

University Senate  
May 3, 2010

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, May 3, 2010 in the Auditorium of W. T. Young Library. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a voice vote unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Dave Randall called the meeting to order at 3:05 pm. He questioned the Sergeant-at-Arms, Michelle Sohner, and she verified that a quorum was present.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair offered a variety of announcements.

- The Senate Council (SC) approved a waiver of *Senate Rules 5.2.4.8.1* ("Common Examinations") for HIS 371.
- The SC also approved a waiver of *Senate Rules 5.2.4.8.1* ("Common Examinations") for ACC 301.
- The SC approved the addition of one Education graduate student to the May 2010 degree list because a clerical error prevented the student's inclusion.
- The SC moved that in cases where the student can show that failure to be on the degree list is entirely due to an administrative error, the SC will add the student to the degree list on behalf of the Senate; failing that demonstration, the SC will not consider the student's petition.
- In situations regarding "late additions" (due to administrative error) to the degree list when there is no scheduled SC or Senate meeting, the SC moved to direct the SC Chair to act on behalf of the SC regarding additions to degree lists if the matter cannot wait until the next SC meeting.
- College of Health Sciences Dean Lori Gonzalez made an administrative decision to decrease funding to two programs in Health Sciences. As a result, admissions to the master's and PhD programs in Reproductive Sciences were suspended for one year. On April 26, the SC moved that the Chair inform the Senate about this action. This has raised issues about *Senate Rules 3.3.2* and a lack of clarity in that language about what specifically constitutes a "significant reduction" to an academic program. The SC explicitly stated that this action/process, deemed to be less than a "significant reduction" does NOT set a precedent, but rather serves as an impetus to develop formal language to address similar, future situations.
- The SC will hear a report from Ruth Beattie during May 10 SC meeting regarding TurnItIn (TII). The report will include suggestion that the pilots have served sufficiently to investigate the product, and the next step is to purchase TII. Please send in any final comments about TII to Beattie by Wednesday.
- A formal proposal, second reading and vote on a permanent Winter Intersession will be presented in September.

- A web transmittal is currently posted – senators have until one week from today to review. Over 50 proposals were received in the Office of the Senate Council over the past few days, and every effort will be made to process them prior to the semester’s end. Thus, more transmittals will be coming.
- Send in any additional “Improve the Senate” comments to Mrs. Brothers by Wednesday.
- A webinar presented by the Advising Network will be presented on the topic of “The Role of Faculty Advisors in Student Success” on Thursday, May 13. See Matthew Deffendall with questions.
- Regarding the submission of final grades, senators are asked to please remember that *Senate Rules 5.1.6.A* states that grades must be submitted to the Registrar within 72 hours after the final examination is administered, and not the Monday after Finals Week.
- Please remind your constituents that the Quality Enhancement Program (QEP) “Big Ideas” solicitation is still ongoing. Senators are asked to please:
  - Remind your constituents to visit the website ([www.uky.edu/QEP](http://www.uky.edu/QEP)) to post ideas;
  - Nudge unit/dept heads & assessment coordinators to complete the unit assessment worksheet and forward it to [deanna.sellnow@uky.edu](mailto:deanna.sellnow@uky.edu) in May; and
  - Remind unit/dept heads & assessment coordinators to copy [deanna.sellnow@uky.edu](mailto:deanna.sellnow@uky.edu) and [dsnow@email.uky.edu](mailto:dsnow@email.uky.edu) when submitting their spring 2010 Program Outcome assessment reports to the Office of Assessment.

## 2. Proposed New Center for Interprofessional Healthcare Education, Research, and Practice

The Chair introduced Professor Andrea Pfeifle (ME/Internal Medicine), who attended to answer questions regarding the proposed new Center for Interprofessional Healthcare Education, Research, and Practice (CIHERP). Guest Pfeifle explained that there were a variety of her colleagues in attendance who supported the proposal and were available to answer questions. She said that the purpose of CIHERP is to help enable graduate students to work as effective collaborators, regardless of specific careers. Interprofessional healthcare activities are a national and international concern. Another key function of CIHERP is a research component, and a good working model has been incorporated into the center proposal. Since the proposal was first submitted in November, the reporting structure has changed so that it will reside in the Office of the Provost, not the College of Medicine. CIHERP will be governed by a board of deans made up of the participating colleges, along with other colleagues. CIHERP’s director will also sit on the board and work to establish priorities with a working group from each participating college.

