

University Senate Meeting
November 13, 2006

The University Senate met at 3 pm on Monday, November 13, 2006 in the Auditorium of the W. T. Young Library. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless otherwise indicated.

Absences: Anderson, H., Anyaegbunam^{*}, Bartilow, Baxter*, Bhavsar, Blackwell*, Brown, Butler, Campbell*, Caudill*, Chew, Cibulka*, Clarke, Clauter*, Coyne*, Crofford*, DeSimone, Duke*, El-Ghannam, Fording*, Forgue*, Frost, Gaetke*, Grabau*, Hasselbring, Haven, Hazard*, Hoffman, Houtz*, Infanger*, Jackson, Johnson, D., Karpf, Kirschling, Kraemer, Lee*, Lester, Lillich, Look, Martin*, McCormick, McKnight*, Michael, Mobley, Mohney, Moliterno*, Odoi, Parker*, Perman, Petrone*, Pulito, Ray*, Roberts*, Rothgeb, Segerstrom*, Shay, Smart, Smith, D. *, Smith, R., Smith, M. S. *, Staben, Steltenkamp, Subbaswamy, Sudharshan, Terrell, Thelin*, Todd, Turner, S., Turner, W., Vasconez, Vestal, Voss*, Waldhart*, Williams, G., Wiseman, Witt, Wyatt, Yanarella*.

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 pm.

1. Minutes from October 9 and Announcements

Because the minutes were not available for review, the Chair said they would be distributed before the December 2006 University Senate (Senate) meeting for review by senators. The Chair noted that Professor Blyton, Senate Parliamentarian, was not present due to sickness. He asked that senators keep him in their thoughts and prayers.

The Chair announced that the Annual Board and Senates' Holiday Reception would start at 2:30 pm, immediately after the Board of Trustees meeting on December 12, and continue until 5 pm. He said that in a departure from past years, the reception would be held at the UK Art Museum, which will specially hold over their current art show exclusively for the reception. He added that guests were free to come and go during the reception.

The Chair noted that the Senate Council (SC) was empowered to act for the Senate in certain circumstances, so long as the actions are reported to the Senate at the next meeting. There were three such actions he was reporting.

On August 28, the SC voted unanimously that, for IRIS' purposes, graduate certificates in 13 areas, which were already awarded to students and had current enrollees, be deemed as having received the appropriate approval for the purposes of notation on the transcript. The Chair explained that for the past several years, graduate certificates did not go through all steps that were necessary now for approval. There were students who received them and who were currently working towards them, but were also the subject of a recent web

^{*} Denotes absence explained prior to meeting.

transmittal, for review for ten days. He said that the affirmation was done to retroactively approve the certificates for those affected students.

On October 16, the SC waived Senate Rule 5.1.8.5.A.2 (“two year window” for submission of retroactive withdrawal (RW) application), which outlines the deadline by which a student must apply to receive a W retroactively, for non-academic reasons. The student can only request a RW within two years of the end of the semester in which the course ended. A then-new administrator misunderstood the RW process and did not process the forms in a timely manner. Once he realized his mistake, it was past the two year deadline. The SC waived the rule to allow the Senate’s Retroactive Withdrawal Application Committee (SRWAC) to review the application.

Lastly, on October 30, the SC voted to authorize the College of Nursing to move their deadline for applications to the undergraduate program from May 1 to March 1 (with a final credentials deadline of March 15), with the proviso that exceptions to the deadline be made to applicants as appropriate, effective immediately. After discussion about possible ramifications of waiting for official Senate approval, the SC approved a motion stating that the SC considered the deadline change to be urgent enough to act on behalf of the Senate, as long as the Senate would be notified of the approval at the next meeting.

Moving to another topic, the Chair mentioned that he wanted to share information about a new symbol for a grade to represent a missing grade on a transcript. Currently in SIS, there are two circumstances in which a student could have a grade of “****” on their transcript – it could stand for a course that was currently in progress or could represent a missing grade, one that was perhaps never turned in. The Campus Management module of SAP could not accept two meanings for one symbol, so the Office of the Senate Council was contacted by the Registrar to see about the creation of a new symbol. The Chair said he thought that the action was ministerial; the new symbol for a missing grade would be “- - -” while “****” will continue to be used for current semester courses. He said it was not clear if the new symbol needed Senate approval, but he considered the change to be an administrative action, not academic. He said the Senate’s Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) would soon be asked to generate language regarding the new symbol. The Chair asked if there were any objections. There being no comments or questions, the matter stood as approved.

