

Senate Council Meeting  
November 6, 2006

The Senate Council met at 3:00 pm on Monday, November 06, 2006 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were conducted via a show of hands, unless otherwise indicated.

After establishing quorum, the meeting was called to order at 3:15 pm.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair noted that Liaison Greissman, Randall and Yanarella would be absent. He then reminded Senate Council (SC) members of the November 9<sup>th</sup> breakfast with President Todd.

Odoi asked about the status of the proposal for an extended fall break. He said the Chair had informed him that the Calendar Committee had not yet met, but that he (Odoi) was under pressure from other student representatives to report on the status of the proposal. The Chair said that he would request that Yanarella, Calendar Committee chair, offer an update on the proposal at the next SC meeting.

The minutes from October 30 were approved as distributed.

2. December Degree List

The Chair said that it was by Kentucky Revised Statue that elected University Faculty senators were given the power and responsibility to approve the list of individuals earning degrees, one of the very few rights and privileges granted by state law. He said that senators should review the list for names that should be removed and for omissions of students who should be added.

Lesnaw **moved** to send the December 2006 Degree List to the Senate for approval. Odoi **seconded**. The motion was unanimously **approved**.

3. [Agenda for November Senate Meeting](#)

The Chair requested SC members vote on the proposed agenda for the Senate meeting on November 13. He also thanked Duke for recent advice to move an agenda item to a subsequent meeting. The Chair suggested that the historical graduate certificates be removed from the Senate agenda and instead be posted on a web transmittal.

Waldhart so **moved**. Lesnaw **seconded**. There was a brief discussion regarding the possible order of presentations. A **vote** was taken on the motion to place the historical graduate certificates on a web transmittal for approval, instead of going to a live Senate meeting. The motion **passed** unanimously.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to approve an unordered Senate agenda. The motion was unanimously **approved**.

#### 4. [Discussion Regarding Timeline for December Senate Council Officer Nominations/Elections](#)

The Chair stated the *Senate Rules* required elections of Senate Council officers be held in the month of December. He expressed some hesitancy to be the individual responsible for initiating discussions regarding officer elections, but noted that there was no other entity that would do so. The Chair suggested allowing one week for nominations to be submitted to the Office of the Senate Council, ending on a Friday. He added that SC members could send nominations (for the positions of chair and vice chair) to the SC listserv, or to Vice Chair Grabau, or to Mrs. Brothers. Michael suggested Mrs. Brothers receive the nominations. It was agreed that the election would be done via secret ballot, similar to the December 2005 SC officer elections.

Waldhart **moved** that the open nomination period for the Senate Council officer positions of chair and vice chair begin on Monday, November 27, 2006 and end on Friday, December 1; that nominations be sent to Mrs. Brothers; and that the election for the SC officer positions be held on Monday, December 4, 2006. Lesnaw **seconded**. Michael suggested a deadline be given for the end of nominations on December 1. Waldhart reworded her motion to include "4:00 pm."

A **vote** was taken on the motion suggesting that the open nomination period for the Senate Council officer positions of chair and vice chair begin on Monday, November 27, 2006 and end at 4:00 pm on Friday, December 1; that nominations be sent to Mrs. Brothers; and that the election for the SC officer positions will be conducted at the Senate Council meeting on Monday, December 4, 2006. The motion **passed** unanimously.

#### 5. [Revision to Updated Senate Rules Section VII \(Retention of Period of Student Records\)](#)

The Chair offered background information on the agenda item. The major revisions to *Senate Rules (SR) Section VII* were approved by the SC in October 2006. In the past, the *SR* had allowed students 365 days in which to question a grade but that was changed to 180 days. During the major revisions to *SR 7.2.3*, the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) correspondingly changed the amount of time for which instructors needed to keep student records from 365 days to 180 days. After the SC's approval, the Office of the Senate Council sent the change to Academic Ombud Joel Lee, who suggested keeping the period of records retention by instructors at 365 days. Ombud Lee expressed some concern that a student could lodge a complaint late on the 180<sup>th</sup> day; by the time the instructor was contacted the next day, the records could already be discarded. Also, it might take a few days to schedule an appointment between a student and the Ombud and then additional time for investigations and contacting the instructor, during which time records could be discarded for being over 180

days old. The Ombud suggested the language be changed back to reflect 365 days for record keeping before sending *Section VII* to the Senate.

The Chair said the SC could undo that particular change or request the Ombud attend the Senate meeting and make an amendment to the changes to *Section VII* on the Senate floor. Lesnaw **moved** that the wording for *SR 7.2.3* be changed to read, in part, "...be retained by the instructor until 365 days subsequent to the conclusion...." Waldhart **seconded**. In response to a question by Odoi, the Chair stated that students would learn that they have 180 days (from the end of the academic term in which a problem occurred) to file a complaint from regular announcements by the Office of the Academic Ombud.

