

US February 13, 2006_xcript.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

FEBRUARY 13, 2006
3:00 P.M.

* * * *

* * * *

SENATE COUNCIL OFFICE
203 MAIN BUILDING OFFICE OF THE CHAIR
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

* * * *

* * * *

AN/DOR REPORTING & VIDEO TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
179 EAST MAXWELL STREET
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40508
(859) 254-0568

* * * *

* * * *

KAVEH TAGAVI, ACTING CHAIR
GIFFORD BLYTON, PARLIAMENTARIAN
SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR
LISA E. HOINKE, CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER

CHAIR: My name is Kaveh Tagavi, and let me first put aside the rumors: The Senate Council Office has not been invaded and Ernie Yanarella is not taken hostage. Okay?

Actually, Ernie called me and said he had a personal matter that came up and he asked me to preside, and that's why I'm here.

Okay. First order of business is minutes and announcement. Minutes have been distributed both by e-mail and is on the -- on the Web. Is it also in the handouts?

MS. BROTHERS: Uh-huh (Affirmative).

CHAIR: Yes, it's in the handouts. Are there any corrections?
(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Hearing none, the minutes stand

US February 13, 2006_xcript.txt
approved as distributed.

Next -- by the way, these presentations are courtesy of Ernie. I'm just following his orders. This -- if I recall correctly, we already announced this last time but for some reason it's still on the -- on the list, so I'm just going to go in no -- in no particular significant order.

These are the results of Senate Council election that was -- happened during the end of, I think, maybe December last year. The new members are: Anthony Baxter -- if you are here, please get up so everyone would see you and recognize you. Doug Michael, Law, Baxter, Engineering and David Randall, Medicine.

Thank you for your braveness to be on the Senate Council. We appreciate it. We need new blood. They are already on new committees, I can tell you that. That...

The result of the Senate Council officer election: For Senate -- for the Senate Council elections, the officers -- Ernie asked me that Davy Jones read a personal statement from Ernie.

As you know, Davy Jones is a Senate Council member. He is also Chair of the Rules and Election Committee, so I'm going to ask Davy to come and read the statement.

JONES:

Okay. This -- again, this is the statement from Ernie.

"At the December 12th Senate Meeting, the Senate Council, represented by Mike Cibull, brought to this body a motion to suspend the rules regarding the two-year limit over which an incumbent Senate Council Chair could be nominated and hold office. After a lively discussion and debate, the University Senate voted to waive the rule and allow my name to be put in nomination for a third term.

On December 19, the Senate Council held elections and selected Kaveh Tagavi as Senate Council Chair and Larry Grabau as Vice-Chair for the 2006/2007 term beginning June 1, 2006.

I want to thank not only my Senate Council supporters, who brought this request to the Senate and subsequently voted for me, I also want to express my gratitude to those in the University Senate who permitted my nomination to occur.

Kaveh and I may have had our differences on policy matters and approaches to faculty administrative relations but I know we stand united in our determination to use our best lights and guiding principles to further faculty interests and academic values and to work for the overall betterment of the University and all its members.

I congratulate Kaveh and Larry on their election, and I ask you to join me in offering support and in wishing them the best

US February 13, 2006_xcript.txt
in the coming year of new challenges and opportunities."

CHAIR: We have a full load, so if you guys help me hopefully we can get through it.

The first item is Graduate Certificate in Anatomical Sciences Instruction.

Just to give you a very brief background, this is a certificate for Department of Anatomy and Neurobiology. It consists of twelve hours, including three hours of practicum. The purpose of it is, briefly, to provide basic competency Anatomical Sciences Instruction.

Is Doug Gould, who is the Graduate Certificate Director here, and does he want to say -- if you want to come over or -- from there to give us a synopsis, please go ahead.

GOULD: Thank you. That -- that -- that's basically it. There's very few anatomy programs left that are actually graduating individuals capable of teaching the anatomical sciences. And we have some of our graduate students that are interested in getting experience and doing that, and this is a way we viewed of -- of sort of giving them the stamp that they're capable of such.

It was laid out correctly, it's a 12-credit program, and I think you all probably have a copy of it.

CHAIR: This is a motion or proposal coming to the Senate Counsel with positive recommendation, and doesn't need a second.

Any discussion?
(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: I have put myself on a diet of stop nipping and complaining, but it's not totally out of my system so if I could set aside -- and I don't know if Jeannine Blackwell is here. She is very protective of the word program, and there's a couple of places here where after certificate, you say program.

And just as a friendly suggestion you would agree with just saying certificate is good enough. And there's one other place where it says, every course you should get a "D". I'm -- I'm sure you would accept an "A", so "B" or better. Is that okay with you?

GOULD: That's fine. Thank you.

CHAIR: Okay. Are there -- any suggestions? Any further suggestions?

Could I have a vote? Those of -- all of you who are favor of this proposal, please raise your hand.

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Those opposed?

(NONE OPPOSED)

CHAIR: Okay. If you're abstaining, that's up to you. I'm not going to ask. Ernie could come back and ask for abstains, but no -- no objections.

