

Senate Council Minutes  
April 3, 2006

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

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 pm.

Guests Gary Hansen, Mike Mullen, Lynn Hall, Carolyn Williams, and Julie Sebastian introduced themselves, as did Senate Council members.

1. [Minutes from March 27](#) and Announcements

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

The Chair said he would postpone any announcements until the end of the meeting, with the exception of requesting an update from the Nominating Committee (NC) chair Jones. Jones shared that he had sent out a request to solicit names of faculty members for the Ombud Search Committee (OSC), which required three faculty members plus one suggestion for chair. Jones offered seven names, but said that there was no need to restrict the suggestion process to the names put forth by the NC. Jones stated that the chair was historically a past ombud, and named an individual who had indicated his willingness to serve as chair

The Chair called for discussion on the names. Lesnaw asked if the Senate Council (SC) was submitting a slate of candidates from which President Todd would select, or submitting a committee for approval. The Chair stated his belief that the SC should put forth the committee membership, from which the Provost decided the chair. Jones added that the SC could suggest a chair. The Chair said that four names could be submitted along with a signal of the past tradition of a past ombud serving as chair. Lesnaw asked if all the nominees were available and willing to serve. Jones replied that he could personally vouch for the availability and willingness of only some of the suggested faculty members. Lesnaw began a discussion to finalize the four committee names plus that of the chair. An effort was made to accommodate both gender and college diversity in the final list of nominees.

Lesnaw **moved** to suggest the three names discussed, as well as the fourth name potentially to serve as chair of the Ombud Search Committee. Baxter **seconded**. Liaison Greissman wondered about other individuals being sent forth as alternates. Mrs. Brothers will call those

suggested by Lesnaw to ascertain their willingness and availability to serve. In response to a question from the Chair about the possibility that someone could turn down the invitation, Lesnaw suggested that if necessary, the Chair could send an email to the SC listserv for discussion on a replacement for the an individual named for appointment. Tagavi offered a **friendly amendment** to direct the Chair to choose a replacement. Lesnaw and Baxter **accepted**. In response to a question regarding the choosing of a student member, Jones stated that it was under the Student Government Association's purview. A **vote** was taken on the motion, and it **passed** with six votes in favor, none against, and one abstention.

According to his prerogative, the Chair rearranged the agenda.

#### 11. [BSN to PhD Nursing Proposal](#)

Upon request of the Chair, Guest Hall offered background on the proposal, which came from the graduate faculty of the College of Nursing. Hall stated that many benchmarks and other programs across the country offered baccalaureate-to-PhD programs. She said that the proposed curriculum had been designed to offer a way for a student with a baccalaureate degree and outstanding credentials to enter the PhD program and complete it in three years of full time study, have a residency and thesis and move directly into doctoral level research. The time to degree completion for both the masters degree (received the semester before anticipation of completion of the PhD) and the PhD had been substantially reduced. Guest Sebastian added that the coursework would prepare the student to sit for board certification as a clinical nurse specialist, if so desired. Sebastian said the proposed program would provide a significant amount of flexibility and streamlining. Guest Williams referred to a recent National Academies Press publication in which a strong recommendation was given for programs of this type. Williams said that the program would address nursing's need to prepare faculty and move people into advanced nursing early enough in their career to develop the necessary skills, etc., for research nursing. She was confident students would be interested in the program.

Lynn added that they were in favor of the Graduate Council recommendation [to recommend rather than require a score of 600 verbal and 5 analytical on the GRE]. Jones asked if the program had been put forth by the graduate faculty. Hall explained that it had originated from a PhD program committee, which was a subset of the graduate faculty. It was presented at a graduate faculty meeting, voted upon, and sent forward out of the College of Nursing. Tagavi asked how the time to degree was

shortened. Sebastian stated that the new program would lead to a net decrease of 13 credit hours.

The Chair stated that the proposal came from the Graduate Council with a positive recommendation. A **vote** was taken on the BSN to PhD program in the College of Nursing, and it **passed** unanimously.

