

Senate Council
November 24, 2008

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, November 24, 2008 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a voice vote unless indicated otherwise.

Chair David Randall called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:05 pm. Those present introduced themselves. The Chair noted that Piascik and Yanarella would be absent for the meeting. He shared with SC members that since the last meeting, he had approved the inclusion of an MS student in electrical engineering on UK's December 2008 degree list.

1. [Minutes from November 17 and Announcements](#)

Michael **moved** to approve the minutes from November 17. Swanson **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the minutes from November 17 were **approved** as distributed, without dissent.

2. [Name Change: Department of Diagnostic Radiology](#)

The Chair asked Michael Brooks, radiologist and residency program director, to offer information about the proposed name change to "Department of Radiology." Guest Brooks explained that it was a straightforward change and would bring UK's diagnostic radiology department into alignment with current practices and a national naming trend. There were no questions.

Chappell **moved** to approve the name change of the Department of Diagnostic Radiology to the Department of Radiology and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation, to be effective immediately. Aken **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** without dissent.

3. [New Graduate Certificate in Vocal Pedagogy](#)

The Chair invited Noemi Lugo from the Department of Music to explain the proposal. Wood then commented that the proposal indicated that the graduate certificate was primarily intended for students pursuing master's degrees in voice and choral conducting – Wood stated that graduate certificates were supposed to be directed toward students not in a degree program.

Guest Lugo noted that the version of the proposal in the handout was not the most current version. Mrs. Brothers confirmed that the version in the handout was what had been approved by the Graduate Council. After some additional discussion about other aspects pertaining to the proposal, it was determined that the proposal for a new graduate certificate in vocal pedagogy would need to return to the Graduate Council for review, since the version Lugo brought was different from what the Graduate Council approved.

4. [Name Change: Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology](#)

The Chair invited Fred Danner, department chair, to explain the proposal. Guest Danner was accompanied by the College of Education's interim dean, Rosetta Sandidge.

Danner went over the rationale for the proposal to change the department's name. The addition of the word "school" would better describe the department. Danner and Sandidge answered a variety of questions from SC members.

After discussion, Wood **moved** to approve the change in the name of the Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology to the Department of Educational, School and Counseling Psychology, and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation, effective immediately. Chappell **seconded**. There being no further comments, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** without dissent with seven in favor.

5. [New Graduate Certificate: Clinical and Translational Science](#)

The Chair invited Tom Kelly, from Behavioral Science, to share information about the proposed new graduate certificate. Guest Kelly explained the rationale and answered questions.

A variety of issues were raised by SC members; one of the thorniest involved a proposed requirement of a six-month research practicum. SC members were concerned that there was no mention of a specific course, no mention of whether or not the six-month's research was at full-time or part-time student status, and no mention of the number of associated credit hours.

The SC determined that the proposal for a new Graduate Certificate in Clinical and Translational Sciences should be returned to the department for revision. It was thought that a revised proposal might not need additional formal review by all the relevant councils – review by a council chair could be sufficient.

6. [Distance Learning Checklist](#)

The Chair asked Mrs. Brothers to offer SC members an overview of the Distance Learning Checklist. Mrs. Brothers explained that there had been a request from Connie Ray, vice president for institutional research, planning and effectiveness, to strengthen the review process for distance learning courses. A small group made up of (Senate) council chairs, staff from Distance Learning Programs and a few others looked at the SACS policy statement on distance education; the end result was a distance learning form to help faculty create distance learning courses. The intent was to shift the responsibility for appropriate distance learning considerations from the councils of the Senate to the department/faculty member proposing distance learning delivery.

Mrs. Brothers answered a variety of questions from SC members. She noted that the name of the document should be a "form," instead of a "checklist."

Anderson **moved** that the Senate Council approve the requirement that the Distance Learning Form be submitted with any course form requesting distance learning delivery and also to send this motion to the Senate with a positive recommendation. Chappell **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** without dissent. The Chair thanked Mrs. Brothers for her efforts in developing the form.

7. [University Senate Syllabi Standards](#)

The Chair again asked Mrs. Brothers to explain the standards document. Mrs. Brothers replied that in meetings and conversations with various people on campus, there was a complaint that different councils of the Senate (Graduate Council, Health Care Colleges Council and Undergraduate Council) seemed to have different syllabus requirements. Coincidentally, the small group that worked on the Distance Learning Form suggested that there be syllabus guidelines for distance learning courses; as a result, Mrs. Brothers put together one document of syllabi standards that was based upon the Academic Ombud's suggestions. In addition, the standards were sent to a variety of other people for input; a few suggestions that did not conflict with the Ombud's suggestions were also included. Mrs. Brothers answered a variety of questions.

Chappell **moved** to approve the syllabi standards as guidelines for the Senate's councils when approving course applications. Tagavi **seconded**. There was discussion regarding the motion; some SC members expressed concern that while the syllabi standards pertaining to distance learning should be a required component for distance learning course syllabi, other aspects were primarily guidelines.

Subsequently, Chappell **revised his motion** such that the syllabi standards pertaining to distance learning be moved to the distance learning form, that the remaining syllabi standards be used as guidelines for the Graduate Council, Health Care Colleges Council and the Undergraduate Council when approving course applications. Tagavi **agreed**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** without dissent.

8. [Gen Ed – Discussion on December Senate Meeting](#)

The Chair asked General Education Reform Steering Committee (GERSC) convener Susan Carvalho to offer a few comments. Guest Carvalho explained that GERSC made two small changes, both in LO#4, based on the November Senate discussion. There was brief discussion about this among SC members.

Two invited guests were present – David Bradshaw (Arts and Sciences/Philosophy) and Gretchen Starr-LeBeau (Arts and Sciences/History) – so the Chair suggested Bradshaw offer comments on the perspective of the Department of Philosophy. Guest Bradshaw expressed concern on behalf of the department regarding its ability to create a philosophy course that would meet the requirements of LO#3. The overall suggestion of the department was to change the requirement for LO#3 so that students would be required to take two of three offered courses, one of them being PHI 120, instead of taking a pair of courses. Carvalho noted that if students were allowed to pick two courses (types of courses) out of a possible three, it was very possible a student would not receive the requisite instruction in the areas required by the Design Principles. Bradshaw agreed with Tagavi in that there was no guarantee that a student would take a philosophy course – a student might choose the other two courses.

The Chair noted that although SC meetings were normally adjourned at 5 pm, he said discussion could continue until SC members had to leave. He asked Starr-LeBeau to make her comments. Guest Starr-

LeBeau began by thanking the SC for considering the concerns of the Department of History. She said that the primary concern was that the Curricular Framework for LO#4 referred to an analysis of “diversity” issues. She said that while diversity is indeed important, it was not the only requirement of citizenship. She asked that the phrase “rights and responsibilities” be added to the language so that it would encompass larger issues.

Discussion continued, and included comments on the composition of the as-yet-to-be-composed curricular teams , and also the possibility of suspending the rules at the December Senate meeting for the vote on the LO, so that the LO would have to be approved or rejected without option for substantive amendments.

Respectfully submitted by David Randall,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Aken, Anderson, Chappell, Ford, Michael, Randall, Swanson, Tagavi, and Wood.

Invited guests present: Michael Brooks, David Bradshaw, Fred Danner, Tom Kelly, Noemi Lugo, Joe Quinn, Rosetta Sandidge, Gretchen Staff-LeBeau.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Monday, January 5, 2009.