US February 13, 2006_xcript.txt

Work-Life Faculty Survey. As you might remember from a recent campus-wide e-mail from President Todd, we have this initiative which is very important. It's a companion -- it's basically a survey that has been initiated this month. It's a compliment to the Work-Life Staff Survey, which has already been, I think, concluded.

We -- we -- we would really like to -- for faculty to have a high level of participation, at least or even better than the staff participation.

This surveys holds potential to help administrators at every level to respond to changing faculty needs, and I'm told the survey coordinator is Terri Kanatzer, and I'm told Kay Hoffman would be...

Yes, please. Do you have anything to add? Would you like to over -- come over for your presentation?

HOFFMAN:
CHAIR:
HOFFMAN:

I'll -- I'll just -- just a few.
Please.
A few words, yeah.

Ter -- Terri Kanatzer is the Interim Director of Our Work Life Office, which is now in UK HR. I'm co-chair of the Work-Life Committee -- the University Work-Life Committee that's made up of faculty and staff.

This work-life survey is the first, of course, that has been done here at the University of Kentucky. We consulted with an organization called WFD, which is Work Family Directions, an organization that has assisted a number of universities in this kind of survey, including Ohio State. Our survey is very much like Ohio State's, MIT and I think Berkeley.

The purpose is to get an idea of what our organizational culture is, what the needs are of people, what people see as the strengths and what people see as the -- as the -- as the weaknesses, of course. We conducted focus groups and phone interviews. We had about -- had about a hundred faculty contributing to this.

The staff survey, the response rate was 55 percent which I just think is wonderful and probably speaks to the needs that people are experiencing.

I am asking you to go back to your departments and encourage your colleagues to participate in this very important survey.

KANATZER:

Terri, do you want to add anything?
This is a chance for your voices to be heard. There are currently some -- there are some faculty specific questions on this -- on this survey that relate to de -- delaying the tenure card, academic mentoring, among other supports for faculty. So this is a -- a time for you to be heard, so do what you can to help support the survey. If you haven't already taken it, please do so.

US February 13, 2006_xcript.txt

You'll have up to three reminders if you did not respond when the survey as launched last week to take the survey.

So if -- if perhaps you did not get a copy of the survey, my contact information is on the handout that you have with you and please let me know.

HOFFMAN: And I just want to say: This is for men, too, although there are lots of questions that do have to do with women and the -- and child care and so on. But men are part of families too, and you need the ki -- we need the kind of information -- that sort of information from you.

ANDERSON: There was one -- I'm Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.

HOFFMAN: Hi.

ANDERSON: There was one part that I was very much concerned about, and that was that I know that in some of the focus groups we talked about inclusion of partner benefits, and I had heard that there might be something added to it --

HOFFMAN: Yeah.

-- in the survey --

ANDERSON: Yeah.

HOFFMAN: -- that would address that because I think that's a very important topic --

ANDERSON: I think it is, too. We -- I think that that -- that we goofed on that. I think it probably should have been -- we were trying to do a survey that was about organizational cultural and staying away from benefits, but the truth is when you start talking about child care, even though you -- you are talking about benefits, so our latest plan is to -- we would encourage you to -- if you have comments about this, to use the little box at the end to -- to write your comments in, but also we have -- have -- have had some very, very good help with this, and we're going to launch another short survey which has to do with family structure.

We want to find out who the families are who work here. We don't know, for instance, how many single parents there are. We don't know how many children there are in middle school or high school.

So we're going to do a family structure survey, and then a benefit survey too to see what people need or think they need given what their family structure is.

So we'd like to get this finished first, and then work on it and try to get that out this semester as well.

ANDERSON: Okay. Several of those questions you just mentioned are on this survey: Note the age of your children --

HOFFMAN: Yeah, but we really don't know -- if you look at the -- at some of the demographics, it's going to be a little hard to tell about -- really about family structure, and that's what we're interested

in.

WOODS: Kay, is there -- are there any --
CHAIR: Could you please identify yourself.
I am told to ask everybody.
WOODS: Connie Woods, Statistics.
Are there any plans to make this a
recurring --
HOFFMAN: Uh-huh (Affirmative).
WOODS: -- survey? Because I just
participated in the survey and, as you were
just stating, it's very heavily weighted
towards families and --
HOFFMAN: Uh-huh (Affirmative).
WOODS: -- and children issues, but I
didn't find some of the other things that
perhaps are not as important as those but are
important, such as exercise facility
buildings being opened on the weekends --
HOFFMAN: Yeah. Uh-huh (Affirmative).
WOODS: -- library facilities --
HOFFMAN: Uh-huh (Affirmative).
WOODS: -- that there were a lot of things
that I would like to see addressed here that
were not on the survey and I was wondering if
you were planning on addressing those at a
future date.
HOFFMAN: We sure are. This is a -- this is
-- it gets a -- it gets a baseline for us,
and we're going to continue to collect data
and try to use this -- this is terribly
important, and really try to use this
information in a positive way. So
absolutely.

KANATZER: Any gaps in the survey, there is an
opportunity for you to comment. It's the
last question on the survey. It's open-
ended, and you could comment on any questions
or if there's something on the survey that
should not have been there and you think it
should have been, please put your comments
in.