#### 8. [Name Change of BS in Agricultural Education, Communications and Leadership \(page 3\)](#)

The Chair asked for background on the proposal to change the name of the BS degree in Agricultural Education, Communications and Leadership to “Community Communications and Leadership Development.” Guest Mullen explained that the impetus to changing the name came when the School of Human Environmental Sciences merged into the College of Agriculture and both areas’ education programs became housed in the same college. These two different programs with a common course core meshed into one BS degree with the proposed name of “Community Communications and Leadership Development” (CCLD). Mullen added that the education courses removed in the creation of the CCLD made up the new BS in Career and Technical Development (CTE). In response to Greissman, Mullen stated that it was not uncommon in the College of Agriculture to house one degree program in two departments. Guest Hansen added that due to the past history of both areas cross-listing the courses, the proposals were, in some ways, formalizing current practices. In response to Tagavi, it was explained that a graduate’s degree would not list the option chosen, and that an “option” was similar to an “emphasis.”

Jones asked about faculty involvement in the proposals’ processes. Grossman, as committee chair of the Senate’s Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), stated he had received a formal review and consultation sheet for the proposal, and that it had been through appropriate faculty channels.

There being no further discussion on the name change, Mullen offered information on the next proposal.

#### 10. [New Program BS in Career and Technical Education](#)

Mullen said the proposed new BS in Career and Technical Education was an amalgam of the Department of Family Science’s Family and Consumer Science program and the College of Agriculture’s Agricultural Education

program. The education and methods courses would be the core of the program. National colleagues indicated that “Career and Technical Education” was the trend for naming such programs. Thelin asked if the program had been shared with Rosetta Sandidge [Academic & Student Services Associate Dean in the College of Education]. Hansen said she had been. Mullen added that the College of Communications and Information Studies had also been consulted for the Community Communications and Leadership Development proposal.

Grossman said that he felt compelled to offer a criticism from one SAPC committee member who strenuously objected to the use of the term “technical.” Mullen said that he had not heard any such complaints from faculty members involved in the process. Hansen added that the term was used in the agricultural education discipline professionally and nationally.

Greissman asked about an upper-level writing requirement, which was not listed on page eight of the proposal and perhaps accounted for the credit hours not adding up. Mullen said it was an oversight, since College of Agriculture programs normally included a requirement for ENG 203 or ENG 204. Hansen agreed that not including upper-level English courses was an error. Mullen stated that it was included in the grid on page 16, and that he would check on its inclusion in the other section.

#### 10. [New Minor in Community Communications and Leadership Development](#)

Mullen said the desire was to create a new minor, which would dovetail with the current program of Agricultural Education, Communications and Leadership. Hansen added that a number of students had expressed an interest in a minor.

The Chair asked for further discussion on the three proposals. There being none, he asked if there was a preference for either voting on the proposal separately or as a package. Grossman suggested they be voted on as a package.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to: change the name of the BS degree in Agricultural Education, Communications and Leadership to “Community Communications and Leadership Development;” create a new BS in Career and Technical Education; and institute a new minor in Community Communications and Leadership Development. The omnibus motion **passed** unanimously.

## 2. KCTCS Candidates Applying for Credentials

The Chair asked Jones for information regarding the agenda item. Jones stated that the anticipated next group would have come in June, after faculty at Bluegrass Community and Technical College (BCTCS) approved them and sent them forward through the Kentucky Community and Technical College System (KCTCS) to the Board of Regents. Jones spoke with Peggy Saunier from BCTCS, who said the list had not yet been seen by BCTCS faculty.

After further communications with a variety of involved individuals, Jones was unable to find a compelling reason that the six names offered needed to be voted on immediately.

Jones **moved** to table the names until such time that they were approved by BCTCS faculty. Lesnaw **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

## 3. UK May Degree Candidate List

Jones **moved** to approve the candidate list. Grossman **seconded**. Hobson confirmed that duplicate names were the result of a dual degree. Thelin stated that the list of students earning a Doctor of Philosophy in Studies in Higher Education was missing a student. He said he would look into the situation and report back on the situation, if necessary, at the University Senate meeting on April 10. Thelin recalled that the Graduate School received accolades for a list in Spring 2005 that included a high number of PhDs awarded, almost twice that of the current number of awarded PhDs. Grossman said that the list could have been a combination of two semesters' worth of students. The Chair confirmed the current list did not include December candidates.

There being no further discussion, the Chair suggested a **vote** be taken and that Thelin bring any lacking with regard to the particular student to the attention of the Senate on April 10. Thelin agreed. The motion **passed** with six votes.

## 4. Winter Intersession Calendar

Tagavi wondered why Saturdays were not used for class meeting days during the Winter Intersession (WI). Greissman said that the number of Saturday classes offered at any time of the year had sharply decreased over time.

