

Senate Council Minutes  
October 23, 2006

The Senate Council met at 3:00 pm on Monday, October 23, 2006 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired.

The meeting was called to order at 3:07 pm. Those present introduced themselves. A quorum was not present. After a brief discussion Randall arrived, making a quorum. The Chair noted that Douglas, Duke, Grabau and Thelin had notified the Office of the Senate Council that they would be unable to attend.

1. Minutes from October 16 and Announcements

There being no changes to the minutes, they were approved as distributed.

2. [Additional Revision to Senate Rule 6.4.4 \(Academic Offenses\)](#)

The Chair said that at the Senate Council (SC) meeting on October 16, the SC had determined that the change proposed by Bob Grossman, Academic Offenses Ad Hoc Committee chair was simple enough to allow it to bypass the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) and come directly to the SC. Guest Grossman explained that in the previous version of the *Senate Rules (SR)*, a student had to file an appeal with 10 days of being notified of a finding, after which the Ombud would attempt to mediate. The Academic Offenses Ad Hoc Committee (AOC) incorporated a suggestion to attempt mediation first and then allow a student 10 days in which to file an appeal. There was no deadline, however, in which a student had to approach the Ombud. Grossman added that the first sentence in *Section 6.4.4.A.1* ("Prior to initiating...notify the Academic Ombud.") of the handout should be removed.

There was a brief discussion between Grossman and Baxter in which it was determined that the Ombud would contact an instructor regarding any action about an alleged academic offense. Baxter said that the wording, "of them" was somewhat vague. Grossman suggested, "pursuant to [insert reference here]" be inserted for clarification. Grossman offered to add "officially" to explain how the student would be notified. The Chair requested a motion to approve the language.

Waldhart **moved** to approve the changes to *Senate Rules Section 6.4.4.A.1* to read:

1. Informal resolution. ~~Prior to initiating any Appeals Board action, a student shall notify the Academic Ombud.~~ If a student wishes to contest the finding of an offense or a penalty, the student must approach the Academic Ombud within ten days after being officially notified of them, pursuant to [insert reference here]. The Academic Ombud shall attempt to resolve the case to the satisfaction of all involved parties within [20] twenty 28 days of receiving the student's written request.

and also approve the suggested change to *Section 6.4.4.C*. Waldhart added that the changes, if approved by the Senate, should be codified without further SREC attention. Randall **seconded**. Grossman suggested the change be effective immediately upon approval. The Chair asked for input. Grossman said that the deadline after being notified had originally been 10 days. The Office of the Ombud was currently telling instructors to use “10 days” in letters, even though the deadline was not currently mentioned in the *SR*. If the change was not effective now, a student could come back many years later for an appeal. The Chair opined that there was obviously a deadline and that the effect of the revision would not be creating one. Waldhart said that the intent of the revision was to clarify the time limit, so she added “effective immediately upon approval by the Senate.” Randall agreed. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously in a show of hands. The motion goes to the Senate with a positive recommendation.

Lesnaw initiated a discussion regarding the official number of SC members needed for a quorum and how the minutes would reflect the votes. After a brief discussion, the Chair agreed to Lesnaw’s suggestion that he formally abstain in all votes, to record his vote as part of the quorum. Therefore, the final vote on agenda item number one, the change to *Section 6.4.4*, will be recorded as having **passed** in a show of hands with five in favor and one abstaining.

### 3. [New Graduate Certificate: Applied Statistics](#)

The Chair invited Guest Arnold Stromberg, Director of Graduate Studies in the Department of Statistics, to share information about the proposal for a new Graduate Certificate in Applied Statistics. Stromberg said that the new graduate certificate would put structure and credit around graduate statistics classes and those statistics classes not in the Department of Statistics. Students had been asking for something to give them an official record of accomplishing something in the field of statistics, so the certificate was put together for that reason. Stromberg said that there would be a couple of introductory courses, three courses chosen from three groups of courses and one course from outside Statistics. He said that, presumably, the outside course would be from the home department. He ended by saying that it would require no additional financial expenditure to offer the certificate.

