

Senate Council
August 29, 2011

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, August 29, 2011 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Hollie I. Swanson could not call the meeting to order, due to lack of quorum. She discussed various matters with SC members.

The Chair explained to SC members that the University Senate (US) minutes dating from February 2011 were not finished. Mrs. Brothers' delay in drafting the minutes was caused by a number of factors, including increased submissions of curricular proposals and increased activity on the part of the SC. The Chair said that one idea would be to ask Mrs. Brothers to just document the motions in the minutes and have the transcript if needed. There were a few comments by SC members, none of whom objected to the suggestion.

The UK web design committee asked the Chair to serve on that committee, but the Chair had asked Blonder to serve (Blonder had agreed). The Chair said that Blonder would report back to the SC as appropriate.

The University review committee chaired by the Chair is in the process of planning and informing stakeholders about their activities. She said she would offer additional information to the SC in the future.

The Chair asked SC members to look at the request for additional nominees for the Academic Area Advisory Committee for the Physical and Engineering Sciences. Blonder arrived during the discussion and was greeted with a brief round of applause. (Quorum was thus met.)

Two nominees for the Academic Area Advisory Committee for the Physical and Engineering Sciences were identified. The Chair then asked SC members to look at the request for additional nominees for the Academic Area Advisory Committee for the Social Sciences and four nominees were identified.

1. Minutes from August 22, 2011 and Announcements

Wood **moved** to approve the SC minutes from August 22, 2011 as distributed and Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

2. Old Business

b. Senate Committee Charges

SC members discussed various proposed committee charges, as posted on the online agenda. In response to a discussion on setting priorities for new buildings on campus, Provost's Liaison Greissman commented that Provost Subbaswamy would be pleased to continue attending the SC meeting after Senate meetings. The Provost might be able to discuss building priorities during his next visit.

After some discussion, Wood **moved** to charge the Senate's Academic Facilities Committee with investigating current procedures for setting building priorities and recommend, if necessary, new procedures to increase transparency and faculty representation in setting those priorities. Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

SC members looked at the remainder of the charges for Senate committees and did not change any of the other proposed charges. During discussion, Steiner requested that the minutes from August 22 be revised to include more of the discussion on committee charges.

Blonder **moved** to approve the 2011-2012 Senate committee charges below.

Senate's Academic Advising Committee

1. Evaluate the quality of academic advising.

Senate's Academic Facilities Committee

1. Examine the procedures by which PPD provides cost estimates and charges to units under the Provost's purview.
2. Investigate current procedures for setting building priorities and recommend, if necessary, new procedures to increase transparency and faculty representation in setting those priorities.

Senate's Academic Planning and Priorities Committee

1. Establish mechanism(s) for effective two-way communication with University faculty and staff to solicit opinions related to academic priorities and new ideas for plans to achieve academic goals.
2. Proactively scan the University's internal and external environments/contexts – i.e., structural, bureaucratic, political, cultural, attitudinal, etc. – to identify strategic opportunities and threats.
3. Identify a liaison to the Provost-run University Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities (UCAPP). This individual, as well as the SC Chair (who is an ex officio UCAPP member) should periodically provide updates to the SC and Senate.

Senate's Academic Programs Committee

1. Establish criteria for reviewing new academic programs and the appropriate procedures for such.

Senate's Admissions Advisory Committee

1. Report to the Senate on how the Senate's Admissions Advisory Committee functions.

Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee

1. Determine the answer to "what is a credit hour" for the 13 different course meeting patterns.
2. Evaluate the issue of transfer credits, the role of faculty in making such decisions, and how its impact can be measured.

Senate's Institutional Finances and Resource Allocation

1. Examine the strengths and weaknesses of UK's current budget process and propose alternatives if appropriate.

Senate's Library Committee

1. Investigate what other universities are doing to address the increased costs of journals and other academic materials, and see if UK can align its efforts with other universities.

Senate's Research Committee

1. Review the overall indemnification process for all of campus, with a specific eye toward the process as it affects non-healthcare areas, and whether non-healthcare areas have an implemented indemnification process.
2. Examine the policies by which grant management is established and determine why the administrative response to faculty concerns is perceived as decreasing.
3. Work with other Senate committees on guidelines and evaluation of multi-disciplinary research centers (MDRC).

Senate's Rules and Elections Committee

1. Identify problems with and potential solutions for current election processes. (Specifically, the need to let trustee candidates know that upon election, any family member employed at UK must resign in order for the faculty trustee to serve)

Wasilkowski **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

c. Senate Committee Preferences (Round I)

SC members discussed the proposed committee assignments. Wasilkowski **moved** to approve the committee compositions as presented and Blonder **seconded**. After very brief discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

e. Proposed Changes to Senate Rules 6.2.1.1, 6.5.1.2 and 6.5.1.3

The Chair explained that the proposed language was intended to codify current procedures.