CHAIR: Any other comment or questions?
(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Okay. We thank you very much.
KANATZER: Thank you.

CHAIR: At times, as a Senator -- I'd like
to re-emphasize what Kay said at the
beginning. As Senator, I have communicated
with my colleagues, and sometimes when --
while professors kind of ignore mass
mailings, they don't ignore when it comes
from one of their own colleagues. So I do
also encourage you to correspond with your
faculty in your college.
Okay. Next item is SAP update.
First, I admit, I have -- I know "S" is
probably for student but that's all I know.
This is a part of IRIS project.
Phyllis Nash, Project Director, is in charge
of this. I hope she's here today. Are you
here, Phyllis?
(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: She's not. I was going to thank

US February 13, 2006_xcript.txt
her for her generosity of her time and her
patience, but maybe I have to do this a
little bit later.

So why don't I, with your approval,
delay this to after the next item and see if
Phyllis is here. If not, then we just have
to postpone this to -- to the next meeting.

Okay. Next is Academic Offenses
policy. A little background, if that's even
possible; I mean, literally.

Last time the main part of the
proposal came to the Senate. The Senate
Counsel thought that there was one item which
was somewhat controversial compared to the
other items and Senate Council did not want
the -- the bigger proposal to get shot down
because of this smaller controversial part.

So we were suppose to have two
items to consider last time. We considered
the main part, and then this -- the second
part there was some former problem and it was
tabled.

So today I need a -- I guess I need
a motion to untable this. But before, I'd
like to -- to give you an explanation.
Originally, if my recollection is correct,
the second part came to the Senate with a
negative recommendation. Then it was tabled.

It mainly deals with petition to
remove notation of academic offenses from --
from the transcript. As we speak today, the
rule is three years for suspension and, if
I'm not mistaken -- and dismissal, and
forever for expulsion.

Bob would correct if I'm wrong,
thank you for nodding your head.

The proposal that we approved last
time, which will be effective next fall,
makes the notation for almost all offenses
except offenses of "E" and less than "E" the
notation permanent. The part that was tabled
was the part that would allow students to
make a petition either after a year or after
three years, depending on the penalty, with
some hoops that they have to go through and
some hoops that the University Appeals Board
had to go through. That's the part that the
Senate Council had recommended against.

So today we are ready to untable
this, but the Senate Council has requested
your approval to withdraw the motion or the
proposal altogether. I already checked with
Gifford beforehand, and he told me we are
allowed to -- to request that.

Gifford, do we have to untable it
first and then request it to be withdrawn or
can we just request the motion to be -- the
proposal to be withdrawn?

BLYTON:
CHAIR:

Yeah.

He tells me you could have limited
discussion. So -- and I will appreciate if
-- if we get into the merit of it, if there
are any questions regarding what happened,

how we got to here, regarding withdrawal I will answer. If you guys disagree with it and you want to discuss the merit of it, then I would ask my colleague Bob to come here and help me.

Limited discussion on -- on withdrawing the motion.

GROSSMAN: Can I just --

CHAIR: Bob Grossman.

GROSSMAN: Yes. Bob Grossman.

May I just give an historical -- a little of history as to how this came into the proposal?

CHAIR: Sure. Please.

GROSSMAN: First, originally the proposal that came out of the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Offenses said that for a second offense "XE" was going to be the minimum penalty, and the committee felt that some people that -- some people might consider that overly harsh and that's one reason why the committee included this process of later on having an opportunity to bring an "XE" back to a regular "E".

When the proposal got to the Senate Council, the Senate Council decided to make the minimum penalty for a second offense just an "E", and the minimum penalty for a third offense suspension.

So the rationale that the Academic Offenses Committee had for including this process for petitions was thereby somewhat diminished. That's a little bit of history on that.

I would also add that the Senate Council voted unanimously to request the Senate permission to withdraw the -- this part of the Academic Offenses proposal.

CHAIR: So the motion before us is Senate Council requesting, I think unanimously, to withdraw the proposal. Are there any discussion on that specific motion?

BERGER: Just a question.

CHAIR: Name, please.

BERGER: Yeah. Rinaldo Berger, Medicine.

We're withdrawing the -- the proposal you're referring to is only that revision -- post hoc revision part. That's the only thing we're withdrawing? I'm just asking: Exactly what are withdrawing? Is it only that added --

CHAIR: If I could put a number on it --

BERGER: -- on with the review process? Is that the only thing we're withdrawing?

CHAIR: -- ninety percent of the main proposal was approved last time, and it's all over. There was a 10 percent or maybe 5 --

BERGER: No, I understand that. My question is very specific. It can be answered yes or no. Are we withdrawing only the part of the revision after two years, whatever it was?

CHAIR: Correct. We are withdrawing the part that was tabled.

US February 13, 2006_xcript.txt

BERGER:

All right.

CHAIR:

Are there any other questions or discussions regarding this request from Senate Council?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR:

If not, I think we are ready to vote. May I see your hands if you agree with the suggestion by the Senate Council.

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR:

Any opposed?

(NONE OPPOSED)

CHAIR:

There are no opposed, so it's approved.