The Chair offered two additional editorial revisions: remove the phrase, "in which the problem occurred" from *SR 7.2.3.F*; and change the final sentence of *SR 7.2.3.F* to read, in part, "shall be kept on file with the instructor of record."

A **vote** was taken on the motion to keep the original period of time of 365 days for records retention by the instructor in *Senate Rules 7.3.2.F*. The motion **passed** unanimously. The Chair explained that he would not explain to the Senate the change from and back to 365 days to the Senate. SC members concurred.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to remove the phrase, "in which the problem occurred" from *SR 7.2.3.F*; and change the final sentence of *SR 7.2.3.F* to read, in part, "shall be kept on file with the instructor of record." The motion **passed** unanimously.

The Chair noted that a motion was needed to include agenda items number two and five (as listed on the handout) on the November Senate agenda. Lesnaw **moved** to place agenda items two (December UK Degree List) and five (Revision to *SR 7*) on the unordered Senate agenda for the November meeting. Harley **seconded**. A **vote** was taken on the motion, which **passed** unanimously.

The Chair shared that Lesnaw requested a few minutes at the end of the meeting to say a few words. Lesnaw shared that she had a specific topic to discuss with President Todd at the breakfast and desired SC input into the matter. Lesnaw said that there was a new potential danger to the UK Arboretum, that of a proposal from the UK Track Team regarding a training track through the Arboretum, including Walnut Woods. Lesnaw acknowledged that as one of the three individuals who conceived the idea for an arboretum, she was very biased toward the Arboretum. She was the first Oak Society inductee and has been working hard on behalf of the Arboretum for the past 35 years.

Lesnaw related that for the past five years or so, it was not unusual for Arboretum volunteers to see the track team practicing at the Arboretum and, perhaps inadvertently, cause significant damage to trees that many others had

spent much time nurturing. She wanted to bring the issue to President Todd's attention to help preserve the Arboretum and that there was a tremendous academic element to the Arboretum, apart from the sheer preservation of green space. She said the Arboretum was used by the College of Agriculture's Department of Forestry and other academic departments. The Department of Biology (College of Arts and Sciences) used the Arboretum for research and education, Walnut Woods being one of the key elements of that educational and research mission. Lesnaw said that the Arboretum was one of the last virgin stands of forest in Kentucky and expressed appreciation for any SC or faculty support for preserving this remarkable tract of land.

Grabau said that during a recent conversation, he was led to believe that University Architect Warren Denny might have an alternate proposal, which would move the cross country track and other running paths to the periphery of the Arboretum. Grabau added that the Arboretum's Director, Marcia Farris, had met with resistance while attempting to formally object to the proposed new training track through normal, administrative channels. Duke wondered why the Arboretum was even used in the first place; Waldhart suggested the runners needed varied terrains. Lesnaw said that those different running paths could be found elsewhere in Lexington. Grabau said that some high school athletic teams had been banned from the Arboretum as early as this past fall and wondered why UK's teams should be treated differently.

Lesnaw said that the arboretum, jointly owned and managed by UK and City of Lexington, was one of the first partnerships between UK and Lexington. In response to a question from Duke, Lesnaw said that Arboretum supporters were furious about the proposed new track. Grabau opined that the Director of the Arboretum had been trying to work within administrative processes before "rallying the troops" and contacting Arboretum supporters to protest.

The Chair said he would prefer to alert President Todd in advance of any public discussion regarding the Arboretum. SC members concurred. The Chair said he would broach the subject with President Todd at their monthly meeting.

Grabau departed.

Due to agenda items having been completed, Thelin asked for time to discuss another matter. The Chair agreed. Thelin wondered if structural changes at UK were, at times, disguises for potentially unpleasant personnel actions. Each SC member participated in the subsequent, lengthy conversation. Toward the end of the discussion, the Chair suggested that he bring the subject up with President Todd at their next meeting. SC members agreed, and Thelin added that the conversation should of course remain courteous and appropriate, yet still convey a sense of the SC's interest in a potentially troubling matter.

Odoi **moved** to adjourn. Duke **seconded**. The Chair said he neglected to bring the names of those suggested as nominees for the College of Design Dean Search Committee. He said he had contacted College of Design senators, the Design faculty council and the Presidents' Commissions on Diversity and Women for suggestions. He suggested, and SC members agreed to, offering the names on the SC listserv for approval.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:16 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh Tagavi,  
Senate Council Chair

Members present: Baxter, Duke, Grabau, Harley, Lesnaw, Odoi, Tagavi, Thelin, and Waldhart.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on November 7, 2006.