

University Senate
December 14, 2009

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, December 14, 2009. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a voice vote unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Dave Randall called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:02 pm. He noted that the court reporter would be absent.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair reminded senators to give their name and affiliation when speaking, to communicate with their constituencies, and respond to “web postings” and emails as appropriate.

The Chair noted that there were revisions to both the October 12 and November 9 minutes, which were primarily grammatical. In addition, one senator was removed from the list of those absent from the October Senate meeting.

Hayes **moved** that the amended minutes for October 12 and the amended minutes for November 9 be approved and Yost **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair reported that the Senate Council (SC) elected officers at its most recent meeting, for terms of June 1, 2010 through May 30, 2011. Hollie Swanson (ME/Molecular and Biomedical Pharmacology) was elected chair, and Debra Anderson (Nursing) was elected vice chair.

There were a couple of waivers to report. The Chair approved the inclusion of one graduate student to the December 2009 degree list, because the student was mistakenly made ineligible through a clerical error. The second also pertained to including another graduate student to the December 2009 degree list – the student was given incorrect information by the advisor.

There were a variety of announcements:

- The SC named various representatives to the other academic councils. Hollie Swanson will serve for the Graduate Council, Debra Anderson for the Health Care Colleges Council, and Shelly Steiner for the Undergraduate Council.
- The SC received and accepted a report outlining how to “reactivate” the Senate’s committees. The gist is that the SC will prepare charges for each Senate committee during its summer retreat. The SC will also ask the Provost to advise the SC on issues to which attention should be focused.
- UK’s degree list will be broken down by department next time, but it will take the form of a rough report, not the polished list usually sent to senators.
- Senators should request handouts prior to the time noted on the minutes/agenda email sent out on the Tuesday prior to the meeting.
- The 12/3 Senate transmittal comes down tonight – please review it.

- The voting round for SC elections began at noon and will run through noon on Friday. The Chair reported that he had already voted, and it was easy to do.
- Any senator interested in serving on the Work-Life supervisor of the year selection committee should email Mrs. Brothers (sbrother@uky.edu).
- The Chair offered many, many thanks to the departing SC members: Janet Ford (Social Work); Connie Wood (Arts & Sciences) and Jurgen Rohr (Pharmacy). Senators gave them a round of applause.

2. New Graduate Certificate in Vocal Pedagogy

The Chair invited Professor Cecilia Wang to explain the proposal. Guest Wang said that the proposed new graduate certificate would help many students to learn the more scientific aspects of vocal pedagogy. Many were looking forward to its approval. The Chair noted that all the day's proposals came with positive recommendations from the SC.

Estus **moved** to approve that the Senate approve the Graduate Certificate in Vocal Pedagogy, effective fall 2009. Denison **seconded**. There being no questions or discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Informational Presentation on Center for Applied Energy Research – Rodney Andrews, Director

In keeping with the practice of introducing the Senate to lesser known aspects of UK, the Chair welcomed the director of the Center for Applied Energy Research, Rodney Andrews. Guest Andrews then gave senators a detailed presentation. There were no questions from senators after his presentation.

4. Motion to Waive Senate Rules 1.2.3 (requires receipt of meeting materials six days in advance of the meeting)

The Chair explained that the motion was necessary to consider the report on the vetting teams, since the information was not available to senators six days prior to the meeting. Some vetting teams did not complete their deliberations until the end of the previous week.

Wood **moved** that the Senate move to waive *Senate Rules 1.2.3* for the December 14, 2009 Senate meeting and Mendiondo **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Vetting Teams' Report

The Chair invited Mike Mullen, associate provost for undergraduate education, to share information on the vetting teams' report. Mullen recalled that there was a process for nominations laid out, followed by the Senate election (after a campuswide solicitation for nominees). After the Senate vote, the SC composed the remainder of the vetting teams (VT). One outcome of the composition process was that the process was somewhat behind – the first VT meeting did not occur until November 9.

Mullen explained that the information shared during the day was based on what was agreed to be presented to the Senate, with outcomes, at this particular point. He said the Senate was being asked to grant permission to move forward with a pilot Gen Ed offering in the spring. He referred senators to the single sheet of paper which listed a number of courses to be taught in the spring semester. He said that

60 course proposals were submitted during the previous summer; some were brand new and some were revisions of existing courses. Twenty-two of the courses were ready to be reviewed this fall. He noted that he received a final report from the VT responsible for the courses in Inquiry the Social Sciences – the VT tentatively approved all the listed Social Sciences courses. There were still a few course reviews in progress, although the expectation was that they would also be approved.

