

Senate Council Minutes  
October 2, 2006

The Senate Council met on Monday, October 2, 2006 at 3:00 pm in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired.

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 pm.

1. Minutes from August 28 and September 18 and 25, and Announcements

The Chair explained that a very brief account of the Senate Council (SC) meeting on September 25, 2006, at which a quorum was not met, had been included in the handout, but not distributed prior to the meeting's start. There being no changes, the minutes from the SC meetings on August 28, 2006; September 18, 2006; and September 25, 2006 were approved as distributed. Those present introduced themselves. The Chair shared that Davy Jones had resigned from the SC to prepare for a Spring sabbatical, and Enid Waldhart was the next runner-up in the last SC election, explaining her attendance. He said Waldhart would serve until the end of Jones' term, in December 2006. Because the amount of time left in Jones' term was less than one year, Waldhart would be eligible to run for election to the Senate Council.

The Chair said that Provost Subbaswamy had let him know that the SC would need to put forth nominees for membership on search committees for a Vice President for Research and a Vice President for Institutional Diversity, assuming the positions were approved by the Board of Trustees (BoT).

In deference to the visitors, the Chair suggested that the agenda be reordered. SC members agreed.

4. Update on Writing Initiative

The Chair introduced Janet Eldred, Director of the Writing Initiative, who gave a presentation on the evolution of the writing initiative (WI) since its inception in 2004. The WI was approved as a three-year pilot program. Guest Eldred said that writing requirement courses were approved either by being approved by the Undergraduate Council for inclusion in the WI, or through changes to courses sent through the councils, SC and University Senate (Senate). She said that in a review of the WI, 192 papers by students in WI courses were reviewed by seven raters, scored holistically. The mean of the scores was a 2.29, just above the rating of "marginally acceptable."

In response to Duke, Eldred explained that the student writers were in a variety of colleges and had completed their first year, and also transfer students. She said that the median grades in the courses had not been at a similar level. She said that the papers were four pages or longer and had been developed through a revision process before being turned in. Eldred explained that the papers were intended to function as a look at the current WI program. Grabau added that in

order to fulfill the graduate writing requirement (GWR), a student would need a minimum grade of “C” on each piece counting toward the GWR. He said that as a member of the group that reviewed the papers, the sense was that scoring an “attempt marginally successful” was average for students. Eldred said that the problem with many papers was not poor grammar, but rather due to poor content and overly simple theses. Some papers included in the review were ones that did not receive a passing course grade. Lesnaw wondered how papers that had gone through a review process with the instructor could still receive such poor grades.

Eldred went on to explain that 200-level English courses were often not taught by regular faculty, similar to issues in 100-level courses. She said that it was possible that the WI courses in the major could perform better. She said that data on WI courses in the major would be included in the next review report. The WI requirement was still mostly provided by the Department of English. Another problem was that the University of Louisville, as a result of decisions by the Council on Postsecondary Education, was home to the doctoral program in writing, while UK offered a doctorate in literature. Therefore, there was a lack of graduate students and faculty with a background in writing. Eldred noted that faculty development funds were available in the second year of the pilot, 2005 – 2006, with assessments being done in the first and third years.

Eldred said that she was pleased with the degree to which the WI was making inroads into majors, and thought the program was working, although more majors should be encouraged to participate. In response to Lesnaw, Eldred explained that the original intent was to put the WI into 300- and 400-level courses, but that 200-level courses were most feasible. She said that the funds would be used largely for administrative personnel purposes, to provide assessment and review syllabi to ensure the courses met WI requirements. Eldred added that many instructors did not grade papers in effective ways, which WI individuals were hoping to help.

Liaison Greissman commented that using 300- and 400-level courses could move into areas in which the major offered the courses. Eldred agreed, saying that there was a desire to keep the program voluntary, which would negate using 300- and 400-level courses. Without appropriate funding, expertise, support, etc., majors viewed WI courses at the advanced level as an unfunded mandate.

The Chair asked if Eldred had a suggestion as to a next step. Eldred said she thought the Senate should see the report, although no action was necessary. She said she had sent the report to a variety of involved individuals, including the Provost, College of Arts & Sciences Dean Hoch and Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, and that the SC would need to advise on a Graduation Writing Requirement Committee in the future. The Chair thanked Eldred for attending.

## 8. Senate's Library Committee Motions

The Chair explained that the Senate's Library Committee (SLC) put forth two motions to the SC, and that Associate Dean for Collections and Technical Services Mary Beth Thompson was in attendance to answer questions. Guest Thompson added that College of Libraries Dean Carol Diedrichs spoke with Library faculty, who strongly supported the motion from the SLC, urging UK become a signatory to Senate bill S. 2695 (Federal Research Public Access Act of 2006). Lesnaw, a member of the SLC, shared that the entire SLC felt very strongly that [the motion](#) be approved. She said that it would not jeopardize the peer review system, but would affect the income professional societies receives from publications in their journals. Waldhart wondered if the scientific results would be reported in such a way that it would be understandable to laypeople. Lesnaw replied that consumers would benefit through increased availability of research information to scientific and other communities. Guest Thompson clarified for Greissman that only research that was accepted through the peer review process and published would be included, not those papers that were rejected. She added that any federally-funded research manuscript could be withheld from the general public for six months, but would then have to become available. Grabau wondered if the higher-end journals would institute a publication cost to make up for article access fees, a cost that could be a burden to some researchers, or if researchers would pass through any publication cost to a grant through the budget.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** from the Senate's Library Committee that the University of Kentucky become a signatory to the public letter of support for (United States) Senate bill S. 2695 (Federal Research Public Access Act of 2006) which would maximize taxpayer access to the results of federally-funded research. The motion **passed** unanimously with a **positive recommendation**.