The Chair noted that elections for membership on the Senate Council would be held soon. The term would be for three years, beginning January 1, 2007 and ending December 31, 2009. There would be one nominating period followed by an election conducted, via the web.

2. [Honorary Degree Qualifications \(effective 2007 – 2008\)](#)

The Chair recalled that the Senate approved the 2006 – 2007 Honorary Degree qualifications at the October 2006 Senate meeting. The Senate’s Admissions &

Academic Standards Committee (SA&ASC), chaired by Ken Calvert, reviewed the qualifications for all future honorary degrees. The Chair said that some sections were moved around for clarity, but the qualifications remained largely unchanged.

Calvert agreed with the Chair's assessment. He added that the SA&ASC inserted a preamble but the qualifications remained much the same. The Chair said the revised qualifications came from the SA&ASC through the SC with a positive recommendation. A **vote** by the elected Faculty Senators was taken on the motion to approve the qualifications for Honorary Degree recipients. The motion **passed** unanimously.

3. UK Women's Place – Dorothy Edwards

The Chair invited Women's Place Director Dorothy Edwards to offer information about UK Women's Place. Guest Edwards explained that Women's Place was created through a Department of Justice grant on college campus violence. The grant had since run out but had been renewed to cover approximately half of the budget; remaining funds came from Student Affairs or from the general fund. She said that the office provided direct services to male and female students, staff and faculty. Edwards explained that that a man seeking help was usually either affected by violence against a woman in his life or a man who was victimized as a child. Despite the name, Women's Place helped both genders.

Edwards said that Women's Place was working on the prevention of violence. Women's Place had historically provided direct services, aid for women currently being hurt. She said that the numbers of women abused were not going down so the Women's Place was committed to preventing violence to begin with. She said Women's Place visited freshman orientation and sessions with fraternities and sororities to discuss prevention of violence against women. Women's Place was trying to take a broader perspective. Edwards ended by saying that UK must be a safe environment to truly be a Top 20 Institution. UK Women's Place remains open for business and will be communicating with a variety of university departments to develop collaborations.

4. Writing Initiative Update – Janet Eldred

The Chair said that the Writing Initiative (WI) began in the 2004 – 2005 academic year with courses through the Department of English. Now there are currently a variety of disciplines offering WI courses. The Chair invited Writing Initiative Director Janet Eldred to offer information about the Writing Initiative pilot.

Guest Eldred offered a [presentation](#) regarding the history and future steps of the Writing Initiative pilot, including budgetary issues and structural organization. She ended by saying that the presentation would be available to the Advising Network listserv, as well as the Writing Initiative web site.

5. [MS in Athletic Training](#)

The Chair said that students currently interested in pursuing athletic training at UK pursue a “concentration in athletic training” through the Department of Kinesiology and Health Promotion. The SC unanimously approved the proposal and sent it to the Senate with a positive recommendation. There being no questions, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to approve a new MS in Athletic Training. The motion **passed** unanimously.

6. [Change to Senate Rule 6.4.4 \(RE: Deadline for Informal Resolution\)](#)

The Chair said the proposal created a deadline by which a student must approach the Ombud to contest an offense or penalty. There was also a change to the maximum time for resolving an informal resolution – from 28 to 20 days. The intent was to give four weeks; since “day” was already defined in the *SR* as being a “working day,” 20 working days was equivalent to 28 days. This represented a change in semantics but no real change in duration. The Chair noted how well the new rule regarding academic offenses was written, as evidenced by just two loopholes having been discovered so far. He invited Grossman (chair of the Academic Offenses Ad Hoc Committee, AOC) to give additional information.

Grossman explained that *Senate Rule 6.4 (Academic Offenses)* originally contained language stating that a student, after being informed of an accusation of having committed an academic offense, had 10 days in which to appeal. After the appeal was filed, the Ombud then became involved in an informal resolution. The AOC thought it logical that the Ombud would attempt an informal resolution before the filing of an appeal, but neglected to include in the section a deadline by which the student had to request an informal resolution. In addition, the AOC added a definition to the beginning of the section stating that a “day” referred to working days, not calendar days. Therefore, the time period for the duration of an informal resolution was modified from 28 days to 20 working days, both time periods lasting approximately four weeks. In response to a question from Deem, Grossman replied that the section with the definitions was in the *Senate Rules (SR)*, but not shown in the handout. Also, the 10 days a student had for requesting an informal decision was also technically 10 working days.

