

Senate Council
May 13, 2013

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, May 13, 2103 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Lee X. Blonder called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:03 pm.

1. Minutes from April 16, 22, 29, 2013 and Announcements

The Chair announced that there were two changes to the April 22 minutes, regarding the name change to the School of Interior Design. There being no further corrections offered, the Chair pronounced the minutes from April 16, April 22 and April 29, 2013 as **approved by unanimous consent**.

Although Edwards was absent due to illness, he asked the Chair to let SC members know how much he appreciated the experience of working with SC members and the experience of shared governance in action.

The Chair reported that the Governing Regulations regarding nepotism were still being reviewed. Swanson offered a grammatical change from “an member” to “a member.” Grossman suggested a change to the language about employment of relatives of members of the Board of Trustees (Board) such that employment of a relative cannot be initiated while one is a member of the Board, as opposed to the current interpretation that no relative of a trustee can be employed at all while the person is a trustee. The Chair suggested that comments be sent to her. There was additional discussion among SC members about the employment of relatives of Board members.

There was a change in the reporting structure for the units that previously reported up through the position of vice president for commercialization and economic development – those units have largely remained intact, but now report to other, appropriate areas.

The Chair thanked Watt and Debski for their work on the graduate housing appeals committee – the Board will be approving a lease for apartment housing for graduate students who were displaced by the demolition of Cooperstown. SC members acknowledged Watt and Debski's contributions with a round of applause.

The Chair suggested that SC members go around the table and offer their opinions of the May 6 University Senate (Senate) meeting. Below are some of the comments. Not all comments were met with agreement

- The Senate meeting finished much sooner than was anticipated, based on the length of the agenda
- There needs to be better program coordination across and among colleges to prevent situations where a program is held up at the last minute due to insufficient communication among interested parties.
- It is curious that a question about a course was not resolved prior to approval of a program.

- Instances of duplication of effort may not be fixed with redundant reviews if there are assumptions that duplication was already investigated at a prior level of review.
- Contact between programs and departments should occur throughout the development and review process, not just at inception. Having a formal letter with a date, as opposed to a verbal assurance of communication, should be insisted upon in the future.
- This type of thing may occur more often with the implementation of a value-based funding model.
- The presentations were somewhat disappointing; they were not particularly illuminating or germane. The information was more or less a rehash of previous information.
- There used to be an annual presentation by the president in the fall and a bookend presentation by the provost in the spring – the recent upheaval in administration has created the appearance of a two-year gap.

Due to the presence of invited guests, the Chair suggested the agenda be rearranged; there were no objections.

2. Old Business

b. Proposed New BA/BS in Information Communication Technology - Update

The Chair invited Guests Will Buntin (CI/Library and Information Science) and Ken Calvert (EN/Computer Science, chair) to the table for the discussion. Buntin explained that at their discussion that morning, Calvert identified some confusion over the word “programming” – it was previously removed from the narrative but had remained on the new program form. The proposal for a new BA/BS in Information Communication Technology (ICT) has also been changed to recommend CS 115. In response to a comment from Calvert, Buntin further explained that additional language was added to clarify that the ICT degree will not work for positions that require computer science degrees.

The Chair recapped that the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) recommend to the SC and Senate vote to approve the proposed new BA/BS program: Information Communication Technology. On the Senate floor, there was a motion to return the proposal to the SAPC once the concerns about duplication were noted. Modifications have subsequently been made, but there have been no substantive changes. The Chair asked Hippisley, chair of the SAPC, to offer his opinion.

Hippisley said that the SAPC was satisfied before and after the Senate meeting with the proposal as it was presented to the Senate. He submitted the revised proposal to SAPC members via email earlier in the day. There has been insufficient time for all SAPC members to respond, but the responses received thus far recommend approval, again. There was one isolated comment that a student might not understand the difference between the programs in ICT and Computer Science. An idea about a joint degree between the two departments was intriguing, but may not be implementable, realistically. Buntin commented that the morning's discussion prompted comments about a commonality for students who do not want a pure computer science degree but might be more interested in more programming than what the ICT program involves. There were very preliminary comments about a degree that would be of interest to a student interested in the policy and regulation side of computer science, but without the actual programming skills. Calvert said it could include the problem-solving skills that CS does not cover, with perhaps less math than required by the Accreditation Board for

Engineering and Technology. It could be a future track in the program or an undergraduate certificate, but has not passed the preliminary discussion stage.

