

Senate Council
October 1, 2012

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm in 103 Main Building on Monday, October 1, 2012. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Lee X. Blonder called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:03 pm.

1. Minutes from September 24, 2012 and Announcements

The Chair reported that no corrections or changes were received for the September 24 meeting minutes. There being **no objection**, the minutes from September 24 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair offered a variety of announcements.

- A graduate student, Jason Block, is sitting in on the SC meeting to observe faculty governance.
- The world language requirement approved by the University Senate (Senate) (as a campuswide requirement) in 2009 has not yet been implemented for a variety of reasons. The expectation was that there would be infrastructure to support a state-level requirement for high school foreign language competency; the infrastructure is not yet in place.
- The next meeting of the budget metrics committee will be on Wednesday and Katherine McCormick (Education/Special Education and Rehabilitation Counseling), David Perry (AS/Psychology) and Hollie Swanson (Medicine/Molecular and Biomedical Pharmacology) will serve as faculty representatives and report back to the SC and Senate.

2. Old Business

a. Proposed New Master of Arts in Art Administration

The Chair explained that the Senate discussed the proposed new Master of Arts in Arts Administration in April 2012, but there was a question about the home academic unit. The intended home for the degree was the Department of Theatre. Some senators were concerned that the home academic unit for the master's degree would be different from the home academic unit for the existing bachelor's degree in Arts Administration (homed in the college). Ultimately, the Senate voted to return the proposal to the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) for clarification.

Andrew Hippiusley (AS/English), chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee, explained the proposal. Guests Hippiusley, Michael Braun (FA/Theatre) and Rachel Shane (FA/Art and Visual Studies) answered a variety of questions from SC members.

SC members asked for three changes: 1. clarify on the form that the degree is a master of arts degree; 2. remove the information on the form pertaining to residency, since there are no residency requirements for master's degrees; and 3. revise the titles for both appendices so there is some differentiation between the two.

Hippiusley repeated that the **motion** from the SAPC was to recommend the Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new Master of Arts in Arts Administration in

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

b. Proposed Changes to Senate Rules 1.3.1.2 and Senate Rules 1.3.1.3 (Pertains to Election of Senate Council Officers)

The Chair asked Guest Davy Jones, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), to explain the proposal. He said that the SREC was asked to clarify the proposed changes in language – the new language was inserted into existing text, and no text was deleted.

Grossman **moved** that the proposed language be presented to the Senate, with the SC recommending approval. Brion **seconded**.

Debski noted that the previously discussed (and inserted) phrase regarding the SC's responsibility to resolve a tie and what happens if the SC cannot resolve the tie was not included. Jones said that it would be added back.

After additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with one opposed.

c. Ad Hoc Committee on Senate Ex Officio Members and Their Voting Rights

Wood, who created the draft charge, rationale and composition, explained the language to SC members. There was extensive discussion surrounding the proposed language and the fact that faculty are the only campus constituency who shares a large portion of its University-level representative body (University Senate) with students and administrators. Edwards suggested that it would make more sense to have a "Faculty Senate" (body dedicated to faculty governance). Wilson expressed concern that changing the voting rights of students and administrators at the current time could be contentious.

SC members discussed the proposed language. Grossman **moved** that the SC establish an ad hoc committee to identify the number and role of non-faculty, ex officio members of the University Senate and to make recommendations to the Senate Council regarding their respective voting status. Pienkowski **seconded**. There was additional discussion.

Debski **offered an amendment** to replace the phrase "...their respective voting status" with "University Senate organization and structure." Brion **seconded**. A **vote** was taken on the amendment and the amendment **passed** with six in favor.

Grossman asked that the last sentence of the rationale be removed, along with the phrase "ex officio," from the charge and the committee name. Brion suggested it be replaced with "non-faculty." Wood suggested removing "(and Voting Rights)" from the committee name. Brion clarified that the revised name of the committee will be "Ad Hoc Committee on Senate Non-faculty Membership."

A **vote** was taken on the **motion** to establish an ad hoc committee to identify the number and role of non-faculty members of the University Senate and to make recommendations to the Senate Council regarding University Senate organization and structure. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

SC members discussed membership of the new ad hoc committee; members will be Wood (chair), Edwards, Jones (ex officio voting), Pienkowski and Wasilkowski.