Next items is LCC/KCTCS Degree Candidates. For reasons that I don't quite understand there was -- there were two names -- or we thought there were two names missing, and there was a procedure -- we brought this back to the Senate Council, now Senate Council is asking you to add two names.

However, today there was some other developments, and we received a note from Ernie's counterpart at... Is it LCC or KCTCS?

JONES:

LCC.

CHAIR:

All right. LCC. ...saying one of the students that I'm going to say whose last name starts with "S", I'm assuming the names are -- are the names available to Senators? I don't know.

JONES:

Yes.

CHAIR:

They are. Okay. I don't want to say it in the tape recorder even. The student whose last starts with "S" is not eligible, so we are asked to not even submit that name.

The other student whose last name starts with "W" is eligible, and I'd like to read this -- oh, here it is. "To approve placement of the student's name onto the December 2005 list for LCC students graduating with UK Degrees contingent upon the LCC faculty performing its corresponding approval process in March 2006, so that's the -- that's the motion on -- before you.

Yes, Davy Jones.

JONES:

Just a little further clarification: The -- the Ernie counterpart at LCC has determined that they -- the -- the LCC faculty have already approved this, and so we don't need to make it contingent. Our -- our approval is the last approval that's...

CHAIR:

I see. That's --

JONES:

That --

CHAIR:

That development had changed.

JONES:

Another development at this time.

CHAIR:

Okay. I'll take as fact, and so we need to approve the addition one -- of one name.

JONES:

I move.

CHAIR:

Any second?

ANDERSON: Second.
CHAIR: Davy Jones has moved. The second
by whom?
ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, Nursing.
CHAIR: Debra Anderson.
Okay. Are there any discussion on
this motion?
(NO RESPONSE)
CHAIR: Hearing none, let me see your hands
if you agree with this motion, please.
(MEMBERS VOTE)
CHAIR: Any opposed?
(NONE OPPOSED)
CHAIR: All right. It's approved
unanimously. Oh. I was supposed to include
those. I forgot.
Next proposal is Nunn Center
Proposal. This is a proposal to name the UK
Library's Oral History Program after former
Governor Louie Nunn. The Senate Rules &
Elections Committee chair interpretation is
that this center would not qualify as an
educational center, per se, and therefore
Senate Council Motion Six, an expression of
endorsement and support from this -- for this
proposal prior to -- to the Board of
Trustee's action.
It's my understanding that Jeff
Suchanek -- I hope that's close enough -- is
the Director of the Oral History Program and
either he might be here or Terry
Birdwhistell, Associate Dean of Special
Collections & Digital Program.
Yes. Either one of you please come
over if you want to give us a brief synopsis
of what's --
BIRDWHISTELL: Well, I think the information is in
your packet that was sent with the agenda,
and I'm -- I'm here to answer any additional
questions you might have in regard to our
proposal.
REPORTER: And your name, please?
BIRDWHISTELL: Terry Birdwhistell. I'm sorry.
REPORTER: Thank you.
CHAIR: Are there any questions for our
guest?
JONES: There was some --
CHAIR: Name.
JONES: Davy Jones.
There was some friendly inquiry in
the Senate Council as to how much the
librarian faculty were involved in the
discussions about this.
BIRDWHISTELL: They have been informed about it,
and there will be -- it will be on our agenda
at the February 20th library faculty meeting.
CHAIR: Okay.
JONES: Thank you.
CHAIR: I don't know -- we have to do this
-- we have to endorse and support this, so
could I have -- I guess there's a motion that
we support and endorse this proposal, so on
that motion those of you approve of this

US February 13, 2006_xcript.txt
please raise your hands.
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Thank you. Any opposed?
(NONE OPPOSED)

CHAIR: Very good. Proposed changes to Senate -- Senate Rules. Davy Jones is going to give you a bigger background, but let -- just to get you started, Sections 1 and 5 and 7 and 2 are -- are revised based on some criteria that I'm sure Davy is going to go over momentarily.

We thought maybe there might not be enough to -- to approve all of this, so we put it at the end, but hopefully I'm pretty sure we can get to all of these.

Let me just -- before I go -- and I should have asked, is Phyllis Nash here at this point?
(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Okay. She is not.

So we have this proposal from the Senate Council in front of us. We don't need -- we don't need any motion or second, so what I'm going to ask is Davy to come over and give us his presentation, please.

This is going to long, so I am going to sit down. Okay? I don't know if you're going to --

JONES: Okay. I've -- I've distilled this down to a single-page loose handout that all of you should have, which looks like this up here.

BROTHERS: It's the separate sheet that was out front. It isn't in the big stapled packet.

SOHNER: If anyone needs one, I have them here.

JONES: While she's handing out those to the people that don't have it, what we have here is -- this is a ripple effect from the Board of Trustees action last June in which it revised the governing regulations of the University for change to a provost system, separation of LCC and -- and a number of other updates.

Because the governing regulations are the -- the law of the University, it creates a ripple effect that the University Senate Rules need to be brought into compliance and -- and there's a parallel actions going on right now under the auspice of the President where he's making his Administrative Regulations also reflect these governing regulations so -- but the University Senate is in charge of it's Senate Rules to -- to go through this updating exercise.

