

University Senate
November 8, 2010

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, November 8, 2010 in the Auditorium of the W. T. Young Library. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Hollie I. Swanson called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:02 pm. With more than 60 senators in attendance, quorum was attained. The Chair asked that senators: give their name and affiliation when speaking; communicate with their constituencies; attend meetings; respond to emails and web postings as appropriate; acknowledge and respect others and external guests; and silence cell phones and beepers.

The Chair explained that a waiver of *Senate Rules 1.2.3 (SR 1.2.3)* was needed to review the minutes from the October 11 meeting, as well as hear a Quality Enhancement Program presentation (QEP). Finkel **moved** that the Senate waive *SR 1.2.3*, so that the minutes from October can be considered, and the QEP agenda item added. D’Orazio **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

1. Minutes from October 11 and Announcements

Finkel **moved** to approve the minutes from October 11, and Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no discussion, the minutes from October 11 were **approved** as distributed.

The Chair offered a variety of announcements.

- The Staff Senate Chair, Jann Burks has initiated a series of informal, shared chats with administrators. The first is with Provost Subbaswamy on November 12, from 12:30 – 1:30 in 230 Student Center. There will be another such informal chat, with Vice President for Diversity Judy Jackson. That will take place on December 3, from 12 – 12:50 in 014 Health Sciences Building. Senators are welcome to invite colleagues. She asked senators to email her or Mrs. Brothers with suggestions about other administrators with whom to have informal chats.
- The majority of Senate committees have held their inaugural meetings. The Chair offered thanks to all who are participating, particularly the chairs! Reports from these committees will be incorporated into the “State of the University Address - The Faculty’s Perspective” scheduled for the April 11, 2011 Senate meeting.
- The members of the 2010-2011 Reinstatement Committee are the Chair, Kyle Kirk and Bob Grossman.
- There will be elections for the Senate Council (SC) in late fall. The nominating round will be from November 29 to December 3, and the voting round will take place from December 13 to December 17. The Chair commented that the SC should be viewed as an executive body that represents the Senate. She opined that a majority of SC members held primary appointments in the medical fields, and suggested that senators take disciplinary area into consideration when the nomination round begins.

- Senators were reminded about the need to submit final grades within 72 hours of the end of the final exam, not the Monday after the end of Finals Week. There are staff employees who are busy incorporating final grades into the system and find themselves in unheated buildings the day before Christmas, so grades should be turned in, in a timely fashion, out of respect for those doing the entering.
- The Chair said that there would be a request for nominees for committees performing evaluations of the Graduate School and Engineering deans. Senators should email possible nominees to Mrs. Brothers.

2. Memorial Resolution for College of Pharmacy Professor Thomas Scott Foster

Senator Daniel Wermeling offered a resolution in honor of College of Pharmacy Professor Thomas Scott Foster.

Memorial Resolution
Presented to University Senate
November 8, 2010
Professor Tom Foster
College of Pharmacy

Thomas Scott Foster departed this life on October 14, 2010 following a brief illness. He is survived by his wife Marijo, a daughter Megan (David) Sullivan of the Isle of Guernsey, UK, and a son Scott (Courtney) of Ocean City, NJ, three grand children in Guernsey and three grandchildren in Ocean City.

Tom was a 1970 graduate of the State University of New York at Buffalo School of Pharmacy with a B.S.Pharm. degree and the University of Kentucky College of Pharmacy with the Doctor of Pharmacy degree in 1973. He also completed a pharmacy practice residency at UK in the same year. He then embarked on a highly successful career as a clinical practitioner and academician at the University of Kentucky. Joining the faculty of the UK College of Pharmacy as an Assistant Professor, he quickly rose through the professorial ranks to be Professor of Pharmacy. He continued to be active in teaching, research and service roles at UK until shortly before his passing.

He also held joint faculty appointments as Professor in the UK College of Medicine, Department of Anesthesiology, and the UK College of Public Health, Department of Health Services Management.

He served the College of Pharmacy at UK in administrative roles as a Division Director. He also served UK as Executive Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board for over twenty years.

