

Senate Council
March 7, 2011

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm in 103 Main Building on Monday, March 7, 2011. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Immediate Past Chair Dave Randall (Chair Randall) called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:01 pm. Chair Randall explained that the Chair, Hollie I. Swanson, was out of town, as was Vice Chair Debra Anderson.

1. Minutes from February 21 and February 28 and Announcements

It was explained to SC members that the SC, during the February 21 meeting, approved the creation of a standing University Senate (Senate) committee on assessment, but the decision to send the action to the Senate was postponed until a charge was developed. During the SC meeting on February 28, the minutes from February 21 were not ready, and SC members heard the Chair describe an ad hoc assessment committee, made up jointly of faculty and staff, with some faculty identified by members of IGEOC (Interim General Education Oversight Committee). Mrs. Brothers explained that she assumed the SC intended the standing committee motion to be a long-term goal, and the ad hoc committee would be short term, and perhaps inform the charge for and/or morph into the standing Senate committee. SC members discussed the matter.

After some time, Chair Randall requested a motion. Wermeling **moved** that to approve the SC minutes from February 21, 2011 as distributed and Grossman **seconded**. There being no discussion, **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Grossman **moved** to approve the SC minutes from February 28, 2011 as distributed and Kirk **seconded**. There being no discussion, **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Chair Randall drew SC members' attention to the list of nominees for the Ombud Search Committee. After brief discussion, SC members opted to choose from the list of self-nominees, and identified two individuals to appoint to the committee.

Turning to the request from College of Arts and Sciences Dean Mark Kornbluh for provisional approval for about 25 courses to add distance learning (DL) delivery. Wermeling asked Mrs. Brothers to explain the review process she conducts, and she did so. Mrs. Brothers answered a variety of other questions from SC members, and commented that if the SC approved the request, she would like to review the proposals prior to their being presented to the Chair. When asked about workload and an additional individual, she stated that an additional employee would very likely improve the efficiency and timeliness of the curricular approval process.

Yanarella **moved** that the SC allow the Chair to offer provisional approval to the list of courses sent by Dean Kornbluh, and Steiner **seconded**.

SC members (and guests) offered the comments below, among others:

- Decreases in funding for positions in the Office of the Senate Council have impacted efficiency.

- Approving the request amounted to “kicking the can down the road” when it comes to the effectiveness or lack thereof of the current curricular approval process.
- If an electronic document handling system were to be successfully implemented, as well as a deadline by which items would be processed by a certain date, the process would be vastly improved. (Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mike Mullen, guest)
- While needing to be fixed, any errors identified after provisional approval was granted could be addressed afterwards without too much difficulty. (Provost’s Liaison Greissman)
- The Chair should communicate that the SC will not look kindly upon any future bulk requests for approval – movement through the curricular approval process should be considered when making plans.
- Some of the errors described (actual examples) could result in a significant change to the course, which faculty should weigh in on prior to approval.
- Offering provisional approval places a false priority on some courses, over other courses.

After about 20 minutes or so, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** that the SC allow the Chair to offer provisional approval to the list of courses sent by Dean Kornbluh. The motion **passed** with one opposed.

Wermeling **moved** that no further new items be offered provisional approval during the spring semester. Wasilkowski **seconded**. After brief discussion, Wermeling **amended his motion to move** that all future curricular proposals be reviewed in the order in which they are received. Wasilkowski **seconded** the amended motion.

SC members discussed the motion. Some spoke in favor of it, and a few were concerned that the motion improperly restricted the authority of the SC Chair. Afterwards, a **vote** was taken and the motion **failed** with three in favor and five opposed.

Wermeling **moved** that Mrs. Brothers report back to the SC in about six weeks on the status of courses received from the Undergraduate Council (UC) that have yet to be approved by the Senate, as well as the date the UC received the proposal, and the date the UC forwarded it to the Office of the Senate Council, ordered first by when the courses were received by the UC, and then by course prefix. Wasilkowski **seconded**.

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

Moving to other announcements, Chair Randall commented that a narrative description of Senate and trustee election eligibility was sent to the Office of the Senate Council by Davy Jones, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee. Chair Randall asked for a motion to approve its posting online.

Grossman **moved** that the narrative description of Senate and trustee election eligibility be posted on the Senate’s website, and Wermeling **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

2. Old Business

a. Action Items

Chair Randall suggested that, due to the time, unless someone wished to specifically discuss an action item, the SC move to the next agenda item. There were no objections.