Jones asked for clarification regarding the type of center being proposed. Pfeifle ultimately agreed that it was a multidisciplinary research center and Jones noted that if it were to be an educational unit, a governing board of deans would not have the authority to set educational policies for CIHERP.

Kightlinger said that the proposal includes the College of Law, yet there was no signature from Law’s dean. He said that Law’s associate deans were unaware of the proposal and that the faculty had not signed off on any participation. Pfeifle replied that the letter from former Law Dean Vestal had been removed since his departure, but that the acting dean had been fully supportive. She thought it unfair to

say that Law faculty had not been actively involved. Kightlinger replied that Dean Brennan was unaware of any such participation when Kightlinger queried him about it a few hours previously.

Thelin, referring to language in the CIHERP proposal about UK being a national leader, said that this type of center has already been established at many other institutions. During SC discussions, Thelin said that Pfeifle listed UK's lack of an invitation to participate in the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as another rationale for the proposed CIHERP. Thelin said that it seemed a little presumptuous to claim UK to be a national leader in anything, and that CIHERP is neither original nor innovative.

Pfeifle responded that UK was not behind, but that an informal group of faculty and staff have worked together for some time, but not having an organized center puts UK behind when other universities have such entities. Guest Ron Botto (DE/Oral Health Science) said that his impression of the language was not that UK was planning to be the leader, but rather will do the best it can and strive towards that goal.

Guest Donna Webber (ME/Molecular and Biomedical Pharmacology) explained that she recently headed up an experiential activity with Pharmacy and Medicine students. UK is one of the first universities in the country to have a required component of courses in Medicine and Pharmacy in which all those students are involved in an interprofessional activity. She said there was no point in striving for mediocrity, and that other current activities will be benefitted by CIHERP.

Swanson asked for more information on how CIHERP could have benefitted the course Webber conducted. Webber said that the project involved all second-year medical students and all third-year pharmacy students. She had wanted to also include students from the College of Nursing, but it was difficult to schedule them as well as Pharmacy and Medicine students. From the standpoint of working with experienced people in standardized patient care simulations, CIHERP would facilitate the use of multiple facilities across campus, as well as with assessment of the course. Involving more than one college's students requires a lot of planning and expertise, which could be facilitated by CIHERP.

D. Anderson commented that it seemed that if anything were needed, it would be an interprofessional center for the entire campus, instead of involving just nine colleges. The College of Engineering has been doing phenomenal things with healthcare, and many departments in the College of Arts and Sciences have also been involved with healthcare. D. Anderson stated that if CIHERP will reside in the Provost's office, it should certainly be campuswide. Pfeifle explained that they started with the healthcare colleges and that many other have come forward and are regularly participating in interprofessional activities. Guest Patricia Burkhart (associate dean of undergraduate studies, College of Nursing) added that CIHERP was supported by a vote of the Nursing faculty, and will establish a visible university presence demonstrated at the professional level. CIHERP will open the door to conversations and elevate UK's status to be competitive for grant opportunities.

Thelin commented that using \$260,000 in annual operating budget to break down institutional barriers created by the administration was interesting, when faculty were not receiving any salary increase. Pfeifle said that the \$260,000 was primarily allocated for salary support for the interprofessional faculty involvement, and no college underwriting. Financial support will be provided by the Provost and Executive Vice President for Health Affairs (EVPHA). That money cannot be used for general purposes, and that the monies spent were under the discretion of those two individuals, who could choose to direct it to CIHERP. As far as salaries go, Pfeifle said that it was modest – a director, one full-time staff employee and a coordinator. The remainder of the monies goes to the programs.

