Senate Council
February 20, 2012

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, February 20, 2012 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 called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:03 pm.

John F. Wilson, the faculty member who will fulfill the remainder of Joe Peek's term, was welcomed by SC members. Wilson offered a few comments to senators. Those present introduced themselves.

1. Minutes and Announcements
The Chair offered a variety of announcement.

- The SC will have an informal chat with President Eli Capilouto on Monday, February 27.

- The Chair has asked Information Technology for assistance with creating a formal, digital mechanism by which faculty can offer input into the activities of the Faculty Committee on Review, Rewards and Retention (FCR³). Public forums are also planned. FCR³ members will each be asked to choose a college to represent (not their own). FCR³ will also interact with college faculty councils.

- The Senate's Academic Programs Committee is doing a commendable job reviewing a slew of new programs.

- The University Senate's Sergeant-at-Arms, Michelle Sohner, will be out of town during the March meeting. It was agreed that the Chair will ask a past chair to serve.

- SC members agreed the proposed changes to the Honors Program will be reviewed on a web transmittal, but senators will be specifically informed about the item.

2. Old Business
b. Framing the Discussion on Undergraduate Program Admissions Requirements
The Chair explained that there were increasing numbers of degree programs that have admissions requirements. The SC recognized the need for academic rigor and also wanted to learn more about how such requirements affect other programs.

SC members and guests Mark Kornbluh, dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Sharon Stewart, interim dean of the College of Health Sciences, and Mike Mullen, associate provost for undergraduate education, engaged in an informative and lively discussion.

The Chair began by explaining that the SC was increasingly seeing programs that have some kind of admissions requirement and wanted to engage interested individuals in a discussion on how the need for academic rigor may affect other programs at UK.

SC members discussed pre-major requirements (of a certain grade, or grade point average (GPA), admission requirements (of a certain grade, or GPA, and progression requirements (of a certain grade, or GPA).

Dean Kornbluh stated that the College of Arts and Sciences (AS) did not intend to have admissions requirements and that other programs' admissions requirements were a problem for AS. Retention rates in AS are among the best across campus. Debski expressed concern with pre-major requirements used to deal with reductions in resources. Grossman recalled a past University Senate (Senate) discussion in which specific GPA requirements were for enrollment management. Such a practice will increase other college's enrollments.

Stewart explained that the College of Health Sciences offered a bachelor's of health sciences degree in Communication Sciences and Disorders, but a master's degree is required for clinical practice. In addition, accreditation requirements specify how many students are allowed per faculty member. There were about 90 undergraduates, but only 12 slots in the master's program. There were good undergraduates that just could not get into the master's program. The way the program tried to handle it was to increase enrollment at the graduate level by assigning a few more faculty there, and then instituting selective enrollments for students in the undergraduate program. The sentiment was that it was simply unfair to accept more undergraduate students than could be accommodated in the master's program.

Davis commented on a specific undergraduate degree program with a GPA admissions requirement – students who could not enter that program ended up in a similar but different program. That different program then has an inordinate number of students who have been unable to meet minimum requirements and who perhaps bring down the academic rigor of the different program. Once their GPA is high enough, the student will then leave the different program and return to the original program with a GPA admissions requirement. Such situations lead to students with varying degrees of prerequisite knowledge.

Dean Kornbluh opined that a problem was students taking courses to improve their GPA – he has seen some students graduating with 140 credits because they retake courses.

SC members generally agreed that GPA requirements for entrance into a program were more problematic than GPA progression requirements.

Coyne said that admission requirements should include the rationale from an accreditation or future graduate program aspect. Wood said that the program and admissions requirements were different issues. She thought that specific grade requiremetns for progression are preferable to GPA requirements for progression. Pre-major requirements, however, are limiting students' options. McCormick opined that these types of decisions are program specific and should be guided by the faculty in that area.

Wimberly commented that when she came to UK, an advisor in the program she wanted to be in suggested she go to a different program that the advisor thought would be more rigorous. She said that in the program she is currently in, she is in the same classes as friends who did not meet the GPA requirements for her program. In some cases, a student just will not be able to progress without meeting certain grade requirements.

Grossman commented that the discussion really highlighted problems with GPA requirements – he had not heard any negative comments about specific grade requirements. He suggested that deans determine if the issue of GPA requirements needed to be brought to faculty in colleges with GPA requirements, to look into whether there is a way for students to meet goals for progression toward a useful degree that does not involve imposing a GPA requirement, which causes weaker students to flood other programs. Mullen stated that a compelling reason for requirements was different from requirements that simply make it more difficult for students to complete a degree in four years.

The Chair thanked those present for the discussion, noting that it was helpful.