The Chair said the changes came from the SC with a positive recommendation. A **vote** was taken on the **motion** to change *SR 6.4.4.A.1* to read:

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 Section 6.4.3.A.4, 6.4.3.B.2, or 6.4.3.D.4. The Academic Ombud shall attempt to resolve the case to the satisfaction of all involved parties within [20] twenty days of receiving the student's written request.

and to change *SR 6.4.4.C* to read, “If a student fails to approach the Ombud within the time specified in Section 6.4.4(A)(1), or if an appeal is not filed....” The motion **passed** unanimously.

7. UK December 2006 Degree List

The Chair invited Davy Jones to offer background information about the degree list. Jones explained that reviewing and approving the degree list was one activity uniquely assigned to (elected) University Faculty through the state legislature, supported by the Board of Trustees (BoT). The list was sent out to senators for review and there were several students identified who should have been on the list but were not, and were subsequently added; there were also some names that were included but should not have been. In response to a question by Finkel, Jones replied that while the list did include names of individuals who would not complete their degree requirements by December, by nature of not completing the requirements they would automatically not receive a degree. Jones said that while an attempt was made to have as correct a list as possible to send to the BoT, the omission of an individual who should receive a degree was more important to identify.

Sawaya opined that reviewing the list was not his responsibility, but was willing to do so. He said he would like to see a signature form each department or program director attesting that the students had done the necessary work to graduate. Recognition of a name was insufficient to serve as a check – he thought that a statement attesting to accuracy would be beneficial. Jones replied that during the process of sending names to the Registrar, the individuals indicated did indeed make every attempt to forward a correct list. However, due to errors, sometimes names were omitted. Sawaya asked if there was a signed statement on file from departments affirming the appropriateness of the names submitted. The Chair said that such affirmations did exist, but were not included in the list submitted to the Office of the Senate Council for Senate approval. At some point in the process, an appropriate individual did attest to the accuracy of the list. Jones added that some errors are a function of the human element – someone out sick, etc. Jones emphasized that the University Faculty were responsible for the names sent to the BoT.

The Chair stated that the degree list came to the Senate with a positive recommendation from the SC. A **vote** was taken by the elected Faculty Senators was on the **motion** to approve the December 2006 degree list. The motion **passed** with a clear majority in favor, none against and one abstaining.

8. [Senate Rules Section V \(track changes\)](#)

The Chair invited past SREC chair Jones to explain the revisions, which came from the SREC through the SC with a positive recommendation. Jones stated that the revisions were primarily editorial, to react to changes to the *Governing Regulations (GR)* in June 2005 that codified the removal of LCC references, due to the change to a provost system, etc. If substantive revisions resulted, it was compelled by the *GR* changes.

Grossman asked about the term “normally” with respect to the description in *SR 5.1.1* of the grade XE and removal of the grade through retroactive withdrawal.

Jones replied that it was a result of a cut and paste of a description of the XE grade – it was not a creation of the SREC. Hulse noted that there was a section removed from *SR V* that addressed informing a student of progress thus far at the midterm. He wondered why it was removed. Jones replied that it was to be moved to *Section VI*, with other information about students' rights.

The Chair thanked Finkel for sending typographical corrections to the Senate Council in advance of the meeting. He indicated the corrections would be incorporated into the *SR* after approval by the Senate.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken to approve the revisions to *Senate Rules Section V* without further SREC attention. The motion **passed** with a clear majority in favor, none opposed and one abstaining.

9. [Senate Rules Section VII \(track changes\)](#)

The changes to *SR Section VII* were also described by Jones, who stated that his description of the changes to *Section V* could be applied to the changes to *Section VII*. Finkel stated that *Section 7.2.0* was missing a word. Jones replied that "individuals" should be inserted to make the sentence read correctly.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** from the SREC through the SC with a positive recommendation to approve the revisions to *Senate Rules Section VII*. The motion **passed** unanimously.

10. [Change of Voting Status for One Ex Officio Member of Senate's RWA Committee](#)

The Chair explained that the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Application Committee (SRWAC) unanimously requested non-voting status for the ex officio Counseling and Testing Center (CTC) member. There was a concern about a possible conflict of interest if the SRWAC heard case from a student involved with CTC. The SC unanimously approved the change, which goes to the Senate with a positive recommendation.

