Senate Council
June 15, 2011

The Senate Council met in special session for its first summer "Advance" on Wednesday, June 15, 2011 at 9 am in 119 Student Center. 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) Advance to order at 9:13 am.

1. <u>Minutes from March 28, April 4, April 18, and May 2, 2011 an Announcements</u>
The Chair announced that Thelin was currently on sabbatical, and had resigned from the SC. Katherine McCormick (ED/Special Education and Rehabilitation Counseling) was an eligible candidate from the most recent SC election ranked the highest without being elected, and was willing and eligible to serve. In addition, Yanarella will become department chair on July 1, and Connie Wood agreed to serve out the remainder of his term – she attended the day's meeting as an invited guest. All those present introduced themselves. The Chair commented that a replacement for Nokes would be discussed later in the meeting.

SC members began talking about department chairs and voting rights, appointment process, etc. After brief discussion, SC members determined that the status of department chairs and directors of interdisciplinary centers should be discussed during the August Advance **[AI]**.

This led to a discussion about faculty councils, and whether or not the existence of a faculty council was required by either UK's *Governing Regulations* (*GR*) or *Administrative Regulations* (*AR*). Also discussed was the freedom of faculty members to run faculty council meetings without interference from the dean. The Chair suggested that as a part of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) accreditation efforts, she ask college deans' offices to submit information about faculty governance of their faculty council, and SC members concurred **[AI]**.

There were a variety of announcements.

- The Chair approved the retroactive inclusion of a Master of Arts in Philosophy student on the December 2010 degree list. The student was inadvertently omitted due to a clerical error on the part of the Graduate School.

- The Chair granted provisional approval for a change to the Minor in Art Studio.

- The Chair granted provisional approval for series of UK Core courses:

*Courses Approved by UC, pending minor syllabi updates*

1. CME 455
2. GEO 222
3. PHI 343
4. PS 101 - Approved as Change and DL on May 16.  But, GE separated.

UC Approved, Need to be Sent to SC:
1. PLS 104
2. UKC 100-109

3. UKC 110-119
4. UKC 120-129
5. UKC 130-139
6. UKC 140-149
7. UKC 150-159
8. UKC 160-169
9. UKC 170-179
10. UKC 180-189
11. UKC 190-199
12. UKC 300-309
13. UKC 310-319
14. UKC 320-329
15. UKC 330-339
16. UKC 340-349
17. UKC 350-359
18. UKC 360-369
19. UKC 370-379
20. UKC 380-389
21. UKC 390-399

*Courses approved by GEOC, but have not been approved by UC yet:*

1. A-H 105
2. ARC 314
3. CLA 191
4. ECO 101
5. ENG 191 (in course catalog as A&S 100, section 43)
6. GEO 221 (in course catalog as A&S 100, sections 28-33)
7. GLY 151 (in course catalog as A&S 100, sections 19-22)
8. HIS 104
9. PHY 231 & 241
10. PLS 103
11. PS 210
12. SOC/AAS 235

*Course approved by SC, but not Gen Ed approved, a Pre-GEOC course.*

1. GER 105 – New course approved by SC on 11/15/2010 - Pre IGEOC, no indication of GE

*At SC, not yet approved*

1. A-H 106 - Sharon sent to Sheila on 2/8/11 but left off Gen Ed forms. It was PRE-IGEOC APPROVED.
2. GLY 185 (in course catalog as A&S 100, sections 401-402)– Sharon sent to Sheila on 4/19/11 for Natural Science. The form was incorrect and should instead be Quantitative Foundations. Sharon, could you please make this adjustment and notify Sheila?
3. HIS 108 – Sent to SC on 5/16/11
4. HIS 109 – Sent to SC on 5/16/11
5. PSY 215 –Marked as approved May 16, Pre-IGEOC, not listed on transmittal as GE
6. SPA 208 – Sharon sent to SC on 4/19/11 and cc'd me. The document appears to be complete. Sheila has that this course was received by SC on 5/6/11. Not sure why the discrepancy?
7. TA 273 – (formerly TA 371). This course was sent to SC on 4/20/11 with course change forms and Gen Ed forms, files look complete.
8. TA 274 - (formerly TA 471). This course was sent to SC on 4/20/11 with course change forms and Gen Ed forms, files look complete.
9. WRD 111 – I have this recorded as UGC approved on 12/1/10 and that Sharon sent it to Sheila in December. CIS 110, 111, and WRD 110 are all approved as Gen Ed on April 11 transmittal. WRD 111 is same course as CIS 111, only difference is the prefix.

