

Senate Council Minutes
April 18, 2005

The Senate Council met on Monday, April 18, 2005 at 3:00 pm in room 103 Main Building and took the following actions.

1. [Approval of the Minutes from April 4, 2005](#)

The Chair asked if there were any corrections to the minutes. There being none, the minutes were approved as written.

2. Resolution discussion

The Chair exercised his privilege to rearrange the agenda, since one of the resolution's authors had to leave the meeting early.

Jones made a **motion** that the Senate Council approve this resolution with the direction to the Senate Council Chair that the Senate Council Chair provide it to the President now so the President has the opportunity to engage the Senate Council in discussion, upon which the Senate Council will then decide if the resolution needs to go to the May meeting of the University Senate. Grossman **seconded** the motion.

Lesnaw offered the friendly amendment that the wording in the resolution be altered to say Senate Council rather than University Senate so as not to inadvertently misrepresent the Senate. Grossman said that was unnecessary, since the Chair would make it clear to the President that the resolution was a draft document that had not yet been seen by the Senate.

Tagavi offered the **friendly amendment** that after number five the words "be it resolved" be added. He also suggested adding "asking the President to implement the recommendations of the joint administration/faculty ad hoc committee in a timely fashion" after the word University, in order to clarify what was being asked of the President. Jones accepted the two suggestions as friendly.

Grossman offered a **friendly amendment** to add to Tagavi's suggestion the wording "and ensure that administrative officers abide by existing regulations when appointing search committees". Jones accepted that suggestion as well.

Bailey questioned the value of discussing the resolution with the President prior to Senate review, since the President made it clear during an earlier

discussion with the Chair that the Provost search committee composition would not be changed. The Chair noted there was always value and virtue in communication and added there was additional information available now that may aid the conversation.

Cibull provided the **friendly amendment** that the words “nor even responded to” be removed from item 3. Jones agreed. Cibull and Tagavi suggested the wording “has not implemented the new or followed the existing regulations, whereas the existing regulation states”, and then quoting the appropriate section of the AR, which Jones said should be AR II-1.0-8.

Grossman left the meeting at this time.

Grabau asked if the intention of the motion was to invite the President to a Senate Council meeting to discuss the resolution or if the Chair would visit the President for a discussion. Jones said the intent of the motion was not to restrict the President regarding the method of his response. The Chair suggested a breakfast with the President may provide an opportunity for informal dialogue on the subject.

The motion and all amendments were restated. The various changes suggested by Senate Council members will be compiled and circulated to the listserv to check for accuracy. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken and the motion **passed** without dissent.

3. Academic Programs Recommendation

The Chair noted that there were no members of the committee present, but that Grossman as committee chair had circulated the opinion of his committee prior to the meeting with the intent that his absence should not hinder the proposals, both of which were recommended by the committee.

[Master of Arts in Teaching World Languages](#)

Cibull asked if any new resources would be required to offer the program. Fiedler replied that one new faculty position would be required, that it would be funded by the Provost’s office for three years, and would be shared between Arts and Sciences and Education on a three-to-one basis. He added that the two colleges had developed excellent working relations and should provide a model for intercollegiate collaboration in the future.

Greissman asked why students were required to provide a statement of moral and ethical principles. Fiedler replied that it was part of the requirement for students who would teach in the schools. Grabau expressed concern that the Educational and Counseling Psychology courses that were listed were not necessarily offered in the suggested sequence, were sometimes not offered during summer, and sometimes required each other as prerequisites. Fiedler promised to investigate the courses in question. Thelin suggested including the possibility that students could take an appropriate course from Educational Policy Evaluation, such as some of the courses offered by DeYoung and Goldstein. Fiedler agreed.

The Chair noted the mention of possibly offering some of the methods courses through KVVU and asked if UK students would take KVVU courses or be taught in the classroom. Fiedler responded that UK students would be taught in the classrooms but that KVVU might be utilized by language teachers in rural schools who sought to further their education.

There being no further discussion a vote was taken. The proposal **passed** without dissent and will be forwarded to the May University Senate meeting with a positive recommendation.

[Doctor of Physical Therapy](#)

Malone provided some brief background, noting that the changes were very similar to those made to the Pharmacy program a few years prior. He added that most Physical Therapy programs around the country were eliminating the Masters degree and offering the professional Doctoral degree instead. He suggested that in order to remain competitive UK's program in this field should follow suit.

There being no further discussion, a vote was taken and the proposal **passed** without dissent. It will be forwarded to the May 9 meeting of the University Senate with a positive recommendation.

4. [ACMC ad hoc review committee](#)

Dembo provided some background information on events leading to the committee's formation, the committee's work and its two recommendations. He noted that [Recommendation #1](#) addressed questions of a new name for the Council (Health Care Colleges Council, or HCCC), the Council's leadership, and whether the Council should continue to exist. [Recommendation #2](#) addressed the committee's feeling that the Council's responsibilities should be expanded.

