

Senate Council  
March 7, 2014

The Senate Council met irregularly at noon on Friday, March 7, 2014 in 103 Main Building. (The Senate Council was scheduled to meet at 3 pm on Monday, March 3, but the University of Kentucky was officially closed that day due to winter weather. The SC meeting regularly scheduled for March 3 was therefore rescheduled to Friday, March 7.) Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Lee X. Blonder called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 12:05 pm.

1. Minutes from February 24, 2014 and February 25, 2014 and Announcements

The Chair reported that there were no corrections to either set of minutes. There being **no objection**, the minutes from February 24, 2014 and February 25, 2014 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**. Due to personal schedules, the Chair suggested the SC agenda be rearranged so that the next item considered would be the change to the Senate Rules. There were no objections.

3. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) - Greg Graf, Chair

i. Proposed Change to Senate Rules 4.2.1.2 for BHS in Medical Laboratory Sciences

Guest Graf, chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), explained the proposal. Brown commented on the inherent benefit to a student of taking courses that may have little bearing to a specific degree program. He wondered if that played any role in the history of *SR 4.2.1.2*. Graf said that in conversation with Davy Jones, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), the 67-hour rule began with the expansion of vocational schools in Kentucky and concern by UK faculty about the quality of courses taught at other institutions, hence the creation of a 67-hour cap. A student transferring into UK may have already taken about 100 credit hours for an associate's degree. It will take about 40 hours to earn the Medical Laboratory Sciences bachelor's degree. If the number of transfer credits is capped at 67 hours for these students (who are transferring in with an associate's degree for Medical Laboratory Technician) the requirement that such students must also take core courses at UK they will end up earning between 156 – 160 credit hours for a four-year degree. Although the student may very well benefit from the additional courses, the SAASC believed it would be an onerous requirement.

After a few additional questions, the Chair commented that after discussions with Jones, the appropriate motion was that someone move to recommend the SC to the Senate that the Senate make an exception in Senate Rules 4.2.1.2 for the BHS in Medical Laboratory Sciences to allow the transfer of 80 credit hours for that degree. Christ **moved** thusly and Harling **seconded**. After a few additional questions, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstaining.

2. Old Business

a. Area and Advisory Committees

SC members identified additional nominees to serve on area and advisory committees.

b. Honorary Degrees

Guest Jeannine Blackwell, dean of the Graduate School and chair of the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees (UJCHD) explained that she made a simple mistake when preparing the presentation on nominees for honorary degrees; although notes from the UJCHD reflect a vote to approve Honorary

Doctorates of Humanities, she put in “Honorary Doctorate of Letters.” She added that “Letters” was more appropriate for literature or poetry, while “Humanities” was much broader and for contributions in humanities and humanitarian contributions.

The Chair asked Butler to explain the process that the Senate would need to undertake to change the degree type from Honorary Doctorate of Letters to the correct doctorate, Honorary Doctorate of Humanities. Butler explained that the motion for “Letters” was done and cannot be amended. There were two ways to proceed, although one was clearly preferable: the Senate could vote to revoke the degree, which was extreme, or the Senate could use parliamentary action to re-discuss a simple mistake. A motion to reconsider will need to be made on the Senate floor, which will mean that the original action has been removed, without comment, just that the Senate thought it over some more. Reconsidering is not negative in any way – it clearly states that the first vote was a mistake so a motion to reconsider is appropriate. Butler added it would be helpful for the Senate if the SC made it clear that this issue has been thoughtfully discussed, although the SC cannot send a formal recommendation to reconsider – a senator will have to make that motion from the floor. The Chair, Butler and SC members discussed the order and types of motions to solicit.

Christ **moved** that because the SC has considered the nominations for honorary degree types, it recommends that the Senate reconsider both motions. Harling **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. It was reiterated that reconsidering a motion had no negative connotations, whatsoever.

#### 4. Outstanding Senator Award

The Chair led SC members in a brief discussion of the annual Outstanding Senator Award process. Wood agreed to continue the precedent of the SC vice chair serving as chair of that committee, and Anderson and McCormick also volunteered.

#### 5. Tentative Senate Agenda

SC members and Butler (parliamentarian) discussed the proper order and the individual items. Due to the length and content of the agenda, the SC requested that the Chair offer the proposed informational updates. Anderson **moved** that the SC approve the tentative Senate agenda for March 10, 2014 as an ordered list, as amended, with the understanding that items may be rearranged to accommodate guests’ schedules. Harling **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 6. Other Business

The Chair said that the SC should discuss the annual evaluation of President Capilouto. She explained that via email she offered the President the opportunity to weigh in on some of the questions in the survey, as per the motion passed by SC on February 24. His response, however, indicated that he was disappointed that SC did not offer him an opportunity to have more input into the format and content of the survey. There was extensive discussion among SC members – many of the topics discussed are listed below.

- The SC must do an evaluation of the President annually. The actual content of the faculty’s evaluation of the President is important, as well as the ability to habituate faculty and the Board of Trustees to regular and routine faculty participation in the President’s evaluation.
- While the President is welcome to offer his opinions in a collaborative discussion about the content and format of a survey to evaluate the faculty’s opinion of his performance, it is the SC that must have the final say in what questions are used, etc.

- Although the President indicated that the timing such that it was too late for him to be able to offer meaningful input into the survey evaluation, the SC began discussing evaluating the President about a month earlier this time (in spring 2014) than it did last year (spring 2013).
- Although the President said last year that he would like the faculty respondent demographic information to be disaggregated, it could prevent true anonymity, particularly in smaller units and colleges. Faculty may be discouraged from participating if they must document their rank, title series, department, college, etc. prior to starting the survey. If the information is at the end of the survey, there is a risk that only some will fill it out.
- For the survey that will be sent out in spring 2015, the SC could solicit questions from faculty as well as the President and group the questions according to who suggested the question.

The Chair said that the discussion led her to believe that the will of the SC is that the SC will still conduct the survey for this year. In addition, the SC would still like input from the President into the survey evaluation if the input is offered soon. SC members indicated their agreement – there was no change to the SC motion regarding an evaluation of the President that passed during the last SC meeting. There was a brief discussion about inviting the E. Britt Brockman, MD, chair of the Board of Trustees, to meet with the SC in the same format as the informal chat with the President.

There being no additional business to attend to, Brown **moved** to adjourn and Harling **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 1:44 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Lee X. Blonder,  
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Blonder, Brown, Christ, Harling, Hippisley, McCormick, Palli, Pienkowski, Watt, Wilson and Wood.

Invited guests: Jeannine Blackwell, J. S. Butler, Michelle Butina and Greg Graf.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Monday, March 17, 2014