

Senate Council Meeting
December 4, 2006

The Senate Council met at 3 pm on Monday, December 04, 2006 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless noted otherwise.

The meeting was called to order at 3 pm. The Chair ascertained that all SC members would be able to stay for the entire meeting, so that the Senate Council (SC) election for the office of chair and vice chair could take place at any time during the meeting. Vice Chair Grabau affirmed that he would be able to serve as acting Chair during the chair election. After a brief discussion, Lesnaw voiced the consensus of SC members that the guests' agenda items should be reviewed before conducting the election for officers.

Those present introduced themselves.

1. [New Policy: Information Systems Use Policy](#)

The Chair invited Associate General Counsel Katherine Adams to offer [background information](#) on the proposed new Information Systems policy. Guest Adams explained that she was normally involved in legal matters regarding research, but was tapped to draft language regarding a policy on use of UK's Information Systems due to a tie-in with matters of intellectual property. She said that individual units, such as ProCard administrators and hospital administrators had said that they each had their own policies. IRIS personnel ultimately informed her that student IDs would be treated as employee IDs – not considered sensitive, but that there should be no access to sensitive information without some type of password requirement. She added that the policy addressed any type of sensitive information, not just Social Security numbers.

Adams said that the policy intended to be a codification of good sense and common usage practices, but the policy did not get to the level of mandating exactly how sensitive information should be protected. She said that any type of information protected by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), state and federal laws was involved. Adams added that individuals affected by the policy would need to double check that transmitted information would only be seen by those who needed such access, but that the policy would not affect emails on campus. The proposed policy had been circulated to a wide variety of individuals on campus, such as web designers, researchers, IT personnel and, from the SC meeting, the faculty perspective. She said that it was important to protect everyone's business needs, so she encouraged comments and suggestions. Adams said she would next take the proposed policy to the Staff Senate, after which it would go to the President's Cabinet to be adopted as Information Technology policy.

The Chair explained that the proposed policy had been brought to the SC not for approval, but for feedback and input. Baxter asked a few questions about what types of email transmissions would be prohibited under the proposed language. Adams replied that Baxter's practice of receiving written permission for students to have grades emailed to students was a good practice. She said that certain types of information must not be transmitted via email, such as research data on abused children of parents addicted to certain drugs, and would require something such as a VPN login to ensure the data was protected. An email that would include confidential information should only be sent from a UK computer, to ensure that appropriate levels of security were in place.

Baxter expressed concern that in SIS, he could access the information of any student, not just those in his college or whom he advised. Adams said that FERPA regulations mandated that access to a student's confidential information be used only by someone with a need to do so. Baxter explained that even though he did not access information that he did not need, it was unacceptable that mechanisms for addressing appropriate levels of access were not in effect. Grabau suggested that as an example of a punitive mechanism, UK removed the advising duties of a faculty member who had no legitimate need but still checked on his daughter's academic record. Grabau opined the Campus Management module of SAP would be able to provide access on an as-needed basis.

Michael wondered if the language was so broad that it could affect even members of the general public. Adams said that it could, but only if a member of the general public was accessing sensitive information via UK's Information Systems, as defined by the proposed policy. UK was well aware of the importance of protecting identities and the need for firewalls was well known. The proposed policy would not create new obligations but was intended to ensure that protections currently available would be utilized.

There being no further questions on the matter, the Chair said that Senate input was definitely needed on the issue and asked for a motion. (Duke arrived at this point in the meeting.) In response to the Chair, Mrs. Brothers indicated that it would not be possible to add the proposed new policy to the December Senate agenda, but could be placed on the February Senate agenda. Adams was concerned that a delay in instituting the proposed new policy could result in an inadvertent or otherwise disclosure of personal information.

The Chair suggested that the language of the proposed new Information Systems Use Policy be circulated to the Senate via a 10-day web transmittal for review, with a request that senators send comments to either the Office of the Senate Council or to Adams. Lesnaw **moved** thusly. Yanarella **seconded**. The wording of the motion was changed to request that input be sent to Adams and carbon copied to the Office of the Senate Council. Yanarella said that it would be useful to flag the web transmittal as an important issue for review by senators and likely the last opportunity for suggestions and comments on the language.

The Chair added that the 10-day transmittal would be available online at the time of the December 11 Senate meeting and that he would verbalize it then and again request comments.

Adams expressed deep appreciation for the discussion and comments; although everything might not be included in the policy, it was helpful to know about things that could impact the policy. She said she would try to find answers to concerns.