The twenty-four courses were placed in the Schedule of Classes during the fall to have them available to students during priority registration for the spring semester. Also on the handout was the USP equivalent for each course; Mullen explained that offering equivalent USP credit was the carrot to entice students into the courses.

Mullen said that there was a meeting next Friday of the VT chairs, himself and the Chair. In addition to looking at courses in relation to learning outcomes, the VT were also asked to look at the vetting process, including composition, and how it could be improved. Additional reports from the VT will come in after that meeting. Subsequent to that, the recommendations and the status of the entire 60 courses will be given to senators to review in advance of the February Senate meeting.

Regarding process, Mullen suggested that new and revised courses proposed as possible Gen Ed courses also come to the Undergraduate Council for review. He noted that members of the UC were informed that the number of spring meetings would be roughly doubled. There was also a need to reaffirm that basic structure, particularly that of syllabi, should be adhered to. Faculty members should be having discussions with their chairs and deans about resources and class sizes. There are other discussions to be had – Mullen said that Information Technology had already been asking about support systems for Gen Ed courses. Finally, Gen Ed courses should be owned by the faculty of the department, not by individual faculty. Mullen said he was happy to answer questions about the recommendations.

Swanson asked about the last bullet point, particularly “provide evidence that courses are departmentally rather than individually-owned.” Mullen opined that issue may be taken care of when the courses go through the formal approval process. For example, some courses submitted to the VT were not submitted to the faculty member’s department. Mullen said that everyone needed to talk to everyone about the courses.

Janacek asked about the next phase and how to submit courses. Mullen encouraged faculty members with an idea for a course offering to run it through their respective colleges’ approval process and then send it on to the UC and the VT. Janacek then followed up with a question about class size and who would determine it. Mullen replied that one of the overriding concerns of Gen Ed is for students to interact with the course material; there was a desire to avoid classes with 200 to 300 students. The goal was 75 to 125 students per class, with break-out sessions for smaller group work. That issue, then, leads to resource needs, so however a class is configured, there must be an opportunity for students to be engaged with material.

Lee commented on the need to look at the portfolio of class sizes and determining the capacity for launching Gen Ed. Dean Kornbluh commented that in the College of Arts and Sciences, there will be meetings with all department chairs within the next six weeks to look at the issue of numbers of seats for courses. At the end of January, there will be estimates on the numbers of seats in each area and costs. Jensen asked if other colleges were doing the same. Mullen said that they were certainly being asked to do so, saying that there was a wide representation of colleges, but that Arts and Sciences

would be the largest contributor. Jensen asked about colleges developing a resource plan and Mullen replied that he and others would work with deans to ensure everyone had a handle on resource issues.

Janacek asked a question about double-dipping. He said that his perception was that the course must satisfy Gen Ed requirements, but could also be used for a degree's major requirements if so desired by the program. Mullen agreed, but said that first and foremost the course must meet the requirements set forth in the course templates and Learning Outcomes. If those conditions are met first, then it is okay for the major to use it if it makes sense. Mullen said that his take on it flowed from Design Principle 3, which talked about Gen Ed reaching into the major. He said he would like to avoid a "pick one of these three for Gen Ed credit" types of scenarios.

The Chair noted that the next step was to approve the courses for pilot presentation during the spring. Grossman **moved** that the Senate accept the courses as listed for inclusion in the spring 2010 General Education Pilot, unless a course is subsequently not approved as meeting General Education Course Template outcomes. Anderson **seconded**.

Lesnaw noted that some of the courses were provisionally approved based on revisions, and in some cases were based on substantial revisions. She wondered who would take responsibility for ensuring that the revisions had been made. Mullen said that he would, and that he would make sure the courses returned to the VT. Lesnaw opined that it had been a wonderful process, full of great creativity. She also asked that what senators were to vote on be clarified. Mullen responded that he thought it implicit in the motion, and that some approvals were provisional. He said he would ensure that those faculty offering courses for review by the VT received comments from the VT.

