

Senate Council
August 27, 2007

The Senate Council met at 3 pm on Monday, August 27, 2007 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Kaveh A. Tagavi called the meeting to order at 3:03 pm. Those present introduced themselves for the benefit of guests.

1. Minutes from July 25 and Announcements

The Chair said there were a variety of announcements.

The Chair reported that on behalf of the Senate Council (SC) and the University Senate (Senate), he approved the granting of a degree for a particular student. According to the college, the student had fulfilled the requirements for her degree and had received a job offer. She was unable to accept, however, due to not having officially received the degree. Because the situation occurred outside the normal meeting schedule of the SC and Senate, the Chair was willing to and did approve the degree on behalf of the Senate and sent the recommendation to the BoT.

Brad Canon (Arts and Sciences/Political Science) agreed to serve again as parliamentarian for the Senate, but only for the fall 2007 semester.

Due to the likelihood of needing a special Senate meeting to discuss the University Studies Program (USP) Proposal, the Chair said that October 22 had been marked as a possible, but heretofore unannounced special Senate meeting.

UK's September 2007 degree list would need to be approved during the September 10 Senate meeting. Due to Labor Day, there would be no additional SC meeting prior to the September Senate meeting; the Chair explained that on behalf of the SC, he would recommend that the Senate review the degree list.

The President's Commission on Women (PCW) requested a liaison to serve a three-year term – the Chair reported that Lesnaw had expressed a willingness to serve.

With regard to the President's Commission on Diversity (PCD), the Chair and SC members engaged in a discussion regarding a nomination for the SC liaison to the PCD. Because of the importance associated with service on the PCD, most SC members agreed that the faculty member nominated should be also be a member of either the Senate or SC. Dembo volunteered to serve on the PCD. The Chair accepted the self-nomination and said he would let the PCD know of Dembo's willingness to serve.

Finkel asked about the “recommendation and rationale” language (for a possible change to membership of the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees) at the bottom of page one of the July 27 minutes. The Chair replied that he had a rationale and proposal that he had shared with the Office of the Provost, but that he wished to receive input from the Office of the Provost prior to placing it on a SC agenda. It would be given, though, to SC in the near future.

There being no changes to the minutes from July 27, they were approved as distributed.

2. Next Steps for USP Proposal

The Chair asked Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Phil Kraemer to share the progress of the USP Reform Steering Committee (USPRSC). Guest Kraemer said that the USP Proposal document (Proposal) emailed to SC members earlier in the week was a set of first principles. He acknowledged that there were some deficiencies, and said that he was requesting input by October 1. After input from college deans and faculty councils was received, the proposal would be revised and shared with the university community at large.

Kraemer stated that he wanted a variety of individuals to offer suggestions, particularly those individuals involved in recent general education reform efforts, such as members of the USP External Review, the USP Internal Review, and the General Education Reform and Assessment Committees. He stated the Proposal would be widely circulated across campus and hoped the Senate could be involved in a dedicated two-hour discussion, from which comments and feedback would be solicited. After modifications from the discussion were incorporated into the Proposal, it could return to the Senate for a final vote in either November or December.

There was a discussion regarding the proper order of next steps to take with the Proposal and the following aspects were mentioned:

- The importance of fora for groups in addition to the faculty, such as advisors, students, etc.;
- The need for input into the principles prior to major expansion of the Proposal;
- Having enough details to engage in an in-depth discussion;
- Whether faculty at large should be invited to the Senate meeting, or if a separate forum would offer a better opportunity for additional discussion;
- Some aspects, such as details about foreign language, being somewhat vague;
- The need to accommodate written comments and suggestions, not just oral input received during the fora and special Senate meeting; and
- The appropriate calendar timing of Senate meetings and fora for the best possible discussions and interactions.

There was extensive discussion regarding the scheduling of input sessions. Along with Kraemer, the SC developed a tentative timeline, which could allow sufficient time for input from all constituencies; incorporation of revisions received; and a timely progress towards final review.

After input was received from deans and college faculty councils, the document would be shared with the university community as a whole in early October. From that time through a possible special Senate meeting on October 22, additional input would be received, which would be ready for review at the November Senate meeting. A second reading, during which a final vote could be taken to approve or disapprove the Proposal, could take place during the December Senate meeting.

The Chair suggested that additional tweaking of the calendar of review could take place over the listserv. Kraemer reiterated that he and other USPRSC members would be responsive to concerns and wanted a lot of feedback to help them revise the Proposal. He added that USPRSC members would attend the Senate meeting when it was discussed.