A **vote** was taken on the motion that the proposed new Information Systems Use Policy would be circulated to the Senate via a 10-day web transmittal for review, with a request that senators send input to Adams and carbon copy the Office of the Senate Council. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Due to there being no guests present on behalf of other agenda items, the Chair suggested and SC members agreed to next conduct the election for the officer positions of chair and vice chair.

7. Senate Council Officer Elections

The Chair requested that Vice Chair Grabau conduct the election portion of the meeting. The Vice Chair noted that those who were nominated were willing to serve and asked that they both affirm their willingness to serve. Lesnaw and Tagavi indicated they accepted the nomination to serve as chair. Grabau reminded SC members that based on how it had been agreed to conduct the election, no nominations would be accepted from the floor; nominations had been emailed to Mrs. Brothers and were made by anyone participating in the SC listserv officer election discussion. Not everyone on the listserv was eligible to vote and not everyone was eligible to serve. Vice Chair Grabau said that he learned that he was unable to run again for vice chair because his Senate Council term would expire December 31, 2007. The election would be conducted by secret ballot.

In response to Yanarella, the Vice Chair shared that Lesnaw and Randall had been nominated for vice chair and could presumably serve if elected. Yanarella asked that the two chair nominees make a brief statement. The Vice Chair agreed.

Lesnaw expressed her appreciation for Chair Tagavi's work; she said he had done a fabulous job. Lesnaw said she accepted the nomination after a great deal of consideration and thought. She said she brought a unique, broad perspective of the campus and offered examples of such. She wanted to nurture faculty governance and break down barriers between campus sectors, particularly among medical center faculty. Lesnaw said she would support more activities to unit the Staff Senate and the Senate Council toward common objectives. She ended by saying she had a long-standing desire to address the faculty salary inversion problem.

The Vice Chair invited Chair Tagavi to make a statement. Chair Tagavi said he would be brief. He said working with SC members had been an amazing experience. During interactions with higher administration, such as the Provost and President, he had been treated very well; he met with the President and with the Provost each monthly, was informed by them of issues in advance, and just began regular meetings with the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs. Chair Tagavi said he was looking forward to continuing as Chair.

The Vice Chair said that for the election of chair, SC members should already know if they were eligible to vote or not. He then directed those voting to write (on the handed-out scrap of paper) the name of the person for whom they wished to vote. Mrs. Brothers was asked to **count the ballots**. Mrs. Brothers did so and counted them again. She announced that Chair Tagavi received eight votes and Lesnaw received one. Therefore, Chair Tagavi was **re-elected as Senate Council Chair** for the period June 1, 2007 – May 30, 2008.

The Chair again presided over the meeting. He said he had enjoyed working with Grabau, who was a perfect balance and thanked him for his service. The Chair explained that he tried to include the Vice Chair in as many high level activities as possible. The Chair said he would do the same for the next vice chair. He then asked if a statement from the nominees for vice chair was necessary.

Lesnaw referred to her previous statement. Randall said it would be an honor and a privilege to support the Chair. He said he was anxious to integrate medical center colleagues into the campus.

The Chair instructed those voting to write (on the handed-out scrap of paper) the name of the person for whom they wished to vote. Mrs. Brothers was asked to **count the ballots**. Mrs. Brothers did so and counted them again. She announced that Randall received five votes and Lesnaw received three. Therefore, Randall was **elected as Senate Council Vice Chair** for the period June 1, 2007 – May 30, 2008. The Chair noted that, for the record, he did not vote in the election for the vice chair, and thanked SC members.

4. Clinical Title Series Follow-Up

Guest Anderson thanked SC members for inviting her to return. She stated that the matter of revisions to the clinical title series (CTS) was of such importance that she would be uncomfortable rushing it. She was unable to obtain responses to all the questions raised at the previous week's meeting. During a discussion with college deans on November 28, a suggestion was made to take the time to address all concerns before moving forward.

As a result, Anderson suggested opening a dialogue between the SC members and colleges utilizing this title series. The purpose of a dialogue would allow all of the SC members to obtain the data that is needed to make an informed decision about the recommendations, etc. Anderson offered several strategies and asked

for input from SC on the best approach to accomplish this shared discussion. The strategies were that: SC members invite representatives from the colleges utilizing the CTS to a SC meeting to answer questions; SC members invite representatives from select colleges utilizing the CTS to a SC meeting to answer questions; or the SC Chair visit colleges with CTS faculty with Anderson. Anderson reiterated that deans appreciated the critical importance of any changes to the CTS and understood the need for adequate time to obtain information and digest it.

