

Brothers, Sheila C

From: Rayens, William S
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2012 11:54 PM
To: Brothers, Sheila C
Cc: Mullen, Michael D; Blonder, Lee; Jones, Davy
Subject: Items for Senate Council Retreat

Dear Sheila – Here are two items that we were expecting to be discussed at the retreat. Certainly the first one is more important than the second. Thanks – Bill Rayens

1. Vetting Order

At issue here was whether courses submitted for Core approval should go to Undergraduate Council first or to GEOC first. Currently they go to GEOC first. When I took this job (summer of 2010) I immediately started working to see how we could build a review process that would do the job as efficiently as possible. Having served on Undergraduate Council for a number of years I knew too well that most – not all – of the discussions on UGC revolved around syllabus integrity, and the correctness of forms. So my proposal to GEOC in the summer of 2010 was to have the Area Experts given permission to do what the UGC would do – check over the integrity of the syllabus and look for problems with the forms. Reference the Minutes from July 15, 2010 GEOC meeting (on Core website). I talked to Mike Mullen about it and he consulted UGC and made it happen. He informed me and I informed GEOC on 9/7/2010. So the process started with GEOC doing the bulk of the work that UGC would normally do, while they reviewed the course for the Core. Of course UGC still looked at the proposal, if only briefly, to ask additional questions of duplication, program conflicts, etc. UGC had to spend almost no time with the Core proposals once there.

So we need to work through how to best do this. It was suggested (Davy may recall this) that since GEOC's Area Experts are already doing the work of the UGC wrt syllabi here, then it may be that courses intended for the Core only need to go through GEOC and then are consent agenda courses at the next UGC meeting. Not sure how having AEs as a subcommittee of UGC impacts the status of GEOC as a standing committee of the Senate Council, but these are the issues. GEOC's perspective is that it just need to be a reasonable process that is a flat as possible. By the way: for several months now Mike Mullen has had a staff person checking the correctness of forms and the basic structure of the syllabus before the proposals even get forwarded to the Area Experts. Importantly – very importantly – now that the Senate Council forced some clarity on what can and cannot be required in a syllabus, much of this type of checking is mechanical.

2. Name Change

This email exchange may help. I had a couple of suggestions below. I'm just lobbying the Senate and/or Senate Council to consider something more original than UKCC for the acronym. Or **UKC-FSC for UK Core - Faculty Steering Committee** which would in due time just be known as the **FSC**, which makes a lot more sense to me than UKCC. Even **CSC (Core Steering Committee)** is better than UKCC.