Wright commented that she would bring up the issue later in the week at the Student Government Association's Senate meeting. Edwards, who serves as SGA Senate chair, said he would solicit a motion indicating approval of a change to non-voting status for students in the University Senate. SC members thanked him and asked that he also pursue a motion about creating another vehicle for communication among faculty, staff and students.

d. Discussion on HCCC Chair

The Chair led SC members in a discussion on the person(s) or position(s) that could chair the Health Care Colleges Council (HCCC). She explained that Provost Tracy preferred that the new position of associate provost for faculty advancement concentrate on faculty advancement. Both she and Jones offered background information for the positions that chaired the HCCC in the past. Blonder said she would confirm with the Provost that financial support for the office of the HCCC will continue from the Provost's office.

SC members discussed a variety of individuals or positions that could chair the HCCC. Grossman **moved** that the SC recommend to the Provost that the chair of the Health Care Colleges Council be appointed from the associate deans for instruction in the health care colleges and that the three-year term rotate among health care colleges (alphabetically by name of college). Brion **seconded**. After brief discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Request to Waive Senate Rules 5.2.4.8.1 ("Common Examinations") - CHE 232

Grossman explained his request for a waiver of *Senate Rules 5.2.4.8.1*. Brion **moved** that the SC approve the change in the common exam time for CHE 232 as requested and Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Degree Lists - Removal of Students (General Discussion)

The Chair introduced this topic by noting that there is concern about degree list removal authority due to a case at the University of West Virginia where the Governor's daughter was improperly listed to get a degree without having fulfilled requirements. Had a senate body been involved, this person would not have gotten a degree.

Ms. Brothers explained the current situation to SC members: whenever a degree list is emailed to senators, there are perhaps one or two requests to add a student to the list, but there can be 10 or 15 requests to remove students from the list. Additions require clear evidence of administrative error on the part of a department or employee. Ms. Brothers asserted that removing students was unnecessary because students can only receive a degree if they have completed the degree requirements; if a student does not complete the degree requirements, being on the degree list is irrelevant. She added that it put the Registrar in the awkward position of removing a student's name from a manually-generated list of degree candidates, although the degree application remains valid until the college/department rejects the graduation application.

There was general discussion among SC members. Grossman **moved** that the staff members in the Senate Council Office be empowered to ignore requests to remove students from degree lists. Wasilkowski **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Tentative Senate Agenda for October 8, 2012

After brief discussion, Grossman **moved** to approve the tentative Senate agenda for October 8, 2012 as an ordered list, with the understanding that items may be rearranged to accommodate guests' schedules. Wasilkowski **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. Discussion on Faculty Response to UK's Financial Situation and Anticipated Budget Cuts

SC members spent quite a bit of time reviewing the budget forum memo drafted (and circulated via email) by the Chair. The Chair clarified that the memo would be sent to President Capilouto and Interim Provost Tracy, and carbon copied to senators. Senators will have the option of endorsing the letter during the October 8 Senate meeting.

During discussion, Edwards **moved** that the SC urge the Senate to call for a University Assembly to discuss the current financial situation of the University. Grossman **seconded**. There was some concern that such an action should take place only after the budget forum memo is sent. Edwards **withdrew** his motion.

Wood **moved** that the memo include in the Recommendations section the following text: "provide a point by point response to all constituencies regarding the concerns expressed herein." Brion **seconded**. After additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with three opposed and two abstaining.

There was additional discussion. Noting the time, the Chair suggested that further comments be discussed via email. Anderson **moved** that the SC endorse the Chair sending the budget forum memo on behalf of the SC to the President and Provost. Wasilkowski **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn and the motion passed with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 5:17 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Lee X. Blonder,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Blonder, Brion, Coyne, Debski, Edwards, Grossman, Pienkowski, Swanson, Voro, Wasilkowski, Wilson, Wood and Wright.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Guests: Jason Block, Michael Braun, Andrew Hippisley, Davy Jones and Rachel Shane.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, October 4, 2012.