After a brief discussion, it was decided that representatives of the colleges with large numbers of CTS faculty could come to the SC to answer questions and that Anderson, the Chair, the Vice Chair and any other interested SC member could go to the colleges with just a handful of CTS faculty to gather information. It was agreed by all that it would be beneficial to develop standardized questions to ask the colleges. Anderson said that Lesnaw had requested answers to some benchmark-related questions:

- How many of UK's benchmarks have faculty in lines similar to that of the clinical title series?
- At those benchmarks with such types of faculty, what are the numbers of tenured and non-tenured title series faculty?
- How many of the CTS faculty at benchmarks have self-generating salaries, i.e. are paid through the work they perform?
- How many benchmarks have sabbatical leave policies for CTS-type faculty and what are those policies?
- How are the CTS positions funded?
- What is the ratio of clinicians (non-tenured faculty) to tenure and tenure-track clinical faculty in benchmarks' colleges?

SC members and Anderson discussed possible questions for colleges with CTS faculty:

- How would colleges with CTS faculty define the purpose of sabbatical for CTS faculty?
- Would CTS faculty be given voting rights in their college? If so, would CTS faculty vote on all issues or on select, specific issues only?
- Would it work to allow colleges to each decide on a percentage cap based on a college's specific needs?
- Would CTS faculty be eligible to serve and vote in the Senate?
- How could the economic impact of CTS faculty on benefits be determined?
- How do colleges feel about being in violation of the cap? Does the 25% cap on CTS faculty offer any benefit to the college?
- Should there be any limit on the proportion CTS faculty relative to tenure-track faculty?
- What will be the overall impact on the University if the 25% cap is changed or removed?
- What is the cost-benefit ratio to decreasing or removing the cap?

- How can colleges utilizing large numbers CTS faculty become more closely integrated into the University Senate?
- How do colleges with large numbers of CTS faculty feel about the role of the college as it pertains to academic issues of the Senate?

For the meetings with the SC, it was decided to invite college deans and suggest deans bring appropriate individuals well-versed in faculty affairs.

The Chair said he and Anderson would work out a schedule and communicate it to SC members. He thanked Anderson for attending and she left.

3. [Policy Change: Test of ESL for International Graduate Students](#)

The Chair invited Graduate School Dean Jeannine Blackwell to offer background information on the proposals. Guest Blackwell shared that the policies regarding entry of foreign students into the United States had changed drastically in the past few years, as had the administrative structure of UK; the proposed changes cleaned up the wording on language testing in the *Administrative Regulations (AR)*, Graduate School Bulletin, etc. The proposed change reflected the changes in reporting lines for international TAs as well as changes in the agencies distributing mass English as a Second Language (ESL) tests and different types of tests that UK should accept.

Blackwell explained that current language in the Department of Homeland Security's required an affirmation by the university of the language ability of students who were not citizens or permanent residents. The change expanded the accepted testing system from the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) to include that of the International English Language Testing System (IELTS), offered by the University of Cambridge. Many professionals in the second language acquisition field believed the IELTS to be a better oral interview component with better security; it was standard in European Union countries. Accepting IELTS scores would expand the number of foreign graduate students who could apply to the Graduate School. Blackwell said that there were equivalency charts for the various scores.

Blackwell said that she had been accepting the IELTS score on an ad hoc basis since becoming dean, but wanted to be able to publicize that the IELTS was accepted. The other reason for the change to the policy dealt with the drastic testing changes in the IELTS from a paper exam, to an online computer test, to an internet version.

In response to the Chair, Blackwell said that the policy would only apply to graduate students and would appear in the Graduate School Bulletin. It was asked if the policy change would require revising the *Senate Rules*. Blackwell replied that she did not know. In response to Duke, Blackwell said that the changes would not change the acceptable scores; the policy change would reflect that the IELTS would also be accepted for entry into the Graduate School

and offered equivalencies for the three versions of TOEFL's (original, computer- and internet-based) scores.

Lesnaw **moved** to send the change in the policy of testing of ESL for International Graduate Students to the Senate with a positive recommendation and codify it in the *Senate Rules* if necessary. After additional discussion, Lesnaw agreed to add "and make it effective for students applying for Fall 2007 admission to the Graduate School" to the motion. Baxter **seconded**. A **vote** was taken on the motion, which **passed** unanimously.

2. [Policy Change: Minimum Language Requirements for ITAs](#)

Blackwell explained that in 1992, the KY legislature passed a statute requiring English language proficiency testing for all instructors at state universities. The TA component was codified in the *AR* with very detailed, specific language about the training orientation and the testing of international TAs (ITAs). The changes to the policy would make it more flexible. In addition, ITAs would be required to take the test far earlier than currently required and also make the language that constitutes the language ability as required by the state more flexible.