So the Senate Council charged the Rules Committee with drafting the -- the revision to each of the sections of the Senate Rules to make it reflect the provost system and -- and the governing regulations.

You can see in Section 2 here that

US February 13, 2006_xcript.txt
the things that were on the radar of the Rules & Elections Committee when it did this, and we kept ourself very narrowly focused on -- it's not our charge to get involved and come in with great ideas on substantive changes that are outside the scope of what's being required by the higher governing regulations right now.

So you can see the things that we were focused on were converting to the terminology of a provost system. The governing regulations had some clarifications in the definitions of who are the faculty bodies, and on the internal organization of the Senate, the President's relationship to the Senate. Again, not major changes but some nuance changes that we have to make the Senate Rules reflect this.

And then we removed the provisions from the Senate Rules relating to LCC, and this is just mechanical going through, removing things that were basically, at great effort, put in in 1998 when the separation of all the other community colleges happened. We had to go back and undo what the Rules Committee had done at that time.

And on "E" and "F", we took advantage of the opportunity just for some editorial aspects, and we found a number of places where editorial corrections were needed; the word university was repeated twice or -- things like that.

And, finally, we made all the Senate sponsored elections electronic.

So let me just speak a little bit more here about each of these. Going down to item 3 on your list, the provost terminology. Every place that it says provost, you know, or chancellor we've changed it to say provost. There are some new titles in the provost's office of assistant or associate provost that we had to find who were their counterparts in the Senate Rules and make the appropriate changes.

The registrar now has three titles. I think the registrar has the record at the University for actually how many different hats: Registrar, Director of Admissions and Assistant Provost for Enrollment Management.

And previously the Senate Rules just said Registrar everywhere, so we had to work with Don Witt, who's a member of the Rules Committee. Okay. In right here which hat are you wearing and right here which hat are you wearing, so we made this -- the Senate Rules and the sections we've gone over so far match the appropriate title for that particular part, removed the terminology to the old Medical Center Sector or the Lexington Campus Sector.

Going down to No. 4, then, just a little more detail on what we've done, the -- there was -- there was inconsistency even in

US February 13, 2006_xcript.txt
the governing regulations on whether it was referring to educational unit versus academic units, which raise the question, well, what's the difference between them and what are we referring. So the gover -- the regulations have already clarified that. There are only educational units and administrative units. There are not academic units any more because that was -- that was too fuzzy.

So the educational units of the University were defined, and it's basically college, school, department, graduate center, research or multi-dis -- multi-disciplinary research centers and institutes and inter-disciplinary instructional programs. Those are the educational units.

Anything that's not those, is an administrative unit. And there's an important distinction there because review processes for educational units are not the same as administrative units.

The membership of the various faculty bodies was -- was tweaked, and so we brought the Senate Rules up to date on that. That was -- that's important, for example, for the colleges, you know, who's a member of the faculty body, you know, for the purposes of election of Senators, and we had to make that clear now.

The President's relationship to the Senate as its Chair, there are a number of places in the governing regulations that refer to the President having this capacity as Chair of the Senate or that capacity as Chair of the Senate.

You know, in one place, for example, it says the President may waive certain Senate Rules but not of the Senate Rules or in another place he's appointing members to certain Senate committees in his capacity as Chair of the Senate.

These were all scattered around, and what we've done -- we haven't done anything new, but we've brought all those together in one place in the Senate Rules. Where previously it just said President, Chair of the Senate, we now have some elaboration underneath that, all the things that the President does and that -- it's just a collation mechanically that we've done.

Item "D", the governing regulations drew a circle around the sub-set of Senators that are the elected faculty Senators for a small number of the functions of the University Senate. They're the functions related to the authority of the faculty under State Law.

For example, the degree list, which we just did just now, approval of the honorary degrees or the conditions for graduation with degree honors. Only the elected faculty Senators vote on that, so we've made that be reflected into the Senate

US February 13, 2006_xcript.txt
Rules as well.

Current committee charges. There were a number of committees where despite the charge in the Senate Rules the practices on what the committees had been expected to do over the years or how they did it have become well established in contrast to what the University Senate Rules provided, so we have updated that.

And just as an example, the Admissions Advisory Committee that was established in '91 or '92, it said there that, well, if the student is going to appeal some determination about their admission the Admissions Advisory Committee will appoint a subcommittee to hear it.

Well, when I talked with Don Witt and Tony Baxter, and those who are on the committee, you know, as far back as anybody could remember, that's not how it had ever been done.

The committees acted as a committee as a whole rather than appoint a subcommittee as itself, and so Don and the others said, just bring the Senate Rules up to date the way we've been doing it for the past 13 years. And so that's an example of how we've updated the committee charge.

Another aspect with respect to the Admissions Advisory Committee was in Section 1 of the Senate Rules was some statement of charge to the Admissions Advisory Committee, but also a little bit of policy on, well, you know, what -- what are certain criteria for admissions. But over in Section 3 of the Senate Rules there was a little bit about committee charge and a whole lot about criteria and policy.

