

Senate Council Minutes
August 28, 2006

The Senate Council met on Monday, August 28, 2006 at 3:00 pm in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired.

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 pm.

1. Minutes from August 21 and Announcements

There being no changes to the minutes from August 21, they were approved as distributed. The Chair shared that the minutes from future meetings would be available as both an .htm document with links to supporting documentation, as well as one large .pdf file to include the meeting minutes and all supporting documentation, similar to the handout format currently used in Senate Council meetings.

The Chair recognized faculty trustee Dembo, who stated that he concurred with faculty trustee Yanarella's comments at the August 21 SC meeting regarding the Board of Trustees retreat.

The Chair reminded Senate Council members that Provost Subbaswamy had specifically requested input from the Senate Council (SC) and University Senate (Senate) on the 2006 – 2009 Strategic Plan (Provisional) (SP). Therefore, the agenda would be altered somewhat to allow for discussion on the SP. He anticipated that the issue of domestic partner benefits would be discussed immediately thereafter.

Yanarella shared that the General Education Reform and Assessment Committee (GERA) was currently working on the final report that the SC had requested. While the original expectation was that GERA would be finished by the end of August, the postponement of GERA's Process Planning Workshop prevented a timely submission of the final report. Yanarella (also co-chair of GERA) requested the life of GERA be extended through September, with the understanding that a final report would be ready in advance of the September 18 Senate Council meeting, to go on to the October 9 Senate meeting.

Yanarella **moved** that the tenure of the General Education Reform and Assessment Committee be extended through the end of September in anticipation of completion of its final report to be submitted to the Senate Council before October and going to the Senate on October 9. Grabau **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

Those present introduced themselves for the benefit of the guests.

2. [Extension of Oral Communications Requirement Suspension \(until Fall 2008\)](#)

Guest Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Phil Kraemer offered background information on the oral communications requirement suspension (suspension). The original suspension a couple of years ago was approved because of an inability to meet the needs of incoming students. Although the University Studies Committee (USC) had expected to review the curriculum and perhaps offer suggestions for change for the coming academic year, the Department of Communication and the College of Communications and Information Studies (CIS) agreed to extend the suspension until 2008. Due to the efforts and strides made by GERA and associated University Studies Program (USP) changes, it was decided that it would be beneficial to carry out discussion on the reform of oral communications curriculum in concert with University-wide general education reform activities.

Kraemer said that the USC unanimously supported the extension to the suspension. He added that it would be helpful for the SC to formally request a report addressing the oral communications requirement and its needs. Guest Department of Communication Chair Nancy Harrington referred to the presentation she gave during the original suspension in which she outlined the resources necessary to address the growing freshman class. She supported developing guidelines for suspension. Harrington added that neither the department nor the college wanted to keep the suspension in place forever.

Guest College of Communications and Information Studies Dean Johnson said that to offer an explanation in numerical terms, one could think in terms of one course for every 25 students. CIS had the resources to accommodate 2,600 students. With an increase of 1,400 students since the original request for the suspension, CIS would need 56 additional sections of courses and 14 extra faculty members to serve the current incoming freshman class. Johnson said that faculty in CIS had been briefed via their faculty council and that day's noontime college assembly and that CIS faculty were completely in agreement with the extended suspension. He expressed support for resolving the issues of general education reform and the oral communications requirement together.

Grabau asked if any of the 54 new faculty lines announced by President Todd were going to CIS; if Johnson could comment further on the included, additional request to suspend new demands for Oral Communications instruction; and whether or not only a one-year suspension would allow sufficient time for review and change. Johnson replied that he had requested resources sufficient to support the oral communications program every year that he had been a dean. In order to get to the Top 20 Business Plan ratio of 16 to one student to faculty, CIS would need 70 new faculty members.

Yanarella stated that GERA had heard in many forums about the importance faculty placed on oral communications. The August GERA Workshop also was an outlet for statements that supported the high level of importance placed on oral communications. He said the issue of oral communications would require

very serious attention by the University Faculty. He supported resolving the issue under the umbrella of general education reform and that a one-year suspension would be too short. Yanarella hoped the oral communications requirement responsibility would be shared by other colleges.