The Chair thanked Kraemer for attending, after which Kraemer left the meeting.

SC members agreed to the Chair's suggestion that the agenda be rearranged to accommodate the remaining guest.

5. UK Branding – UK PR Executive Director Jay Blanton

The Chair invited Public Relations Executive Director Jay Blanton to share his [presentation](#) with SC members. Guest Blanton thanked SC members for the invitation. He then gave a presentation on UK's recent efforts to improve its branding, recognition and enrollment growth.

During the presentation, Blanton answered a variety of questions from SC members and offered to send additional pieces of data that were not on hand.

The Chair asked if there would be a button for the Libraries on the main page. Blanton replied that the screen shots displayed in the presentation did not show the Libraries button, but that was due to using an older iteration of the new design. Although it had been left off in an earlier iteration, it would be present when the new home page debuted.

3. KCTCS June 2007 Candidates for Credentials

There was some discussion regarding the June 2007 Candidates for Credentials. Mrs. Brothers noted that she sent the list to the faculty chair at KCTCS so that any problems could be rectified there, internally.

Finkel **moved** to approve the KCTCS June 2007 Candidates for Credentials. Piascik **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

4. Naming of Reinstatement Committee

The Chair asked for SC members to volunteer to serve on the Reinstatement Committee. During a brief discussion, Piascik, Randall and Lord (student member) volunteered; Randall agreed to serve again as chair. It was agreed that Tagavi would serve as an alternate if either of the two faculty members could not attend.

Yanarella **moved** to approve the composition and chair position of the Senate's Reinstatement Committee. Aken **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

6. Senate Committee Preferences

The Chair asked SC members to turn to the committee preference sheets for Senate committee membership. The Chair also suggested that current committee chairs, if they were so willing, be asked to continue in their positions.

SC members engaged in a discussion regarding the Senate's committee structure. Concern was expressed regarding the lack of regular meetings by some committees and the reason(s) behind it. Dembo noted that while some committees' functions were clear, other committees' purposes were not so well described. Those committees could greatly benefit from direction by the SC and SC Chair. Michael supported Dembo's statement; with the exception of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, which was intended to be proactive, other committees needed to be given tasks appropriate to their charges.

Provost's Liaison Greissman noted that Provost Subbaswamy suggested the subcommittees of the University Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities (UCAPP) think about how to work differently and more closely align the subcommittees with specific units to get faculty input in a more effective way. Greissman wondered if it would be a good idea to look into changing the Senate's committee structure to one of joint Senate- and Provost-appointed advisory committees.

In response to a question from Michael, Mrs. Brothers said that an ad hoc Committee on Senate Committee Structure had been created previously and was made up of the chairs of the Senate's committees. Requests for information, however, had gone mostly unanswered.

After additional discussion, Wood **moved** that the proposed 2007 – 2008 committee compositions be accepted (with the addition of Aken and Randall to the Senate's Library Committee) and that the Senate Council set up a new ad hoc committee on Senate committee structure to review the Senate's committee structure. Lesnaw **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

9. [Tentative Senate Agenda for September 10](#)

The Chair noted that because the Monday prior to the Senate meeting was the Labor Day holiday, the SC had to approve the agenda for the Senate meeting two weeks in advance.

The Chair drew SC members' attention to the third item down, "Revisit Tabled Item from May 7." He reminded SC members that there had been a proposal from the College of Pharmacy to disallow the repeat option for its students. That proposal was approved, but there was also a second, associated motion that would have placed language into *Senate Rules 5.3.1.1* (under the heading "Students in Undergraduate Programs") to alert students that the Graduate School and professional degree programs might restrict repeat options. The associated motion was tabled at the Senate meeting. The Chair asked SC members for help as to how the item could be disposed of.

Wood thought that Vice President for Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness Connie Ray might have some additional information about whether or not some of the professional programs were considered to be undergraduate.

Michael stated that because the section title included the word "undergraduate" it was patently clear to whom the repeat option information applied. He said it was something for the Parliamentarian to address.

Wood **moved** to remove "Revisit Tabled Item from May 7" from the agenda and then approve the tentative Senate agenda for September 10 as an unordered list. Piascik **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh A. Tagavi,
Senate Council Chair

SC members in attendance: Aken, Dembo, Finkel, Harley, Lesnaw, Lord, Michael, Piascik, Randall, Tagavi, Thelin, Wood, and Yanarella.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guests present: Jay Blanton and Phil Kraemer.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on August 29, 2007.