

Senate Council Meeting
January 8, 2007

The Senate Council met at 3 pm on Monday, January 8, 2007 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were conducted via a show of hands unless otherwise indicated.

The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:08 pm. Those present introduced themselves. The Chair said that the question of whether or not Vice Chair Grabau served the remainder of his Senate Council (SC) term as a voting or nonvoting member would be resolved prior to the next meeting. In light of that information, the Vice Chair refrained from voting during the meeting.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The minutes from December 4 and the minutes from December 18 were approved as distributed. The Chair noted he had several announcements to share.

The Chair reminded SC members that at the last SC meeting, on December 18, Provost Subbaswamy attended and answered questions about the whitepaper he wrote on general education reform. At that meeting, he requested formal Senate comments, adding he hoped that all campus comments could be received by February 15. After the Provost left, SC members discussed how to offer such input; believing the February 12 Senate meeting date too late, SC members voted to hold a special January meeting on January 29 to dedicate to a discussion on general education reform and the whitepaper. The USP Steering Committee (USPRSC) membership, which included Grabau and Liaison Greissman, met and offered input in regard to the special meeting. The Chair asked Grabau to offer details.

Grabau explained that some USPRSC members expressed concern that a Senate discussion at such a preliminary stage could create a polarizing situation in which opinions could be so strongly voiced that it limited an engaged discussion. The Chair added that information about a special meeting had been posted to the Senate website in a few places, but that no official announcement had been made. Upon learning of the concern of some USPRSC members, the special meeting information was removed from the web. He asked SC members to offer opinions on the special meeting.

Lesnaw said that she remained in favor of holding a dedicated Senate meeting in which to discuss the whitepaper. She opined that a dedicated meeting would provide a forum in which the broadest opinions possible could be offered. Lesnaw said it would be constructive to know what colleagues across campus were thinking before taking further steps. The Chair said that there would be additional opportunities during Senate meetings to offer input on the general education reform initiative. Waiting a few months to offer input would allow the

USPRSC to offer more developed ideas. Lesnaw replied that she understood about additional opportunities but also believed that a broad spectrum of input early on would be of maximum benefit to the USPRSC.

Finkel offered an abbreviated timeline of general education reform activities from the General Education Reform and Assessment Committee (GERA) activities to the present. He said that the USPRSC would need as much information as it could get regarding reactions to the Provost's whitepaper. He seconded Lesnaw's assertion that a special meeting was necessary; any faculty input would be beneficial to USPRSC deliberations. Finkel acknowledged that vehement assertions of opinions might occur, but even that type of outburst would elucidate where faculties were in their thinking and what moved them. He said an early discussion in an environment that included campuswide representation made good sense.

Grabau shared additional information about the initial general education reform activities, including the self study by the University Studies Committee and the preliminary report by the External Review Committee on USP and its subsequent final report. He added that the GERA Committee attended approximately 14 consultations with faculty and other constituent groups and collated the information. The members of USPRSC made it clear that they would not object to a special meeting. The concern stemmed from a discussion the USP Self Study group had with Lou Swift about four years ago. Swift related that the very aspects of USP currently criticized were created due to compromises he was forced to make at the Senate level in order to appease various individuals and groups. [Swift was the chair of the committee that created the University Studies Program in the early 1980s.] Grabau explained that he was merely offering a full context for USPRSC concerns about a special meeting.

Lesnaw stated that the focus of GERA was less on "how to" and more on "should we" reform general education. As a participant at many of the GERA sessions, she said that the focus was not on how to implement a change. She said that if roadblocks were identified in the Senate, there would be more time to iron out differences if nothing were yet set in stone. The Chair thought that LEAP would not make an implementation plan, but rather how to create an implementation plan. Input would be requested from the Senate before charging another body to implement a change. He noted that there would be no polished plan to react to, but also drew SC members attention to the date of February 15 by which the Provost had requested Senate input. He asked if there were additional comments.