Thompson said that College of Library Dean Diedrichs very much supported the [second motion](#) from the SLC, that the Dean of Libraries provide an annual "State of the Library" report to the Senate. Dembo commented that many other annual reports were mandated by the *Senate Rules*, yet never materialized. He wanted SC members to be cognizant of the time that would need to be committed to such a report. Lesnaw added that the SLC rationalized that the Library occupied a very central place in every faculty members' professional life. She supported the report being used as another mechanism for communication regarding the Library. Waldhart wondered if the report could be offered electronically. Lesnaw said that giving an annual report via email would be far less effective than offering one in person.

A **vote** was taken on the motion from the Senate's Library Committee that the Dean of Libraries shall be invited to appear annually before the University Senate to provide a 'State of the Library' report. The motion **passed** unanimously with a **positive recommendation**.

The Chair thanked Thompson for attending.

2. Granting of *Ex Officio* Non-Voting Membership in Senate to Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs

The Chair stated that he had prepared sample wording that could be used in a motion granting *ex officio* non-voting membership to Heidi Anderson, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs (APFA). Regardless of whether or not a change to the *Senate Rules* would be necessary to grant such membership, Anderson could be granted membership by such a motion in the interim. The Chair added that a recent revision to the *Governing Regulations* gave the Senate the right to offer *ex officio* nonvoting membership to any university employee.

Lesnaw **moved** that the Senate grant *ex officio* Senate membership without voting privileges to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, Heidi Anderson, until 8/16/07. The Chair added that once the BoT approved the APFA position, a permanent change could be made to the *Senate Rules*. Waldhart **seconded**. The motion unanimously **passed** with a positive recommendation.

3. KCTCS Candidates for Degrees

Baxter **moved** to accept the list of KCTCS candidates for credentials included in the handout, and send to the Senate with a positive recommendation. Harley **seconded**. The motion unanimously **passed**.

5. Approval of Existing Qualifications for (2006 – 2007) Honorary Degrees

The Chair offered background information, and how the SC had been very involved with the development of the *Administrative Regulation (AR)* regarding Honorary Degrees (HD). The new *AR* gave the Senate the responsibility to determine the qualifications by which nominees for HD were judged. There was insufficient time to extensively review the current qualifications for HD recipients, so the existing qualifications were to be approved until the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SA&ASC) could thoroughly evaluate them.

Lesnaw **moved** the Senate Council send to the University Senate the existing criteria for Honorary Degrees for approval for the 2006 – 2007 year. Duke **seconded**. A **vote** was taken on the motion to send to the University Senate the existing criteria for Honorary Degrees for approval for the 2006 – 2007 year. The motion **passed** unanimously, and goes to the Senate with a **positive recommendation**.

On a related note, the Chair noted that in conjunction with the charge he had given the SA&ASC to evaluate the current qualifications for HD, *AR III-1.0-6* stated that the Chair needed to confer with the President while offering a list of four faculty nominees to ensure the best possible diversity in membership on the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees (UJCHD). Duke noted that the

list of eight nominees were predominantly female. There was discussion regarding a perceived lack of wide disciplinary diversity.

The Chair stated that SC members could offer additional names to include on the list if anyone had suggestions. In response to Lesnaw, he explained that that the individuals on the committee would have staggered one-, two- and three-year terms, since this would be a brand new committee.

Waldhart offered an **amendment to the motion** from the Nominating Committee to accept the list of eight names. In response to a request from the Chair, Waldhart reworded her motion such that the Chair would be given the prerogative to consult with the President to select four individuals to nominate. Lesnaw **seconded**. A **vote** was taken on the motion from the Nominating Committee to accept the list of names, from which the Chair would choose four and later confer with the President. The vote on the amendment to the motion **passed** with five votes in favor and one against.

There was discussion regarding diversity of the names for those to serve on the UJCHD. In response to a request from Duke, the Chair explained the process by which the Nominating Committee identified those on the list. The Chair said that Davy Jones had sent two requests to the Senate, requested names on the SC listserv and sent queries to a variety of faculty councils.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to submit the names of those individuals put forward by the Nominating Committee, and give the Chair a prerogative to confer with the President. The motion **passed** unanimously. A brief discussion followed regarding the need for increased faculty involvement in the HD process.