His teaching focused on pharmacotherapeutics, pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics and computer applications in health care delivery. An animated and engaging lecturer, he had a unique ability to motivate students to achieve more than they thought they could. He was an early leader in developing educational initiatives in clinical pharmacy in internal medicine and critical care medicine.

He led programs of multidisciplinary clinical pharmacology research involving investigational drugs and drug administration systems. Those efforts facilitated the development of numerous human pharmaceutical and biopharmaceutical products to improve the health of Americans and others around the world.

His service to professional organizations was highly noteworthy. He served as Chair of the Section of Teachers of Clinical Pharmacy of the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy. He was the founding Vice Chair of the Board of Pharmaceutical Specialties of the American Pharmacists Association, the credentialing board for specialists in pharmacy practice. The Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education regularly enlisted him to serve as a member of accreditation site visit committees. He contributed to composing national licensure examinations for pharmacists. He enjoyed many roles with the United States Pharmacopeial Convention, the national body that establishes standards for medications distributed within the U.S. This year he received the Beal Award for Distinguished Volunteer Service to the U.S.P., the highest award of that important non-governmental standards agency.

He was a pioneer in using his pharmacy knowledge to address drug product selection issues for the benefit of the public in Kentucky, ultimately chairing Kentucky's Drug Formulary Council and Drug Management Review Board. He was appointed to the Kentucky Board of Pharmacy, the licensure agency for pharmacists, and chaired the group. He served as a consultant to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration as well as to the Office of Human Research Protection of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

His achievements were recognized by his peers through election to fellowship in the American Pharmacists Association, American College of Clinical Pharmacy, and American College of Clinical Pharmacology.

Tom was a man of many talents, a man of many friends. His number of friends was almost matched by his number of bowties, his sartorial signature.

An avid sailor, he was happiest when with his grandchildren sailing on Seneca Lake in New York's Finger Lakes Region where his family had a summer home. Two Airedales, Commander and Chief, were his constant companions.

I move that this resolution be made a part of the minutes of the University Senate and that a copy be sent to Dr. Foster's family.

Arnold **seconded** the motion. A moment of silence was held in Professor Foster's honor.

The Chair called for a **vote**, and the **motion** that the resolution be made a part of the minutes of the University Senate and that a copy be sent to Dr. Foster's family **passed**, with none opposed.

3. Officer Reports

a. Chair

The Chair reported that a discussion has been initiated at the Senate Council (SC) by the Provost (<http://www.uky.edu/Faculty/Senate/>). The discussion asks, "What is the role and nature of centers,

institutes and multidisciplinary instructional programs?” and “How do these kinds of educational units and their faculties relate to departments, schools and colleges?” The discussion will soon broaden to involve the entire academic community.

All college faculties and their faculty councils will be asked for feedback on how these issues may impact their college and the University. At the final stage, all college faculties and faculty councils will be asked for their vote to endorse any possible changes. Any changes in policy will be presented to the Board of Trustees for final approval.

b. Parliamentarian

Parliamentarian Catherine Seago offered some information about motions. She said that a motion includes the following aspects:

- Introduce a motion;
- Second a motion;
- Discussion;
- Amendments may be offered; and
- Action is taken which can include tabling the motion.

Seago then read from the *Senate Rules (SRs)*:

When a document embodying a major policy decision is to be considered by the University Senate, the Senate Council may, whenever feasible, first place the document on the agenda of a meeting "for discussion only" and on the agenda of a subsequent meeting of the Senate "for action." When a document is on the floor of the Senate for discussion only, amendments may be proposed and discussed but not passed. Discussion may be terminated by consent of the body or by postponing temporarily. In addition, amendments may be submitted in writing to the Senate Council by any two members of the Senate for distribution with the agenda of the meeting at which action is to be taken.

She said that the *SRs* also allowed for amendments to the presented motion, but as per *SR 1.2.3*, the amendments must be submitted in writing prior to the opening of the Senate meeting when the item is on the agenda for a second reading.

4. Committee Reports

b. Update on Presidential Search Committee – Professor Shelly Steiner

Steiner, also one of the faculty representatives on the Presidential Search Committee, offered an update to senators. He commented that he had signed a confidentiality agreement, so he was somewhat limited in what he could share. Steiner talked about the open session of the most recent meeting of the Presidential Search Committee and the proposed timeline, and answered a few questions from senators.