*Courses on the Books, Approved for GEN ED by PRE_IGEOC Vetting Teams:*

1. A-H 310
2. A-H 334
3. ANT 311
4. LAS 201
5. SOC 350

- The Chair offered provisional approval for a series of courses and programs, posted online on May 16 and May 18.

**May 16 Courses:**
ANT 242
CHE 105
CHE 111
CLS 120
CLS 822
CLS 835
CLS 836
CLS 843
CLS 844
CLS 848
CLS 856
CLS 860
CLS 881
CLS 882
CLS 883
CLS 884
CLS 885
CLS 890
CLS 895
HJS Courses
MLS 400
MLS 430
MLS 440
MLS 465
MLS 466
MLS 467
MLS 468
MLS 464
MLS 469
MLS 476
MFS 609
PHI 300
SPA 371

**May 18 Courses:**
A-E 685
A-H 101
A-H 106
A-H 628
A-S 380
AAD 150
AAD 202
AAD 302
CIS 110
CIS 111
EDC 533
EE 499
ENG 518
GEN 100
GEO 255
GEO 320
HIS 112
LIN 318
MA 111
MA 113
MA 137
MA 514
PT 686
TA 271
WRD 110

**May 18 Programs:**
Agriculture BS Programs
BA/BS Linguistics
BS Computer Science
MA Art Education
MA Middle School Education
BA Art Studio
BFA Art Studio
BA Arts Administration
BS Nursing, Second Degree Nursing Option

**May 16 Programs:**
Minor in Judaic Studies
PhD in Statistics
BHS in Clinical Laboratory Sciences

- The Chair announced the tentative date for the August Advance – Friday, August 5. At this Advance, SC members will establish goals for the upcoming year and charges for University Senate (Senate) committees, among other things.

The Chair asked Peek if he had any thoughts to offer on the Board of Trustees' Healthcare Committee Retreat or the Board of Trustees (Board) meeting the previous day. Peek offered an update to SC members and there was a brief discussion about the abysmal state of UK's brick and mortar facilities.

The Chair solicited a motion to approve the SC minutes from March 28, 2011, April 4, April 18, and May 2, 2011 as distributed. Grossman **moved** thusly. Wermeling **seconded**. There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

2. Old Business
a. Action Items
The Chair reported on the status of some Action Items (AI).

AI #5 – SC subset to examine and revise the description of the administrative coordinator's job duties with a view towards increasing compensation. (7/14/10): The Chair said that these efforts were still ongoing

AI #20 – Charge Senate's Academic Programs Committee with creating processes for substantive change issues (teach-out, contractual/consortium process, off-campus sites, how to reopen a suspended program). (8/23/10): This will carry forward to academic year (AY) 2011-12.

AI #31 - Ask the Provost to submit a statement of financial and administrative feasibility for proposals prior to the proposals being sent to cmte. (10/4/10): This is in progress, and will be incorporated into the new document handling system.

AI #36 – Send solicitation for Commencement Cmte Co-Chair to college associate deans. (10/18/10): The Chair reported that a number of solicitations from the Office of the Senate Council had failed to identify a faculty member willing to volunteer. Jeannine Blackwell, dean of the Graduate School and commencement organizer, suggested to the Chair that Ruth Beattie (AS/Biology) be allowed to serve as Commencement Committee co-chair. The Chair reported that she had not objected, and there were no objections from SC members.

SC members talked about past and ongoing faculty governance initiatives. Mrs. Brothers commented that there was insufficient staffing in the Office of the Senate Council (OSC) to carry out all the activities initiated by the SC. Wermeling said it was important to identify and examine the core functions of the OSC and determine what should be deferred or pushed down. The Chair commented that this would be partly discussed later in the meeting when SC members reviewed the next agenda item, "Status of Pending Courses - Final Report." The Chair commented that the report seemed to illustrate the need to push the responsibility for details on course forms back to the college or council, and away from the OSC.