Wood **moved** that the Senate Council approve the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 6.2.1.1* ("Functions" of the Academic Ombud) and *6.5.1.2* ("Cases of Grade Appeal"), and renumbering of existing *6.5.1.2* (to *6.5.1.3*, "Cases of Student Academic Rights"). Steiner **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

g. Discussion on Interpretation of Senate Rules 5.2.4.7

The Chair shared that during discussion last week, those present suggested clarifying language: that the final exam is a two-hour exam unless indicated otherwise in the syllabus, and within the time allotted by the Registrar. Steiner **moved** to approve the proposed interpretation and Wimberly **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

h. Distance Learning Approval for Special Topics Courses

The agenda item involved a recommended process (below) for approval of distance learning (DL) delivery for special topics courses.

1. Dept/college thinks a special topics course may have titles delivered via DL in the future.
 - a. Faculty member prepares Change Course Form, with the **ONLY** change being that of adding DL delivery.
 - b. Course Change Form proceeds through normal college approval processes.
 - c. Course Change Form proceeds through HCCC/UC/GC.

- d. Course Change Form is processed in Office of the Senate Council and posted for 10-day review on web transmittal.
 - e. Registrar is informed that the special topics placeholder is ready for DL approval.
2. Dept/college decides that a specific title needs to be delivered via DL. (Assumes the dept has already submitted the course change form to add DL delivery.)
- a. Faculty member prepares DL Form and course syllabus.
 - b. Review of DL Form and course syllabus proceeds through normal college approval processes.
 - c. DL Form and course syllabus sent to Office of the Senate Council, bypassing academic councils.
 - d. SC Chair reviews (approves or rejects) the request for DL delivery of a specific title.
 - e. Upon approval, the DL Form and course syllabus are sent to the Registrar to “turn on” a 200-level section for the special topics course.

Steiner **moved** that the SC approve the proposed approval process for distance learning delivery of special topics courses, effective immediately and Blonder **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstained.

2.i. Identification of Senate Parliamentarian for 2011-2012

The Chair agreed to contact a specific faculty member.

3. Tentative Senate Agenda for September 12, 2011

The Chair explained first that she intended to reserve one hour for President Capilouto’s address to the Senate, and then shared other information regarding the agenda.

SC members discussed and then rearranged some of the tentative agenda items. Wood **moved** that the SC approve the tentative Senate agenda for September 12 as amended. Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

2.d. Composition of Reinstatement Committee

The Chair asked that the SC formally approve the composition of the Senate’s Reinstatement Committee (the Chair, Grossman and Wimberly). Wood **moved** thusly, and Steiner **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Process for UK Core Exceptions

The Chair introduced Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mike Mullen, who explained the proposed process to approve courses for UK Core credit on an as-needed basis for transfer students. After Guest Mullen’s comments, SC members discussed pros and cons of Mullen’s suggestion as well as other possible solutions. SC members were concerned about a few issues, particularly workload and input from a home academic unit when discussing a student’s request that a course transferred from another institution be accepted for credit in UK Core.

After discussion wound down, the Chair opined that the SC had two viable choices – the proposal from Mullen or asking the Interim General Education Oversight Committee (IGEOC) make such decisions until the end of the year, and then offer recommendation on future processes.

Wood **moved** that the Interim General Education Oversight Committee assume the responsibility for making exceptions to UK Core and Steiner **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. UK 2011 Summer Degree List (second of two)

Wood **moved** that the that the elected faculty senators approve UK's second August 2011 list of candidates for credentials, for submission to the Senate and then through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Blonder **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. Sample Undergraduate Council Syllabus

The Chair invited Mullen to share information about the syllabus template developed by the Undergraduate Council, which he did. The Chair said she would like to present it to the Senate as a sample syllabus, to assist faculty members (who want the assistance) with what the Undergraduate Council looks for in a course syllabus.

Mullen went on to explain that it was intended to be part of an online syllabus builder with drop-down information and narrative fields. He had an updated version that should be shared with the Senate. SC members offered a few comments. It was clear that use of the syllabus template was voluntary, and meant to aid faculty members in creating/revising a syllabus, if the assistance was so desired.

Wood **moved** to endorse the UC syllabus template and Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

7. QEP Membership

SC members discussed the revised proposed membership of the Quality Enhancement Plan's Topic Development Team. There was some concern that there was neither a cross-representation of campus, nor of the College of Arts and Sciences. SC members suggested that they meet with the QEP representatives to learn more about the committee and the proposed membership.