5. UK's December 2010 Degree List

The Chair noted that a handful of students were removed, one name was corrected and a degree type changed.

D. Jones **moved** that the that the elected faculty senators approve the December 2010 list of degree candidates, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the

recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Rohr **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

7. Approval of New General Education Curriculum (first reading)

The Chair offered some background information about revisions to UK’s General Education curriculum, thus far.

- Background and Timeline:
 - 2004: Discussions on the core curriculum were initiated.
 - March 2008: Design Principles were approved by the University Senate.
 - General Education Reform Steering Cmte established.
 - December 2008: Learning Outcomes and Curricular Framework recommended by the General Education Reform Steering Committee was approved by the University Senate.
 - April 2009: A cost estimate of \$4.4 million was provided by Provost Subbaswamy.

- May 2009: Final readings of the recommended Course Templates was approved by the University Senate with the following provisions:
 - The Senate must be satisfied that all necessary resources, etc. are available for a new Gen Ed with attention paid to a tentative implementation date of fall 2011.
 - The SC expects that the process for forming a group to vet proposed Gen Ed courses will be approved by the Senate.

- May 2010: Establishment of the Interim General Education Oversight Committee (IGEOC) was approved by the University Senate.
 - Composed of a core of ten faculty members & *ex officios*
 - Will operate from May 17, 2010 until May 15, 2012

The Chair invited Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mike Mullen to present information about the agenda item. The motion on the floor was from the SC, so it required no second: move that the Senate approve the implementation of the General Education curriculum for fall 2011 for all incoming undergraduate students. Mullen did so, noting that his office was mindful of two things – financial resources to do the job, and the ability to illustrate that a process to evaluate courses will be ready by fall 2011. Mullen went over the amounts of money allocated for various aspects of a new Gen Ed, as shown below.

Inquiry – Arts and Creativity	\$958,050
Inquiry - Humanities	\$143,863
Inquiry – Natural Sciences	\$575,644
Inquiry – Social Sciences	\$540,094
Composition and Communications	\$1,721,320
QR – Quantitative Foundations	\$209,485
QR – Stat Inferential Reasoning	\$264,718
US Citizenship and Global Dynamics	<u>\$895,280</u>
TOTAL	\$5,308,455

Mullen explained that \$2.6 million was allocated during the 2010-11 academic year, with another \$2.7 million for the 2011-12 academic year. Mullen also explained that there are a variety of seats available per college for Gen Ed, which will be fluid over the coming years.

Area	Seats
Inquiry - Arts and Creativity	4200
Inquiry – Humanities	7080
Inquiry – Natural Sciences	9000
Inquiry – Social Sciences	7330
Composition and Communication I	4400
Composition and Communication II	4400
Quantitative Foundations	5900
Statistical Inferential Reasoning	4800
Community, Culture, Citizenship USA	4500
Global Dynamics	3960

Faculty will be brought in as new course interests dictate, and will fit into the areas listed above.

Regarding the course approval process, Mullen explained that there was a call for proposals in May 2009, and about 60 proposals were sent in. The Senate approved the concept of vetting teams to review Gen Ed proposals, and those functioned from November 2009 through May 2010. A permanent vetting group and process will need to be identified, and that is where the Interim General Education Oversight Committee (IGEOC) comes in. IGEOC is comprised of 10 core faculty members, who represent one of each of the 10 areas. There are also a few non-voting ex officio members: Bill Rayens (assistant provost) and representatives from the Registrar, assessment, and the Libraries. Mullen asked Bill Rayens to explain the vetting process.

Assistant Provost Bill Rayens explained how IGEOC was functioning. Guest Rayens explained that a decision was made very early to remain faithful to the Course Templates (CT) that were approved by the Senate, and that IGEOC decided to develop Gen Ed course approval forms that reflect the CT. The forms were sent to the faculty on the original CT committees to see if they were satisfied with the forms. Input was received, the forms were revised again, and the CT folks were satisfied with the finalized forms.