And so when I talked with Don Witt and some of the others they said, that created some confu -- some confusion in the past as to, well, which rule do we look at for the purpose of the Admission Policy or the -- the procedures by which the committee operates, and so what we just did mechanically was we moved everything about the charge to the committee to Section 1 of the Senate Rules and we're moving every aspect of the policy on what are the criteria for admissions over to Section 3.

Section 3 is not in front of you right now, but it's our intention, then, to move it over to Section 3.

But the Section 1 you have right now has brought all into one place all aspects of the committee charge for that committee. That's an example of what we've done with the various committees.

Item 6 on your list here, clarifying intents. Again, these are not substantive changes but there were a number of places where we would find the Senate Rule would say, Senate Council this, Graduate

US February 13, 2006_xcript.txt
Council that and in the next paragraph the
Council. Well, which Council, the Senate
Council or the Graduate Council.

So we were able to determine intent
for each of these, but we then made it --
made it clear, ah, this last reference means
Graduate Council. It doesn't mean Senate
Council.

Or there were several places where
does the alternate for the HDC vote when
serving as a replacement for the person who
can't be there, and so we clarified, you
know, the voting status of the alternates.
And, again, this was not substantive changes,
just clarifying the intent.

And, finally, on the elections,
we've made electronic, voting through the
web, the Senate -- the elections by the
members of the Senate for representatives to
the Senate Council. We've made electronic
the trustee elections, but there was another
election -- a University wide election that's
under the control of the Senate, and that is
on the rare occasion that we're searching for
a University President. The Board
established a Search Committee, and the
Board's Governing Regulations say, you know,
the Senate names -- the three faculty
representatives who are going to be on the
Presidential Search Committee, and it's still
under the old paper ballot system.

So what we did was we took the
electronic voting system that you had
approved for election of Senators to the
Senate Council and took that virtually
verbatim and made that be the process, the
electronic voting, to determine who would be
the faculty representatives to a Presidential
Search Committee.

So, again, in a nutshell that's
what we've done on Section 1. Again, we
studiously avoided substantive changes
that -- we came up with what we thought were
some great ideas on some things, but we
segregated those ideas away and what you have
for action today is the more mechanical but
thorough updating of Section 1.

CHAIR: I can answer any questions.
I can add a couple of things.
One, and correct me if I'm wrong, Davy, in
correcting or adding anything to the charge
of the committees you solicited this actually
from the Chairs of the Senate Committees?

JONES: Oh, yeah. Yeah. As part of this
process, requests went out to all the Chairs
of the Sen -- each Senate Committees, you
know, asking them -- this is your charge
here, you know, do you -- do you have any
suggestions on how we make this actually
compatible with current practice.

CHAIR: One other point, and I can tell you
that from first-hand knowledge, I'm on the
Rules & Elections Committee, who Davy is the

Chair, and he's ruthless. He made us come to meetings during summer many, many times.

I have heard this whispering from the members that they liked the previous Chair much better than the current Chair.

But how do you want to do this? These are really important proposals, and we want to do one proposal at a time.

JONES: Okay. Just do Section 1 right now.
CHAIR: Okay. So we'd like to ask for your input and your suggestions on Section 1, if there are any questions or suggestions or... This is before you from the Senate Council, a positive recommendation. It does not require a second.

WALDHART: Yes. Please identify yourself.
Enid Waldhart, Communication.

I thank you for the summary handout. This explains a whole lot that I couldn't figure out by myself trying to read through it, and -- and I think it lays it out very nicely. Thank you for doing that.

JONES: And I do want to take that as an opportunity to segway into thanking the other members of the Rules & Elections Committee who maintained a brutal pace in this exercise from last summer until now.

CHAIR: I don't want to pass this section and go to the section hastily, so are there any questions?
(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Okay. Then we need to vote at this time, so all of those in favor of the proposal that revises the language of chapter -- section, chapter?

JONES: Section 1.
CHAIR: -- Section 1 of the Senate Rules, please raise your hand.
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Those opposed.
(NONE OPPOSED)

CHAIR: None opposed.
Do you want to say anything about Section 2, or what is the next section?

JONES: Five. So one is over now; correct?
(NONVERBAL RESPONSE)

JONES: Okay. Going on now to page 101, which deals with Section 5 -- a part of Section 5. This is not all of Section 5. This is basically the part of Section 5 dealing with the Honorary Degrees. Again, because the Board of Trustees has drawn a circle around the elected Faculty Senators as the subset of the Senate that votes on recommendations for Honorary Degrees to the Board of Trustees, and -- and we just had an exercise of that last December, we wanted to right now -- or the committee wanted to revise that section first and make that section correspond to the Governing Regulations.

Just a little bit of a background on what's here and what this is reflecting

US February 13, 2006_xcript.txt
that's going to be happening, the -- this committee -- the Honorary Degrees Committee, which if you -- if you go to the University archives, Terry, which is great, and spend days thumbing -- thumbing the background of that committee, that originally was a Senate established committee.

Over the 1970s and '80s, it kind of moved into a little backwater that: Is this a Senate Committee or is this a Presidential Committee? And that became -- and to what extent is the Senate hostaged, you might say, to the recommendations that are coming from that committee.