In response to a question by Baxter, Stromberg explained that the certificate was primarily for non-majors; graduate students in Statistics do not receive credit for the courses involved in the certificate. He said that some students needed statistical analysis for their dissertation and that Statistics wanted to encourage students to receive instruction in statistics from the Department of Statistics. Waldhart said that the certificate looked interesting, adding that in the past three years, there were about three doctoral students in her area who would have loved to have earned such a certificate. Stromberg said it would be beneficial to students to have the certificate listed on their transcript and resumé. Lesnaw asked about the number of students who would be involved and what

departments they would represent. Stromberg said that about 20 would be expected every year, many from business, agriculture and some sociology. In response to Lesnaw, Stromberg said that there were some biology students who would likely be involved in the certificate.

The Chair asked for clarification about the word “generally” in the sentence about “...completing 12-15 hours of class work with no grade lower than a B...” and wondered if it could be removed. Stromberg acknowledged that course STA 580 was incorrectly paired with STA 671; STA 671 should have been paired with STA 681. In response to Baxter, Stromberg said that the 12-15 hours of class work included the one additional course in applied statistics. Randall suggested the course groups be listed. Waldhart said that would clarify the requirements. In response to a question from Randall, Stromberg said that the committee would need to approve the additional course. He thought that as DGS he would have some initial judgments to make about which courses to accept, but thought it would quickly progress to a stage in which the committee would easily be able to approve or not.

The Chair said that the motion to approve the new Graduate Certificate in Applied Statistics came from the Senate’s Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) with a positive recommendation. Stromberg agreed to remove the word “generally,” make the requirements a list, change the misidentified STA 580 paired with STA 671 to STA 681 paired with STA 671, and add the description of STA 681 to the proposal. A **vote** was taken and the motion with stated changes **passed** in a show of hands with five in favor and one abstaining.

#### 4. [New Program: MS in Athletic Training](#)

Guest Carl Mattacola explained that he and another faculty member had been hired in 1999 into a tenure track line in the College of Health Sciences. Although there was a moratorium on new degree programs at the time, a track was created in kinesiology with an eye for developing a masters program. Two separate external review groups had studied the need for such a program and said that the curriculum was feasible and was in an area in which there was need. Mattacola added that in February 2006, he requested that Dean Cibulka put the new program on an agenda for the College of Education to review, although it would be primarily Kinesiology faculty involved. The entire College of Education approved the proposal. The Chair said that the proposal came from the SAPC with a positive recommendation.

In response to Baxter, Mattacola said that approximately 10 – 12 students per year would be in the program, primarily those in the kinesiology program. Waldhart asked about what students currently in the MS program in kinesiology could say about any focus in their training. Mattacola said that from a recruitment standpoint, students currently note on resumés that they have a specialty in athletic training.

The Chair invited Guest Keith Webster, an athletics trainer in the Department of Athletics, to offer a comment should he wish to. Webster said that the profession of athletic training had advanced and that there would be 10 students in the fully funded program in the Department of Athletics. Mattacola added that there were another five students outside of Athletics who were also fully funded.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to approve an MS in Athletic Training and send the proposal to the Senate with a positive recommendation. The motion **passed** in a show of hands with five in favor and one abstaining.

#### 5. [Honorary Degree Requirements \(from Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Cmte\)](#)

The Chair shared that there was insufficient time to create new qualifications for 2006 – 2007 Honorary Degree recipients, so the SC and Senate approved the existing qualifications for 2006 – 2007 only. The Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SA&ASC) reviewed the current qualifications and moved six of them to a "Conditions" section and place the remaining three items under the heading of "Principles." Otherwise, the qualifications were largely the same. Ken Calvert, SA&ASC chair, was unable to attend the SC meeting. He had informed the Chair know that the SA&ASC did not have a preference as to whether or not current faculty and staff should be eligible. The SA&ASC did, however, feel strongly that current employees should, if eligible, be guided by the same regulations as non-employees.

