

Senate Council Meeting  
December 18, 2006

The Senate Council met on Monday, December 18, 2006 at 3 pm in 103 Main Building. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise. Below is a record of what transpired.

The meeting was called to order at 3:13 pm, after those present enjoyed some refreshments. The Chair shared that Provost Subbaswamy would need to leave the meeting shortly before 4 o'clock.

The Chair noted that Duke, Waldhart and Vice Chair Grabau's terms on the SC would end as of December 31, 2006. He expressed his appreciation for Waldhart accepting the remainder of Jones' term. He went on to explain that by virtue of his officer position, Vice Chair Grabau would remain on the SC through May 30, 2006. The Chair said that he had appreciated Grabau's support, wisdom and even temperament. The Chair also expressed his immense appreciation for Duke's wisdom.

The Chair noted that he had invited Jones and Grossman to attend the day's SC meeting in light of their recent, valued service on the SC.

1. Minutes for December 4 and Announcements

The Chair said that the minutes were not ready for review but that Provost Subbaswamy was present to take part in a discussion on the GERA (General Education Reform and Assessment) initiative. He reminded SC members that he had sent the Provost's whitepaper to the SC listserv, questions were raised and a face-to-face meeting was suggested, resulting in the Provost's attendance. The Chair added that Provost Subbaswamy subsequently gave him a proposal that would allow administrators such as deans, associate deans, the provost and associate provosts to remain as faculty; retaining faculty status would require a change to Human Resources Policy & Procedures Manual. If time permitted, the SC could discuss the issue at the meeting, otherwise the issue would be discussed in early spring 2007.

2. The Future of the General Education Initiative

The Chair invited Provost Subbaswamy to give SC members background on the UK-LEAP [whitepaper](#) by Provost Subbaswamy. Provost Subbaswamy began by saying that the memo [on the GERA initiative](#) he and the Chair jointly sent out was fairly self-explanatory. General education reform was an important part of what UK stood for. A reexamination of the general education curriculum was something institutions should be and were doing across the country; it was a natural process to perform such a review. The Provost opined that the USP Self-Study Report reflected wisdom and careful thinking on a local and national level.

The Joint Provost/Senate Council GERA Committee took the next step of engagement by attending conferences and talking to colleges, committees and faculty groups to gather reactions to the USP External Review Committee's final report. GERA's final report offered suggestions as to what general education at UK should be look like and was accepted by the University Senate in October 2006. The Senate recommended the appointment of a steering committee to formulate a framework and develop a University Studies Program to be adopted by the faculty. The GERA timeline suggested that any new program be in place by fall 2008; peer institutions had also taken about three years to go from conception to adoption of a revised general education initiative.

Provost Subbaswamy said that the whitepaper was an attempt to summarize and distill local and national conversations on general education and should be used to help get things started. The Provost said he was not vested in the specific items in the whitepaper and would not feel slighted in the least if there were changes; items in the whitepaper were only suggestions.

A national conversation from the federal government included topics such as accountability and assessment. In the future, UK could be held accountable for not only graduation rates, but also the quality of an education and how it was delivered; the Provost opined that voluntary or mandatory collegiate learning assessments would be the norm in the future. Along with the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), the GERA committee treated expected outcomes as a fundamental component of any general education reform.

Provost Subbaswamy referred SC members to page six of the proposal to find a brief list of possible curricular areas. All the items were built on the previous ones, with an integrated conceptual approach. He cautioned against thinking of the bullets as courses, but rather to view them as the components that should be assessed: Essential Skills; Common Studies I: Foundations (Tier I and Tier II); Common Studies II: Education for Citizenship; and Integration and Application. The Provost said Common Studies I spoke to a breadth requirement and different epistemologies; Tier II would involve a deeper immersion but could always be iterated differently. Such decisions were exactly what the conversations with the campus community should involve.

Common Studies II would involve education regarding the responsibilities of citizenship. Provost Subbaswamy said that he should have used a different term for list item "Personal Finance" – perhaps a reference to personal responsibilities as a citizen; the importance of health; what taxes pay for, etc. The two-year high school language requirement would be integrated and as with the other list items, would build on all that came before.

Provost Subbaswamy said that the capstone experience would not necessarily have to be in the major; such matters were open to discussion. He said that the

following pages, which offered learning outcomes and an assessment mechanism, needed to be fleshed out. Deb Moore, from the Office of Assessment, had been a member of the GERA Committee and would naturally have a place in and a part of conversations on assessment of any new general education curriculum.