Grossman asked why the CTC individual was such a special case that non-voting status should be specifically stated. He said that members with a potential conflict should recuse themselves from voting in that particular instance. The Chair clarified that the CTC representative was an ex officio, non-faculty, non-senator member who attended to offer perspective. Calvert asked if the description of the SRWAC would be revised in the *SR*. Grossman also wondered why the CTC representative was not even named as an ex officio member.

Cibull moved to **table** the proposal until the next Senate meeting. Bollinger **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with a clear majority in favor, none opposed and one abstaining.

Because the meeting progressed ahead of schedule, Mrs. Brothers left the meeting at this point to call the next presenter to see about having the presentation sooner than previously scheduled.

11. Work-Life Survey Results - Laura Koppes, Work-Life Director

The Chair offered some background information. The Work-Life Task Force was appointed in 2002, after which a Work-Life Office was established and a director hired. The UK@Work Life Culture Surveys were conducted in October 2005 (staff) and February 2006 (faculty). The Chair invited Work-Life Director Laura Koppes to the podium.

Guest Koppes offered a [presentation](#) regarding the results of the UK@Work Life Culture Survey. Toward the end of the presentation, Koppes stated she would be happy to be informed of a senator or SC representative who could serve on the Work-Life Advisory Council.

After the presentation, Koppes answered questions from senators. Cibull suggested that the presentation be made available to faculty and staff via email. In response to Cibull, Koppes stated that data was available to break the results down to separate out medical college faculty, since survey respondents self-identified if they worked for UK HealthCare. Bordo asked if there were any striking findings after analyzing responses that were broken down by gender, age, race, etc. Koppes said that while there were differences in respondents by race, gender and some other attributes, there were no compelling results. She added that the greatest difference found were the opinions by different races regarding how committed UK is to diversity issues; the differences in response by gender were primarily what was expected.

Miller expressed surprise at the low levels of trust reported by respondents. He asked if there were ideas about how to address that issue. Koppes explained that she had been employed as Work-Life director since March; the survey for faculty closed the first week of March. She said she did not know of the historical/contextual reason for low feelings of trust. She said she had already requested that the Work-Life Advisory Council look into how UK can “get at” issues of institutional culture. Koppes welcomed suggestions.

Steiner asked if there had been research done into the impact of reduced retiree health benefits on recruiting. Koppes replied that such a question was not included in the survey, nor was she involved in the issue, but acknowledged the usefulness of such information should it become available.

Snow thanked Koppes for her Herculean efforts in conducting the survey. Snow wondered about the percentage of individuals expressing satisfaction with their job versus the percentage of individuals who (as stated in the presentation) expressed interest in looking for employment elsewhere. She wondered how that could be reconciled. Koppes replied that there was some data gleaned that did

not make it into the presentation; because there was no random sampling done, but rather a census survey, it was hard to tease specific pieces of information out from comparing responses to two questions. In response to Snow, Koppes said that there were roughly equal percentages of male and females looking to leave UK.

Grossman referred to the responses stating that expanding the employee education program (EEP) benefit to pass it onto a spouse or child was greatly desired. He said for the past 12 years or so, employees have been requesting an expansion. He wondered if there was a time frame by which the Work-Life subcommittees should have reports submitted. Koppes replied that the committees charged with reviewing an expanded EEP benefit and offering domestic partner benefits would submit recommendations by mid-January. Because those two changes would have budgetary implications, work on any change for 2007 – 2008 would need to begin in January.

Bordo applauded Koppes' work with the survey, but offered a comment that she stopped part way through the survey because she felt boxed in by some of the answer choices provided. She said that others with the same problem could have skewed some results. Koppes said she appreciated the input about the survey questions.

Hertog said that percentages (of responses) were usually evaluated against something; he wondered what the UK@Work-Life survey results would be compared against. Koppes explained that the firm contracted to develop the survey was chosen due to the contractor having given similar surveys to other universities; the hope was that data could be compared to other institutions. However, the database only included three other universities, and only one, Ohio State, had a survey with questions comparable to UK's survey. She said that the Chronicle of Higher Education publishes data about faculty satisfaction, which is broken down by demographics; the satisfaction data at UK is lower than the Chronicle's. She acknowledged that direct comparisons to anything would be difficult, but reiterated that the faculty and staff surveys were conducted to create a baseline by which progress can be gauged.

There being no further questions, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh Tagavi¹,
Senate Council Chair

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on November 14, 2006.

¹ University Senate Vice Chair Larry Grabau was unable to attend the Senate meeting, so Senate Council Chair Tagavi reviewed the meeting minutes.