Jones asked when a report on the effectiveness of the WI would be available for review. Council members discussed the need for a review of the WI, and

thought that after the 2004-2005, 2005-2006 and the coming 2006-2007 WI, sufficient data would be present after the '06-'07 WI to allow a formal review of the pilot program. Those present indicated a strong desire to see a report on outcomes of the WI pilot program prior to approving another WI beyond that of '06-'07.

Grossman **moved** to approve the Winter Intersession calendar subject to the provisions that were approved for prior Winter Intersessions and state that prior to approving any subsequent Winter Intersessions, the Senate Council would expect to see a presentation with a formal evaluation of the Winter Intersession from inception to the current time and that any subsequent proposal be for termination or for inclusion in the permanent University Calendar. Jones **seconded**. Tagavi expressed concern that the conditioning of reviewing a report could not be a condition of approval. There was further discussion on rewording the motion. Grossman **amended** the motion to approve the Winter Intersession calendar subject to the conditions that were approved for previous Winter Intersessions. Jones **agreed** to the rewording. Tagavi asked Mrs. Brothers to incorporate the conditions attached to previously approved Winter Intersession calendars.

Thus, the **amended motion** from Grossman was to approve the Winter Intersession calendar with the provision that its structure meets past academic criteria. A **vote** was taken on the motion and it **passed** unanimously.

Grossman **moved** that the Administration be informed that the Senate Council would be unlikely to approve any future Winter Intersession calendars in the absence of a report on the Winter Intersession pilot program. Jones **seconded**. A **vote** was taken on the motion, which **passed** unanimously.

#### 6. AAAC and Other Nominees – Nomination Process & Options

Jones offered background on the academic area advisory committee nominations (AAAC). He explained that the Senate Council annually produced a short list for the President to use, in his capacity as Chair of the University Senate, as a pool for appointments to AAAC. Jones noted that these actions were usually carried out earlier in the semester. He said the process included accommodating a rotation of department representation so that no one department was neglected in terms of representation; nominating only full tenured professors with faculty status; and making an effort to ensure appropriate representation of both genders. To that extent, he sent out a spreadsheet with information on AAAC make-up with respect to gender,

eligible/ineligible faculty and recent departmental representation. That spreadsheet was sent to all college faculty councils with a request for nominees.

The Chair stated there was no record of receiving the President's memorandum requesting nominees in the Senate Council office, but added that Jones' strategy for finding names would offer the best opportunity to garner a wide diversity of names in the quickest possible time. The Chair added that it was likely a finalized list of individuals could be available for review by the Senate Council (via the listserv) during the week of April 17.

Jones asked if other advisory committees required nominations. The Chair said he would look into it. He offered his appreciation for Jones' work in soliciting nominees from appropriate faculty bodies.

## 7. [Proposed SI Grade](#)

The Chair explained that the proposal was not all that complicated, but that no spokesperson from the Graduate School was present. Mrs. Brothers strove to have someone attend, but the individual she was directed to contact, Brian Jackson, was unable to attend the Senate Council meeting due to his schedule. Thus, no spokesperson was present.

Tagavi asked if there was a Senate Council liaison on the Graduate Council. Moore stated that he was, but did not recall discussion on the SI grade. Greissman stated that while the proposal was requested by IRIS personnel, an attempt was made to not let a technology need drive a curricular request. As such, the proposal addressed a need for a grade to indicate a purposeful non-completion of coursework by semester's end, an issue previously indicated by the Registrar's Office as needing attention. The creation of SI would also alleviate the need to utilize "I," which had some onerous implications. Greissman added that changes due to IRIS were offering an opportunity to look at inconsistent policies, etc.

Jones asked why the UN grade was no longer used. Greissman stated that UN had a specialized purpose but another grade could be awarded where there was no credit offered. Baxter asked for clarification on the phrase, "that after a certain amount of time...any SI... [would] automatically change to a 'final' grade." He wondered what it would change to. Tagavi wondered why the proposal contained email threads. He added that the portion regarding zero credits and zero academic credit should be kept. In response to Baxter, Tagavi stated that "S" was only used in graduate-level courses.

