

Senate Council
March 5, 2012

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, March 5, 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 3:02 pm.

1. Minutes from February 20 and February 27 and Announcements

The Chair had a few announcements for SC members.

- The term is ending for a Communications and Information Studies faculty member on the University Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities (UCAPP). The Chair suggested a replacement. There were no objections.
- The Chair announced that the University Marshall for the next year will be Sue Nokes (AG/Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering).

The Chair explained that she received an email today from Provost Kumble Subbaswamy asking for the SC's input on an academic matter – a decision needs to be made if there will be any special arrangements allowed campuswide for students whose families have been affected by the recent tornadoes in Kentucky. There was extensive discussion among SC members.

Grossman **moved** that the SC act on emergency basis on behalf of the University Senate to create one-time rule that if a student's home is in a county that has been declared disaster area by Governor Steve Beshear, and the student needs to be at home for clean-up, that student shall be granted an excused absence, so long as the student returns to begin classes by the Monday, March 19 (the Monday following spring break 2012). Debski **seconded**. There were additional suggestions for the language, including changing the return to classes date to end date to Monday, March 26, the Monday a week after spring break. Debski requested clarification as to whether volunteering to help strangers was as permissible as helping immediate family members. The Chair said she would draft language and send it to SC members for some quick edits. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Discussion on Proposed Changes to *Governing Regulations I C.3* ("Vision, Mission and Values")

The Chair offered a few introductory comments. The concept of shared governance requires that power is appropriately balanced and that all (i.e., faculty, administrators and Board of Trustees (Board) members) fully participate in the process. Wilson and Voro coming to the SC to inform on these issues and seek SC's input is an excellent example of active participation.

As faculty strive for appropriate balance of power, the Chair opined that the SC needs to be mindful that policies and procedures reflect the fact that they are written for the roles of certain positions, not for individuals that currently occupy these positions. In the day's discussion, Wilson and Voro will be discussing a current issue and will present a possible solution. The Chair asked SC members to be mindful of the short-term and long term consequences of any actions that we may take today, including any unintended consequences that need to be carefully considered. She asked Wilson to explain the matter more fully.

Wilson explained that the University's Vision, Mission and Values (*Governing Regulations I*) have tended to stay the same over time; it came as a surprise to him and Voro in preparation for the February Board of Trustees (Board) meeting that two values were removed. He offered some additional history. When the 2009 – 2014 Strategic Plan was presented to the Board on June 9, 2009, the Vision, Mission and Values language was not presented in track changes nor was it presented as a change to the Vision, Mission and Values (VMV) language in *Governing Regulation I (GR I)*. Wilson spoke with Everett McCorvey and Ernest Yanarella, both faculty trustees at the time, and neither of them remembered the language being presented as a change from current language. The minutes from that Board meeting include the following sentence, "...The values remain the same other than refining some language..." What makes the whole situation problematic for everyone is that the 2009 VMV language is only now being added to *GR I*.

He concluded by saying that the change to the language did not seem to be merely clerical and that both he and Voro would like to see the two Values that are slated to be removed ("Personal and institutional responsibility and accountability" and "A sense of community") be restored. SC members then engaged in discussion.

Anderson **moved** that the language for the Core Values included in the language in *Governing Regulations I* and 2009 – 2014 Strategic Plan restore the Values regarding and institutional responsibility and a sense of community. There was additional discussion on whether the actual language of the motion accomplished the intent. The motion **died** due to lack of a second.

Grossman **moved** that the Senate Council ask President Capilouto to forward to the Board of Trustees a request to amend the 2009 – 2014 Strategic Plan to include the Core Values of "Personal and institutional responsibility and accountability" and "A sense of community" and ensure that the amended *Governing Regulation I* language includes those two Core Values, also. Anderson **seconded**.

The Chair commented that she spoke with Vice President for Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness Heidi Anderson, who confirmed that changing the VMV at this time will require every college to change that language in individual strategic plans.

After additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The Chair asked if the Senate should also vote on the proposed change to *Governing Regulations I*. Wilson thought the Senate should vote on it, and there were no objections.