#### 7. Discussion Regarding Senate's Research Committee

The Chair invited Guest Acting Head, Office of the Vice President for Research Chuck Staben to begin the discussion on the Senate's Research Committee (SRC). Staben related that in years past, a Lexington Research Committee and Medical Center Research Committee existed at UK. There was also a University Research Advisory Committee (URAC), made up of all associate deans for research at UK. When former EVPR Wendy Baldwin was hired and came to UK, she found the URAC to be too large to make a valuable contribution. As a result of the committee's end, there was no substantial faculty input into research at the vice presidential level. Referring to the SRC, Staben related that it had not met for many years, until 2005 – 2006, when it met a few times; Staben attended a couple of the meetings. He thought the SRC would be a good mechanism to offer faculty-based input into research process at UK, but that after reviewing SRC membership, he thought that it would benefit from members in additional disciplines. The members could be added on an ad hoc basis until an official joint committee from the Office of the Vice President for Research (VPR) and the Senate Council could be developed

In response to faculty trustee Dembo, Staben said that he thought an appropriate size for such a committee would be no larger than 15 members, and that concerns from faculty could come to the committee in any number of ways: through associate deans for research; through the strategic planning process; and from more informal means. The Chair added that Staben had suggested expanding the SRC by three individuals, and that the SRC would begin to advise Staben in his role as interim VPR. Because of the transient nature of his current position, Staben suggested adding members on an ad hoc basis, instead of proposing a change to the charge of the SRC in the *Senate Rules*.

There was a discussion regarding adding additional members, and how best to round out the diversity needed in a committee that advises the VPR. Lesnaw **moved** that the Senate Council accept three to four nominees from the Office of the Vice President for Research to add to the Senate's Research Committee for the purpose of diversifying disciplinary mix, and that the Senate's Research Committee advise the Office of the Vice President for Research in matters pertinent to both groups. Harley **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

6. [Updated \(from informal discussion 9/25/06\) Modification to Senate Rule 6.4.1.A](#)

The Chair offered background information on the agenda item. When the Senate approved the full academic offenses section (Section 6.4 of the *Senate Rules*), it was decided that faculty, and not any other instructor, such as a teaching assistant (TA), would be responsible for decisions made in an academic offense complaint. Some disciplines argued that their very experienced TAs should be allowed to make such decisions and that there were staff-employee course directors who oversaw many sections of the same course. For purposes of uniformity and practice, some areas wanted those staff employee course directors to be able to act in the role of "instructor."

Lesnaw **moved** to send the proposal to change the wording of the entire *Section 6.4.1.A* to read as follows:

If an instructor is not a faculty employee (for example, the instructor is a teaching assistant), then the faculty employee who is ultimately responsible for signing the grade reports for the course shall normally assume the role of the instructor. However, with the agreement of the responsible faculty employee, the chair may decide either to allow the actual instructor to retain this role or to ask another staff employee who is directly involved with the course (for example, a course coordinator) to assume this role. In any case, the actual instructor should retain an important consultative role.

Waldhart **seconded**. Dembo asked if including the word "staff" would preclude a department chair from asking another faculty member the

authority to make decisions. Lesnaw stated that any faculty members would already have that right. The impetus for the change was the use of staff employees as course directors. Baxter offered an **amendment to the motion** that “staff” be stricken from the section. Duke **seconded**. Waldhart spoke against removing “staff,” saying that the purpose of the change was to allow a staff employee the authority to make decisions. A **vote** was taken on the amendment to the motion to remove “staff” from the proposed change to *Section 6.4.1.A*, and the motion **passed**, with six in favor and one against.

A **vote** was taken on the rewording of the entire *Section 6.4.1.A* so that it would read as follows:

If an instructor is not a faculty employee (for example, the instructor is a teaching assistant), then the faculty employee who is ultimately responsible for signing the grade reports for the course shall normally assume the role of the instructor. However, with the agreement of the responsible faculty employee, the chair may decide either to allow the actual instructor to retain this role or to ask another employee who is directly involved with the course (for example, a course coordinator) to assume this role. In any case, the actual instructor should retain an important consultative role.

The motion **passed** unanimously, and goes to the Senate with a **positive recommendation**.

#### 9. [Tentative Agenda for October 9 Senate Meeting](#)

There was a discussion regarding the tentative Senate agenda and whether all items could be addressed during the Senate meeting. Lesnaw **moved** to accept the tentative Senate agenda as an unordered list; add to the agenda the actions from the October 2 Senate Council meeting needing Senate approval; move the Work-Life survey results presentation to the November agenda; and give the Senate Council Chair the authority to order the items. Harley **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

The Chair, noting the time, said that nominees for the external committee reviewing the College of Agriculture Dean were due to Connie Ray’s office by October 13. Because there would be no SC meetings in the interim, he asked if SC would approve discussing the names of nominees over the listserv. SC members agreed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh Tagavi,  
Senate Council Chair

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

Liaison present: Greissman.

Others present: Janet Eldred, Chuck Staben, Mary Beth Thompson.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on October 5, 2006.