Blackwell said that a one to two year trial basis was being proposed, during which a tape of the oral interview component of the either the IELTS or the TOEFL would be used to pre-evaluate the language level of ITAs. She said that taping the oral interview would be used as a tool to predict who would likely be a good enough speaker to go into the classroom. Currently, the language screening happened on campus the week before classes began in August. If and when an ITA did not perform well, the student's program would be contractually bound to the student, who, at the point of not meeting the minimum language requirements and not being eligible to be in the classroom, had already been admitted to the Graduate School and promised financial aid.

The proposed change would allow the Graduate School to use the oral interview score as a pre-screen for ITAs and allow those ITAs with acceptable speaking abilities to go into the classroom. The program would be asked to check on ITAs not receiving a full language screening; if the English speaking ability was questionable, the ITA could be removed from the classroom.

Blackwell said that the security for the IELTS' oral interview process was sufficient; there were new security measures in place for the TOEFL oral interviews, as well. In response to the Chair, Blackwell said that the change would be on a one-year trial basis and would begin for incoming Fall 2008 Graduate School students. With regard to the length of the trial, Blackwell stated that one year's worth of data would be sufficient. She confirmed for Lesnaw that the IELTS was a very accurate test.

In response to Michael, Blackwell said that the Graduate School would, for ITAs, propose a minimum score of 26 on the speaking component of TOEFL; propose

a composite score of 79-80 on the four sections of the TOEFL for all international applicants; and 6.5 as the minimum IELTS composite score. Also in response to Michael, Blackwell said that the sentence on the bottom of page three of the proposal that was missing text should be completed as follows: "...English language ability of all entering students before the student visa can be granted. Thus we must require acceptable English language testing of all students before their acceptance and entry into the United States."

Randall **moved** that the minimum language requirements for ITAs policy change be forwarded to the University Senate with a positive recommendation, including preliminarily accepting the oral interview score of the TOEFL score on a one-year trial basis for ITAs, beginning with those entering in Fall 2008. After a brief discussion regarding any ramifications of beginning the trial period for those entering in Fall 2007, Randall **changed his motion** such that the period would begin in Fall 2007. Grabau **seconded**.

There was a short discussion among Liaison Greissman, Blackwell and Grabau about whether or not the *AR* should be changed. Blackwell said that the trial period was suggested by the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee, instead of immediately modifying the *AR*. Greissman pointed out that Senate faculty set admissions standards, which should not be specifically outlined in the *AR*; graduate admissions were also not part of the *AR*.

A **vote** was taken on the motion that the minimum language requirements for ITAs policy change be forwarded to the University Senate with a positive recommendation, including preliminarily accepting the oral interview score of the TOEFL score on a one-year trial basis for international teaching assistants, beginning with those entering the Graduate program in Fall 2007. The motion **passed** unanimously.

5. Minutes from November 20 and November 27 and Announcements

The Chair explained that the November 20 minutes were finished and had been sent out, but that he was currently in the process of reviewing the minutes from November 27. There being no changes to the minutes from November 20, they were approved as distributed.

The Chair shared that the letter-number description of the rule waivers (see agenda items number eight and nine, below) was an internal office mechanism to identify the student, yet preserve anonymity.

8. Rule Waiver Request - RWA Past "Two-Year Window" (GT-12)

The Chair stated that the request to waive *SR 5.1.8.5.A.2* (two-year window rule) for student GT-12 was primarily due to the death of the student's mother during the two-year window.

Lesnaw **moved** that *Senate Rule 5.1.8.5.A.2* be waived for student GT-12 and that the rule waiver be reported to the Senate. Michael **seconded**. Michael offered a **friendly amendment** that the rule waiver was only good for 30 days. Lesnaw **accepted**. Mrs. Brothers confirmed that the reason for requesting the waiver to the two-year window was due to another “qualifying event” that occurred during the time in which the student was gathering documentation for the retroactive withdrawal request, but that the application was complete and ready to be reviewed by the Senate’s Retroactive Withdrawal Application Committee (SRWAC). The Chair noted that the chair of the (SRWAC), Katherine McCormick, supported the request for a waiver.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to waive Senate Rule 5.1.8.5.A.2 for student GT-12 for thirty days and that the rule waiver be reported to the Senate. The motion **passed** unanimously.