As a point of information, Wood asked why the proposal in front of the SC. The Chair responded that the SC has the authority to act on behalf of the Senate to approve the program and report back to the Senate in the fall. Part of the issue was that the two units (School of Library and Information Science and Department of Computer Science) had not talked and worked things out. If the SC feels that the issues were addressed satisfactorily and that the Senate would accept the proposal, the SC can act on behalf of the Senate and send the proposal to the Board of Trustees with a positive recommendation.

Swanson **moved** that the proposal move forward and be sent to the Board of Trustees with a positive recommendation. Christ **seconded**. Debski asked Buntin to explain the need for approval now, versus waiting until fall. There was extensive discussion. Although the program can be approved any time prior to February 2014 and still be within the window of approval set by the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE), students cannot be recruited until the Board of Trustees approves the proposed new program. This is driving the push to have the SC approve the program on behalf of the Senate. Without Senate approval, recruitment will be delayed substantially. Some SC members were adamantly opposed to the SC acting on behalf of the Senate with regards to a proposed new program, while others saw the motion to return to committee as being based on a concern that has since been successfully resolved.

After additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **failed** with one in favor and six opposed.

Grossman **moved** that the SC recommend that the Senate approve the revised BA/BS in Information Communication Technology in the School of Library and Information Science, in the College of Communication and Information. Brion **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The Chair said the proposal will go to the Senate in September for approval.

c. Proposed Changes to Senate Rules Regarding MOOCs: SR 3.3.0 ("Procedures for Processing Courses and Changes in Courses")

The Chair noted that a large group of people, primarily faculty but including administrators, met recently; they reviewed the proposed changes to *Senate Rules* regarding massively open online courses (MOOCs). The language was also reviewed by the chairs of the academic councils of the University Senate (Senate).

There were a few questions. Grossman asked for clarification of the phrase "portrayed as activities taken by an individual faculty member." He asked if "does not apply to activities taken by an individual faculty member" would also work, because his suggested language was less ambiguous.

The Chair suggested sending the proposed language to the Senate for review, with responses returned by August, for a vote in the Senate at the September 2013 Senate meeting. There were a variety of comments; the SC members who spoke thought such a review was unnecessary.

Grossman **moved** that the SC recommend to the Senate that the language in the proposal be incorporated into *Senate Rules 3.3.0* with the correction of "This rule does not apply to individual activities of a faculty member."

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

3. Proposed Changes to PharmD Admissions Criteria

The Chair explained that during the course of a separate review, Davy Jones, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), noticed a discrepancy between the current Bulletin and the *Senate Rules (SR)*. That precipitated some extensive research to track down the history. The College of Pharmacy faculty voted and a majority approved adoption of the current Bulletin admissions criteria. Guest Jones offered additional background information, saying that the *SR* contain admissions requirements for two programs in Pharmacy, although one of the degrees has not existed in 18 years. In 1995 the Senate voted to do away with the undergraduate Bachelor of Science degree in pharmacy, as well as tweak some admissions criteria for the PharmD. The *SR*, however, were not updated. Recent investigations by others ferreted out the 1995 actions.

Jones explained the current *SR* language for Pharmacy admissions to SC members. Section A involves language about the old BS degree that does not exist anymore, which needs to be deleted to make the *SR* compliant with the senate action in 1995. Regarding the language about admission to the PharmD, the *SR* text will be replaced by the Bulletin sentence beginning with, "A minimum of 70 credit hours...." That encompasses the Senate action from 1995. The next section of the obsolete *SR* should be a sentence (existing in the current Bulletin) on the number of students admitted being based upon availability of resources to support a quality program. Both sentences express virtually the same sentiment. The last change is to remove the current *SR* language and replace it with a sentence from current Bulletin language, about competitive admissions and considerations. Again, the proposed *SR* language (from the Bulletin) is very similar to the outdated *SR* language. Jones noted that the Senate had already approved the substantive changes, but not the revisions, which are not substantive. He said that the request was for the SC to direct the SREC to codify the necessary changes in the *SR*.