The Chair added that Davy Jones had supplied him with a newspaper clipping from 1913 in which faculty members were conferring honorary degrees upon one another and using honorary degrees with names that sounded similar to earned degrees. That was the impetus for not allowing current employees to be granted an honorary degree and for using names that would easily differentiate between an earned and honorary degree. The Chair said that in the spirit of shared governance, he emailed both President Todd and Provost Subbaswamy to inquire into their opinion of current employees receiving an honorary degree; both preferred excluding current employees from receiving honorary degrees.

Randall offered a **revision** to change the wording of [Section 5.4.2.4B.5](#) to "~~Current and f~~Former faculty and staff of the University of Kentucky shall meet the same criteria as other nominees; current faculty and staff are not eligible." Waldhart **seconded**. A **vote** was taken on the motion to send the revised qualifications for honorary degrees to the Senate with a positive recommendation, to go into effect for the 2007 – 2008 academic year. The motion **passed** in a show of hands with five in favor and one abstaining.

#### 6. [Discussion – Presentation to Senate RE: Chandler Hospital Update](#)

The Chair explained that the first phase of the hospital expansion, the patient care facility, would cost approximately \$450 million. Faculty trustee Ernie Yanarella has suggested a presentation on the progress of the new hospital with

30 minutes for presentation and 15 minutes for questions and answers. The Chair asked what SC members thought about such a time frame.

There was a discussion on the appropriate length of a presentation as well as what particular aspects of the new hospital would be most appropriate for an audience of senators. It was ultimately decided that some portion of an update on the new hospital facility would be emailed to senators, but a presentation (less than 30 minutes with 15 minutes for Q&A) to the Senate should be on the topic of the new educational complex. The Chair said he would contact those involved in the presentation to ask for a synopsis of the presentation and return with that information to a future SC meeting.

#### 7. Historical – [Graduate Certificate in Gerontology](#)

The Chair recalled that due to changes in the practice by which graduate certificates (grad certs) were approved, some historical grad certs were only approved by the Graduate Council and then sent directly to the Registrar. There was a push to formally approve these historical grad certs within the current approval process. The Chair noted that since these certificates were currently being awarded to students and had students enrolled in them, the historical grad certs were not sent to a committee for review, but rather were sent directly to the SC for approval, to go to the Senate for final approval.

Lesnaw **moved** to approve the Graduate Certificate in Gerontology and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation, to become effective immediately upon Senate approval. Harley **seconded**. The motion **passed** in a show of hands with five in favor and one abstaining.

#### 8. Historical – [Graduate Certificate in Health Communication](#)

Waldhart **moved** to approve the Graduate Certificate in Health Communication and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation, to become effective immediately upon Senate approval. Lesnaw **seconded**. A **vote** was taken on the motion, which **passed** in a show of hands with five in favor and one abstaining.

#### 9. Historical – [Graduate Certificate in Informatics](#)

Baxter **moved** to approve the Graduate Certificate in Informatics and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation, to become effective immediately upon Senate approval. Lesnaw **seconded**. A **vote** was taken on the motion, which **passed** in a show of hands with five in favor and one abstaining.

The Chair noted that the process of composing the membership of the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees went very well this first time around, especially with regard to the interface with the Office of the President. The Chair said that this should be a model for future joint efforts.

Upon the request of the Chair, Lesnaw **moved** to adjourn. Harley **seconded**. The meeting ended at 4:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh Tagavi,  
Senate Council Chair

Senate Council members present: Baxter, Harley, Lesnaw, Randall, Tagavi,  
Waldhart.

Non-members present: Bob Grossman, Carl Mattacola, Arnold Stromberg, Keith  
Webster.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on October 24, 2006.