3. Committee Reports

Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee - Alison Davis, Chair

a. Proposed New Grade Type, College of Pharmacy

Both Alison Davis and the contact person were unable to attend, so Wermeling explained the proposed new grade type within the College of Pharmacy (Pharmacy). In response to a question from Grossman, Mrs. Brothers explained that the proposed "pass with honors" grade was limited to Pharmacy practice experience courses. A few SC members asked questions, which Wermeling answered.

Wasilkowski **moved** to approve the proposed new grade type for Pharmacy practice experience courses in the College of Pharmacy, effective fall 2011. Kirk **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with seven in favor, one opposed and one abstention.

4. Proposed Changes to Administrative Regulations 6:10 ("Hazing")

Those present introduced themselves, including guests Keith Ellis (Assistant Dean of Students), David Lowe (Interfraternity Council), Todd Cox (Assistant Director of the Center for Student Involvement) and Marcy Deaton (Associate General Counsel).

Guests and SC members engaged in a lengthy discussion about the proposed changes to *Administrative Regulations 6:10* ("Hazing"). Among others, the concerns below were expressed.

- The language about what constitutes hazing is overly vague, and could be construed to mean anything done in the privacy of one's home.
- The mixing of criminal activities with non-criminal activities in the list of hazing examples is troublesome.
- Members of the University community should not be made complicit in hazing for failing to report an event.
- "Organizations" should specifically be added, even if organizations are made up of "individuals," which are listed.

It was evident that SC members were disinclined to endorse the language as currently proposed.

Due to the time, Chair Randall asked Deaton if the discussion on agenda item number five ("Proposed New *Administrative Regulation 1:6* ("Formulation and Issuance of University Regulations")) could be postponed, and she said that was acceptable.

7. Tentative Senate Agenda for March 21, 2011

SC members made the following changes to the tentative Senate agenda for March 21, 2011:

- Remove Parliamentary report.

- Move items 2f (“UAB Report – Joe Fink, UAB Hearing Officer”) and 2g (“UK Faculty Athletics Representative to the SEC and NCAA Report - Joe Fink”) to come after the August 2010 KCTCS Degree List.
- Move item number eight (“August 2010 KCTCS Candidate for Credentials”) to come immediately after Committee Reports.
- Remove item number six (“Proposed Changes to *Administrative Regulations 6:10* (“Hazing”)”).
- Remove item number seven (“Proposed New *Administrative Regulation 1:6* (“Formulation and Issuance of University Regulations”)”).

There being no further discussion, Grossman **moved** to approve the tentative Senate agenda for March 21, 2011 as amended, and Yanarella **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

8. QEP Topic - Deanna Sellnow and Diane Snow

Guests Deanna Sellnow (CIS/Communication) and Diane Snow (ME/Anatomy and Neurobiology) offered a brief presentation. At the end of their presentation, Grossman **moved** that the Senate Council endorse the chosen topic of MCXC (“multi-modal communication across the curriculum”) and Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. Senate Assessment Issues - Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education

Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mike Mullen explained ongoing assessment efforts on campus. He said that Gen Ed would allow for regular evaluation and assessment against rubrics. The rubrics will be developed by three-person teams for each of the four Learning Outcomes. Aside from the general need to assess Gen Ed, SACS (Southern Association for Colleges and Schools) has assessment criteria that must be met.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 pm. [The Action Items are part of the minutes, but fall at the end of the document.]

Respectfully submitted by Dave Randall,
Immediate Past Chair

SC members present: Blonder, Grossman, Kirk, Nokes, Peek, Randall, Steiner, Thelin, Wasilkowski, Wermeling and Yanarella.

Provost’s Liaison present: Greissman.

Guests: Todd Cox, Marcy Deaton, Keith Ellis, Mike Mullen, Catherine Seago

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Friday, March 25, 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	
24.		Review Senate meeting attendance policies. (8/30/10)	SC	
26.	√	Query VP IRPE Connie Ray about number of administrators at UK vs. benchmark institutions. (9/20/10)	Mrs. Brothers	02/2011
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)	Greissman/SC	
36.		Send solicitation for Commencement Cmte Co-Chair to college associate deans. (10/18/10)	Mrs. Brothers	
40.		Draft changes to <i>Senate Rule</i> 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	
48.		Create a charge for a committee to review DL courses. (12/6/10)	Chair, SC	
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	
59.		Invite Board of Trustees members and chair to April "State of Faculty Affairs" address. (1/31/11)	Mrs. Brothers / Chair	
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	
65.		Invite Associate Provost for Undergrad Ed to offer "State of Undergraduate Education" address to Senate. (2/21/11)		
66.		Invite Associate Provost for Academic Affairs about distance learning courses. (2/21/2011)	Mrs. Brothers	
65.	√	Query Connie Ray to explain use of CIP codes for courses and faculty. (2/28/11)	SC	02/2011