In response to the Chair's request for a motion, Yanarella **moved** that the suspension of the oral communications requirement be extended until Fall 2009, meaning the incoming class of 2009 would be the last class for which the requirement were suspended, through Spring 2009. Harley **seconded**. Randall offered a **friendly amendment** that some type of interim report be given regarding progress toward a solution. Kraemer indicated a report could be submitted by the end of January 2007. Both Yanarella and Harley **accepted**.

Kraemer, Harrington and Johnson all expressed support for the motion. It was confirmed that the end of the extension could be described in one of two ways: the suspension would apply to the incoming class of 2007; and/or the suspension originally ended in Spring 2007.

Grabau asked if any of the guests wanted included (in the motion) the hiatus for new demands for Oral Communication instruction. Baxter asked if there would be any accreditation issues if no new Oral Communication responsibilities were approved. Harrington clarified that the hiatus only applied to the freshman class as a whole. Liaison Greissman asked if any report had been generated to look at how the effort to promote oral communications courses across the curriculum had worked. It was indicated that there had been no comprehensive assessment of a solution to the problem of offering/requiring oral communications courses.

Michael asked if there was a risk that there would be a problem with Southern Association of Colleges and Schools or if there were any problems as a result of the last suspension. Kraemer said that SACS would probably look askance at not having any oral communications, but that the classes in that area were still offered. He added that an appropriate action would not be to look how to extend the current model, but rather to explore the nature of oral communication skills. Kraemer stated that the January report would help keep momentum going.

The Chair confirmed that Yanarella's **motion** to extend until Fall 2009 the suspension of the oral communications requirement (meaning the incoming class of 2009 would be the last class for which the extension were suspended) and request from the Senate Council for a report from the USC on the progress for a solution be submitted by the end of January 2007, would go to the Senate with a positive recommendation. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** unanimously.

3. Graduate Certificates for Expedited Review and Approval

The Chair offered background on the agenda item. There were some Graduate Certificates in current use that were only approved by the Graduate Council,

some that were only approved by the Senate Council and some that were already approved by the SC and Senate but had not been sent to the Registrar (which was subsequently completed over the summer). Although there was a process currently in place to put a Graduate Certificate (certificate) on a student's transcript, the transition from SIS to the Campus Management Module of SAP would necessitate a recreation of the currently-approved, official approval process. The Chair stated that if the certificates were going to be reviewed individually, it would have to wait until a future meeting. Otherwise, since students had already received notations of certificates on their transcripts and there were currently students working toward the certificates, the Chair referred SC members to Dean Blackwell's rationale and request for an emergency SC approval and Senate approval via a 10-day transmittal.

Michael noted that Dean Blackwell's suggestion reflected the description of the process in the *Senate Rules*. The Chair stated that, due to lack of a description of the certificates in Developmental Disabilities, German Studies, and Reproductive Laboratory Sciences, he removed those three certificates from the agenda.

Guest Dean Blackwell expressed surprise that the three certificates named by the Chair would not be reviewed. She said that after being approved by just the Graduate Council, CPE began to consider certificates as curriculum, after which the SC was involved in the approval process. The IRIS Office said that coding programs required the items be duly approved by the regular bodies and processes. Currently, the notation of a certificate was in the "Notes" section of SIS, which would be very hard to transfer to SAP in an automated fashion. The issue also included how future certificate recipients would have the certificate noted on their transcripts. Blackwell shared that because the go-live date for the Campus Management Module of SAP had been pushed back to Spring, there was no longer a dire need to have the certificates approved before October 1.

Because the Graduate Council, an elected faculty group, had considered them and approved them, Blackwell said she had asked the Chair to consider the certificates as a group. She added that there was a "sunset" rule on certificates such that they needed to be reviewed every six years or else the certificate would cease to exist. Blackwell stated that all of the pre-2001 approved certificates would be reviewed in Spring 2007.

In response to Dembo, Blackwell confirmed that unless the certificates were officially approved by the Senate Council and Senate, the Registrar would have to find an alternate method to identify a student who had earned a certificate, perhaps by a letter attached to the transcript. After a brief discussion on how the certificates were referred to, Blackwell offered a good faith assurance that the only notation on transcripts would be that of a "Graduate Certificate in XYZ" and not have any reference to any other type of certificate, such as a PhD certificate.