Grossman **amended his motion** to add "final" before "approval." Anderson **agreed**. Wood asked Mullen to clarify that the Senate was offering temporary approval, only valid until the full vetting process was put into place. Mullen agreed, and said that if for any reason a course was not approved (even though it would be taught, since students had already enrolled in the classes listed), it will be excluded from the Gen Ed assessment process. Wood added that the approval of the Senate would allow the courses to be offered during the spring 2010 semester, and offer credit for the University Studies Program (USP).

Hayes expressed concern that if she voted to approve the 24 listed courses, she would also be condemning the approximately 40 courses that did not appear on the list. Mullen clarified that the process of reviewing courses was late in getting started, and that he alerted VT that their priority for reviewing courses should be those that were to be offered for spring. Of the 60 submitted, the ones listed for senators were ones that the faculty member said could be prepared and taught in spring 2010. In response to a follow-up question from Hayes, Mullen said that of the 60 courses submitted by faculty, only 24 courses could be taught in the spring. The remainder of the submitted courses will be reviewed in the spring for a fall pilot. Prats asked about the courses being listed as USP courses and wondered if just the descriptions were the only thing that was new. Mullen replied that the courses were being offered as special topics courses in USP, but that the courses would have to be reapproved through the typical process to give them new prefixes and numbers.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion to that the Senate accept the courses as listed for inclusion in the spring 2010 General Education Pilot pending final approval of the vetting teams, unless a course is subsequently not approved as meeting General Education Course Template outcomes. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. New University Scholars Program – Georgetown College Baccalaureate Degree in Economics and MS Agricultural Economics

The Chair invited Mullen to explain the proposal. Noting his previous position in the College of Agriculture (AG), Mullen explained that about a year and a half ago, the Provost from Georgetown College (Georgetown) and other student affairs individuals sat down with Mullen and others from UK. The common tie at that time was AG's then-new Equine Science and Management degree and Georgetown's extracurricular equine activities and a joint desire to develop commonalities. The proposed University Scholars Program involves 12 credit hours the student can use toward their baccalaureate Economics degree and the MS in Agricultural Economics. Georgetown also has a similar program in place with the Martin School of Public Policy. Mullen added that it would result in a different stream of students coming into the MS in Agricultural Economics.

Blackwell **moved** that the Senate approve the University Scholars Program comprised of a Baccalaureate Degree in Economics from Georgetown College and a UK master's degree in Agricultural Economics, effective spring 2010 and Jensen **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed**, with none opposed.

8. Academic Calendars

Snow **moved** to approve the 2010 - 2011 Calendar; 2012 - 2013 Calendar, Tentative; 2010 – 2011 Dentistry; 2012 - 2013 Dentistry, Tentative; Fall 2010 Law; Spring 2011 Law; Summer 2011 Law; Fall 2012 Law, Tentative; Spring 2013 Law, Tentative; Summer 2013 Law, Tentative; and 2010 - 2011 Medicine Calendars as presented. Wermeling **seconded**.

Grossman asked the Chair to comment on the recent Kentucky Kernel article on changes to the academic calendar. The Chair replied that the Student Government Association (SGA) representatives were working on a revision to the calendar, which would basically split finals week. Acknowledging that he had yet to see the proposal, the Chair guessed that under that proposal, finals week would begin on a Thursday and finish the following week, allowing a true reading period. This would involve students returning to campus a week earlier, which could include some corresponding financial costs. He said that he let the student leaders of the proposal know that he could not support any decrease in teaching days, and was told that the proposal did not decrease teaching days. The Chair said that there were two other calendar proposals pending, so when the SGA proposal arrived, it was likely that an ad hoc committee would be convened to address all three proposals. The Kernel made it sound like a done deal, perhaps because SGA President Ryan Smith mentioned it at the Board of Trustees meeting, but the Chair opined that the Kernel misinterpreted Smith's comments.

Meier asked if the calendars for 2011 - 2012 should also be listed. Mrs. Brothers explained that the set of calendars presented to the Senate always were a year apart, and that the "missing" year series was approved by the Senate during the previous academic year.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

8. Informational Presentation on the Department of Information Technology

Vince Kellen, chief information officer for Information Technology, offered a presentation to senators about Information Technology (IT). Afterwards, Guest Kellen answered a variety of questions from senators.

Viele asked about concerns pertaining to UK's email system. He said it was fairly limited and that many faculty were using a system other than UK's. Kellen replied he hoped that by summer, the student email side would be outsourced and hoped for a parallel outsourcing of employee email after ensuring there were no legal, privacy, etc. issues. He said that from a technology standpoint it was a no-brainer, but that there were issues about potentially giving up rights, or giving up security.