Jones asked for additional information regarding the money and funding. Greissman said that he heard the Provost explain to the SC that the money to fund CIHERP was primarily coming from a healthcare endowment fund that derives money from practice plan income, and can only be spent on the healthcare colleges. The principle sum is coming from monies bracketed by healthcare initiatives, which is why the EVPHA would be involved. Jones opined that the Provost's description of start-up monies was somewhat different from the explanation currently being given.

Nadel asked if there was a way to independently verify information given by the Provost. He said that at the last May Senate meeting the Provost said that no money would be spent on a new Gen Ed unless the Senate voted on a budget, but money has been spent yet no vote has been taken. Greissman said that with the exception of the fall pilot projects, recurring monies have not and will not be allocated until the Senate votes on implementation. Non-recurring sums have been spent to demonstrate that courses can be developed and taught successfully. Nadel replied that he had heard that six faculty lines had been filled for Gen Ed instruction in the Department of English, and funded as recurring lines. He acknowledged he could have erroneous information, but wondered where the truth lay. Greissman suggested that the discussion regarding salaries and Gen Ed be taken up when Provost Subbaswamy arrived later in the meeting.

The Chair noted the length of the agenda and asked if there were any further comments. Wood asked about the proportion of money would come from the earmarked healthcare funds, and what portion would come from the Provost. Greissman said he was unsure, and the Chair suggested the question be asked when the Provost arrived.

Having previously drawn senators' attention to the two proposed motions regarding CIHERP (that the Senate approve the proposed new Center for Interprofessional Healthcare Education, Research, and Practice based upon its academic merits; and that the Senate not endorse the proposed new Center based upon its non-academic merits) Zentall asked for information regarding the difference between the two motions.

The Chair explained that the Senate has unquestionable responsibility regarding academic merit, and while the SC vote was not unanimous, the SC did approve the academic issues involved with CIHERP.

Thelin said that to put aside money, one has to have an administrative solution to an administrative problem. He said that the essence of College of Medicine Dean Perman's comments to the SC was that the members of the health campus did not cooperate well among themselves. Thelin expressed disbelief that a dean from one college contacting another dean could not accomplish as much as CIHERP is proposed to do. He cited many faculty committees working across campus. Pfeifle said that the majority of the budget did fund faculty lines, and much of the budget is allocated to faculty grants. Thelin responded that he saw a \$109,000 salary for the director, and Pfeifle noted that the person was a faculty member. Thelin responded that moving that faculty person into the directorship moved that person into an administrative role. That position takes the faculty member away from teaching, etc. and will give them a Distribution of Effort (DOE) percentage that is overwhelmingly administrative. Pfeifle said that she had been fulfilling 30% toward interprofessional activities on her DOE, and was not mired in administrivia and that the director will also not be, with appropriate staff support.

Burkhart said that the proposal for CIHERP supported the spirit of breaking down the barriers referred to by Thelin. Of course deans may talk, but CIHERP would establish a concrete mechanism for working

together. She expressed excitement about the collaborations in CIHERP, and mentioned that there were discussions at the hospital about an interprofessional unit.

Guest Karen Novak (DE/Oral Health Practice) said that CIHERP could bring students together, and would provide experiences similar to the interprofessional honors colloquium. Guest Janice Kuperstein (HS/Rehabilitation Sciences) said that the silos at UK were not created here, but rather existed for decades.

Jones **moved** that the Senate approve the proposed new Center for Interprofessional Healthcare Education, Research, and Practice based upon its academic merits and Kelly **seconded**.

Nadel asked about the consequences of passing the first motion prior to the second motion. Greissman and Jones discussed Nadel's comments. After a short period, Jones said that if the Senate disapproved the motion on the floor, there would be no educational environment and if SACS or the CPE asked questions about an established CIHERP, both the Provost and President would be obliged to report the non-academic status of the center. A vote on the second motion is advisory. In response to a follow-up question from Nadel, both Jones and Greissman agreed that the second, advisory vote may or may not be heeded by the Provost and/or President.

There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion to approve the proposed new Center for Interprofessional Healthcare Education, Research, and Practice based upon its academic merits. The motion **passed** in a show of hands, with 39 in favor and 16 opposed.