Grossman opined that the SC has two major functions: 1. perform the business of the faculty; and 2. represent faculty to the administration. He said that the SC had not done much with the latter aspect

(represent faculty to the administration) but that it was increasing. In addition, the first component (perform the business of the faculty) had not gotten smaller, but rather was getting bigger. Performing the business of the faculty has been the focus of the SC for the past several years.

AI #46 – Discuss election of officers, specifically who is eligible to cast votes. (12/6/10); Solicit opinions from the Senate. (2/28/11): A second reading of this change is needed, and will be conducted during the September Senate meeting. Grossman expressed concern that incoming senators would not have sufficient background information on the proposal to be well informed when voting. It was determined that the issue would be discussed in new senator orientation, and that the Chair would also mention it in a welcome email to new senators.

[AI] #49 – Create a charge for a committee to review DL courses. (12/6/10): There was some discussion about this item and whether or not the SC could utilize a small distance learning (DL) workgroup that sprang from the Interim General Education Oversight Committee (IGEOC). There was general consensus that at least some of the small workgroup members would be invited to be members of a new ad hoc committee. SC members also discussed the need for guidance for faculty about, among other things, DL meeting patterns and appropriate methods to secure an exam in a DL course. Having an ex officio member from administration was also suggested.

Grossman **moved** that the SC form an ad hoc committee charged with formulating a document describing best practices with regard to distance learning practices, and that the membership of such a committee be determined by the SC Chair. Yanarella **seconded**. There was some discussion about the motion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed **[AI]**.

AI #57 – Look into creating a Senate committee on assessment. (1/31/11): The Chair asked if another ad hoc committee was in order. SC members discussed the merits of an ad hoc committee versus a standing Senate committee, the purpose of the committee (to involve faculty in an activity heretofore largely organized by administrators), and the varying assessment needs and methodologies for individual disciplines and colleges. SC members liked the idea of a standing Senate committee, fed by college assessment committees under the purview of the faculty councils. A standing committee could have general oversight, but also intervene if program faculty feel they are being assessed unfairly.

Grossman **moved** that the Senate establish an ad hoc committee on assessment whose charges are as follows: first, ask the college faculty councils to establish their own committee on assessment to work with administration to put into place assessment-related policies relevant to courses and programs in those colleges; second, work with the newly-formed college assessment committees on issues of governance to ensure the assessment process is fair and equitable for all involved; and third, report back to the full Senate at least once during an academic year. Yanarella **seconded**.

SC members discussed the motion at length, including what exactly would be assessed (learning assessment from a faculty perspective), membership, and the assessment principles to be utilized (from SACS or other accrediting bodies). The Chair suggested that the director of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness be invited to the SC's August Advance **[AI]**.

After a little while, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and two abstaining.

AI #66 - Develop metrics for faculty input into president's performance during summer retreats. (4/4/11): The Chair reminded SC members that Wasilkowski had been particularly interested in this issue. She suggested the SC address it at the August Advance, and there were no objections **[AI]**.

It was noted that the numbering on the Action Items list was off, and needed to be corrected.

[AI] # 67 - Offer ideas on the presidential search process, from the faculty perspective. (4/18/11): It was ultimately decided that the faculty members on the Presidential Search Committee (the Chair, Steiner and Lee Meyer (AG/Agricultural Economics)) will draft a report on their perceptions of the process, and also incorporate perspectives of other roughly similar universities that have recently undergone a presidential search **[AI]**. The Chair suggested that if the report was good enough, it could be submitted to one or two national higher education periodicals.

b. Update on Status of Pending Courses - Final Report
The Chair referred SC members to the final report on course approvals, and the associated spreadsheet of courses grouped by problem. The report was created by a temporary employee that was funded by the Office of the Provost for three months, through May 30. The Chair summarized by saying that of the 600 courses received in the OSC, 312 had problems that required the OSC to engage in additional communication with the contact person. The Chair wondered out loud why the OSC was spending its scarce resources on these types of issues.