Well, the Board of Trustees has helped to resolve that by clarifying, you know, it's the elected Faculty Senators here that can -- that determine the recommendation that's going to be reaching the Board of Trustees on Honorary Degrees.

And so toward that end, the Senate Council has had a lot of iteration with the Administration on revamping the Honorary Degrees Committee.

It's going to be a committee of the University in which I believe it's half the members are going to be named by the University Senate Council and happen to be named by the Administration.

It will forward recommendations to the University Senate in which the elected Faculty Senators there will either approve or disapprove those names, and there will be a provision for, in rare circumstances -- and it's intended -- in good faith, this would be in rare situations, the University Faculty Senators could decide, you know, we want to have a process by which a name is considered and sent forth that did not come from this committee.

You know, it -- rare examples that were contemplated is, you know, Phil Sharp, for example, the Kentucky native, you know, a few years ago wins the Nobel Prize, there's an announcement and then there's -- there's a second announcement that, oh, he's got brain cancer. You know, he's not going to live for more than a year, you know, so we can't wait till the next cycle but his name wasn't on the list of three that came from the committee.

In a rare situation like that, you know, we would, with explanation to the Board of Trustees, you know, explain, you know, we're sending a name forward that didn't come out of this joint committee and here's the reason why.

Okay. So on to page -- so that's the committee structure that's going to be developed. It's going to come out under these revised President's Administrative Regulations that this other committee is -- is going to do -- has been formed for.

US February 13, 2006_xcript.txt

That Administrative Regulation is cross-reference our Senate Rules. That Administrative Regulation is sort of going to talk about, well, what -- what happens with this committee and its recommendation that's external to the Senate, per se. The Senate Rules are controlling what happens once it reaches the internal Senate apparatus. Okay.

So you see on page 101, Section 5.4.2, this -- this part that's underlined is basically explaining the Board of Trustees is giving the authority to the elected Faculty Senators for this purpose.

If we then go to page -- just -- just bragging a little bit here, on page 102 at the bottom, Section A, that's just an example again where you can see LCC is being pulled put out, you know, the -- the Graduation with Honors criteria are -- are being removed there.

Section 5.4.2.3 is explaining the role of this committee. Section A there is explaining the role this committee that I just talked to you about, and you can see there in the middle they're saying as described in AR Roman Numeral III, XXX. That reg hasn't come out yet, but we'll cross-reference it just like it will cross-reference this regulation. And then B, it will be the role of the elected Faculty Senators, as described to you right now.

Going on to page 104, again, this is what we -- it wasn't the role of our committee to write substantive things. You see here the circumstances for award of Honorary Degrees. This is taken just verbatim from the Web site of the Graduate School right now, which up until now, has been sort of the headquarters of the Honorary Degree Committee and where these kind of policies have been posted. So this is nothing new. It's just incorporating in here into the Senate Rules. And Item D here, these titles of the Honorary Degrees, you know, (Unintelligible). These are the names of the degrees for the past 20 years that have been awarded, so none of these are new.

5.4.2.4, you see just a note here nothing's being done on that right now, the conditions of merit for Honorary Degrees. The Board of Trustees has named the Elected Faculty Senators here as having the responsibility now rather than the Graduate Faculty and the Honorary Degree Committee. It's -- it's the Elected Faculty Senators for a change in the criteria or modifying or updating criteria for getting Honorary Degrees. That's beyond the scope of what we're doing. That will be something substantive.

This is just a note to you to have in the back of your mind. At some point in the future, something will probably reach you

US February 13, 2006_xcript.txt
wanting you to substantively consider: Do we need to make any changes or not to the policy that's still sitting out there at the Graduate School Web site?

And, finally, Section 5.4.5 diplomas, the Board of Trustees further clarified that the elected Faculty Senators are responsible for not diploma award in the sense that the Board of Trustees approving them but of the content of the information that's on the diploma, and we can specify minimal information that's on the diploma.

An Honorary Degree recipient gets a diploma that attests their Honorary Degree.

So what we've done here under Sections A and B, on diplomas, and we worked closely with the Registrar's Office on this, it basically reflect what is the current policy. Nothing -- nothing is being changed here as to what information is on the diploma. It just hadn't been codified anywhere, and so now that we're responsible for it, we're pulling practice into here and then later we can revisit, you know, if there needs to be change.

So that's Section 5 -- part of Section 5, of the Senate Rules.

CHAIR: This Section is coming to us with a positive recommendation from Senate Council. So are there any questions for Davy?

COLLINS: Michael Collins, and I'm -- and I was on the committee so I should probably know this: Davy, you have -- you didn't mention Section 5.4.3, which doesn't appear to make very much sense, that there is no Section 5.4.4. Are those things we're not taking any action on?

JONES: That pertain 5.4.3? Is that --

COLLINS: Yes.
JONES: Yeah. We're not taking any action on that. That's the conditions for Magna Cum Laude and whatnot, and there was nothing the Board of Trustees did that affected that so that's why that's not printed out and we're not acting on that.

