

Senate Council
February 25, 2008

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, February 25, 2008 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Kaveh A. Tagavi called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:04 pm. He noted that Swanson and Provost's Liaison Greissman had informed the Office of the Senate Council that they would be absent.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair noted that both sets of minutes had been sent out on Friday afternoon. He said that if any SC member had not had sufficient time to read them, the review of minutes could be postponed for a week. There were no objections.

The Chair asked if there were any changes to the minutes from January 28. There was one minor change, so the minutes from January 28 were approved as modified.

The Chair then moved to the next set of minutes, those from February 18. There being no changes, the minutes from February 18 were approved as distributed.

The Chair then suggested that all individuals present introduce themselves for the benefit of invited guests.

2. [Discussion on Health Care Colleges Student Professional Behavior Code](#)

The Chair offered a brief introduction regarding the Health Care Colleges Student Professional Behavior Code (Code). He also noted that Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Heidi Anderson was present to hear comments from SC members while the Code was still being revised.

Guest H. Anderson handed out a timeline of the efforts to revise the Code and went over some highlights. H. Anderson asked if either College of Pharmacy Associate Dean for Academic Affairs Bill Lubawy or College of Medicine Assistant Dean for Student Affairs Todd Cheever had anything to add. Guest Lubawy said that the Code had not been revised in some time. A few situations had arisen that could not be dealt with under the version currently in place; the revisions were intended to improve the overall document as well as deal with such situations. Guest Cheever said that there had been a lot of input regarding the Code and that any time revisions were made, the Code went back to bodies that had reviewed it previously for further deliberation.

The Chair added that the proposal would eventually return to the SC and that the Senate would need to officially approve it when it was completed.

Finkel said that along with some substantive comments, he had some grammatical comments that he would email to H. Anderson.

SC members engaged in a discussion regarding the proposed changes. Lubawy said that the primary changes dealt with: 1. an update to the list of communication devices and harassing behavior, since the current version did not address email, blogs, etc.; and 2. behaviors that occurred off campus, outside UK.

SC members discussed various aspects of the Code, including a possible different appeals process for students in the health care colleges; the release of student records; and the intent of the Code to hold students responsible for behavior that may take place off campus, but might be negatively viewed by the student's future (disciplinary area) accrediting or licensing agency. While other topics were touched on, SC members were primarily concerned about a lack of explicit language in the Code regarding the types of behavior that would be prohibited both on and off campus. Those taking part in the discussion were adamant that the Code not tread on students' rights to free speech, free congregation, etc.

After about 45 minutes, the Chair thanked H. Anderson, Cheever and Lubawy for attending. H. Anderson said that she welcomed further suggestions – they could be emailed to her.

3. [Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Physiology Training](#)

Randall stated that he was able to give background information on the proposed new certificate, since it came from his department. He added that he would abstain from voting on it during the SC meeting.

Randall said that like many departments in the College of Medicine, the focus in the Department of Physiology was very research oriented. When a graduate student entered a program of study, the student worked with a research mentor and also was required to publish – if the student picked up some competency in teaching, that was just an added benefit. Randall said that the proposed certificate would be a means for a student to demonstrate physiology teaching competency as well as provide a mechanism for a semi-formal program to focus on didactics.

Finkel asked about the lack of input from the College of Education (Education), since the graduate certificate would involve instruction. Randall replied that he was not aware of what Education courses would be applicable. The certificate was aimed at offering skills to teach general physiology – there was not much in the way of educational theory in the certificate. He went on to say that the student in the graduate certificate would have exposure to a seminar and practicum, both dealing with teaching medical sciences, and would have instruction on how to put together a syllabus, write an exam, etc. There would

also be an opportunity for the student to give a lecture and be critiqued by the faculty. Randall summed it up as very practical and applied.

In response to a question from Aken, Randall said that any student in a graduate program or even in post-baccalaureate status could enter into the graduate certificate, as long as the admission requirements were met.

Chappell expressed some concern that such a graduate certificate would encourage the blossoming of other such graduate certificates in disciplinary-specific teaching. He asked if Education had been involved with the deliberations.

Randall said that the only other such graduate certificate in Medicine was for students interested in teaching gross anatomy, a field for which there was a dearth of interested and trained individuals. He said the motivation was to develop a way for a student to teach a general course in physiology. Michael commented that the problem alluded to by Chappell was endemic – the university was in the business of training physicians, for example, not academicians to teach courses required to be a physician. He noted that the College of Law did not include any faculty member whose specialty was teaching law training.

After a few more comments, the Chair noted that it would be best to remove the word “program” from the graduate certificate paperwork, since it would not be a program. Randall agreed to that change. The Chair also expressed concern about the terms “teaching” and “certificate” being so close to each other in the title but had no remedy for it.

Finkel strongly suggested that someone in Education review the graduate certificate proposal prior to the proposal being sent to the Senate for final approval. The Chair said that he would do so.

Wood **moved** that the SC approve the proposed graduate certificate in physiology teaching with an effective date of spring 2008 and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation. Piascik **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with six in favor and two abstaining.

4. Ongoing Discussion on Gen Ed Reform

SC members engaged in a lively discussion regarding the document “Principles of a Revised General Education Curriculum for the University of Kentucky.” Wood had previously offered some suggested revisions for the document, and those changes were also discussed. SC members also discussed the appropriate manner to communicate the suggested revisions to Provost Subbaswamy since the Provost had previously asked to be afforded a chance to engage the SC if the SC was inclined to make changes to the document. The Chair clarified that if the Senate approved the principles, those principles would

then be sent to a joint task force, which would then begin the development of a new curriculum to be approved by the Senate in the future.

It was ultimately decided that Wood would revise her version further to accommodate comments made during the SC meeting and send it to the SC listserv. That document would then be sent to the Provost as quickly as possible to ensure that the Provost did not view the changes as extensive, since the SC had previously agreed not to make drastic changes to the principles without first involving the Provost.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh A. Tagavi,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Aken, D. Anderson, Finkel, Michael, Piascik, Randall, Tagavi, Wood and Yanarella.

Invited guests present: Heidi Anderson, Todd Cheever, Marcy Deaton and Bill Lubawy.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Friday, February 29, 2008.