Those present, including Mrs. Brothers, engaged in a lengthy discussion of the issue of course and program reviews. Grossman suggested that the report be circulated more widely, to help illustrate that the OSC was not slowing down the curricular approval process. Mrs. Brothers offered a recent anecdote about all three academic councils (Graduate Council, GC; Health Care Colleges Council, HCCC; and Undergraduate Council, UC) having approved a series of courses with "L" in the course number. Because course numbers cannot include random letters, Mrs. Brothers was then obliged to work with the proposing department to change all the invalid course number/letters, modify associated course change forms and prerequisites, and modify the program change form. That issue should have been dealt with at one of the academic councils, if not inside the college before being submitted to an academic council. Grossman suggested that Mrs. Brothers put together a checklist of the problems she encounters most often in reviewing curricular proposals, and disseminate that to colleges **[AI]**.

Among other aspects, SC members discussed the insufficient funding and staffing for the OSC, the primary duties and functions of the SC, and the need for academic councils to do a better job reviewing the clerical aspects of curricular proposals. It was ultimately decided that Mrs. Brothers will, for all future issues, return the particular proposal to the most recent reviewing council with explicit information on what is wrong and carbon copy the contact person. The contact person will be instructed to work with the appropriate council coordinator, and a revised, final version can then be sent back to the OSC. SC members were divided as to the merits of widely publishing the report on courses. The Chair will contact deans and academic council chairs to let them know that the OSC will be returning incomplete/incorrect forms to the reviewing council **[AI]**.

The Chair asked Mrs. Brothers to give an update on the ongoing efforts for a document handling system, and Mrs. Brothers did so. The probable need for an additional employee in the OSC was discussed again. It was recognized that a completely different and new document handling system may change the needs of the OSC. The Chair asked Mrs. Brothers to schedule a meeting with Provost Subbaswamy to share with him the ongoing issues and possible solutions for the curricular approval process **[AI]**.

3. Appointment of Senator to Serve Remainder of Nokes' Term (through December 2012)
SC members heard that there were no more "runners up" from the last SC election to call upon to fill the remainder of Nokes term, when she steps down from the SC on July 1 to assume the position of department chair of Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering. SC members discussed possible replacements from the Senate and concentrated on professors from Agriculture.

SC members agreed that so long as the Chair concentrated on full professors from Agriculture, she had the leeway to settle on a final senator to serve in the SC.

4. QEP-Topic Development Team (TDT) Membership
The Chair directed SC members to the proposed membership of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Topic Development Team (TDT) on communication across the curriculum, as well as the descriptions of the various subcommittees. SC members discussed the proposed membership. They commented that about half the membership was made up of staff and administrators, and there were not many scientists or engineers in the mix.

Grossman **moved** that the SC ask the organizers QEP Topic Development Team to add four more scientists/engineers be added to the proposed membership prior to SC endorsement, and increase the proportion of faculty members who do not hold the position of department chair or higher. McCormick **seconded**. It was agreed that the addition of new scientists/engineers could either be completely new members, or replacements for proposed members.

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

5. Overview of Faculty Meetings
The Chair explained that about three weeks prior to the Advance, President-elect Eli Capilouto called her and asked if she would organize about eight Faculty Meetings, with six to eight faculty members each, for small group discussions. President-elect Capilouto asked that the faculty be diverse in nature and represent the broad spectrum of campus. She said that almost 200 faculty were invited and about 50 attended the Faculty Meetings. The Chair attended a couple of the Faculty Meetings, but due to travel and other issues, Grossman and Blonder attended the remainder as hosts.

Blonder and Grossman offered their opinions on the Faculty Meetings, as did others present who also attended. There seemed to be a few topics that were discussed most frequently:
- Underfunding of teaching assistants and losing students to other universities.
- Status of women, probationary period extensions and inequities across campus with respect to use of the probationary period extensions.
- Lack of transparency and accountability from administrators.
- Value of Top 20 Business Plan.
- Abysmal state of brick and mortar facilities.
- The perceived state of undergraduate education lying in "the Valley of Death" (caught between Athletics and UK Healthcare).
- Department chairs.
- The "good old boys' network" in the College of Medicine.
- Salaries.
- Difficulty starting new and/or unique educational offerings.