Rayens then explained that the next issue was that of how to approve courses for inclusion in Gen Ed. Upon request, the SC offered IGEOC approval to function for a year with the forms they developed. Once a course proposal is submitted, an area expert is alerted who identifies two referees for the course approval. The referees fill out the Gen Ed course approval form as the course is reviewed, and then returned to the area expert. When all parties are in agreement, the results of the vetting process are brought to the entire IGEOC committee, which then holds a vote. Rayens noted that 79 proposals were submitted, with 37 submitted on or after October 1. IGEOC has been working very hard and taking their responsibilities seriously. Rayens then turned presentation back over to Mullen.

Mullen said that the last issue was that of assessment. IGEOC has been tasked with the oversight of the Gen Ed process, so it will also play a role in assessment. There is a mechanism for faculty to offer input into the Gen Ed assessment process, and a complete plan is available on the Gen Ed website. The Senate-approved Design Principles included assessment as a part of a new Gen Ed, to continuously improve the program and avoid movement away from the original intent. Proposed Gen Ed courses are mapped to student Learning Outcomes (LO), which must include something other than a stand-alone grade for assessment purposes. Therefore, what is being called an “authentication artifact” will be part of the course assessment, which will be a graded assignment that addresses one or more student LO.

Mullen said that hopefully there will be more than one artifact in any Gen Ed course, and they will be graded. A pool of artifacts will be created for each of the four LO area, although not every artifact will be reviewed. A stratified random sample will be used by an as-yet-unnamed set of evaluators, who will review the artifacts against an appropriate rubric. The development of rubrics will be something that faculty will be involved with long term, and will begin with the rubrics offered by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) rubrics. Evaluators will not be looking for a “right answer,” but rather if the student thought about this or that while, for example, writing a paper. Discussions will be had about staying on track, and if the LO are being met, although it will be a global view on Gen Ed, not a microscopic view of each course. Every course may not be reviewed every time, and the data will be used to evaluate Gen Ed and avoid straying from the Design Principles and LO that the faculty said were important for Gen Ed. Mullen said he had finished his comments, and welcomed questions.

Prats asked for an explanation of a “seat.” Mullen replied that it referred to estimates from colleges about the number of seats available per course. Prats then asked if it was correct to say that Inquiry in the Humanities was going for about \$20 a seat, and Inquiry in the Arts and Creativity for about \$140 a seat. Mullen said that a few issues were at play, including building an infrastructure that was not present before, as was the case with Arts and Creativity. Other decisions were made within colleges about allocation of monies. Prats said that he thought the Provost had allocated the monies, so he wondered how that was possible. Mullen said that money was allocated based on proposals received during the year.

Dean Kornbluh (Arts and Sciences, or AS) explained the process for AS. Dean Kornbluh met with department chairs about what seats they could provide for each LO area. In addition, he met with departments and talked about reallocating time resources. Hiring of faculty is currently going on, with the understanding that all types of faculty/instructors will teach lower-division, upper-division and graduate students. The amount of funds needed was worked out with the Provost, and AS will receive \$3.5 million to provide about 90% of the Gen Ed instruction. All Gen Ed courses will have smaller classes or sections in which faculty or graduate students are directly engaged with students. All large courses with no engagement were eliminated, and money was shifted around internally as well, to ensure that AS can provide those seats.

Assistant Provost for Program Support Greissman reiterated Mullen’s explanation about having to build Arts and Creativity as almost brand new, except for about 500 seats that Fine Arts used for their own students. To do that total calculation, one would have to add the money being reallocated, but the number given was new investment information.

Finkel said that he had been asked to pose a related question. When one talks of a seat, one is talking about a physical seat, or perhaps not if one is talking about distance learning (DL). He wondered if the numbers were being padded by including DL seats in with classroom seats, and said that Gen Ed via DL was perhaps not a good service. Mullen replied that the numbers offered did not reflect DL courses, but rather are fall and spring classroom seats, taking class on campus face to face with a professor. Dean Kornbluh added that AS is planning on offering DL courses in some of the Gen Ed areas over the summer, but those were not included in the numbers presented. AS is looking at models, and seeing what transfer students need, etc. Mullen said that the numbers also did not include seats that might be taught in the four-week and eight-week summer sessions.

