

Senate Council
February 16, 2009

The Senate Council met in regular session on Monday, February 16, 2009 at 3 pm in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands, unless indicated otherwise.

Chair David Randall called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:03 pm. The Chair suggested that everyone present introduce themselves.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair noted that Anderson, Chappell, Piascik and Yanarella would be absent from the meeting. He added that he intended to rearrange the agenda to accommodate guests and no one objected.

Turning to announcements, the Chair referred SC members to a memo from a senator who was concerned about the possibility that the proposed new GenEd might cause some programs' total number of credit hours to increase. The Chair explained that he had no plan of action to propose, but rather wanted to inform SC members. He asked SC members to let him know if someone thought it appropriate to take action, and he would add the issue to a future agenda.

Swanson **moved** to approve the SC minutes from January 26, 2009. Ford **seconded**. There being none opposed, the minutes from January 26, 2009 were **approved** as distributed. Wood **moved** to approve the SC minutes from February 2, 2009 and Aken **seconded**. There being none opposed, the minutes from February 2, 2009 were **approved** as distributed.

The Chair explained that all the curricular items for which guests were present would be heard first, and votes would be held at the end. He added that SC members appreciated having time for candid discussion towards the end of the meeting, but that guests were welcome to remain if they so desired.

3. [New Program: BA Gender and Women's Studies](#)

The Chair asked Professor Susan Bordo from the Department of English to share information about the proposal for a new Bachelor of Arts degree in Gender and Women's Studies (GWS). Guest Bordo said that Associate Dean for Academic Programs Leonidas Bachas could offer additional information, and went on to explain the proposal.

SC members asked Bordo and Guest Bachas a variety of questions, including queries about new GWS courses, benchmark comparisons, possible job opportunities for program graduates, and the number of teaching FTE faculty in the program.

Afterwards, the Chair thanked Bordo and Bachas for attending and they departed.

6. [New Graduate Certificate: Assistive and Rehabilitation Technology](#)

The Chair invited Margaret Bausch, professor from the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation Counseling, to explain the proposal. He commented that she had recently won a 2009 UK Alumni Association Great Teacher Award. Guest Bausch offered a definition of assistive and rehabilitation technology and went on to explain the proposal.

After a couple of questions, Wood asked about the two areas of specialization. Bausch explained that after a student completed the core courses, a student would choose between an emphasis in special education or an emphasis in rehabilitation counseling, by taking either EDS 640 or EDS 648.

Wood said that she was not convinced that a choice between one course or another would necessarily amount to an emphasis in that area. She asked if Bausch objected to changing the word “emphasis” to “elective” in the second-to-last sentence of the first paragraph, and substituting “The Certificate” for “Both emphases” in the last sentence of the first paragraph. Bausch had no objections to the changes.

The Chair thanked Bausch for attending, and she departed.

New Program: BA Gender and Women’s Studies

Kelly **moved** to approve the new BA in Gender and Women’s Studies and send it to the University Senate with a positive recommendation. Ford **seconded**. SC members then engaged in a discussion about the some concerns regarding whether there were sufficient numbers of teaching FTE faculty associated with the proposed new program. Wood offered a **friendly amendment** to send the proposal to the Senate with no recommendation. Both Kelly and Ford **accepted** the friendly amendment.

Further discussion ensued about the new program and the wording of the revised motion. Steiner **moved** to table the proposed new BA in Gender and Women’s Studies until the February 26 Senate Council meeting. Aken **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. SC members asked to have Bordo provide additional information at the February 26 meeting to explain the specific faculty involved in the program and who will teach which courses.

New Graduate Certificate in Assistive and Rehabilitation Technology

Wood **moved** to approve the new Graduate Certificate in Assistive and Rehabilitation Technology and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation. Ford **seconded**. There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Wood asked that the SC address the senator’s written concerns about the possibility that the proposed new GenEd might cause some programs’ total number of credit hours to increase. She asked that the Chair formally transmit the memo to Provost’s Liaison Greissman and Gen Ed Steering Committee Convener Susan Carvalho, so that it could be shared with the curricular teams. The Chair agreed to do so.

4. [Proposed Changes to Governing Regulations IV \(“The University Senate”\)](#)

The Chair asked Davy Jones, chair of the Senate’s Rules and Elections Committee, to explain the agenda item. Guest Jones noted that *Governing Regulations IV (GR IV)* contained a reference to the position of associate provost for academic affairs, which no longer existed, as an ex officio member of the Senate; it had been replaced by the position of associate provost for faculty affairs. The new ex officio position, however, was not listed in either the *Senate Rules (SR)* or the *GR*. Fixing that issue was one of the suggested revisions made by the Senate’s Rules and Elections Committee (SREC).

The next change pertained to revisions in the *GR* that had been made in 2005. A near-final draft of the *GR* in 2005 did not express the representative nature of the University Senate, in contrast to the language describing the staff and students' senates; the word "representative" was added (to replace "member"), immediately prior to the Board of Trustees (BoT) meeting at which the *GR* change was discussed. However, the word following the new insertion was not changed, so the phrase became "representative of," which incorrectly implied senators represented the University Senate (Senate) to external organizations. Therefore, the SREC suggested changing "of" to "in." There were a handful of other changes, all editorial.

After some discussion, it was clarified that the position of executive vice president for research, which was no longer in use, should be removed from the third paragraph of *GR IV*, in which the ex officio voting membership of the Senate was listed.