2. Discussion on Proposed Changes to *Governing Regulations IV C* ("The University Senate")

Guest Davy Jones, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), explained the proposed changes to *Governing Regulations IV*. Wilson and Voro requested a tweaking of the language to make it clear that the closure of degree programs was in the purview of the Senate, and the Board will only formally close a degree program upon the Senate's recommendation to do so.

Brion **moved** that the SC recommend to the Senate that it endorse the following proposed changes to *Governing Regulations IV*:

C. University Senate Functions

The University Senate is not assigned any management or administrative functions. The University Senate functions include the following:

1. Determine the broad academic policies of the University, including the similar academic policies that may be made necessary by governmental or accreditation agencies, and make rules to implement these policies.
2. Approve all new academic programs, ~~and~~ make final academic decisions on recommendations to changes of these programs, ~~and recommend the closing of degree-granting~~ approve closure of all academic programs, subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees.
3. Make final decisions for the University on curricula, courses, certificates and diplomas offered at the University, ~~and on the termination of academic programs.~~

Grossman **seconded**. After brief discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Old Business

b. A Brief History of the Graduation Writing Requirement (Discussion Only) - Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mike Mullen

The Chair commented that with the emails and conversations since the last SC meeting, regarding the history of and proposed changes to the Graduation Writing Requirement, she and others were more confused than ever. She invited Guests Mike Mullen, associate provost for undergraduate education, and Mark Kornbluh, dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, to explain the current situation to SC members. Chair Swanson apologized for the length of time that had elapsed between the submission of this proposal in late March, 2011 and its appearance to the SC. Given that the Admissions and Academic Standards committee already had a full slate at that time, she sent it to the committee when it was reformed in the fall.

There was a discussion among SC members, Mullen and Dean Kornbluh. SC members commented that there was considerable confusion between what much of Mullen and Kornbluh were saying as compared to what was told to SC members during the meeting on February 27. Below are some of the highlights.

- Some departments/programs are not participating in the GWR because the writing done in some disciplines, such as engineering, biology, etc. is not the kind of writing required by the GWR requirements. The GWR requirement is very specific as to the type and amount of writing that is required.
- The Graduation Writing Requirement (GWR) is not being routinely waived for students. However, students are receiving waivers so that writing intensive courses that have not been approved for the GWR can be used as credit for the GWR. The intent is to allow seniors who are otherwise ready to graduate to not be delayed by the lack of GWR courses.
- The process for approving courses for inclusion in the GWR has not gone away, but has changed under the purview of the Undergraduate Council to be more flexible for instructors.

- The proposal recommends that at least two of the three communication modalities (oral, written and visual) be addressed in the revised GWR (Communications Requirement in the Major, CRM), but there is no requirement that writing must be included.
- The GWR-CRM proposal places a heavy emphasis on the need for assessment, but is very short on details of assessment.
- The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) of Multimodal Communication Across the Curriculum will be able to assist instructors create and grade assignments that meet specific communication needs for different disciplines.
- It will be difficult to change from a very prescriptive requirement to one that is more flexible.
- There was once a strong push to have all introductory literature classes be approved for GWR, which unfairly burdened that department.
- Mullen and Kornbluh stated that ENG 203 and ENG 204 are still being offered by the Department of English.

Mullen said that the GWR-CRM proposal will be rewritten and submitted to the SC prior to the April or May Senate meeting.

5. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee - Andrew Hippisley, Chair

ii. Proposed New PhD in Gender and Women's Studies

Guest Andrew Hippisley, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), noted that the **motion** from the Senate's Academic Programs Committee was to recommend that the University Senate approve the establishment of the proposed new PhD in Gender and Women's Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences for submission to the Board of Trustees.

Hippisley explained the proposal to SC members. He noted that the SAPC has a specific charge so that "...in approving a new program, the Committee shall recommend a priority to indicate its importance and the immediacy with which it should be implemented." Due to the low number of expected students per year, the SAPC chose to give the program a low priority rating. Guest Patricia Cooper (AS/Gender and Women's Studies) offered information on the status of the Department of Gender and Women's Studies (GWS) and how the program expected to recruit the cream of the crop in terms of students, but would deliberately grow at a measured rate. There was extensive discussion. Cooper clarified that the proposed new Master's in GWS will be *en passant* – students will not be admitted directly into the master's program.