Finkel said that the February regular meeting would only follow the special meeting by a week or so. In response to Finkel, Mrs. Brothers said that there were three or four items already scheduled for the February meeting. The Chair said that there was time for 45 minutes or so of discussion should the topic be discussed at that date. Yanarella arrived at this time.

Greissman noted that he hesitated to offer comments, but that he thought the issue of general education reform was important enough to warrant a special meeting; he went on to say that he also supported the opinion that a January special meeting was premature. Greissman also said that the charge to the USPRSC was to come up with a framework for a general education program, not plan for a plan and that Provost Subbaswamy hoped that by summer faculty could begin to think about curricular development. Greissman expressed concern that a special meeting on January 29 would not give the USPRSC sufficient time to produce something of value around which a discussion could be held. The Chair asked Yanarella if he had a comment to make.

Yanarella (who co-chaired GERA) said that if the issue was to hold the special meeting or not, he thought it would be best to hold the special meeting on January 29. Even just apprising key faculty activists and representatives of the continued progress of general education reform was important enough for a special meeting. Yanarella stated that while there would be ample opportunity for faculty comments in the months ahead, he cautioned that the labors of the USPRSC should not be unmediated. The first phase of GERA's activities involved extensive and intensive solicitations of faculty input at colleges and with other constituency groups. Yanarella said that moving forward quickly should not short-circuit the opportunity for continuing faculty discussion.

The Chair asked if there were additional comments. He said that procedurally speaking, unless a motion was made to change the special meeting, the special meeting would go on as planned. He said information about the special meeting would go back onto the website and that senators would be emailed. In response to Grabau, Mrs. Brothers confirmed that the Auditorium was still reserved on the 29th.

Greissman asked if Provost Subbaswamy should attend the Senate meeting. After a brief discussion, it was decided that Provost Subbaswamy should be invited to present his whitepaper in a manner similar to his presentation of the whitepaper to the SC. After the presentation, the Chair should lead a discussion on the whitepaper and other matters pertaining to general education reform. In addition, USPRSC members should be invited and introduced, but not expected to make introductory comments. The Chair requested that Greissman let the Provost know of the discussion.

The Chair remembered that Wood had let the Office of the Senate Council know that she would be absent.

Randall asked the Chair allow a comment on the December 4 minutes. Hearing no objections, the Chair did so. Randall said that the two places that referred to the dates of the officer positions' terms (on page four of the minutes) should be

changed to read: "...the period June 1, 2006~~7~~ – May 30, 2007~~8~~." Hearing no objection, the Chair said the minutes would be changed accordingly.

The Chair noted that he had a few more announcements to make. He referred SC members to a question on clinical title series (CTS) faculty that was emailed to him from Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Heidi Anderson. She was not certain what the question¹ meant. The Chair asked if SC members recalled the reason for the question; there were many other good questions that could take its place if necessary.

Randall opined that, as a member of the College of Medicine (COM) faculty, it was not clear how their faculty would see the University Senate as relevant to their lives. He thought the question could pertain to how COM faculty see as their roles with respect to larger University Senate issues, as well as questioning how the Senate impacted the academic roles of COM faculty. The Chair confirmed that SC members approved editing the question for clarity. Aken suggested the language of "relevance of the University Senate to CTS faculty" be used. Lesnaw wondered if the issue was more about interplay between CTS faculty and academic issues, not necessarily issues of the Senate. She thought the question asked for the relevance of including CTS faculty in the Senate. Thelin thought that the question somehow wrongly implied the need to persuade CTS faculty of their importance.

Randall said that it had to do with the perception of CTS faculty and how they see the Senate as being relevant to them. Greissman opined that the question dealt with how CTS faculty would be represented in the Senate and Senate Council, in terms of membership.

The Chair said that he would send a copy of the minutes to Anderson on Tuesday to help explain the intent of the question. SC members concurred.