Grossman asked for clarification on what constitutes the minimum requirements for the PharmD, known as "prepharmacy course work." He objected to having a website listing specific courses that may or may not have been approved by the Senate. There was extensive discussion among SC members about which of two possible scenarios was appropriate: the prepharmacy course work in its entirety must be listed in the Bulletin as well as in the *SR*; or the prepharmacy coursework must be listed in its entirety in the Bulletin, with language in the *SR* referring the reader to the Bulletin for the specific list of courses. Jones commented that because the prepharmacy course work already existed in the Bulletin, the *SR* could reference that list of courses, instead of list the courses in the *SR*.

Brion **moved** that the SC recommend that the SREC codify the language as presented, with the addition of wording to the first new paragraph that directs readers to the Bulletin for the list of prepharmacy course work. Pienkowski **seconded**. Debski asked about the C grade or higher in all the prepharmacy coursework. Guest Kelly Smith (PH/Pharmacy Practice and Science) explained that the admissions process is holistic and considers a number of factors, not just GPA. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Senate Council's Ad Hoc Committee on Best Practices in Distance Learning

Guest Sharon Lock, chair of the SC's ad hoc committee on Best Practices in Distance Learning, thanked SC members for being put on the agenda so quickly. She referred back to their last visit with SC, when the topics included state authority for distance learning offerings, a process over which the SC and Senate have no control. She said Connie Baird, director of distance learning programs, and member of the committee, would give a brief presentation update to SC members regarding state authorizations. Lock added that another aspect of the day's discussion involved intellectual property rights and possible changes to UK's regulations. The Chair noted that Associate General Legal Counsel Marcy Deaton was present and could also participate in the discussion.

Guest Connie Baird offered a presentation to SC members and answered a variety of questions from SC members. After that, Guest Roger Brown (AG/Agricultural Economics, lecturer), another committee member, offered some comments about intellectual property rights as they pertain to distance learning activities. There was lively discussion among those present about intellectual property rights as they pertain to distance learning, as well as in general. The Chair suggested that a more thorough discussion could be had during the SC's June retreat. It was agreed that there needed to be much, much more discussion in various quarters before any overall policy decisions were made. Guest Deaton said she had started reviewing other universities' intellectual property policies for comparison's sake. The Chair thought work on the policy could continue over the summer, perhaps with a formal recommendation to the Regulation Review Committee in the fall.

2. Old Business

a. President's Evaluation by the Faculty – Survey Update

Wood offered SC members some basic information about the REDCAP survey, such as the number of respondents and how the statistics could be described. There were a variety of questions and comments from SC members during Wood's description of the survey results. She also explained how the narrative responses to open questions were collated. There was extensive discussion about what format the preliminary data should take when it is ultimately reported to senators. It was generally agreed that President Capilouto and Board of Trustees Chair E. Britt Brockman should receive a complete copy of the survey results at a meeting in the near future.

Brion **moved** that the SC authorize the Chair to have the survey verified and provide it to President Capilouto and Board of Trustees Chair E. Britt Brockman. Wood commented that it was important that the data not be summarized for those individuals, but rather the data in its entirety should be shared in the spirit of the SC's role in offering a faculty viewpoint for the Board of Trustees' formal evaluation of the President. Grossman **seconded**. There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Jones asked if the survey comprised the totality of the SC's input into the Board's evaluation of the President. Wilson opined that the survey information did not preclude offering additional input. The Chair was advised to offer the survey information in hard copy to the President and Board Chair.

5. Update on eCATS

Ms. Brothers offered an update on the electronic curricular approval tracking system, or eCATS. In summary, the staff in the Office of the Senate Council (OSC) recognize that eCATS has improved perception of the course approval process among users in colleges who are responsible for submitting and tracking courses. However, due to some issues with eCATS that almost exclusively affect staff in the OSC, there is a very high level of frustration within the office. For example, saving the PDF of a course proposal used to take 12 steps; saving the PDF of a course proposal now takes twice that much time. Unless some changes are enacted by the Information Technology individuals responsible for programming and project management, Ms. Brothers will recommend stopping the eCATS pilot and returning to the old process of emailing PDFs around campus.

6. SC June Retreat – Planning

The Chair said that information about the June retreat would be sent out closer to the date. SC members reviewed the possible agenda items and had no questions or comments.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:12 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Lee X. Blonder,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Blonder, Christ, Debski, Grossman, Hippisley, Pienkowski, Swanson, Wilson and Wood.

Invited guests present: Connie Baird, Roger Brown, Will Buntin, Ken Calvert, Marcy Deaton, Davy Jones and Kelly Smith.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, June 6, 2013.