The Provost stated that the entire document was a starting point for discussion, not a final product. He, the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Phil Kraemer and others were hopeful that all feedback from campus could be received by February 15, after which the USP Steering Committee would incorporate the input into a continuing proposal. It is possible that there will be targeted discussions with directors of undergraduate studies and also fora for additional input. Provost Subbaswamy said he wanted any draft pre-curriculum report to go to the University Senate before the end of spring 2007. He said that if it looked doable, he hoped a group of faculty could spend the summer fleshing out what a general education curriculum would look like. Aspects such as summer salary for those faculty members and other financial needs would be supported by the Office of the Provost. New courses could be developed, etc. A fully fleshed-out proposal could be ready for review by the university campus and the Senate for consideration in early fall 2007. If adopted then by the Senate, students matriculating in fall 2008 would be the first to fall under a new general education curriculum.

The Chair stated that there would at least one more SC meeting for discussion and comments on the whitepaper before it went to the Senate. Those around the table introduced themselves. He added that new SC member Piascik could not attend due to familial obligations.

Lesnaw thanked the Provost for putting together the whitepaper, opining that it was enormously helpful. She spoke at length about her concern that basic sciences areas from the health care colleges were not included in the list of knowledge areas. She strongly urged the Provost to include them. The Provost replied that the list was not intended to be exhaustive and was kept short to avoid introducing items into such a complicated issue. He noted that there was a potential problem of including health care colleges' basic science with regard to funding as it pertained to the offering of courses. He said that while funding models could present hurdles and should definitely be reviewed, he just did not explicitly insert them into the whitepaper. Provost Subbaswamy added that the Department of Physiology had a significant undergraduate model that could be a template for other undergraduate health care colleges. He said that the whitepaper had already gone to all deans.

Yanarella (also GERA co-chair) expressed appreciation of the ERC and GERA reports' receptions, as well as with the commitment on the part of the Provost in terms of the supportive framework being favorably viewed. Yanarella stressed that a theme heard over and over again from many faculty across campus was

the critical importance of faculty development in any general education initiative. He said that faculty would need to be educated on how to teach differently. Yanarella hoped that the funding for faculty development in summer 2007 would not be the last major contribution from the Office of the Provost, but rather would be followed by regular faculty development offerings, which would ease assessment concerns.

Provost Subbaswamy replied that he was assuming that there would be a summer faculty institute, patterned after the professional colleges' development offerings, since those colleges do a better job of training and developing individual faculty members for teaching. He wanted to establish a culture in which faculty who taught courses in the new general education program would necessarily have to undergo a faculty development institute, which would offer information on how to teach a course so that learning outcomes could be assessed, offer different methods for teaching a large or small lecture course, etc.

Waldhart, referring to the now-defunct modern and global studies offerings of USP, said that great ideas are often diluted by the passage of time and a lack of money. She said that faculty development needed to be a regular offering, not just something offered once. Provost Subbaswamy agreed, saying that while some issues do boil down to money, continuing development will be important.

Grossman, referring to a capstone course in the major, said that in the sciences it was traditionally a laboratory research experience, as long as the student wanted it and had the necessary??? GPA to do it. Such an experience was expensive and time consuming for faculty members and those supervising the student – Grossman wondered how to accommodate safety concerns if students were required to do a capstone within their major. The Provost replied that creativity was needed to solve such problems. It would be acceptable to impose a GPA or other requirement for laboratory capstone work, but that everyone had to realize that one “solution” would not fit all situations encountered in disciplines across campus, due in part to safety and cost factors. He said that one possible alternative would be a capstone coordinator for those students who could not be in a lab – people would have to be flexible and realistic in solving such problems.

Randall wondered how recent faculty contracts that broke down the three tiers (teaching, research and service) of responsibility would affect the general education initiative. The Provost responded that at peer institutions that enrolled 7,000 - 8,000 students per year, there was faculty present who specialized in teaching the fundamental skills to students. In addition, the American Association of University Professors recognized the need of specialized faculty and has addressed best practices for such situations.

Due to another appointment, the Provost left. The Chair thanked him for attending and said that he was always welcome.

Moving on to other matters, the Chair said that Baxter was resigning from the SC, due to a potential conflict of interest issue. Baxter had been urged by the Office of Legal Counsel to go on unpaid leave until that office determined how to address the situation. Baxter apologized for having to resign and said that he was unaware of the problem when he was elected to the SC. He added that he was likely a poster child for legislative changes to allow UK faculty to be engaged in entrepreneurial activities that partially or in whole benefited UK.

The Chair said that the chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee would need to identify the replacement for Baxter.

Referring to the first meeting of the 2007 year, the Chair said that the SC would need to meet on January 8 and asked SC members to put that date on their calendar. He then asked how SC members thought the conversation on the whitepaper should proceed. The Chair reminded SC members that the Provost had already sent the general education whitepaper to college undergraduate curriculum committees for review.

