

Senate Council
December 15, 2008

The Senate Council met in regular session on Monday, December 15 in room 231 of the Student Center. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands, unless indicated otherwise.

Chair David Randall called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:08 pm, noting that quorum had not yet been reached.

Chappell complimented the Chair for his leadership during the December Senate meeting, in particular the discussion and vote on the Learning Outcomes. Chappell asked SC member to join him in a round of applause for the Chair, which they did. The Chair thanked them, and commented that he did not think there was anyone who could say that their voice had not been heard during the discussion.

1. Minutes and Announcements

There were no minutes ready for approval. The Chair noted that agenda items number three and five would be switched to ensure sufficient time to discuss the composition of the curricular teams. He added that he would ask Michael, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), for an update on the election of SC members when he arrived. Regarding absences, both Ford and McCorvey had reported that they would not be able to attend the day's meeting.

The Chair said that he wanted to discuss the use of paper in the Office of the Senate Council (OSC) and perhaps ask for the SC's approval to phase out hard copies of the Senate agenda and associated supporting materials. He noted the amount of time and effort that was required to prepare hard copies of University Senate (Senate) meeting agendas, noting that the very long agenda for the December Senate meeting was not even the longest handout that had been prepared. Mrs. Brothers added that aside from personnel, paper was the OSC's largest expense.

The Chair explained that he had been considering not having hard copies automatically available to senators for Senate meetings and that he might make an announcement to that effect at the February meeting. (Aken and Michael arrived during the discussion, thereby achieving quorum.)

SC members discussed the possibility of not offering hard copy agendas and among other statements, made the following comments:

- Hard copies could be reserved in advance;
- Paper copies are invaluable to those who have trouble reading the information on the overhead screen;

- If senators brought their own copies, it could force those who procrastinate doing the reading to come prepared, instead of reading the proposals moments before discussion;
- Doing away with hard copies would make it more difficult for senators to follow along with the meeting and would decrease both participation and attendance, even though it would save paper and decrease paper costs;
- Senators without hard copies could follow along on laptops, since the W. T. Young Library Auditorium has a wireless internet connection;
- Senators could be encouraged to provide their own copies, and let the OSC know that a copy was not needed;
- The paper copies are helpful for taking notes and jotting down thoughts and possible wording for motions.

It was ultimately decided that senators would be asked to notify Mrs. Brothers if they wanted to reserve a hard copy. Mrs. Brothers said that she would also post a PDF of the agenda handout at http://www.uky.edu/USC/New/university_senate/agendas/index.htm with the online agenda, to make it easier for senators to print a copy of the agenda.

In response to a question from the Chair, Michael reported that the newly elected SC members were Jane Jensen, Tom Kelly and Shelley Steiner. Michael noted that he [Michael] was the only SC member who was actually leaving as of December 31; the other two members who would normally have rolled off were Aken and Randall, who will remain on the SC by virtue of their officer positions.

2. Election of Senate Council Officers

The Chair asked Michael to preside for the duration of the agenda item on officer elections, because the Chair was standing for re-election; Michael agreed.

Chair Michael explained that there were two candidates for the position of chair, Randall and Wood, and one candidate for the position of vice chair. He passed out orange ballots for voting and asked Mrs. Brothers to read and tally the votes.

Subsequent to voting, Mrs. Brothers counted the pieces of paper twice and stated that Randall received five votes and Wood received one vote. Chair Michael stated that Randall was reelected to the position of chair.

Chair Michael explained that there was only one candidate for vice chair, Hollie Swanson. Chappell **moved** to accept Swanson's service by acclimation and Piascik **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** without dissent.

Tagavi thanked Michael for his service on the SC and the SREC. Chair Michael said it was again appropriate for Chair Randall to preside.

Rule Waiver for Student – Repeat Option

The Chair explained that a student had attended UK as a part-time student and graduated with a bachelor's degree, but subsequently learned that he could have used the repeat option and brought up his GPA. [According to the *Senate Rules*, students must utilize a repeat option prior to graduation.]

SC members engaged in a discussion about the request. Wood expressed concern about how utilization of the repeat option after graduation would affect the student's transcript and the Board of Trustees-approved diploma. Additional comments were made, but there was no clear sense of agreement on how to proceed.

Randall suggested that the Reinstatement Committee discuss the request and render a final decision. In the event that the Reinstatement Committee offered a favorable decision, Randall said that unless anyone objected, he would explore options with the Registrar for changing the grade in question; no one registered a concern.

5. Next Steps for Gen Ed

SC members engaged in a very lengthy discussion of the curricular teams (how to compose, actual composition and various aspects of diversity, expected start date, expected results from, planning for continuity from past successes, etc.).