The Chair noted that the proposal came from a committee of the Senate, so no second was needed. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion to endorse the revisions suggested by the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee and send them to the Senate for consideration. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

8. Continuing Discussion on Combined Administrative Regulations II-1.0-1

Greissman reminded SC members that Part I, Part II and Part III of *Administrative Regulations (AR) II-1.0-1* had been combined into one section, which had been the topic of a few discussions at recent SC meetings. He quickly outlined the issues that had been raised at the last SC meeting:

- The SC recommended that a faculty member be able to pull his/her dossier from early tenure consideration (the one comprehensive review) if it appeared that there was substantive concern about the dossier within the college or department, as long as the dossier had not left the college. Greissman explained that Provost Subbaswamy had not relented on the terms of an early tenure review; once initiated, an early tenure review will count as the one opportunity for a comprehensive tenure review under the revised language of version B.
- The SC expressed concern that in the language pertaining to terminal year review, there was no language on procedural steps, and no information on the rights during appeal.
- The SC had reviewed language that better clarified the specific composition of college advisory committees, so that such committees' memberships were better representative of the faculty of the college.
- The revisions did not take address the following situation: if (in a failed tenure review) a faculty member waives the right to a sixth-year review, does that waiver exhaust the comprehensive review, and does that mean that the faculty member is not entitled to a terminal year review? The existing language did not make provision for a faculty member who waived the right of review.
- There needed to be a plan of action for vetting the revisions to the *AR* with college faculties. While Provost Subbaswamy was sharing the revisions with deans, he also hoped the SC would share it with the college faculties again. Input had been requested

in the past, but college faculties should be able to offer input into the newest version. In conjunction with vetting with college faculties, Provost Subbaswamy asked for guidance as to whether current faculty or just future faculty hires in tenurable series would be affected by the effective date of July 1, 2009.

SC members, Jones and Greissman discussed various aspects of the revisions. Eventually, the Chair noted that the Provost expected that SC members would recommend how the revisions should be vetted with college faculties. It was ultimately decided that the proposed new language would be emailed to faculty councils.

7. Preliminary Discussion on SGA Proposal Regarding Dead Week

The Chair suggested that Joe Quinn, student representative from the Student Government Association (SGA), explain the proposal. Guest Quinn introduced fellow student representative Karen Sutton. He said that the current proposal was created after the recent calendar proposal was passed without changes to create a true dead period prior to finals week. He also explained the manner in which the proposal had been vetted with students thus far.

SC members engaged in a conversation with Quinn and Sutton regarding the proposed changes. It was ultimately decided that SC members had two primary concerns with the proposal in its current form: 1. the revised language would prohibit any make-up exams from being given in the four weeks prior to Dead Week; and 2. the language pertaining to make-up quizzes/exams did not differentiate between quizzes/exams cancelled by the instructor and then rescheduled for a later date, and quizzes/exams provided to students after the fact for students with university-approved absences.

Quinn agreed to take the comments back to the SGA and would discuss additional steps with the Chair.

5. Coalition of Senate and Faculty Leaders for Higher Education (COSFL) Meeting Update

The Chair shared information with SC members about a variety of issues that were addressed during the past Friday's COSFL meeting, some of which are described below.

- There had been a statewide concern about pending legislation (in Frankfort) about college textbooks that included a possible criminal penalty for faculty. The Chair reported that it was likely a modified version of the bill would go to the floor, but without the penalty language.
- The Board of Regents of the Kentucky Community and Technical College System (KCTCS) was going to be considering a proposal to do away with tenure for all future hires. The Chair reported that there was considerable concern regarding the wisdom of such a move.
- A group of faculty was working on the issue of developmental education, and the numbers of high school graduates who are not ready for college.
- The transfer of credits was discussed and noted to be uppermost in the minds of state legislators. UK's proposed new Gen Ed was also discussed, as well as adult learners and minority access to higher education.

- The amount of time and the number of credit hours that were required to earn an undergraduate degree was also talked about; on average, UK was well above 120 hours.

SC members discussed some of the information in the Chair's report.

9. Preliminary Discussion on Faculty Engagement Document

The Chair invited Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Heidi Anderson to explain the proposal. Guest Anderson thanked SC members for the opportunity to explain UK's recent conversations on faculty engagement, which she did.

A faculty engagement subcommittee, made up of a variety in faculty on different title series and from various academic backgrounds, has prepared a report on the subject and Anderson wanted to start a conversation with the SC about the report's contents. Engagement was not being proposed as a fourth aspect to add to teaching, research and service, but rather as something that would blanket all three current aspects.

Aken asked for an explanation of how engagement was different from public or community service. Guest and Associate Provost for Engagement Phil Greasley explained that teaching, research and service could be performed by faculty without actually engaging the community – they could all be done single-handedly without truly interacting with the community. Anderson added that more information was available in the subcommittee's report and that engagement could become a standard part of a faculty member's Distribution of Effort (DOE) form.

Both Greasley and Anderson emphasized that engagement was something that faculty members could choose to take part in or not, and that it would open the door for faculty to be more involved in research that affects the community, based on the mission and direction of a faculty member's department.

SC member offered a few more comments on the matter, after which the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Dave Randall,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Aken, Ford, Kelley, Randall, Steiner, Swanson, Wood.

Invited guest present: Heidi Anderson, Leonidas Bachas, Margaret Bausch, Susan Bordo, Joe Quinn, Phil Greasley, Davy Jones, Karen Sutton.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Friday, March 3, 2009.