A **vote** was taken on the **motion** from the Senate's Academic Programs Committee to recommend that the University Senate approve the establishment of the proposed new PhD in Gender and Women's Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences for submission to the Board of Trustees. The motion **passed** with seven in favor, one opposed and one abstaining.

i. Proposed New MA in Gender and Women's Studies

Hippisley said that the **motion** from the Senate's Academic Programs Committee was to recommend that the University Senate approve the establishment of the proposed new Master of Arts in Gender and Women's Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences for submission to the Board of Trustees. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with seven in favor, one opposed and one abstaining.

Cooper thanked the SC for its consideration of the proposals and for SC members' efforts on behalf of faculty and faculty governance.

iv. Proposed New BSEd in STEM Education

Hippisley said that the **motion** from the SAPC was to recommend that the University Senate approve the establishment of the proposed new BSEd in STEM Education (in the Mathematics and Physics content areas) for submission to the Board of Trustees.

Hippisley explained the proposal, with the assistance of Guest Margaret Schroeder (ED/STEM Education). Schroeder clarified for SC members that the proposal is for a double major – STEM Education is the primary major while the secondary major is in one of the two content areas (Mathematics or Physics).

After additional discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** from the SAPC to recommend that the University Senate approve the establishment of the proposed new BSEd in STEM Education (in the Mathematics and Physics content areas) for submission to the Board of Trustees. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

iii. Proposed New Minor in Information Studies

Hippisley said that the **motion** from the SAPC was to recommend that the University Senate approve the establishment of the proposed new Minor in Information Studies for submission to the Board of Trustees. He and guest Lisa O'Conner (CIS/Library and Information Science) answered questions from SC members. After brief discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Wood commented that the matter of the minor being offered completely via distance learning was breaking new ground. Grossman said that he would be more concerned if it was major that was offered completely via distance learning.

b. Senate's Rules and Elections Committee - Davy Jones, Chair

i. SACS Comprehensive Standards on Coherence of Increasing Program Rigor

Guest Davy Jones, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, explained that the Southern Association for the Accreditation of Colleges and Schools (SACS) required language that explicitly illustrated increasing program rigor as one looks at undergraduate degrees, graduate certificates, master's degrees, doctoral degrees, etc. There was discussion among SC members about the best way to create and review such language.

After discussion, the Chair suggested that she draft a memo to the Undergraduate Council, Graduate Council, Health Care Colleges Council and the College of Law faculty council to ask that each body identify one individual to draft a paragraph or so explaining the specific rigor of programs within their purview. The language must be returned to SC by April 1. There were no objections.

6. Area and Advisory Committee Nominees

SC members discussed nominees for area committees, Senate advisory committees, the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees, the Research Conflict of Interest Committee and the University Appeals Board. Due to the time, SC members agreed to vet additional names via the SC listerv.

8. Tentative Senate Agenda for March 19, 2012

SC members discussed the tentative Senate agenda for March 19. SC members agreed to remove agenda item number six (“Informational Presentation on Graduation Writing Requirement and Draft Proposal for Communication Requirement in the Major (Discussion Only)”). A trustee report will be added to agenda item number three (“Officer and Other Reports”); Wilson will use that opportunity to explain the proposed changes to *Governing Regulations I* and *Governing Regulations IV*.

Wood **moved** to approve the tentative Senate agenda for March 19 as amended; Davis **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

1. Minutes from February 20 and February 27 and Announcements

Davis **moved** to approve the SC minutes from February 20 and February 27, 2012 as distributed. Grossman **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Hollie I. Swanson,
Senate Council Chair

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

Invited guests present: Margaret Bausch, Lee Blonder, J. S. Butler, Patricia Cooper, Marcy Deaton, Davy Jones, Mark Kornbluh, Mike Mullen, Lisa O’Conner and Ellen Riggle.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, March 8, 2012.