Debski said that the number of courses presented was for fall 2011, and asked if they really represented both fall and spring. Mullen confirmed that was the case.

Wood asked about the course approval process. She said that there was a clear discussion about the current interim committee, and asked if Mullen was proposing that the Interim General Education Oversight Committee (IGEOC) be a permanent body to handle the course approval process, and if so, would the members always be appointed by the chair of the SC, would it be a standing committee of the Senate, would there always be an Undergraduate Council member included, etc. Mullen replied that part of the original charge to IGEOC was that it looks at the final process. He said her point was well taken, and that the present process would be in place for two years, through May 15, 2012. He said that the only answer he could give was that IGEOC will be making recommendations to the SC and Senate on the long-term makeup of the Gen Ed course approval review group. He confirmed for Wood by virtue of the SC's charge to IGEOC, any IGEOC recommendations must return to the SC and Senate for approval.

Arthur asked about whether additional resources were needed to facilitate general curricular and Gen Ed processing. Thyne commented that if so many resources go into evaluating Gen Ed courses, it would be nice as an instructor to know what is inferred or thought about the Gen Ed course. Mullen said that there was nothing to preclude a faculty member from asking for that assessment. Currently, the information is intended to be anonymous, to see if students as a whole are measuring up vis à vis the LO. From an administrative perspective, Mullen said he had no inclination of looking at courses specifically for assessment, but that did not mean a faculty member could not ask for such information. After a follow-up question from Thyne, Mullen said that if the department asks for de-identified information about the department's Gen Ed courses, the assessment folks could provide that.

H. Anderson commented that some universities have a second system to give feedback to faculty members, which is something IGEOC could recommend as part of a long-term implementation strategy. Mullen said that his reticence regarding that type of information came from the perspective that course-specific assessment can be used negatively, and the intent of Gen Ed assessment is at the LO level, not the course level. He said he was willing to look into it further.

Finkel asked for more information about the assessment aspect, including who would map the courses to the LO, decide on artifacts, etc. Mullen replied that the Office of Assessment will ask the instructor to provide an artifact, and efforts are underway to create a way to electronically strip the artifact of identification. If, for example, 4,500 artifacts are collected from one course area, about 200 will be reviewed. Individual evaluators will review the artifacts in groups of ten. Mullen confirmed for Finkel that the sampling will be done automatically by computer. Regarding the rubrics, Mullen said that they would be based upon those of the AACU – he noted that the one for Communications had already been modified at UK for internal use. He said standard rubrics used by colleges and universities across the country were used for examples. The rubrics will be reviewed and modified if necessary by the faculty, and in the short term the ones from the AACU will be used.

Kovash asked Mullen what he envisioned the largest class size would be within the budget framework shown. Mullen said that the goal was that if there were 100 students or more registered, there must be breakout sessions with groups of 20-25 students in a more intimate setting. Kovash said that 4,800 seats were needed for Statistics and Reasoning, but only one course approved for fall 2011. Rayens commented that another course from Psychology was approved for that course area, which will account for about 700 seats. On the local level in Statistics, Rayens said that he had to try to recover those other seats through a variety of means. The number of sessions that TAs would cover was increased by one; discovery was moved into the classroom; technical into lecture; and additional recitation sections were

added. He said it was really tight, but he thought the seats would all be covered. Mullen added that at least one other program was looking into offering a course in that area.

Maynard opined that the area with the least coherence was that of transfer equivalencies, particularly given state legislation and the unique nature of some of the courses. Mullen said that it was being worked on at UK, as well as at the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE), to articulate and simply transfer among state institutions. It is a difficult task, however, since the number of credit hours required for general education programs across the state vary from 30 to 40 hours and have slightly different categories. Faculty from UK and other institutions and the Kentucky Community and Technical College System (KCTCS) worked together and went through learning outcomes, and came up with five units and a 33-hour base of student learning outcomes. There are learning outcomes now to which each university must map. When the agreement is finalized, everyone will have to agree to it. Mullen opined that UK would have an easier time of it, since UK's Gen Ed proposal is on the low end, at 30 credit hours.