SC members were happy with the discussions from the Faculty Meetings. With regard to President-elect Capilouto's questions and comments during the Meetings, SC members reported hearing only good things about the interactions between him and faculty members.

6. Recap - SC's Goals for 2010-11
SC members primarily concentrated on the goals that were ongoing, or that had not yet been met.

Grossman said that Goal 2b ("Improve communication between Senators and Home Departments/Colleges – Encourage senators to establish a mechanism to communicate with their college constituencies") still needed work. He said that when he does not take notes during the University Senate (Senate) meeting when he sends an update to send to Natural Sciences senators in the College of Arts and Sciences – he just gives a brief overview, and emphasizes things that might be of particular interest to his colleagues (e.g. new program in Arts and Sciences, change to/new campuswide regulation).

After additional discussion, the Chair said that she was planning on meeting with each college's faculty council in the fall. She said she would reinforce at those visits the need for each council to identify a senator to be responsible for communications **[AI]**.

After a few additional comments, SC members left for lunch around 12:15, and returned about 1:10.

8. Roundtable with Committee Chairs
John Rawls, Chair, Senate's Academic Facilities Committee
The Chair invited John Rawls, chair of the Senate's Academic Facilities Committee (SAFC), to begin the afternoon session by offering his thoughts on his committee's deliberations over the past year. Those present discussed the process of approval for capital projects, as well as setting priorities. Guest Rawls and SC members engaged in a discussion about UK's facilities for almost an hour. The Chair reiterated to Rawls that when he thought it was time to present something to the Senate, that he merely had to ask to be given time on a meeting agenda. Grossman suggested that the SAFC chair be included regularly in meetings of the Capital Planning Advisory Group, under the auspices of the Provost. SC members liked that idea, particularly the idea of having that individual report back to the Senate **[AI]**.

Wood commented that "academic merit" vs. "non-academic merit" was not easily measurable. She opined that creating metrics to use while reviewing capital planning requests would be helpful for faculty.

As Rawls prepared to depart, he asked SC members for guidance on SAFC activities. SC members were in agreement that a concentration on buildings should remain the primary charge for the SAFC. Rawls then said the SAFC will be conducting some site visits to buildings on campus, and asked the SC to let him know if the SAFC should delve into any other matter related to facilities. SC members related various anecdotes about the academic difficulties presented by a lack of appropriate facilities (wet and dry laboratories, computer labs, classroom space). Grossman suggested that the SAFC also look into UK's Physical Plant Division (PPD) and work order costs, overruns, and mistakes made by PPD for which the department is required to pay.

There was then a brief discussion about membership on the SAFC and other committees, as well as the ex officio members from administration. Mrs. Brothers suggested she send Rawls a list of returning

senators **[AI]** and he said he would gladly use it to begin soliciting members for the upcoming year. Wermeling supported the idea that there be a reciprocal policy of ex officio membership between committees of the faculty and the administration. The Chair noted that she petitioned to have the chair of the Senate's Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, Walter Ferrier, added to the Provost's University Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities and was successful, so there was precedent.

The Chair thanked Rawls, and he departed.

<u>Walter Ferrier - Chair, Academic Planning and Priorities Committee</u>
Guest Walter Ferrier shared his experiences during the year with the Senate's Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (SAPPC). He noted that there had been a clear intent for the SAPPC to emerge from many years of dormancy. However, there were several SAPPC members who never met, as well as a couple of other issues, that created barriers to a successful reemergence and efficacy. He added that one particular bone of contention was sentiment within the SAPPC that their input would not be taken seriously by the Provost. He said he was interested in working with the Senate's Academic Facilities Committee and in actively soliciting new senators as members for the SAPPC. Ferrier opined that the SAPPC should act as a listening post embedded in the faculty at large, and perhaps as an informational conduit and shaper and presenter of what faculty think UK's academic priorities should be. In response to Blonder, he confirmed that the SAPPC was down to about two or three members. He said that with respect to the functioning of the SAPPC, he found the past year to be particularly frustrating since his area of expertise is strategic planning.