Waldhart suggested that college faculty councils be given the whitepaper so that a good representation within each college reviewed it. The Chair then asked how senators should be kept informed. Liaison Greissman confirmed for the Chair that the whitepaper had been emailed to all faculty. Lesnaw asked Yanarella to share his opinion of the whitepaper. Yanarella replied that the whitepaper provided very valuable clay for the USP Steering Committee and interested faculty to shape a basic framework. He said he believed from the beginning of the general education initiative that this was the last, best chance to acknowledge the shortcomings of USP and reshape general education in light of new and developing trends and tendencies. He thought a curriculum could be quickly developed after the USP Steering Committee received input from the campus community.

Dembo thought that the SC could most effectively help the USP Steering Committee by offering a realistic assessment of how faculty in each member's area could react; an identification of possible barriers would be helpful. Duke opined that faculty councils would also have a good idea of barriers to watch out for. In response to the Chair, Greissman said that the Provost hoped to have all faculty input received by February 15. The Chair asked if there should be another SC meeting to discuss the whitepaper before the February Senate meeting. Lesnaw spoke for SC members by saying that another SC discussion would be beneficial.

Waldhart suggested that a special Senate meeting would show the importance of the issue; she thought it would be best to have a meeting dedicated to the whitepaper, instead of trying to fit it into a regular meeting's agenda. She said that a special Senate meeting on January 29 would allow for questions raised at

the meeting to be answered before the deadline (mid-February) for faculty input. Randall suggested that such a meeting needed structure for the discussion. The Chair said that a set of questions could be prepared in advance, perhaps at the January 8 SC meeting.

At about 4:20, the Chair suggested SC members avail themselves one last time to the refreshments outside. The meeting was called back to order around 4:30.

Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Heidi Anderson arrived at this point. The Chair explained she wanted to share information about a new ad in The Chronicle of Higher Education. Guest Anderson said that the ad directed people to <http://www.uy.edu/professors>, which held a bevy of information for faculty interested in coming to UK. Anderson said she would return in January when the site was more fully developed; it was created quickly to allow the ad to run.

The Chair recalled that SC members had suggested that colleges with large numbers of clinical title series (CTS) faculty should be invited to a SC meeting during which a question and answer session could be held, the questions having been developed from a recent SC meeting. The deans of the Colleges of Medicine, Nursing, Dentistry and Pharmacy would be at the SC meeting on January 22 and deans of the colleges of Social Work, Law, Health Sciences and Public Health had been scheduled to attend the January 29 SC meeting. Anderson said that if questions about benchmarks could not be answered by the time of the CTS/deans meetings, the information could be offered at a later date, but still before any final decisions were made regarding changes to the CTS. She added that she edited the questions a bit from what was stated in the minutes for standardization, etc.

There being no additional questions or comments, the Chair thanked Anderson for attending and she left.

### 3. Preliminary Discussion: Proposed change to Hr Policy 4.1.1.1 (Deans as Faculty Members)

The Chair stated that he had distributed over the SC listserv a proposed change to Human Resources policy that came from the Office of the Provost. The change would allow faculty members in the position of associate dean, dean, associate provost or provost to retain their faculty status during the administrative appointment, instead of being identified as a staff employee during their administrative service. There would be a full discussion at a later SC meeting, but the Chair wanted SC to have a chance to offer some preliminary thoughts. Waldhart said that her department chair felt very disenfranchised that she could not even vote in the faculty trustee election. SC members briefly touched on the issues below during the discussion.

- Many department chairs have an administrative percentage of 49%, which does not truly represent the effort of serving as department chair, but allows the individual to retain faculty status.

- Department chairs could be excluded from holding elected office, but what other matters, such as voting rights or election to the SC should be considered?
- Staff employees accumulate sick and vacation time – accrued vacation time is paid out when a staff employee leaves their university employment – would affected administrators want to lose that?
- How do salary supplements work?
- How do the different mechanisms by which departmental chairs are chosen vary from college to college, i.e. are some chairs chosen by faculty or are chairs appointed by the dean?
- By nature of the administrative appointment, is it fair to allow someone who reports to the dean to be involved in representing faculty affairs?
- Does a faculty member unencumbered by an administrative appointment represent other faculty members differently than a faculty member holding an administrative position?

The Chair said that the matter would be revisited. He expressed his appreciation for Duke and Waldhart's contributions and wished them well.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:53 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh Tagavi,  
Senate Council Chair

Senate Council members present: Baxter, Dembo, Duke, Grabau, Harley, Lesnaw, Randall, Tagavi, Thelin, Waldhart, and Yanarella.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Non-SC members present: Finkel, Grossman, and Wood.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on December 19, 2006.