2. <u>Old Business</u>
c. <u>(Revised) Proposal for Formalized High School/University Dual Credit</u>
Mullen offered some information about the Dual Credit proposal. It is largely the same proposal as was seen previously by the SC, but it now includes specific *Senate Rules* (SR) language to codify it. In addition, there is new language about who oversees the signing of memorandums of understanding, course evaluation and reviews to satisfy Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) requirements, with an emphasis on continual improvement. Guest Randolph Hollingsworth, assistant provost for integrated academic services, also offered information.

Grossman explained that while there were a variety of places where the language could have been inserted into the *SR*, it was determined by the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee that the language only needed to be added into *SR 3.2.0* and *SR 4.2.1.3.4*.

Wood expressed concern that the language under number three on the Dual Credit Agreement (between UK and Russell High School, the template) implied that merely submission of the information to the department chair was sufficient for approval. Wood suggested changes[1] to the language, as follows:

> RHS instructors for a UK dual credit course will submit the following to the appropriate UK department chair <u>and instructor for approval</u>:
>   a.   A copy of his/her transcript….

Hollingsworth said that although the language was submitted to Legal Counsel for review, adding such language could still be done.

Grossman **moved** to recommend to the Senate that it approve the proposed additions to *Senate Rules 3.2.0* and *Senate Rules 4.3.1.3.4*. Wasilkowski **seconded**.

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

There was brief discussion regarding what documentation the Senate should receive. It was agreed that the changed *SR* language, the Memorandum of Understanding, and the proposal itself. The transcripts, applications, SACS language, example documentation of dual credit initiative and unused rules revisions will not be included.

2. <u>Old Business</u>

---

[1] Underline formatting denotes added text; strikethrough indicates deleted text.

d. (Revised) Proposed New Undergraduate Certificate in Global Studies
Guests Doug Slaymaker and Beth Goldstein shared the changes to the certificate with SC members. Slaymaker explained that the academic home of the Undergraduate Certificate in Global Studies will be the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and the faculty of record have been identified. A program review will be done in the fourth year.

There was discussion regarding the proposal, as well as additional changes. SC members asked for additional information regarding how the faculty members identified as the faculty record will be chosen or removed. It is not a fixed number, to offer flexibility to the group.

Debski commented that she had made a number of different comments about the description of the program itself – she did not see any changes regarding the issue of a minimum of six credits at the 300-level or above. Slaymaker explained that information was present in section II ("Certificate Description"). Debski clarified that she wanted that information clearly stated in the description of "Coursework," as well.

There was extensive discussion regarding the processing of the co-curricular component, specifically who will be evaluating the essays. SC members were adamant that the evaluation of student essays be performed by a faculty member. Brion summed up the sense of the SC by saying that even though the essay is a result of a co-curricular activity, it is a required component of the certificate – if a student does not complete the co-curricular essay the student will be denied the certificate. Therefore, the essay must be under academic jurisdiction.

SC members suggested changes[2] to the language, as follows:

b. Essays will be submitted via Blackboard; once the two essays have been accepted and evaluated by program faculty, acknowledgment will be noted on the student's APEX screen. Following the model provided both by UK's College of Arts and Sciences Passport program, as well as that of the University of Kansas' passport program, the essay requires reflection by the student and documents attendance; it will not be a graded piece of academic writing.

c. The staff administrator of the Certificate will initially be a staff member designated within the office of Undergraduate Studies. This administrator will work closely with the faculty Director of the Certificate on all aspects of the program, including tracking and evaluating the essays. At the point that student numbers require increased staff support, other options will be considered, such as a graduate assistant dedicated to this work.

Slaymaker and Barnes agreed to the changes.

The Chair noted that there was a **motion** on the floor to send the revised and modified new Undergraduate Certificate in Global Studies to the Senate with a positive recommendation. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

2. Old Business
e. President's Evaluation

_____

[2] Underline formatting denotes added text; strikethrough indicates deleted text.

The Chair commented that Board of Trustees Chair Britt Brockman inquired as to the status of the SC's study of possible metrics for evaluating President Capilouto. She asked Coyne and Wasilkowski to offer an update on their efforts. Coyne and Wasilkowski shared their questions and metrics with SC members.

There was discussion among SC members regarding what point scale (three-point, five-point, six-point etc.) to use. SC members offered Coyne and Wasilkowski a variety of suggestions, which they agreed to incorporate. Wasilkowski said the questions first needed to be established; the design will follow.

SC members then offered their opinions on various aspects of the recent Senate meeting.

The meeting was adjourned about 5:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Hollie I. Swanson,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Brion, Coyne, Davis, Debski, Grossman, McCormick, Swanson, Wasilkowski, Wilson, Wimberly and Wood.

Invited guests present: Lee Blonder, J. S. Butler, Lisa P. Collins, Randolph Hollingsworth, Davy Jones, Mark Kornbluh, Mike Mullen, Doug Slaymaker and Sharon Stewart.

Provost's Liaison present: Richard Greissman.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Saturday, February 24, 2011.