Tagavi suggested that the first proposal include a list of which colleges should be part of the Council. Cibull asked if the second proposal would apply only to professional programs and courses or if it would apply to graduate and undergraduate curricula as well. Dembo replied that items that crossed boundaries into Graduate Council and Undergraduate Council purview would still continue to be routed to and vetted by those Councils, and items requiring Board of Trustees and CPE approval would continue to be sent through current channels. Jones suggested that such distinctions should be codified in the Senate Rules. Cibull agreed, but thought the Recommendations should be acted upon first and codification occur later.

Grabau suggested that the differentiation could be to say that courses at the 800 and 900-levels could be decided by the Council while those at the 600 or 700-levels must still be heard by Graduate Council. Ms. Scott pointed out that some professional level courses had been approved for graduate credit and could possibly fall under the purview of the Graduate Council after Health Care Colleges Council recommendation. Tagavi agreed that adding the word “professional” may be a good idea but mentioned that such is already there in essence in the recommendation where it states that any course that requires approval by other councils must come to the Senate. Dembo reiterated that things like new programs would still go through the current approval process.

Grabau asked what sort of position in the Provost’s office would be analogous with the heads of the other two Councils. Dembo noted that the committee specified the position should be an associate provost or equivalent. Cibull agreed that it was essential to have such a position exist to interface with the colleges of the medical center and hoped the Provost would appoint one. Tagavi noted that the Undergraduate Council is chaired by the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education who is solely involved with undergraduate education and the Graduate Council is chaired by the Dean of the Graduate School who is solely involved with graduate education. He said the problem faced by the Senate Council was due to the fact that there was no such person designated for the area of medical education.

Greissman suggested the Chair should speak with the Provost about the proposal before sending it to the Senate. He added that the authority for academic policy had been delegated by the Provost to the chairs of the other two Councils. Tagavi disagreed, noting that academic policy was the purview of the faculty through the authority of the Senate. Dembo suggested that the

Chair of the HCCC should act as an informed facilitator and should have adequate staff support.

Kaalund said the Recommendations provided were philosophic in nature and suggested that either the Rules Committee or another committee would need to ensure proper codification in the Senate Rules after Senate approval. Cibull agreed, noting that it would be important to obtain Senate approval of the proposed changes before going through the sizable work of preparing the document for insertion into Senate Rules.

Cibull made a **motion** to accept Recommendation #1 with the friendly **amendment** that a list of the appropriate Colleges be included in Item 5. Tagavi added the friendly **amendment** that further changes in the composition of the HCCC would be recommended and approved by the Senate. Cibull accepted, and Kaalund **seconded** the motion. Tagavi suggested that in Recommendation #1 items 1, 2, 4, and 5 could be acted upon and codified, but that item 3 would require Administrative approval. He suggested the Chair discuss item 3 with the Provost. Greissman agreed, suggesting again that a discussion with the Provost was in order.

Jones suggested delaying a vote until the following week, since the Provost may suggest something that could alter the other parts of Recommendation #1. Greissman suggested taking a straw poll so the Provost would have an idea of the Senate Council's position on Recommendation #1. Cibull **withdrew** his motion in preparation for a straw poll. Dembo agreed to the delay, on the condition that Recommendation #1 would still be heard at the May 9 University Senate meeting.

A straw poll was taken on Recommendation #1. All present and voting Senate Council members indicated their support of the proposal.

A discussion of Recommendation #2 spawned many concerns and issues with the present program and course approval process and prompted some further discussion about the way to fix the entire process. Cibull noted that the proposal on the table should be addressed, and that perhaps the proposal at hand could set a precedent for change in the future. After brief further discussion a straw poll was taken on Recommendation #2. All present and voting Senate Council members indicated their support of the proposal.

Dembo thanked the Senate Council and suggested a letter of thanks to Dean Blackwell may be in order, since she is serving as Chair of the APMC in

addition to her usual duties, while also serving as co-chair of the Provost search committee.

5. Announcements

Greissman passed along a clarification from the Provost regarding the Winter Intersession discussion from a previous Senate Council meeting. The Provost wished to clarify that full-time faculty from different colleges could receive differential rates of pay for participation in the Winter Intersession, but that full-time faculty within a given department would receive the same pay rate as each other. While differences may exist across the institution they should not exist within a department. Greissman requested that this clarification be made part of the record.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 4:50pm.

Respectfully submitted by
[Ernie Yanarella](#), Chair

Members present: Bailey, Cibull, Dembo, Duke, Grabau, Grossman, Jones, Kaalund, Kennedy, Lesnaw, Moore, Tagavi, Thelin, Yanarella.

Liaisons present: Greissman, Saunier.

Guests present: English, Fiedler, Malone.

Prepared by [Rebecca Scott](#) on April 19, 2005.