Connors asked about how IT resources were apportioned, and how departments could find out about new resources. Kellen replied that IT budgets seemed to be an accident of history in many areas and that there was a lack of central planning for allocation of resources. He said he did not want to get involved in how any one particular unit/college allocated their funds, but that he was meeting with IT folks from areas across campus to help get information out.

W. Smith said that employees in his area experienced extensive wait times for student records information through SAP. Kellen asked that W. Smith send him an email with details about the problem. He said that type of information would help him identify solutions.

Swanson asked if it was cost-effective to lease computers. Kellen replied that from a purely financial standpoint, there was not a financial argument either for or against leasing, but said that one aspect he liked about leasing is that it tended to be put in recurring budgets.

Miller asked about Kellen's previous comments about Blackboard and wondered if there was a movement toward a different academic platform. Kellen said that it was important for faculty to guide any search for another software package, although Blackboard had evolved to the point where it owned many of the vendors offering academic software systems. He said there was a lot of diversity in teaching and that faculty should not feel shy about reviewing alternatives – thinking is free, and does not require implementation. He noted that such systems should be reviewed every two years.

10. Revisions to Faculty Temporary Disability Leave (TDL) Policy (for endorsement)

Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Heidi Anderson introduced Mary Ferlan (director, Human Resources Operations) and Joey Payne (director, Employee Benefits and Self-funded Plans) and offered some background for the change to the temporary disability leave (TDL) policy. She explained that the policy was brought to her attention at the end of the spring 2009 semester – its most recent revision dated from 1997, and was rife with references to the chancellor system. She asked Payne and Ferlan to help with revisions to the language pertaining to a change to the provost system, along with updating it as a result of new federal and state laws.

In fall 2009, H. Anderson said that she put the policy out for review, and learned from Davy Jones that the policy only ever pertained to the medical center and was never codified for the rest of campus. As a result, she engaged the SC in deliberations to ensure needs were understood and the policy was equitable and clear. There were three key changes: 1. a preface was added to explain the purpose of the document; 2. language pertaining to the chancellor system was replaced with provost-system terminology; and 3. Insertions related to family medical leave as a result of federal changes.

H. Anderson noted that unlike staff employees, faculty employees' do not accrue TDL leave time, although each college uses some alert to handle teaching and other obligations. However, for both staff and faculty, if someone's illness led to long-term disability, it must be documented in order to grant disability benefits.

Starr-LeBeau asked for clarification on the child-bearing leave, saying that it differed from that of the policy in the College of Arts and Sciences (A&S), saying she recalled a semester's leave. H. Anderson replied that the A&S policy was a modified version, and not affected by the TDL revisions.

Guest Ferlan explained that one main issue pertained to delegated authority. The preface notes that if a faculty member is off for more than two weeks, the department chair must be informed. After that, the dean should be informed. Regulations state that TDL is delegated to faculty by the Provost. For shorter periods of illness, it makes sense for lower reporting levels (i.e. at the department) to be responsible. However, the absence(s) do need to be tracked so that if some serious illness occurs, the proper paper trail is available. UK is required to track certain things under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA). H. Anderson added that the proposed revisions were not intended to overtake any particular college's specific requirements. Ferlan said that the addition of points e. and f. for section 6. ("Family Medical Leave") on page 66 of the handout were new, resulting from a change in federal policy in January 2009.

Wermeling asked if there were any net change in benefits. H. Anderson and Ferlan replied that the changes were administrative. Hulse noted that there was a suggestion to notify the department chair at the onset of an illness, even if it seemed simple. He asked about how that could affect long-term disability. Guest Payne explained that an employee must apply for long-term disability (LTD) before being away from work for six months. Faculty members are responsible for covering their classes, etc., and typically do those types of things on their own. If the illness lasts longer than expected, the dean needs to know so that the time off work can be documented. If the time off pertains to something for which the person is expected to recover fairly easily (such as a car accident, and will return to work in a month or so), that is fine. If the faculty member has a cancer diagnosis and is not expected to return, the faculty employee needs to know about the requirement to apply for LTD within six months of being off work.