Greissman stated that IRIS personnel had hoped this matter could be addressed quickly to accommodate the go-live of the student module in SAP. The Chair stated that there were a variety of paths the SC could choose regarding this matter. Jones noted that one option, approving conditionally, was not a good practice. Jones suggested requesting the University Senate delegate to the SC the authority to make a final decision on the matter, since a decision made by the SC would likely occur after the last Senate meeting of the semester. Greissman asked if the Senate Council could discuss over the listserv and then take the issue to the Senate for a final vote.

The Chair believed this was the best option, expressing concern with the general sloppiness of the proposal and the many unanswered questions raised by Council members. While appreciating the imperatives of IRS/SAP, he did not want the SC to impress a stamp of approval on the proposal as it was currently written. Moore added that there was no discussion on the issue during the year in which he had been a member of the Graduate Council, and pointed out that the introductory memo from Dean Blackwell indicated that the approval by the Graduate Council occurred in February 2005. He said that due to the length of time that it sat awaiting formal action, he was not inclined to believe there was an urgency to act now. Greissman said the issue had been brought to his attention in late Fall. The Chair reiterated his desire to accommodate the needs of IRS/SAP.

Tagavi **moved** to send the proposal to the Senate with no recommendation from the Senate Council, due to the tight time constraints and the proposal not being clear. Greissman thought that the Senate would not approve the proposal in its current format. Tagavi **withdrew** the motion.

A decision was made to return the proposal to the Graduate Council. If the proposal were to be cleaned up and clarified, the Graduate School Dean's Office could take it directly to the Senate.

## 12. [Retroactive Withdrawal Rule](#)

Tagavi, the individual responsible for proposing the rule, explained that as Ombud, he had become aware that the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Committee did not check grades to discover if an E was granted for an academic offense. He said that the obvious intent of current practice was not to allow a cheating E to be retroactively changed, which was the impetus for him to suggest the rule. The rule was approved by the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee.



Greissman asked if a cheating E could be changed during academic bankruptcy. Tagavi said that possibility had not occurred to him, but believed it was a loophole that needed to be addressed in the future.

In response to Jones, Tagavi and Grossman agreed that the proposed retroactive withdrawal rule would mesh with the recently approved academic offenses changes to the *Senate Rules*. Grossman said that the new regulations state a student cannot withdraw from a class in which a cheating E is earned, but that retroactive withdrawals were not addressed. Tagavi added that his proposed rule allowed a student to take a request to the University Appeals Board to retroactively withdraw from a cheating E. Moore suggested the word “offence” be spelled “offense.” Jones said that when the proposal came to the Senate’s Rules and Elections Committee the committee would check to ensure it dovetails with other related sections of the *Rules*.

There being no further discussion on the proposal, a **vote** was taken. The motion **passed** unanimously.

### 13. [Dead Week Rule](#)

Tagavi said that as Ombud, he had encountered numerous instances where there were differing interpretations from students and instructors as to what exactly was allowed during dead week. His proposed rule would address those problems.

Council members discussed some rewording, and Grossman suggested the last paragraph in *Section 5.2.4.6-7* be removed, and necessary text added into “A” of the new proposed *Section 5.2.4.6 Dead Week*: “The last week of a regular session semester is termed “Dead Week.” In the rest of these Rules, this term also refers to the last three days of a summer session, a summer term, and a winter intersession.”

Jones suggested removing “University” before the word “Registrar” in *Section 5.2.4.6-7*. The Chair asked if there was further discussion. Grossman said E was ungrammatical but clear. Tagavi said that if Grossman could phrase it better, he could send proposed wording to the Senate’s Rules and Elections Committee to insert when the rule was codified.

A **vote** was taken on the proposed rule, which **passed** unanimously.

### 5. [Agenda for US Meeting 4/10](#)

The item "KCTCS Candidates for Credentials" was removed from the proposed Senate agenda for April 10. The proposed "SI Grade" was also removed, but the Chair noted it could be readdressed under certain circumstances.

The Chair called for a motion to approve the agenda with the two deletions. Jones so **moved**. Grossman **seconded**. A **vote** was taken on the motion, which **passed** unanimously.

There being no further business to attend to, the meeting was adjourned at 4:56 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Ernie  
Yanarella,  
Senate  
Council Chair

Members present: Baxter, Greissman, Grossman, Hobson, Jones, Lesnaw, Moore, Tagavi, Thelin, Yanarella.

Senate Council Liaison present: Greissman.

Guests present: Lynn Hall, Gary Hansen, Mike Mullen, Julie Sebastian, Carolyn Williams.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on April 4, 2006.