9. Rule Waiver Request - RWA Past "Two-Year Window" (JR-86)

The Chair indicated that he would entertain a similar motion for student JR-86. Mrs. Brothers confirmed that the application was complete and waiting on a waiver. Lesnaw **moved** to waive Senate Rule 5.1.8.5.A.2 for student JR-86 for thirty days and that the rule waiver be reported to the Senate. Baxter **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

6. Posthumous Degrees

The Chair explained that he had received an inquiry into how a college could grant an undergraduate degree posthumously to a student. He went on to say that the students for which a posthumous degree had been suggested were very far from completing the requirements for graduation.

There was an extensive discussion on the issue. While SC members deeply sympathized with a family grieving a tragic and unexpected loss of a child, SC members were also cognizant of the need to uphold academic standards when granting a degree. The Chair noted that Vice President for Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness Connie Ray said that the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) would look very negatively upon the Senate waiving a *SR* to allow a student not close to meeting the requirements for a degree, even in the case of tragedy; she suggested that the alternative to waiving the rule would be to change the rule, which would not upset SACS’ regulations, but only as long as UK was in line with other institutions’ similar policies. The Chair offered a handout from Associate Registrar Jacquie Hager with practices of some in-state universities regarding awarding posthumous degrees. The handout showed that none of the Kentucky institutions offered a posthumous degree to students who are more than one year away from graduation.

SC members offered the following suggestions to college deans working with the grieving families of deceased students who could not legitimately be granted a posthumous degree:

- Invite the parents to march with the student's class at graduation and present them with a "paper diploma" (not an academic degree) and include the student in the class composite.
- Create a memorial to a student in his/her home college that pertains to the student's personality; for example, an Agriculture student who passed away was memorialized with a standing nature scene memorial.
- Purchase by the college of a lifelong membership in the University of Kentucky Alumni Association, in honor of the student.
- Request a memorial statement or resolution be read by the college dean at a Student Government Association meeting.

The Chair thanked SC members for their thoughtful consideration of the matter and said he would transmit the suggestions to individuals making such inquiries.

11. [Calendar Committee Composition](#)

The Chair said that Odoi had more than once requested information about the proposed changes reviewed by the ad-hoc Calendar Committee (CC); the Chair had also received queries from Kernel and Herald-Leader reporters about calendar changes.

CC Chair Yanarella explained that at the present time, the proposed changes were not tractable; until there was some sense that both the Office of the Registrar and the Office of Student Affairs believed there was a way to move past the deadlock made evident by the last calendar discussion at the May 8, 2006 SC meeting, he did not want to call a meeting of the CC. He explained that the CC had tried to move back from the grand vision of wholly changing the academic calendar to a change to each of the fall and spring semesters, to finally, at the May 8 meeting, an iteration that further lessened the scope of the proposed changes.

During the May 8 discussion, Don Witt (Registrar) and Pat Terrell's office (Student Affairs) raised significant problems that would occur for them if the proposed changes were enacted. Yanarella said that the only available options would be to ignore those individuals' input or to step back and try to continue to work for a revised proposal that would still have the support of the CC and the students. He said he was continuing to work with Witt and Terrell and would reconvene the CC when there was some way to move forward.

The Chair asked about the current composition of the CC. Yanarella replied that the committee needed a student member to replace Monica Hobson. The Chair opined that Odoi might be willing to serve in that capacity, given his interest in the matter.

In response to the Chair's statement that it was becoming problematic to field calls on the issue and not be able to offer answers to questions from reporters and students, Yanarella suggested it would be appropriate for the SC to request

that the CC have a recommendation offered by a specific date. He said that if there were CC meetings in January, they could decide by mid-February if there was a way to make a proposal that would be fair to students and student-related administrators.

After additional discussion, Thelin **moved** that the Calendar Committee submit to the Senate Council by March 1, 2007 a proposal regarding the academic calendar (changes to fall break, Thanksgiving break and final exam week) and that Josh Odoi be added to the CC membership as the student member. Randall **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

10. [Tentative University Senate Agenda for December 11](#)

The Chair requested a motion to approve the unordered items for the December 11 Senate agenda. Thelin **moved** thusly. Duke **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

The Chair quickly noted that there would be a SC meeting on December 18, at which there would be refreshments to recognize the end of Waldhart, Duke and Grabau's terms on the Senate Council. (Grabau would be remaining until May 30, 2007 in his role as vice chair.)

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh Tagavi,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Baxter, Duke, Lesnaw, Grabau, Harley, Michael, Randall, Tagavi, Thelin, Yanarella.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Non-SC members present: Katherine Adams, Heidi Anderson, Jeannine Blackwell, Thalethia Routt.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on December 7, 2006.