Ferlan explained that some of the areas were grey – when someone is sick for the short term, Human Resources (HR) is usually notified in some way. Even with pregnancy and delivery there is an estimate of a return to work. There were a few recent cases, however, in which a faculty member put off a difficult conversation about health and when the time came for the faculty member to apply for LTD, there was no documentation about starting the six-month waiting period.

Grossman asked about graduate students serving as teaching assistants. Dean Blackwell (Graduate School) noted that there was a similar policy replicating FMLA and that there was a plan to replace the teaching capacity of the student, but that was it. Teaching assistants are not eligible for LTD, so the policy revision does not affect them. Grossman followed up with a question about research assistants, and Dean Blackwell replied that grants complicated that issue, so each situation was its own exception. Jensen asked who would fund the teaching assistant replacement and Dean Blackwell replied that the college was responsible for identifying such funding.

Miller asked about privacy concerns related to telling a department chair about medical testing, which could require hospitalization, etc. Those present to answer questions on the revised policy all stated that the policy only pertained to illness, not testing. Miller clarified that if he were to be out for more than one day, he would need to contact his chair. Anderson said the intent was just to ensure the chair was informed. Grossman opined that an "I've been out sick since Friday" email would be sufficient.

Conner asked about a colleague having a baby and also caring for a terminally-ill parent and the limit of utilizing 30 TDL days per calendar year for family members. It was stated that the time off taken after

birth was probably designed for the individual's own health and care, not the new baby's. It would be a different situation if a husband were caring for his wife/new baby and a parent. Ferlan added that an employee could request an exception to be allowed to take more than 30 days of TDL to care for a family member(s). Conner asked if that was codified in the policy and Ferlan replied that it was codified in other regulations.

Hulse asked about the repercussions of not notifying the department chair within a reasonable period. Payne said that if the faculty member was AWOL for two months, and then the chair finds out that the person is ill, efforts would be made to try to document when the six-month filing window clock should have started. As long as the illness was recorded within that six-month period, it would probably be fine. A problem arises when a person is off for seven months, or ten months, etc., and while the department is aware, there was a lack of information at the level of the college and the Provost. When that person tried to file for LTD, there would be no record in the system of there being any documentation filed about illness, making the process exceedingly difficult. Payne clarified for Hulse that the repercussion would be difficulty in filing for LTD, although there was an appeals process.

Hulse said that if a faculty member had a teaching load for only the fall semester, and then learned in January that s/he had cancer but did not notify the chair, it would be rather easy for an eight- or nine-month period of absence without anyone knowing. Ferlan said that even if the person was not teaching, there was still service, advising, research, etc. duties to take care of so the faculty member was not really off work during the spring semester. The policy merely states that if a faculty member cannot work for a certain period of time, someone must be notified so that in worst-case scenarios, the faculty employee will not miss the six-month filing window that could qualify him/her for LTD.

Hayes **moved** that the Senate endorse the proposed revisions to the faculty temporary disability leave (TDL) policy and Swanson **seconded**. There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Hollie Swanson,
University Senate Secretary

Invited guests present: Rodney Andrews, Mary Ferlan, Vince Kellen, Joey Payne and Cecilia Wang.

Absences: Adams; Andreatta*; Arents; Arnold*; Atwood*; Back; Brenned; Chappell*; Culver; Diedrichs; Dyer; Edgerton; Ensslin; Ettensohn*; Feddock*; Gesund*; Gonzalez*; Hall; Hallman; Hardesty*; Harris; Haurylko; Heller; Howard; Huberfeld; Jackson; Januzzi; Jones, D.*; Jones, R.*; Jung; Kidwell; Kim; Kirk*; Kirschling*; Lester; Maglinger; Marano; Martin*; McCormick*; McCorvey; McMahan; McNamara; Mehra; Mobley; Montgomery*; Murphy*; Nadel; Nardolillo; Nieman; O'Hair, D.*; O'Hair, M.*; Perman; Ray; Richey; Rieske-Kinney*; Ritchie; Robinson; Rohr; Roorda; Rouse; Santhanam*; Shannon; Shay; Smith, M.S.; Smith, R.; Sottile*; Speaks*; Stenhoff; Subbaswamy; Sudharshan; Sutphen; Telling; Todd; Tracy*; Travis; Troske; Turner; Wasilkowski*; Watt*; Wells; Whitt; Wiseman; Witt; Zhang.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on February 2, 2010.

* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.