There was some sentiment that while academic planning may not be occurring at the Senate level, it could very well be occurring at the micro level in programs and departments. Ferrier said that perhaps the SAPPC could function as venture capitalists – when entrepreneurial departments proposed a new program or certificate, perhaps the SAPPC could review those items. The Chair commented that during the Faculty Meetings, one recurring theme was that faculty members hesitated to act on good ideas, due to the long and sometimes confusing approval process. She suggested the SAPPC work on new types of programs. Ferrier replied in favor of that suggestion, saying that sometimes faculty and/or departments don't see a broader reach but the SAPPC could, for example, marry germination ideas from Finance and Pharmacy. The Chair said she would personally like to see some emphasis placed on matching graduating students to jobs that mesh with their educational training.

Grossman wondered about the SAPPC looking at the roles of centers and institutes and from an academic planning aspect, consider when a center or institute should be moved into a college. The Chair added that a related concern was when it was the right time to close a center or institute.

Ferrier suggested that the SAPPC work with the Stuckert Career Center regarding job placement for graduates. SC members also liked the idea of the SAPPC consulting with local business and K-12 leaders for input as to what might be missing from UK's graduates. Wermeling commented that he is often frustrated with students' problem solving abilities, or lack thereof. Other SC members agreed with Wermeling, and poor writing skills was another common disappointment.

The Chair suggested that the SAPPC look at areas on campus that prepare students very well for the job market, or offer an outstanding student experience, and showcase those efforts. Wood wondered if the core issue to be addressed was determining which things UK should be responsible for, and which things should be tackled by the regional universities or community colleges. The Chair suggested that Ferrier attend the Board of Trustees retreat in late August, to listen and watch. McCormick suggested that the

SAPPC look into remediation at UK and associated costs, as well as how well UK is serving the Commonwealth. Peek suggested looking into building relationships between UK and the community colleges. Those present commented that there was a unique opportunity to meet with a variety of newly-placed leaders: new Fayette County schools superintendent; new UK president; new Lexington mayor; and new president of the Council on Postsecondary Education.

Wermeling suggested that the SAPPC also look into meeting with the individuals running the local magnet schools; he opined that they held a lot of sway over their students' decisions on where to go to college.

The Chair suggested that Ferrier write up a possible charge for the SAPPC and share it with the SC for revisions, saying that she did not want to create a top-down charge for the SAPPC. Mrs. Brothers said she would also send Ferrier a list of returning senators **[AI]** for him to use in soliciting SAPPC members for 2011-12.

<u>Davy Jones, Chair, Senate's Rules and Elections Committee</u>
The Chair then turned to Guest Davy Jones, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC). Jones explained that the SREC had a few things on its radar.

There is talk of possible closings or mergers of departments and centers, but there is nothing in UK's regulations or rules about how the transfer of faculty takes place, nor about how the tenure and promotion process is affected for a faculty member whose home unit has changed. Jones asked and received from  input from the Senate's Advisory Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (SACAPT, comprised of the chairs of the area committees) into the promotion/tenure aspect. The Senate's Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure (SACPT) is also looking at the issue.

Next, the *Governing Regulations* state that college and departmental rules must be assessed for consistency with higher level rules, including the *Senate Rules* (*SR*). Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Heidi Anderson is doing the review of college and departmental rules, but is hesitant to check them for consistency with the *SR*. Jones said that he is working with her on a template for expeditiously checking if a college's or department's rules are consistent with the *SR*.

Grossman very briefly recapped the earlier discussion on faculty councils, and wondered if each college's set of rules ought to include language on the college's faculty council. After a bit of discussion, Jones reported that there are various places in the *GRs*, *ARs* and *SRs* that state a dean will consult with the college's faculty council. Grossman commented that the requirement that a faculty council exist within a college was explicit, but the role of a faculty council was not clear. Jones replied that Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Anderson was also working with him on developing a template guide on that aspect.

Another related issue the SREC is dealing with pertains to language in the *SR* about "significant reduction" of units, programs, etc. The problem is that "significant" is not defined anywhere, and words like "review" and "evaluate" are used In various college rules documents, but sometimes there is no clear statement on who in the college makes final college-level decision on the given aspect. Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Anderson is also working with Jones on that issue. Section 3 of the *SR, which* deals with proposals to establish or change academic programs and/or establish or change educational units that house academic programs, has not been revised since the omnibus *GR* changes in 2005. Hence, the procedures and criteria in Section 3 of the SR do not reflect the current *GR* policy that the

Senate has University-level approval authority over academic merit of academic programs, but only has an advisory vote on non-academic merit of infrastructure proposals to establish, change or abolish educational units.

