

Senate Council
February 1, 2010

The Senate Council met in regular session at 2:30 on Monday, February 1, 2010 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Dave Randall called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 2:37 pm.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair explained to SC members that the motion made during the previous meeting regarding the move of the Masters in Health Administration was not quite worded in such a way as to allow the University Senate (Senate) the opportunity to weigh in on both the academic and non-academic merits of the proposal.

Chappell **moved** to reconsider the motion to send the proposal for the move of the Masters in Health Administration Degree Program from the Martin School of Public Policy and Administration to the College of Public Health to the Senate with a positive recommendation for approval and Nokes **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Grossman **moved** to amend the original motion so that the original language remained, with “for consideration of the academic merits and the non-academic merits” added to the end of the motion and Swanson **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion to send the proposal for the move of the Masters in Health Administration Degree Program from the Martin School of Public Policy and Administration to the College of Public Health to the Senate with a positive recommendation for consideration of the academic merits and the non-academic merits. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

7. Revisiting the Calendar Proposals

The Chair opined that he might have been out of order in declaring during the last meeting that an ad hoc committee would be responsible for reviewing and bundling the three pending calendar proposals (the proposal from Grossman investigated by Chappell in fall 2008, the Advising Network proposal, and the as-yet-reviewed calendar proposal from the Student Government Association). He asked Swanson to take over as Chair for the duration of the discussion to ensure an unbiased discussion.

Chappell offered some comments about the Advising Network proposal, and SC members discussed it and the bundling. After discussion, Kelly **moved** to return the Advising Network’s calendar proposal to the Advising Network with the request that they consider the merits of Chappell’s modifications. Jensen **seconded**. Grossman **offered a friendly amendment** that the Advising Network also be informed of the two other, pending calendar proposals, and that they would be invited to participate in those calendar discussions. Both Kelly and Jensen **accepted**. There was additional discussion.

When discussion ended, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to return the Advising Network’s calendar proposal to the Advising Network with the request that they consider the merits of Chappell’s modifications; to inform the Advising Network of the two other, pending calendar proposals; and to let them know that they will be invited to participate in those calendar discussions. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

Swanson relinquished the responsibilities of the Chair.

Those present introduced themselves.

5. Memorandum of Understanding - Law and Libraries (endorsement only)

SC members heard from a variety of guests (Richard Ausness, Terry Birdwhistell (dean, Libraries), David Brennan (dean, College of Law), Helane Davis, Mary Davis, Karen Nuckolls, and Amy Osborne) regarding the proposed movement of Law Library faculty from Libraries to the College of Law. SC members were assured that as a result of the change, the reporting structure of the Law Library would be similar to other law schools across the country, that all faculty who were moving from Libraries to the College of Law were satisfied with the move, and that promotion and tenure issues for the Law Librarians were thought out and unique to that subset. There were other issues discussed and SC members were satisfied with the comments and answers given by the guests.

Jensen **moved** to recommend to the Senate that it endorse the administrative move of the Law Library unit from Libraries to the College of Law, under the conditions specified in the joint Memorandum of Understanding. Anderson **seconded**. There was additional brief discussion. Steiner commented that future requests using accreditation requirements as partial justification should explicitly spell out the accrediting body's language in question.

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

6. Curricular Proposals SharePoint Demo

The Chair invited Jeannine Blackwell, Graduate School dean, to present the SharePoint Curricular Proposals web site, which Guest Blackwell did. When she finished, the Chair noted the time and said he needed to truncate the presentation to move on to the remaining agenda items.

4. QEP Topic Selection Plan - Deanna Sellnow

Guest Deanna Sellnow briefly explained the matter, and went through the slides she planned on presenting to the Senate for its February meeting. There were a few questions, and before departing she thanked SC members, saying that the comments would improve her presentation to the Senate.

The Chair informed SC members of the need to review the honorary degree nominees, in order to place them on the Senate agenda for February 8. SC members noted that the transmission of honorary degree nominees to the Office of the Senate Council did not contain formal bios of the nominees or the honorary degree type to be awarded, and discussed options that would allow the SC to proceed with consideration of the matter.

Kirk **moved** that the SC include the honorary degree recipients on the February 8 Senate meeting agenda, as long as the specific honorary degree types are received by the Office of the Senate Council prior to Thursday, and that no further votes on honorary degree nominees can be held unless the nominee information is received in January and includes the biographies for the Board of Trustees as well as the honorary degree types. Yanarella **seconded**.

Anderson suggested that the motion be separated into two sections, to which Kirk and Yanarella **agreed**. Grossman offered a friendly amendment that the first motion state that the honorary degree types be received by February 4, and both Kirk and Yanarella **agreed**.

There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** that the SC include the honorary degree recipients on the February 8 Senate meeting agenda, as long as the specific honorary degree types are received by the Office of the Senate Council prior to Thursday, February 4. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

Kirk then **moved** that the Chair inform the Graduate School dean that no further votes on honorary degree recipients can be held unless the nominee information is received by January 15 and includes both the biographies for the Board of Trustees as well as the honorary degree types. Yanarella **seconded**. There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

2. Proposed Change to Senate Rules 1.4.2.9 ("Senate Institutional Finance and Resource Allocation Committee")

The Chair asked SC members to review the language. Mrs. Brothers commented that the language was previously approved via email by the SC, but that it was placed on the agenda to ensure documentation of SC approval. There were no objections to the proposed changes.

8. Code of Conduct Issue - College of Pharmacy Senator

The Chair invited Dan Wermeling, from the College of Pharmacy, to give SC members an update on the Code of Conduct issue in his college, which he did. He answered a variety of questions. SC members opined that his comments would be beneficial for the entire Senate to hear, and reiterated their invitation that he speak to the Senate. As he departed, the Chair expressed his thanks to Wermeling for his attendance, and said his work explaining the issue was very much appreciated.

9. Athletics Program and UK Finances - Frank Butler and Angie Martin

Guests Frank Butler (Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration) and Angie Martin (Treasurer) explained the spreadsheet presented to SC members and answered many, many questions. The discussion went on for about an hour.

SC members reiterated on a number of occasions that while there were thoughts about how much money the Athletics Association (AA) could possibly contribute to offset UK's financial straits, the AA was and should remain an integral part of campus life.

Upon their departure, the Chair thanked both Butler and Martin for attending and answering questions.

10. Tentative Senate Agenda for February 8

Swanson **moved** to approve the tentative Senate agenda for February 8 as an unordered list, and Anderson **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:01 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Dave Randall,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Chappell, Grossman, Jensen, Kelly, Kirk, Nokes, Randall, Steiner, Swanson, and Thelin.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guests present: Richard Ausness, Terry Birdwhistell, Jeannine Blackwell, David Brennan, Helane Davis, Mary Davis, Vaughn Fielder, Karen Nuckolls, Amy Osborne, Deanna Sellnow and Daniel Wermeling.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, February 2, 2010.