The Chair drew attention to the second motion ("that the Senate not endorse the proposed new Center for Interprofessional Healthcare Education, Research, and Practice based upon its non-academic merits"). Noting that the motion was in the negative, he added that this motion was advisory and that the SC vote was very close. He suggested Thelin summarize the SC discussion, and Thelin agreed to do so. Thelin said that his recollection was that there was concern about the sources and direction and uses of funding. SC colleagues also raised serious questions and quality and the validity of assessment criteria; there was reasonable agreement that assessment of the proposed center would probably not pass a rudimentary course in program evaluation.

Jensen spoke to clarify the budget issue, saying there was a general question in the SC of how to pay for a new center. During the SC discussion, which may have been clarified later for Greissman, the practice fund was mentioned, but it was not clear that the money would come from health college revenues. Jensen said that regarding the budget piece, it was not clear where the money would come from, and there was a general sense of discomfort with an unfunded situation.

Provost Subbaswamy said that it was important to realize that UK is a single university, and that it does not operate on the notion that any one college works on its own. He said that his office does take account of the fact that many colleges have auxiliary and other funding sources, and deal with it in a judicious manner. There are instances where initiatives step across college boundaries, and if all activities take place in one college, it can be easily argued that funding must come from that one college. If multiple colleges are involved, then the suggestion from the SC that the center be housed in the Provost's Office made sense. He said he contributed a symbolic amount of money, and will split the costs with the Office of the EVPHA. There are some pots of money inherited from the days when campus was separate from the medical center, and those monies must be spent in the health care colleges by statute.

Pfeifle said that the evaluation plan included with the proposal was based upon a strategic planning group comprised of faculty from across colleges, and working together for the past three years. The information was intended to illustrate that best practices will be followed, and at the request of the SC CIHERP will be assessed by established regulations. The Chair requested a motion.

Jones **moved** that the Senate not endorse the proposed new Center for Interprofessional Healthcare Education, Research, and Practice based upon its non-academic merits. Wood **seconded**. The Chair called for discussion of the motion.

D. Anderson said that she had an additional question regarding the financial aspect, because what she just heard was not what she heard at the SC meeting. She asked the Provost to confirm that the financing is coming directly from the hospital and a fund from the Provost's office that is strictly for the healthcare colleges. The Provost affirmed her statement.

There being no further discussion, the Chair reminded senators that an affirmative vote meant a vote against. A **vote** was taken on the motion that that the Senate not endorse the proposed new Center for Interprofessional Healthcare Education, Research, and Practice based upon its non-academic merits and the motion **passed** with 33 in favor and 16 opposed.

### 3. UK August 2010 Degree List

Jensen **moved** that the elected faculty senators approve the UK August 2010 list of candidates for credentials, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board and Wermeling **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

### 4. UK May 2010 Degree List Addendum (Western KY/UK Joint Engineering Programs)

Zentall **moved** that the elected faculty senators approve UK's May 2010 Degree List Addendum (Western KY/UK Joint Engineering Programs), for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. English **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

### 5. Proposed Relocation of Graduate Center for Biomedical Engineering from Graduate School to College of Engineering

[Senators were informed via a PowerPoint slide that Chair Randall has a joint appt in the Graduate Center for Biomedical Engineering.] Jeannine Blackwell, dean of the Graduate School, explained that the proposal would move the Graduate Center for Biomedical Engineering and associated degree programs and budget from the Graduate School to the College of Engineering. The move had been under discussion for several years and has finally been completed. Dean Blackwell noted that various faculty bodies approved the move.

In response to a question from Saatman, Dean Blackwell said that there was no impact on the undergraduate accreditation in the College of Engineering, as the Biomedical Engineering program did not have an undergraduate degree, with no plans for one in the future.

Wermeling asked about the students' opinions and how the move affected them. Guest David Puleo (director, Graduate Center for Biomedical Engineering) replied that they were not really affected, and that those who are aware of the move and have given their opinion have been in support. Blackwell said

that there were no curriculum changes associated with the move, nor would it affect any graduate assistantships or funding for research conferences, etc. The funding is already in place and moves with the Graduate Center for Biomedical Engineering.