8. Report of the Joint Committee of the University and Staff Senates on the Proposed Creation of an Employment Ombud

The Chair said she would report to the Senate on activities of the Joint Committee of the University and Staff Senates on the Proposed Creation of an Employment Ombud to the Senate. She said she would describe how the report came about and will present it to the Senate for endorsement later in the fall semester.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned about 5:00 pm. [The Action Items are a part of the minutes but fall at the end.]

Respectfully submitted by Hollie I. Swanson,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Blonder, Coyne, Peek, Steiner, Swanson, Wasilkowski, Wimberly, and Wood.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman

Invited guest present: Mullen.

#	√	Item	Responsibility	Completed
20.		Charge Senate's Academic Programs Committee with creating processes for substantive change issues (teach-out, contractual/consortium process, off-campus sites, how to reopen a suspended program). (8/23/10)	SC	
31.		Ask the Provost to submit a statement of financial and administrative feasibility for proposals prior to the proposals being sent to cmte. (10/4/10)	Document Handling System	
40.		Draft changes to <i>Senate Rule</i> language on Senate meeting attendance policies for review by SC. (8/30/10 & 11/15/10)	Chair, Steiner	
42.		Discuss with the Provost the method of allocating resources from distance learning courses. (11/15/10)	Chair	
44.		Create ad hoc committee (perhaps with VPR and Provost) to look at what constitutes an administrative or an educational unit, and if there is a continuum or a sharp difference. (11/22/10; 12/6/10)	Chair, SC	
46.		Discuss election of officers, specifically who is eligible to cast votes. (12/6/10); Solicit opinions from the Senate. (2/28/11)	SC	
53.		Investigate "Quality Matters" WRT distance learning courses. (1/10/11)	SC	
57.		Look into creating a Senate committee on assessment. (1/31/11)	SC	
62.		Determine how to address the issue of the proportionate representation of appointed Board of Trustees members. (2/7/11)	SC	
63.		Invite UofL employment ombud to SC meeting after joint ombud cmte visits the University of Cincinnati. (2/21/11)	Mrs. Brothers	
66.		Invite Associate Provost for Undergrad Ed to offer "State of Undergraduate Education" address to Senate. (2/21/11)	Chair	
67.		Invite Associate Provost for Academic Affairs about distance learning courses. (2/21/2011)	Mrs. Brothers	
71.		Invite Dean Kornbluh et al to present "A&S Wired" to the Senate in fall 2011. (5/2/11)	Mrs. Brothers	
72.		Discuss status of department chairs and directors of interdisciplinary centers during the August Advance. (6/15/11)	SC	
73.		Ask each college dean's office to submit information about their faculty council, as part of the SACS reaccreditation effort. (6/15/11)	Chair	
74.	√	Form an ad hoc committee charged with formulating a document describing best practices regarding distance learning practices, with membership of said cmte in the purview of the Chair. (6/15/11)	Chair	06/2011
76.		Develop metrics for faculty input into president's performance during August Advance. (6/15/11)	SC	
77.		Draft a report on the perceptions of the faculty reps on the Presidential Search Committee on the process, and include relevant info from similar universities' recent presidential searches. (6/15/11)	Chair & Steiner	

78.		Create checklist describing most common problems encountered during reviews of curricular proposals and disseminate to colleges. (6/15/11)	Mrs. Brothers	
79.	√	Contact deans and academic council chairs to let them know that incomplete/incorrect curricular approval forms will be returned (with detail on the problems) to the previous academic council for fixing. (6/15/11)	Chair	08/2011
81.		Meet with each college's faculty council in the fall, and also reinforce the importance of identifying a senator to communicate with college faculty. (6/15/11)	Chair	
82.		Request that the chair of the Senate's Academic Facilities Cmte be invited to attend meetings of the Capital Planning Advisory Group. (6/15/11)	Chair	
83.	√	Send list of existing senators and list of new senators to chairs of Senate's Academic Facilities Committee and Senate's Academic Planning and Priorities Committee. (6/15/11)	Mrs. Brothers	08/2011
84.		Deliberate on the idea of recording meetings and posting the video (with time markers of important discussions).	SC	
85.		Find out if the Senate has an approving or endorsing vote on proposed changes to post-tenure review policies.	Chair	
86.		Determine by late August the message(s) the Chair should relay when she visits college faculty councils.	SC	
87.		Invite Mia Alexander-Snow to give her presentation on assessment to the Senate.	Mrs. Brothers	
89.	√	Invite Libraries Dean Terry Birdwhistell to discuss open access at SC meeting. (8/22/11)	Mrs. Brothers	09/2011
90.		Post Senate cmte final reports on their websites. (8-22-11)	Mrs. Brothers	

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Friday, September 15, 2011.