Finally, the SREC, in conjunction with the Senate's Research Committee (SRC), the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC), and the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), have been working on updating Section 3 of the *SR*, for the above considerations, including the issue of interdisciplinary research centers and the kinds of education (that is other than courses and degree programs) that goes on in those centers.

Tom Kelly, Chair, Senate's Research Committee (SRC)
Kelly explained that the SRC had been looking at what the criteria should be for educational activities in multidisciplinary research centers (MDRCs). He said the SRC had boiled the issue down to one rather simple question: Should UK sponsor research activities that do not have an inherent educational benefit? For example, if national security research was being conducted, it was unlikely that the results could be shared. He thought it might be a policy issue to be addressed at the university level. Kelly added that the SRC believed that research should be educational, or should not be conducted at UK.

If one assumes that statement, then Kelly opined the SRC would assert that if one looks at the GRs associated with MDRC being designed specifically for research, then the Senate does not really need to see (in proposals for MDRCs) what the formal policies of the MDRC on its educational activities will be – it will inherently boil up from the educational benefits of research. That is not true at the post-doctoral level, though, i.e., the SRC supports the Senate having some guidelines for postdoctoral educational programs. For the specific "new MDRC with external funding" proposal moving through the approval process, the issue is how beneficial the research will be educationally, and that should be the criteria on which it is evaluated.

In response to a question from Wood, Jones explained that the *SR* in Section 3 has a subsection about proposing new degree programs or courses, but there is a hole In Section 3 in regard to proposals for new educational units, including new MDRCs – if an MDRC does not offer a course or degree, but will be educating post-doctoral students and fellows, what does the Senate need to see in the proposal to assess that there is an educational program going on that requires its own incubator, instead of living within a department or college? There are two categories of MDRC – educational and administrative, and SC members were discussing the educational type of MDRC.

It was understood that the various Senate committees working on this issue of updating *SR* Section 3 will be proposing some language in the fall on which the SC and Senate can deliberate.

Dan Wermeling, Chair, Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC)
Wermeling shared that when the SAPC reviewed a recent [as-yet unapproved] proposal for an MDRC, the proposal was reviewed as would any other, and the SAPC simply noted what was missing. He said that the proposal discussed educational delivery, but did not describe in detail what educational activities would be involved, making it difficult to assess the effectiveness of the educational content. Wermeling opined that having an application or form of some sort would be helpful, so that everyone knows exactly what is needed in a proposal for a new educational MDRC.

SC members agreed that the pending proposal should be vetted as thoroughly as possible in the fall, and not wait until formal language is approved by the Senate, whenever that may be.

SC members discussed the various aspects of MDRCs, and the Chair commented that some sort of decision should be made, since the scheduled time for adjournment had since passed. There was continued discussion, primarily between Wood and Jones, about whether the educational activity surrounding post-doctoral students and fellows to be conducted in newly proposed MDRCs was something the Senate needed to specifically examine and approve when the Senate receives proposals for new MDRCs. There was a sense among SC members that the discussion was not over, and also needed input from senators. Jones reiterated that to the extent that the academic merit of postdoctoral educational programs of MDRCs needs a University-level assessment of academic merit, the BoT in its 2005 changes to the GRs placed this responsibility with the University Senate. Jones said that the Senate must be the body deciding on educational criteria, not an administrator.

The meeting was adjourned about 3:20. [The Action Items are a part of the minutes, and are at the end.]

> Respectfully submitted by Hollie I. Swanson,
> Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Blonder, Grossman, Kelly, McCormick, Peek, Steiner, Swanson, Wermeling and Yanarella.

Invited guests present: Walter Ferrier, Davy Jones, John Rawls and Connie Wood.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, July 27, 2011.

| # | √ | Item | Responsibility | Completed |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5. | | SC subset to examine and revise the description of the administrative coordinator's job duties with a view towards increasing compensation. (7/14/10) | Grossman, Chair | |
| 20. | | Charge Senate's Academic Programs Committee with creating processes for substantive change issues (teach-out, contractual/consortium process, off-campus sites, how to reopen a suspended program). (8/23/10) | SC | |
| 31. | | Ask the Provost to submit a statement of financial and administrative feasibility for proposals prior to the proposals being sent to cmte. (10/4/10) | Document Handling System | |
| 40. | | Draft changes to *Senate Rule* language on Senate meeting attendance policies for review by SC. (8/30/10 & 11/15/10) | Chair, Steiner | |
| 42. | | Discuss with the Provost the method of allocating resources from distance learning courses. (11/15/10) | Chair | |
| 44. | | Create ad hoc committee (perhaps with VPR and Provost) to look at what constitutes an administrative or an educational unit, and if there is a continuum or a sharp difference. (11/22/10; 12/6/10) | Chair, SC | |
| 46. | √ | Discuss election of officers, specifically who is eligible to cast votes. (12/6/10); Solicit opinions from the Senate. (2/28/11) | SC | 1st reading 5/2011 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 48. | | Create a charge for a committee to review DL courses. (12/6/10) - ROLLED INTO [AI] 74. | Chair, SC | 06/2011 |
| 53. | | Investigate "Quality Matters" WRT distance learning courses. (1/10/11) | SC | |
| 57. | | Look into creating a Senate committee on assessment. (1/31/11) | SC | |
| 60. | | Deliberate during summer retreat(s) on what the SC's strategic vision is for academic facilities. (1/31/11) | SC | |
| 62. | | Determine how to address the issue of the proportionate representation of appointed Board of Trustees members. (2/7/11) | SC | |
| 63. | | Invite UofL employment ombud to SC meeting after joint ombud cmte visits the University of Cincinnati. (2/21/11) | Mrs. Brothers | |
| 66. | | Invite Associate Provost for Undergrad Ed to offer "State of Undergraduate Education" address to Senate. (2/21/11) | | |
| 67. | | Invite Associate Provost for Academic Affairs about distance learning courses. (2/21/2011) | Mrs. Brothers | |
| 69. | | Develop metrics for faculty input into president's performance during summer retreats. (4/4/11) ROLLED INTO [AI] 76 | SC | |
| 70. | | Offer ideas on the presidential search process, from the faculty perspective. (4/18/11) | SC | |
| 71. | | Invite Dean Kornbluh et al to present "A&S Wired" to the Senate in fall 2011. (5/2/11) | Mrs. Brothers | |
| 72. | | Discuss status of department chairs and directors of interdisciplinary centers during the August Advance. (6/15/11) | SC | |
| 73. | | Ask each college dean's office to submit information about their faculty council, as part of the SACS reaccreditation effort. (6/15/11) | Chair | |
| 74. | | Form an ad hoc committee charged with formulating a document describing best practices regarding distance learning practices, with membership of said cmte in the purview of the Chair. (6/15/11) | Chair | |
| 75. | √ | Invite director of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness to August "Advance." (6/15/11) | Mrs. Brothers | |
| 76. | | Develop metrics for faculty input into president's performance during August Advance. (6/15/11) | SC | |
| 77. | | Create checklist describing most common problems encountered during reviews of curricular proposals and disseminate to colleges. (6/15/11) | Mrs. Brothers | |
| 78. | | Contact deans and academic council chairs to let them know that incomplete/incorrect curricular approval forms will be returned (with detail on the problems) to the previous academic council for fixing. (6/15/11) | Chair | |
| 79. | √ | Schedule meeting for Chair to go over curricular approval issues with Provost and offer update on document handling system. (6/15/11) | Mrs. Brothers | |
| 80. | | Meet with each college's faculty council in the fall, and also reinforce the importance of identifying a senator to communicate with college faculty. (6/15/11) | Chair | |

| 81. | | Request that the chair of the Senate's Academic Facilities Cmte be invited to attend meetings of the Capital Planning Advisory Group. (6/15/11) | Chair | |
| 82. | | Send list of existing senators and list of new senators to chairs of Senate's Academic Facilities Committee and Senate's Academic Planning and Priorities Committee. (6/15/11) | Mrs. Brothers | |