D. Anderson **moved** that the Senate approve the proposed relocation of the Graduate Center for Biomedical Engineering from the Graduate School to the College of Engineering and Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 6. Proposed New BA and BS in Japanese Language and Literature

Guest Doug Slaymaker (AS/Modern and Classical Languages, Literature and Culture) explained the proposal to senators. He said that there was a need in a state with strong ties to Japan for the state's flagship university to have a Japanese degree program. He said that there were between five and six students in a topical "Japanese" major at any given time. There are also about 30-35 majors in International Studies with Asia as their area of focus. Kentucky's regulations require that for certification of teaching, the person must be competent in the language. Murray State has recently instituted a major in Japanese, but is not nearly as robust as UK's proposed Japanese degree program. Slaymaker said that the proposed degree program will place UK in a position to recommend teachers for certification in teaching Japanese. Last year two new Japanese Studies faculty were hired with foundation seed money, and there are another five or six faculty across campus teaching Japanese-related courses or doing related research. In response to a question from Kightlinger, Slaymaker explained that they expected 30-45 students in the program annually.

Sellnow **moved** that the Senate approve the proposed new BA and BS degrees in Japanese Language and Literature, effective fall 2010 and Nadel **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 7. Proposed Suspension of Dance Minor

The Chair invited Professor Melody Noland (ED/Kinesiology and Health Promotion) to explain the proposal to suspend the Dance Minor. She also touched on aspects of the request to suspend Dance Certification.

Guest Noland explained that the Kinesiology and Health Promotion (KHP) faculty voted unanimously to suspend the Dance Minor. One of the primary reasons is low enrollment – the dance certification existed for six years, and only graduated seven students. In addition, a lot of resources are required for an effective program. About 17 dance classes are offered per year, some for KHP majors taking Dance for physical education, but all those courses are now taught through part-time instructors. Additionally, performance dance does not meet the strategic plan in the College of Education. Dance can be used for physical education training, but also encompasses jazz dance, choreography, etc. and are more of the performing arts than education courses. Noland went on to explain that the market for teachers with Dance Certification is low; the only places hiring such individuals are special or private schools. She said that a few classes would still be taught to assist students majoring in KHP, but after the current students finish out, no more performing arts-type dance classes will be taught. The enrollment in KHP has increased by 33% over the past two years, and faculty felt it important to concentrate on programs other than dance.

In response to a question from Estus, Noland explained that current students received a letter about the suspension of the program, which included a suggestion that the student sit down with their advisor to work out a plan.

Kwon asked about how course enrollments compared to the students taking a major/minor. She said that it was her understanding that KHP was the only area that offered dance courses, and such a suspension would have a big impact. She wondered why it was not part of the College of Fine Arts. Noland replied that the dance courses had a unique history. Enrollment for Dance Certification is very low, sometimes one or two people, but the performing arts-types of classes can have pretty good enrollments, but vary from 10 to 25 students. Some students are not enrolled in any degree program that requires the courses, but rather just take them for enjoyment. Noland said that she thought dance should be in Fine Arts, but would be a minor with low enrollment requiring a lot of resources.

Estus **moved** that the Senate approve the proposed suspension of the Dance Minor effective fall 2010, and D. Anderson **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with one opposed.

#### 8. Proposed Suspension of Dance Teacher Certification

The Chair noted that the rationale for the suspension of the Dance Minor overlapped that of the suspension of the Dance Teacher Certification. There were no additional comments or questions from senators.

Costich **moved** that the Senate approve the proposed suspension of the Dance Teacher Certification effective fall 2010, and L. Meyer **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 9. Proposed Change to *Senate Rules 5.1.1* ("General Grading System")

Jones, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), explained that Grossman had put forward this change, but was unable to attend to explain. Awhile back, a new grade, "SI," was created for those courses that stretch over one semester (i.e. undergraduate research project, research hours, etc.), which indicated that a student was on track for a real grade. Grossman encountered a situation in which he was unable to indicate unsatisfactory interim progress after the first semester. The proposed new grade, "UI," will indicate unsatisfactory progress.