Randall suggested approving all the certificates on the list, to avoid asking Blackwell to return to discuss the matter further. The Chair said he was not willing to leave on the agenda any certificates without appropriate documentation. In response to Michael's comment that there were proposals included in the handout, the Chair clarified that for the three certificates in question, what was available were minutes indicating approval of a certificate, but not the proposals themselves. Randall suggested that the SC approve all the certificates, but approve the three in question contingent upon receiving documentation of the proposal from Blackwell. The Chair agreed that approval contingent upon receipt of documentation would be acceptable.

Grabau **moved** that the Senate Council accept the entire list for approval contingent upon receipt from Dean Blackwell the backup documentation for the Graduate Certificates in Developmental Disabilities, German Studies, and Reproductive Laboratory Sciences. Yanarella **seconded**.

Michael asked about the certificate in Sensing Technologies. Blackwell stated that documentation had since been found that showed the certificate had been approved by both the SC and Senate. Mrs. Brothers said she would go back to locate the documentation offered by Blackwell.

Lesnaw expressed concern about approving anything without first having reviewed the documentation. The Chair suggested that the documentation could be sent to the listserv so that SC members could see for themselves what was received. Michael expressed support for Lesnaw's concern. He said that circulation via the listserv or a delegation to the Chair to review the needed documentation was implicit in Grabau's motion. He also wondered that if there was no longer any urgency, the college or department could send the certificate details to the Graduate Council for review, and then go on to the SC and Senate. Greissman pointed out that the graduate bulletin listed all the certificates and described them in detail. Blackwell said she was asked to find the original proposals. She added that she was hoping for a quick resolution, since students were currently in and had already received the graduate certificates on the agenda. She doubted the SC would not approve them, and thus revoke them from past students. Jones noted that the SC had sent back certificates to departments to revise on a number of occasions.

Lesnaw **called the question**. A **vote** was taken, and the motion to end discussion **passed** unanimously.

A **vote** was taken on the motion that the Senate Council accept the entire list of graduate certificates for approval, contingent upon receipt from Dean Blackwell the backup documentation for the Graduate Certificates in Developmental Disabilities, German Studies, and Reproductive Laboratory Sciences. The motion **failed**, with none for, seven against, and one abstention.

Michael expressed a disinterest in creating superficial roadblocks, but thought it would not be too much trouble to request the proposals for the certificates from the individual departments. Jones agreed. Blackwell noted that many departments contact her office for copies of proposals, since they do not retain them. She stated she would have to go to the bulletin for examples for some of the certificates. Lesnaw wanted to know the difference between what was originally approved and the certificates on file. Jones said he had some questions about some of the certificates on the agenda.

Odoi asked if the issue would have been discussed at all if it were not for IRIS and SAP, and if the certificates would still be meaningful. Blackwell replied that the current procedure of noting a certificate in the "Notes" section of the transcript system would still be in place. She added that when it comes time to renew certain certificates in Spring 2007, each department's certificate will need to go to the Graduate Council (GC) with new substantive documentation and then be approved by the GC, SC and Senate. Without the pressure of IRIS, this confirmation of the certificate (review by SC and Senate) would have been done, anyway. Greissman said that the certificates already awarded would necessarily need to stand, due to the more or less contractual nature of the language in the bulletin regarding the certificates. He said any halting in the certificates would necessarily only affect prospective students. The Chair asked for a motion to help direct the discussion.

Michael **moved** that for IRIS' purposes, the certificates in the 13 areas that were already awarded and for current enrollees be deemed as having received the appropriate approval for the transcript notation. Odoi **seconded**.

SC members and Blackwell all concurred that the past certificates received some level of appropriate faculty review – the issue at hand was the concern that documentation of some of the certificates on the agenda the proposals reviewed could not be found, and that regardless of the level of review, none were officially approved by the Senate.

After additional discussion, the Chair confirmed with Michael that the Senate would receive the motion as an item to approve or deny via a 10-day circulation. The certificates themselves would not be reviewed, per se.

