormick added that much of the situation causing the academic failure had been resolved.

SC members discussed whether or not the name of the student needed to be included in the minutes. It was decided it was not necessary.

A **vote** was taken on the motion for the Senate Council waive *Senate Rule 5.1.8.5.A.2* on the recommendation of the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Application Committee for the specific individual mentioned in the synopsis so that the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Application Committee could choose to hear the petition, due to extraordinary circumstances. The motion **passed** unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh Tagavi,
Senate Council Chair

Senate Council members present: Baxter, Duke, Harley, Jones, Lesnaw, Michael, Odoi, Randall, Tagavi, Yanarella.

Guests present: Adrienne McMahan, Katherine McCormick

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on August 22, 2006.