Yost asked if this proposed grade would stay on the student transcript until the student graduated, or goes on to a qualifying exam, or leaves the university. Jones replied that he was unsure, and said that an amendment from the floor could be offered, or the SREC could be charged with coming up with that language. He said the lack of a sunset was just an oversight. After brief discussion about how to address a sunset clause, Nadel **moved** that the Senate approve the proposed change in *Senate Rules 5.1.1*, to include a new grade of UI, effective fall 2010 and Mountford **seconded**.

Prats asked how the grade differed from "I." Greissman explained that I was for a course that is bounded by one semester, while the UI/SI grades are used for courses that fall over two semesters.

There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with a vast majority in favor.



Yost **moved** that the Senate Council further pursue the issue of a sunset clause or definitive timeframe other than just graduation for use of SI and UI grades, and Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 10. Proposal for a Three-Year December Commencement Pilot

The Chair explained that he spoke with Provost Subbaswamy during the fall semester, which resulted in a January conversation with additional individuals on the possibility of a winter commencement. There was another discussion in March, and the topic has since been talked about by the SC. He asked Greissman to explain the proposal in detail.

Greissman noted that the *Administrative Regulations* establish the Commencement Committee, which worked very hard for a highly choreographed spring commencement, in which one out of ten graduates may show up. Additionally, about 40% of students do not graduate in May – they are eligible to graduate in December. The Provost asked deans to do some informal work about a December commencement, and the result is a formal suggestion for a three-year December commencement pilot, which will admittedly mostly capture undergraduates. The discussion is now at the stage in which faculty must determine how or if it should be made to work. Greissman was explicit that there was no intent to interfere with pinning, hooding, coating, etc. ceremonies, but rather would offer an opportunity for every student to walk across the stage and have their name announced. He said that a discussion of honorary degrees at a December commencement would wait for now.

In response to Jones, Greissman said that the intent is to obviate the need for college recognition ceremonies, and have December and May commencements in which all undergraduates are recognized by name. Dean Smith (AG) said that the version of the proposal that he saw said students would be recognized by name “if feasible,” and said that particular phrase would likely prevent many graduates from showing up. Greissman said that the assumption was that every student’s name will be announced – if not, then it is the same as the current practice.

English asked what a vote to approve this proposal would mean for individual college ceremonies in the spring. Greissman said that if all students’ names are called, it would obviate the need for separate undergraduate ceremonies, notwithstanding pinning, etc. He said that professional and graduate students would also be honored. Wood asked for further clarification about college ceremonies, and asked if approving the pilot would mean that after December 2010 colleges would be unable to have recognition ceremonies. Greissman replied that if one looked at the main commencement ceremony as the event where all students are recognized, one might wonder if the separate recognition ceremonies were even necessary. He said it was a known fact that many students do not attend the main ceremony, preferring to attend the college ceremonies and thinking that will be more meaningful. If there are college recognition ceremonies that continue to be held, it will keep students from attending the main ceremonies in May and, perhaps, December. He said that a starting point is how to make the main ceremony and the pilot more participatory than currently.

Wood said that having served as the chair of the Commencement Committee in the College of Arts and Sciences (AS), she acknowledged the issues surrounding commencement, as described by Greissman. She said that to be clear, senators should understand that a vote for a pilot December commencement was, in essence, a vote against college recognition programs. She voiced her support for the pilot. Greissman said that this particular aspect was part of why the SC insisted that there be a pilot for winter commencements. He said that many recognition ceremonies were created in reaction to what did not take place during commencement.

Dean Kornbluh said that he supported a December commencement, and wondered about a recommendation from the deans' committee regarding recognition ceremonies. D. Anderson said that it was her recollection that the December commencement would not supersede anything else. Greissman said that there would be no college recognition ceremonies in December, to see how well students and parents would attend a full commencement.