After some time, Tagavi **moved** that the SC accept Provost Subbaswamy's suggestions for the curricular teams and that, after solicitation from senators and the faculty at large, the SC will provide a similar list of names by January 15 and then thereafter immediately reconcile the names solicited by the SC and those solicited by the Provost. Piascik **seconded**.

Wood **offered a friendly amendment** that the list of names would be approved by a vote. Tagavi and Piascik **accepted**. Anderson asked about the need to "accept" the names from Provost Subbaswamy; she suggested "receive," which was **accepted as a friendly amendment** by Tagavi and Piascik.

Provost's Liaison Greissman expressed some concern that waiting until January 15 would delay the process overlong. This thought expanded into a general discussion of the best way to quickly and thoroughly solicit nominations for the SC's portion of the curricular teams.

The Chair said that he would ask Mrs. Brothers to send an email to all senators to solicit names, and that Mrs. Brothers would also compile a master list of nominations for the SC to review. SC members suggested that the email solicitation include a request for not

just a name, but also for the specific team(s) for which someone was nominated, as well as a very brief rationale.

In deference to concerns about timeliness, Tagavi and Piascik **accepted as friendly** the suggestion to have the names reconciled and finished by January 12.

When discussion wound down, the Chair suggested that a vote be held. A **vote** was held on the **motion** that the Senate Council receive the Provost's suggestions for the curricular teams and that the Senate Council, after solicitation from senators and faculty at large, come up with a similar list of names, and then immediately reconcile the list to be approved by a vote of the full Senate Council on January 12. The motion **passed** without dissent in a voice vote.

Those present agreed that the charge in the letters of appointment to the curricular teams should be looked at, along with who would be named as conveners for each team.

3. Preliminary Discussion on Undergraduate College

The Chair explained that he had mistakenly not sent SC members some information that Provost Subbaswamy had asked him to forward to SC members. He asked Greissman to explain more fully.

Greissman said that there had been discussions regarding a possible reorganization of undergraduate education. If any reorganization steps, such as creating an undergraduate college, were to proceed, there would need to be a decision made soon. If a national search were to be taken for a new person to oversee undergraduate education, it would have to be done to allow a candidate to begin on July 1. Greissman explained that Provost Subbaswamy wanted there to be sufficient time to pursue options in a deliberative yet efficient manner. As such, he was requesting formal feedback from the SC to help him determine whether and/or how to move forward with restructuring undergraduate education. If a decision to move forward were made, Greissman added that the Provost would prepare a formal proposal for vetting by the SC and by the full Senate.

Greissman answered a few questions from SC members. He commented that in looking at UK's benchmarks, there might be a better way of organizing undergraduate education and serving UK's undeclared and exploratory students. A small committee convened by the Provost prepared an eight-page report on possible alternative administrative structures for undergraduate education, which is what Provost Subbaswamy wanted SC members to review.

Greissman asked that input be submitted by the SC shortly after returning from the winter holidays.

4. Receipt of Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure Report on Administrative Regulations – Version A/B

Greissman offered a brief recap of actions pertaining to proposed changes to the *Administrative Regulations (AR)* dealing with the comprehensive tenure review:

- The suggestion to do away with writing individual letters has been scrapped;
- Consensus items have been incorporated into an alternate version of the *ARs*, “Version B,” which also includes the consensus items and the Board of Trustees-approved parts I, II and II of the *ARs*; and
- The combined Version B has been circulated to deans, whose responses also have been largely positive.

Greissman added that the report from the Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure (SACPT) included concern about the language pertaining to a dean's reasons for providing feedback; this was truly a non-issue, because the language that concerned the SACPT was supposed to have been removed, anyway. He added that there could be some conflict in the discussions on the comprehensive review: Provost Subbaswamy was inclined to have one comprehensive review, ordinarily offered in the sixth year, and if in consultation the faculty member wanted to go up for a comprehensive review in the third year, it could be accommodated. If that review failed, the faculty member would get a terminal reappointment for the fourth year. It was this issue that also concerned the SACPT.

Prior to adjourning, the Chair noted that it was Michael's final meeting as a SC member, and the end of his tenure as chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee. The Chair offered his deepest thanks for Doug's contributions and insights offered and led SC members in a round of applause.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted by David Randall,
Senate Council Chair

SC members in attendance: Aken, Anderson, Chappell, Michael, Piascik, Randall, Tagavi, Wood, and Yanarella.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guests present: Susan Carvalho, Joe Quinn, and Marsha Watson.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Friday, January 23, 2009.