The Chair shared another announcement. He reminded SC members that recently, a course change from CHE 115 to CHE 111 & CHE 113 was approved due to lack of objection on SC and Senate web transmittals. There was no net change to the number of credits and the content of the split courses combined was nearly identical to the original course. There was an issue, though, with the large numbers of programs requiring CHE 115, which no longer exists. The Chair said that instead of requiring every such program to submit a program change form and go through all apparatuses of the Senate for approval, he was asking the SC for approval to send a memo to the Registrar to offer blanket approval for pertinent programs.

Lesnaw said it was possible that some programs could wish to only require one of the paired CHE courses. She wondered if anyone could explain the rationale

¹ "For colleges with large numbers of CTS faculty, what are their perspectives about the role of the college as it pertains to academic issues of the Senate?"

for the change. Grabau responded that the impetus was the theory that students could learn chemistry and other sciences more easily if given the opportunity to physically do something with the knowledge while learning about the topic in lecture format. The intent in the Department of Chemistry was to improve student learning and did not pertain to any bureaucratic or financial concern

In response to a request for clarification from Lesnaw, the Chair said that only programs that requested the change would be included in the blanket memo to the Registrar; nothing would be changed unless a request was made to do so. Grabau added that the changes to ENG 101 in the recent past were enacted globally throughout various programs, so a precedent for such action did exist.

Lesnaw **moved** that the Office of the Senate Council solicit requests from campus programs to be included in a memo to the Registrar offering approval for specific programs to change their program requirements from CHE 115 to CHE 111 and CHE 113. Yanarella **seconded**. There being no further discussion a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously. In response to Finkel, the Chair said that he would prefer to act on behalf of the Senate and not wait until mid-February to inform the Registrar, due to the looming Bulletin publishing deadline. SC members agreed that the Senate could be informed of the action at the February meeting.

The Chair moved to another announcement, that of an issue pertaining to grades transferred to UK from Bluegrass Community and Technical College (BCTC, formerly LCC, or Lexington Community College). The Chair said that he had asked for opinions on the matter over the SC listserv regarding extending the time period during which grades earned at BCTC would factor into a UK GPA, since some students were advised to take BCTC courses to raise their UK GPA, and that the comments on the listserv were unanimously in favor of such extension. The Chair said that he was officially informing the SC that he made a decision to allow one more semester during which grades transferred to UK would be factored into the UK GPA and factored toward commencement honors; he communicated the decision to Registrar Don Witt, Associate Registrar Jacquie Hager and Ombud Joel Lee. The Chair acknowledged that the approval by SC members of the extension included the sentiment that there would be no further extension.

The Chair said that the final announcement pertained to academic area advisory committees. The letter from President Todd requesting nominations for academic area advisory committees (AAAC) was received earlier in the day. Referring to the past year's late delivery of AAAC nominees, the Chair requested that SC members decide how to proceed. Due to recent departures, the SC Nominating Committee (SCNC) was down to one member. The Chair asked if SC members wanted to reconstitute and refresh the SCNC or if the Office of the Senate Council should contact faculty councils and senators for nominations, collate the

information and bring to the SC for approval. He asked for comments and suggestions.

Lesnaw thought it would be better for the Office to solicit and collate names. She suggested that department chairs also be queried. Piascik asked how the SCNC had performed the task in the past. The Chair replied that it was just a one-year old invention. Randall mentioned that it was an extraordinarily inefficient use of the SCNC chair's time, since that person spent quite a bit of time on the phone. Finkel asked how AAAC nominees were found in previous years. Yanarella replied that the Office had solicited names in rounds and then brought them to a SC meeting for approval.

The Chair commented that his own service on an AAAC was a very rewarding committee experience; he expressed disappointment that there had been problems in the past getting names of faculty members willing to serve in such a capacity. The Chair said that identifying individuals to serve on AAAC was one of the most important faculty governance duties; membership on AAAC is confined to those nominated by the Senate Council.