Wermeling asked about student input and desires. Greissman replied that students were consulted by the deans' committee, and that they want a ceremony in which they get real recognition – they want to cross the stage and have their families members see them and hear their names announced.

Steiner asked about whether there were any guesses about the number of potential students who graduate in May, compared to graduating in December. Greissman said that students liked the idea of leaving December as an experiment. Forty percent of students do not attend commencement, so there is a possibility to get them to attend.

Wasilkowski commented that the proposal would not take anything away from students, and that those who want to participate in a college recognition ceremony in May still could. He spoke in favor of the proposal. Greissman agreed that the recognition ceremonies would take place (if at all) during May.

After additional questions about college recognition ceremonies, Provost Subbaswamy said that the intent is not to disallow college recognition ceremonies in December, but rather that such ceremonies would no longer be necessary if students are able to individually cross the stage and have their names announced during a campuswide ceremony.

Estus **moved** that the Senate approve a three-year pilot trial of a December commencement, beginning in December 2010 and ending after a December 2012 commencement and Swanson **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 11. Approval of Establishment of Interim General Education Oversight Committee

Mullen, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, explained that Gen Ed had utilized a steering committee, then had template committees, and then this past fall (2009) had vetting teams to review course proposals. Because the vetting teams will sunset in May, there needs to be a faculty group to oversee the final two years of implementation for Gen Ed, as well as continue the review of proposed Gen Ed courses. An interim General Education Oversight Committee (GEOC) was discussed with the SC and met with positive comments. Members will be appointed by the SC, with input from Mullen, and will meet over the summer.

Wood **moved** that the Senate approve the establishment of an Interim General Education Oversight Committee as outlined in the proposal, with the requirement that one-half of the membership will be comprised of individuals new to the General Education initiative. D. Anderson **seconded**. Wood asked for confirmation about who would be doing the appointing. Mullen replied that it would be the SC, and Wood asked that information to be included with the letter of appointment.

Jensen clarified that during the SC discussions, the one faculty member per each of the ten areas referred to disciplinary background, not strict college or department representation.

Wood asked Mullen to consider another friendly amendment – she wanted to clarify that the composition of the committee be included. In response to C. Lee, Mullen said that while there were seven vetting teams, it was thought that there should be one “representative” for each of the 10 course templates, and function as one committee. Mullen said that he would ask GEOC to offer an update to the SC in August about the most efficient ways to work.

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

13. Update from Vice President for Institutional Diversity

The Chair noted that Vice President for Institutional Diversity Judy “J.J.” Jackson was ill and could not attend the day’s meeting.

14. State of Academic Affairs - Provost Kumble Subbaswamy

The Provost offered his presentation on the State of Academic Affairs at UK. Subsequent to his presentation, he answered questions from senators.

The meeting was adjourned shortly after 5 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Hollie I. Swanson,  
University Senate Secretary

Absences: Adams; H. Anderson\*; Arents; Arnold; Atwood; Back; Barnes; Birdwhistell; Blonder; Boissonneault; Brennen; Chappell; Conners; Culver; Dyer; Ederington; Edgerton; Ettensohn; Gesund\*; Griffith\*; Grossman\*; Hall; Hallman; Hardesty\*; Harris; Hatcher\*; Hayes\*; Heller; Jackson; Januzzi; Kidwell; Kington; Kirk; Kirschling\*; Lester; Maglinger; Martin\*; McCormick\*; McCorvey; McMahan; McNamara; Mehra; Mobley; Nardolillo; Nieman; Nokes\*; D. O’Hair; M. O’Hair\*; Patsalides; Perman; Perry; Richey\*; Rieseke-Kenney; Ritchie; Robinson; Rohr\*; Roorda; Rouse; Schoenberg; Shannon\*; Shay; R. Smith; Snow\*; Sottile; Speaks; Starr-Le-Beau\*; Subbaswamy; Sudharshan; Sutphen; Telling; Thacker; Todd; Tracy; Travis; Troske; Turner; Viele; Watt\*; Wells; Williams; Wiseman\*; Witt; Yanarella; Zhang.

Invited guests present:

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on September 7, 2010.

---

\* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.