Mullen said that similar issues existed with out-of-state transfers, and that courses continue to be evaluated for equivalencies. He offered thanks to Mike Shanks (Admissions and Registrar) for his work in that area. Mullen said he would report to the Senate in the spring regarding statewide learning outcomes.

Peek said that it was his understanding that if a course from some other university has ever been granted equivalency at UK it is automatically mapped for evermore and given credit for general education. Guest Shanks confirmed that. Peek said that that practice was dangerous, if no one periodically checks the courses. Shanks replied that there was an initiative underway to end equivalencies for courses not being offered at UK. Mullen opined that if as a faculty member, if credit is given and the student is not prepared, it is a one-off. If there are 12 students, then there needs to be a discussion with the Registrar's office about removing it from the equivalency list.

Wood asked if there was a process for eliminating an equivalency. Shanks said it there was, but it was all done manually, although an effort is being made to automate the effort. Peek asked if questions could be asked about equivalencies for a certain area and reviewed. Mullen said that was just fine, since it was the department that initially evaluated the course for equivalency.

Referring to statements about faculty and staff efficiencies from Executive Vice President for Health Affairs Michael Karpf, Provost Subbaswamy and President Todd, Debski asked stated that she understood that money had been set aside. She asked where that money came from, and what would be cut to get it. Mullen said that he could not explain exactly which pools of money were providing funding. He said that the money would assist in providing the best education possible, and the Provost saw it as an investment in students, but acknowledged that he had not answered the question directly. Debski said that President Todd had said that UK was raising tuition to improve education and salaries but at least in AS, the money has not gone there. Mullen said that the current discussion would be better had in the next meeting when the Provost was in attendance, and that he would work on having an answer to that question at the next Senate meeting.

There were no further questions or comments. Mullen offered his thanks to the Senate on behalf of the students for the many years of hard work. He asked that any comments or questions be emailed to him. The Chair commented that the Senate would need to revisit the issue of a Senate assessment committee.

6. Proposed Changes to Administrative Regulations 1:2 ("Requests to Address the Board of Trustees")

The Chair invited Marcy Deaton (Associate General Counsel) to explain the proposed changes to *Administrative Regulations 1:2 (AR 1:2)*. Guest Deaton explained that she chaired a University regulation review committee, and that the group did not write or create policy, but rather ensured that regulations are consistent with state and federal laws, etc. She said that the proposed changes to *AR 1:2* came to the committee from former faculty trustee Ernie Yanarella, staff trustee Robynn Pease and student trustee Ryan Smith. The newly elected staff and faculty trustees have worked on the language since, along with the committee. She suggested Peek explain the specific changes.

Peek referred senators to the flow chart to explain the proposal. He said that the major differences were reflected there. He said that he and staff trustee Sheila Brothers spoke with Board of Trustees Chair Britt Brockman, and Chair Brockman subsequently changed the posting date of the Board agenda to the Friday prior to the meeting, at 1 pm. He said that with the proposed language, a petitioner will have 24 hours in which to submit a petition. Peek then went on to explain the various changes to *AR 1:2*.

D. Jones asked if a petitioner would find out why a committee denied the petition. Peek replied that yes, if a petitioner made it to committee, the petitioner will be there in person and hear the discussion. Also written into the language is that a permanent list is kept of the disposition of every petition. Also, a petitioner has seven business days after the Board of Trustees (Board) meeting to request a written response. D. Jones followed up with a question about agenda items that are added at the last moment. He asked how that figured in. Peek said that was not something that had been considered, and there was brief discussion about how to include that language. Peek said that the Senate could endorse the changes, with that suggestion.

Wermeling said that the policy seemed fairly ridiculous and insular. There should be standing reservations for faculty to speak to the Board for just one comment. Peek said that the current regulation went into effect in 1970, and he said he suspected that it was designed to insulate the Board. He said that while the Board should hear a variety of opinions, business also needed to be conducted, so the Board cannot hear from every petitioner every time. He said that there was a limit in the regulation to the number of petitioners per Board meeting.

Mountford thought it odd that the Board did not hold community hearings on issues of importance. After a few additional comments, Mountford opined that the proposed changes to the regulation were inconsequential and that holding hearings would be more substantial.