A **vote** was taken on the motion that for IRIS' purposes, the certificates in the 13 areas, which were already awarded to students and had current enrollees, be deemed as having received the appropriate approval for the transcript notation. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Jones reminded SC members that the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee specifically suggested during the previous semester that there needed to be clarification to the *Senate Rules* regarding the processing and approving at the undergraduate and graduate levels regarding graduate certificates. He asked

that the Chair request from the Senate's Academic Programs Committee an outline of the process that a graduate certificate should go through. Blackwell noted that the Council on Postsecondary Education's guidelines for certificates stated that a certificate should be treated the same as a program, and Jones replied that that should be reason enough to include language regarding the processing of graduate certificates in the *Senate Rules*.

The Chair asked SC members to deviate from the agenda to address the 2006 – 2009 Strategic Plan (Provisional) (SP). Michael **moved** that the agenda be reordered so that the SP could be discussed. Lesnaw **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

The motion was then ruled **out of order**, since the SP was not on the agenda. Michael **moved** to begin discussion on the SP. Lesnaw **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

2006 – 2009 Strategic Plan (Provisional)

The Chair stated that the SP would be discussed at the September Senate meeting, as part of Provost Subbaswamy's presentation. He added that the Provost had requested a specific opinion from both the SC and the Senate on the SP. He asked if the SC had a sense of what should be sent to the Provost.

Michael asked if the Chair was initiating a discussion on the merits of the SP, or on how to frame the discussion. The Chair replied that he was asking about its merits. He said that there were primarily two options: the SC could put together a sense of its reaction to the SP and send it to the Senate in advance of the meeting on September 11; or the SC could wait until after the Senate meeting on the 11th and put together a document expressing the sentiment of the SC and Senate and send that to the Provost. Jones stated his preference for waiting until after the Senate met to put forth an opinion, primarily due to the lack of time remaining in the meeting.

In response to Jones, Greissman stated that the reconciliation of the specific points of the Top 20 Business Plan and the SP would occur over the course of the academic year. The strategic indicators of the SP would necessarily need to wait on academic indicators for a full discussion.

Thelin **moved** that the Senate Council send Provost Subbaswamy a resolution regarding the 2006 – 2009 Strategic Plan (Provisional). Jones **seconded**.

There was extensive editing and revising of the resolution. It was decided to send the resolution before the September 11 Senate meeting.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to send the following resolution to the Provost regarding the 2006 – 2009 Strategic Plan (Provisional): the Senate Council will send a resolution to Provost Subbaswamy, asking that as he considers the

content of the 2006 – 2009 Strategic Plan (Provisional) he will present to the University Senate, he consider the Senate Council's suggestion as to how the Plan can convey a more excited inspiration. The friendly suggestion is that there be a preamble that explicitly states the importance of UK, as the Commonwealth's flagship university, showing bold initiative in instruction, research and service. In the spirit of cooperation, the Senate Council looks forward to the participation, which the Provost announced, of each department faculty in the upcoming discussion and decisions on the specific details for the achievement of the goals and objectives of the Strategic Plan. The motion **passed** unanimously.

The Chair apologized to Dembo that agenda item number five would not be discussed. The Chair said it would be one of the first agenda items for the September 18 SC meeting.

6. [Agenda for September 11 Senate Meeting](#)

SC members approved the following unordered list of agenda items for the September 11 Senate meeting:

- Minutes from April 10, 2006 and Announcements
- President Todd
- Provost Subbaswamy
- Reaction to Strategic Plan (if necessary)
- Rule Waivers by Senate Council
- UK Degree list
- BCTC Degree List
- USP External Review Committee Final Report
- Change to Administrative Regulations II-1.0-6 – CAO Merit Review
- New Minor in Folklore and Mythology
- Oral Communications Requirement Re-Suspension

The Chair commended Mrs. Brothers on the effort required to put together the committee composition list. He asked if agenda item number four could be discussed and approved over the listserv. The Chair also asked that the Office of the Senate Council be given the authority to either extend the term of current chairs unless there was an objection via the listserv, and the authority to contact an alternate individual to serve as chair if the current chair was leaving or could otherwise not serve, as long as the information was approved by the listserv. SC members agreed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh Tagavi,
Senate Council Chair

Members present: Baxter, Dembo, Grabau, Harley, Jones, Lesnaw, Michael, Odoi, Randall, Tagavi, Thelin, and Yanarella.

Liaison present: Greissman.

Guests: Nancy Harrington, David Johnson, Phil Kraemer and Jeannine Blackwell.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on August 31, 2006.