COLLINS: I thought that was in 5.4.2.2, the Magna Cum Laude and Summa are there. What is it that's missing in 5.4.3 that you haven't printed?

CHAIR: Oh, the numbering system.

JONES: Oh.

CHAIR: He's talking about the numbering system --

JONES: Oh.

CHAIR: -- maybe.

JONES: I think there might -- it -- you need 120 hours, you know -- you know, across all programs, and there's a few things in there to graduate that are -- that are generic across all programs, like 120 hours to get a Bachelor's Degree. That's the kind of thing that they're -- and none of that was

US February 13, 2006_xcript.txt
touched by the Board's Governing Regulations,
and so we're not doing anything to -- to act
on 5.4.3 today.

GROSSMAN: Bill Sharp doesn't have brain
cancer does he?

JONES: No, no, no. That's...

CHAIR: We're not going to refer to that in
the... Okay.

Are there any other questions for
Davy?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: If not, then those of you who agree
with this proposal, please raise your hand.
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Any opposed the same?
(NONE OPPOSED)

CHAIR: Nobody opposed, so we move on to
Section --

JONES: Section 8.0.

CHAIR: Section 8. Okay.

JONES: Yeah. I wish they were all this
easy. It's kind of self-evident here. This
is just a little tiny section of the Senate
Rules basically dealing with the printed
schedule of the class -- classes. We changed
it just a little bit to bring it up to date
that rather than say printed we say the
published scheduled because it's published
online now, not necessarily printed. So just
some editorial things there like that.

Since that's so short, let's just
combine Section 8 and Section 2 together.
Would you like, or do you want to do section
by section?

CHAIR: No, I'd like to go section by
section --

JONES: Okay.

CHAIR: -- please, because that's how it
got approved at the Senate Council?

JONES: Yes, that's correct.

CHAIR: So are there any questions
regarding Section --

JONES: 8.

CHAIR: -- 8?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Hearing none, please raise your
hand if you agree with this change.
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Thank you. Those of you who are
opposed?

(NONE OPPOSED)

CHAIR: None. We move on to now Section --

JONES: 2.

CHAIR: -- 2.

JONES: And this is the section dealing
with the University calendar policies.
Again, the Board of Trustees makes the Senate
responsible for the University calendar, and
this is all purely editorial in here. We did
clarify some terminology that -- what is a
term -- or what is a session versus a term
versus a semester, and it -- those -- those
hadn't been used completely consistently and

US February 13, 2006_xcript.txt
so we made that consistent.

You can see on the last page there, 109, we're sort of making some -- some notes to ourselves as we go along that -- that the glossary to the Senate Rules is hopelessly inadequate and so one of the things that we're going to do also is to update the -- update the glossary, and so you can see where we're going to, you know, clearly define there also would be terms like semester and session and term.

Most of this is just very -- very mechanical and editorial, on page 108 you can see LCC has been pulled out.

CHAIR: Is that it?

JONES: That's --

CHAIR: Is that --

JONES: That's it. No, that's it.

CHAIR: Okay. Are there any -- again, this is coming before you from Senate Council with positive recommendation. Are there any questions regarding this Section?

BURKHART: Yes. Please identify yourself.
Patricia Burkhart, College of Nursing.

I don't have any question regarding the few mechanics of this. I just wondered if you'd had any discussion about -- I know there was a recommendation that Thanksgiving Holiday be looked at. We talked -- somebody announced it actually one time in the Senate, that it would be extended.

Is there any more discussion of that which, again, then would affect this and would need to be changed again and that's why --

CHAIR: That's a separate effort. And my understanding is there is a Calendar Committee, Ad Hoc Calendar Committee, who is discussing those, in addition to perhaps removing fall break and my -- also my understanding that the SGA is preparing a recommendation to the Senate for revamping the calendar, including what you just said regarding Thanksgiving week.

BURKHART: Which then would affect --

CHAIR: It's not part --

BURKHART: -- this section, but it hasn't come forward yet so --

CHAIR: No, these are basically editorial

--

BURKHART: Right.

CHAIR: -- changes that Davy mentioned just to bring the code up to date.

Any other questions on this one?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: If not, those of you who agree with this please raise your hand.

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Opposed?

(NONE OPPOSED)

CHAIR: There's none.
I'm afraid Ernie's going to

US February 13, 2006_xcript.txt
discipline me tomorrow for finishing so
early. I'd like to take credit for --
because I did a good job, but I think it's
because I wasn't sitting there. That's what
I think.

Okay. Then we are adjourned.
Thank you very much.

* * * * *

THEREUPON, the UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING was
adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

* * * * *

* * * * *

STATE OF KENTUCKY)

COUNTY OF CAMPBELL)

I, LISA E. HOINKE, the undersigned Notary
Public in and for the State of Kentucky at large,
certify that the facts stated in the caption hereto are
true; that at the time and place stated in said caption
the University Senate Council meeting was commenced and
taken down by me stenographically and later reduced to
computer transcription, and the foregoing is a true
record of the meeting.

My commission expires: January 23, 2007.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
hand and seal of office on this the 2nd day of
March, 2006.

LISA E. HOINKE,
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE-AT-LARGE
K E N T U C K Y