The Chair commented that the Senate could consider holding a forum in April during the Senate meeting, when the faculty perspective on the state of the University is offered, and invite Board members. There were a few comments about engaging the Board, and Peek said that it was his opinion that Board Chair Brockman was willing and interested in meeting with the SC or Senate.

Ferrier asked for some context – how many petitions are currently received? Peek said that probably no petitions were submitted, and agreed with Ferrier's subsequent assertion that the proposed change could stimulate the demand for more petitions to appear before the Board. Sarge asked why the process did not revolve around the faculty determining which petitions go forward, with petitions posted online and an online vote taken by the faculty.

Wasilkowski asked why there were only three days between the release of the agenda and the meeting. Peek said that an attempt was made to write something that would be acceptable to the Board, and the

more the agenda is pushed back, the more there are additions after the release. Wasilkowski said that much time was needed to review the agenda, and that if the proposed changes were not truly better, then they were not good changes. He asked about the rationale for having only three days. Peek replied that it was three days more than people had now. At seven days in advance, the agenda is not firmly set, and the earlier the Board agenda is posted, the greater the likelihood of additions and revisions to the agenda.

D. Jones **moved** that the Senate endorse the proposed changes to *Administrative Regulations 1:2*, and Mountford **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with two opposed.

8. Trustee Report

Peek stated that he did not have much information to share that had not already offered to senators during the meeting. He said it might be better to answer specific questions.

D. Jones commented that it was interesting the Board Chair is bringing a different demeanor to the Board, and asked if there was an indication that it might impact the annual evaluation of the president. Peek said that issue was not under discussion at the recent Board retreat, and that President Todd had opined that evaluating the president annually was too often. Peek said the recent retreat was only about selecting the next president.

Arthur asked if there was a way to get ideas generated about things to actual candidates. Peek said that when there are final candidates, there will likely be forums. There was brief discussion about the use of the comments offered by faculty during the town hall meetings regarding the next president.

Peek reminded senators that there were two faculty trustees that could help get issues in front of a pertinent committee, and that an appearance before a Board committee was less formally structured.

4. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee 2009-2010 Annual Report

The Chair invited Tom Nieman, chair of the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee (SRWAC), to offer its 2009 – 2010 annual report. Nieman described the process by which a student requests a retroactive withdrawal and the parameters. He said there was a concern that cases were reaching SRWAC that should not be there.

D. Jones commented that he was concerned about SRWAC's workload, and that it will be unmanageable at some time. Nieman affirmed that it was increasing exponentially. In response to a question from D. Jones, Nieman said that assistance could be had if the real purpose of SRWAC was appropriately reported and explained. He said that the cases were difficult enough without the adding work of unnecessary cases. In response to Debski, he commented that the breakdowns seem to occur with the advisor and with the associate deans who typically take responsibility for shepherding the student. He said that the dean in the College of Agriculture (AG) was very good at appropriately handling a lot of things within the college, and that in turn when a petition is received from AG, it was understood that it truly belonged with SRWAC for review. That cannot be said for all other colleges.

9. SACS Accreditation - Quality Enhancement Program (QEP) Update

The Chair invited Guest Deanna Sellnow to offer an update on the Quality Enhancement Program (QEP). Afterwards, she took questions from senators.

The meeting was adjourned about 5:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Debra Anderson,
University Senate Secretary

Invited guests present: Marcy Deaton, Bill Rayens and Deanna Sellnow.

Absences: Adams, Anderson*, Andreatta*, Arents, Bensadoun*, Blackwell*, Brennen, Brion, Chappell*, Davis, DeWall*, Edgerton, Ettensohn, Grossman*, Harris, Hatcher, Heller*, Hilton*, Jackson, J. Jensen, R. Jensen, Kanga, Karan, Kidwell, Kirk*, Kirschling, Lee*, Lester, Martin*, J. McCormick, K. McCormick, McCorvey, Meyer, Mobley, Mock, Montgomery*, Nadel, Perry, Ray, Richey, Scutchfield, Shannon, M.S. Smith*, R. Smith, Stombaugh, Subbaswamy, Sudharshan, Swanson, Tick, Todd, J. Tracy, T. Tracy, Turner, Wells, Whiteheart*, