

Senate Council
March 30, 2009

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, March 30, 2009 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. Those present introduced themselves. The Chair said that Anderson, Chappell and Tagavi reported their absence. The Chair added that there were no minutes ready for approval.

1. Announcements

The Chair explained that he wanted to offer a report on the issue of summer school. Regarding the specifics of the minimum number of enrolled students for summer school, the Chair thought it fair to say that while the number 14 is by no means cast in concrete (because a dean can negotiate that number with faculty), the policy will not change much. He said that that is where the issue would be left for now, and that he would not pursue the matter further unless the SC expressed an interest in doing so.

The day's meeting handout was available in two different formats– one version combined two pages onto one sheet of paper to save paper, while the other version remained with one page on one sheet. The Chair asked SC members to let him know if they preferred one page per sheet over the combined version.

The Chair said that, unless there were any objections, he was inclined to permit Mrs. Brothers to post web transmittals for the remainder of the spring 2009 semester for parallel 10-day SC and University Senate (Senate) review, instead of posting web transmittals for 10 days for SC review, and then for a subsequent 10 days for Senate review. There were no objections.

The Chair reminded SC members about the 2009 – 2014 Strategic Plan that had been emailed to them. The Provost had set April 3 as the deadline for receipt of comments, but was willing to entertain input if it was received shortly after the SC's April 6 meeting. Therefore, the 2009 – 2014 Strategic Plan would be on that day's agenda; SC members could choose to endorse it and notify the Senate, but at the least the matter would be discussed.

The proposal to change the foreign language requirement was currently with the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SA&ASC). Due to timing, the Senate would receive a summary of the proposal at the April Senate meeting, but since it would not be ready for formal action in April, the Senate could vote on it, and the rest of the Gen Ed proposal, during the May Senate meeting.

Yanarella commented that the proposal to change the foreign language proposal was at the same time an integral part of Gen Ed and also a separate item. He described the proposal as basically ratifying current admissions requirements for foreign language, in an alternate fashion. He added that the (Gen Ed) Learning Outcome #4 team spent some time during the summer looking into the matter and determined that the best approach was to leave the foreign language requirement as an admissions requirement, rather than a component of Gen Ed.

Provost's Liaison Greissman explained that Kentucky's state government authorized testing of students in high school to ascertain a level of competency, so it would be problematic for UK to continue to test students upon entrance to UK when some students may have taken foreign language courses years previously, in ninth or tenth grade.

Jensen said that the issue of foreign language had moved to secondary schools, and noted that if the foreign language requirement were added to Gen Ed, it would violate the Senate-approved mandate for a 30-credit-hour Gen Ed curriculum.

Finally, the Chair noted that there was a need for additional names to be put forward for the Biological Sciences Area Advisory Committee. SC members discussed possible individuals and decided upon a few persons whose names were to be forwarded to the Provost's office.

[2. Proposed New University Scholars Program: BS Mining Engineering and MS Mining Engineering](#)

The Chair invited College of Engineering's Associate Dean for Administration and Academic Affairs Rick Sweigard to explain the proposal, which he did.

Jensen **moved** to approve the proposal for a new University Scholars Program of a BS in Mining Engineering and an MS in Mining Engineering and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation, effective immediately. Aken **seconded**. Wood **offered a friendly amendment** to make it effective summer 2009, since it was too late in the semester to make changes, and both Jensen and Aken **agreed**.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to approve the proposal for a new University Scholars Program of a BS in Mining Engineering and an MS in Mining Engineering and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation, effective summer 2009. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

[3. Proposed Prefix Changes for College of Pharmacy Courses](#)

The Chair explained that the courses came forward as a minor change, but there was some hesitancy involved in changing course prefixes as a minor course change. Thus, he said the proposed changes were being presented to the SC for review.

After brief discussion, Steiner **moved** to approve the course change proposals included in the Pharmacy omnibus prefix proposal. Swanson **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

[4. New Department: Gender and Women's Studies](#)

The Chair invited Professor Susan Bordo and College of Arts and Sciences Dean Phil Harling to explain the proposal, which they did. SC members posed a variety of questions, all of which were satisfactorily answered by Guest Bordo and Guest Harling.

Wood **moved** to endorse the creation of a new Department of Gender and Women's Studies, effective July 1, 2009, and send the recommendation to the Senate with a positive recommendation. Yanarella **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. KCTCS March 2009 Candidates for Credentials

Yanarella **moved** to approve the March 2009 Candidates for Credentials and Jensen **seconded**. There was no discussion so a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. Discussion on Status of SGA Proposal Regarding Dead Week

There was brief discussion of the SGA's proposal regarding Dead Week. It was confirmed that the proposal would go to the Senate in April for a vote.

7. Changes to Governing Regulations VII

Provost's Liaison Greissman explained that the proposed changes to *Governing Regulations VII (GR VII)* were a confluence of a couple of activities. The first activity was that of the ad hoc *Administrative Regulations (AR)* group and their modifications to *AR II-1.0-1* and the need to codify those principles in the *GR* (striking requirement that the dean of the Graduate School must write letters for tenure and promotion dossiers, changing the section in the *AR* that refers to written evidence of excellence from "may" to "shall," and making consultation with the faculty mandatory).

Secondly, the change to *GR VII* was also based on the establishment in the *AR* of the minimum consultation required to adhere to "faculty consultation." The issue pertained to two forms of documentation of consultation – either individual letters from faculty (as is currently the case) or (or in addition to) a vote by the faculty, with the allowance of a minority opinion.

SC members engaged Greissman in a lengthy discussion about the details of the proposal, all of which were satisfactorily answered. Greissman made a final comment that Provost desired to have the endorsement of the SC before the proposal was submitted to the Boards of Trustees.

Wood **moved** to endorse the proposed changes to *Governing Regulations VII*. Piascik **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. Greissman thanked Davy Jones for his substantial effort in the revision process.

8. Proposed Suspension of Minor in Merchandising, Apparel and Textiles

The Chair invited Professor Vanessa Jackson to explain the proposal, which she did. Afterwards, she answered a few questions from SC members.

Aken **moved** to approve the suspension of the minor in Merchandising, Apparel and Textiles and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation. Steiner **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with seven in favor and one abstention.

9. Discussion on Implementation of Gen Ed

The Chair explained that during the May Senate meeting, senators could want information pertaining to how a new Gen Ed would be implemented, and what body or bodies would vet courses for inclusion.

Greissman suggested that one committee per curricular template seemed inordinately cumbersome, so perhaps there could be one vetting committee for each of the four templates encompassed in Learning Outcome #1, and then one vetting committee for each of the remaining three Learning Outcomes – a total of seven vetting committees. He wondered aloud about how the composition of the vetting committees would be accomplished (by appointment

or by election?) and what the makeup of each vetting committee could be – perhaps faculty in broad disciplinary orbits could be assigned to feed specific vetting committees.

Wood said that she basically agreed with Greissman’s comments, and suggested there should be a combination of disciplinary expertise as well as broader academic representation, such as the “outside members” currently involved in each curricular team. She also suggested there could be four vetting committees (one for each Learning Outcome) with each vetting committee having a sufficient number of members so that there could be subcommittees that report to the larger vetting committee.

Jensen wondered about including the curricular team conveners in the vetting committees for the sake of continuity. Yanarella wondered what would be required by the vetting committee – a form, a syllabus, or both – and whether there was a need for a body to which faculty could appeal if a course was rejected from inclusion in a new Gen Ed. Wood thought that the course vetting process should include more than a syllabus and that additional information, such as explanations of how the Learning Outcomes would be met, should be required.

Discussion continued, and the meeting was adjourned after 5 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Dave Randall,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Aken, Ford, Jensen, Piascik, Swanson, Kelly, Randall, Steiner, Wood and Yanarella.

Provost’s Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guests present: Susan Bordo, Phil Harling, Vanessa Jackson, Davy Jones, Joe Quinn, Kara Sutton and Rick Sweigard.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, April 16, 2009.