Tangentially, Randall wondered about the Chair and Vice Chair attending various colleges' faculty meetings. It would likely be more efficient than attending faculty council meetings and would be, at least for the College of Medicine (COM), a good opportunity to interact with faculty who were usually not involved in the University Senate (US). The Chair noted that he has attended the COM faculty council meeting, but none others. He was open to attending college faculty meetings.

Referring to how faculty were chosen for AAAC, Aken recalled that last year, because there was no Library faculty council in place, she and another senator reviewed names of faculty members across campus to offer as nominees. The Chair said that the Office of the Senate Council would contact faculty councils, department chairs and senators to solicit nominations. In response to Finkel, Mrs. Brothers shared that the deadline for nominations for AAAC to the Office of the President was in mid-February. She added that nominations for other administrative committees were due at the same time. The Chair explained that he had been asked about faculty membership on administrative committees such as the Parking Committee, etc. The Chair mentioned it to President Todd, which evidently resulted in the sentence inviting submissions to other university committees that was in the AAAC memo. The Chair said the Office of the Senate Council would move quickly to solicit nominations.

2. Academic Calendars

The Chair explained that the term "tentative" was reserved for calendars that had yet to be approved. Calendars without "tentative" had been approved previously as a "tentative" calendar.

Lesnaw **moved** to approve and send to the Senate with positive recommendations the following calendars: [2007-2008 Calendar](#); [2009-2010 Tentative Calendar](#); [2007-2008 Medicine Calendar](#); [2009-2010 Medicine Calendar, Tentative](#); [2007-2008 Law Calendar](#); [2009-2010 Law Calendar, Tentative](#); [2007-2008 Dentistry Calendar](#); and [2009-2010 Dentistry Calendar, Tentative](#). Randall **seconded**.

In response to Aken's question about the Winter Intersession (WI) not being in the list of calendars reviewed, Greissman said that the SC had stated it would not approve another trial of WI until receipt of a report on the WI was submitted to the SC. That did not, however, preclude an '07 – '08 WI.

A **vote** was taken on the motion, which **passed** unanimously.

4. KCTCS Candidates for Degrees

In response to Finkel, the Chair explained the reason for elected Faculty Senators reviewing the KCTCS (Kentucky Community and Technical College System) list of candidates for credentials for Bluegrass Community and Technical College (BCTC). When the community colleges were divorced from UK, students enrolled as of a certain date were authorized to receive a degree from UK. Because the diploma carries the UK name, it will be necessary to ensure the list is approved by UK's elected Faculty Senators. Grabau added that the KCTCS faculty governance process is not nearly as robust as that of UK's, so Davy Jones had, in the past, provided the list to BCTC faculty to review and ensure the list was correct.

Thelin **moved** to send the KCTCS list of candidates for credentials to the Senate. Lesnaw **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously. At this point, Yanarella departed.

Lesnaw asked if the Calendar Committee was any closer to pursuing an incorporation of the one-day fall break into the Thanksgiving break. The Chair said that Yanarella, the committee's chair, had promised a report to the SC by the latter half of February. Lesnaw urged SC members not to be swayed by various constituencies who were administratively opposed to a change to the academic calendar. If the change was academically sound, administrators would need to be accommodating.

4. Continuing Discussion on UK-LEAP (General Education Reform)

The Chair said that he was not sure what else should be discussed with regard to UK-LEAP, due to the extensive discussion earlier in the meeting. SC members agreed that the SC input requested by Provost Subbaswamy should come after the special January meeting. The Chair said that the SC meeting following the special Senate meeting would include a discussion on what input the SC should offer.

There being no further business to attend to, the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh Tagavi,
Senate Council Chair

Senate Council members present: Aken, Finkel, Grabau, Lesnaw, Piascik, Randall, Tagavi, Thelin, Yanarella.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, January 10, 2007.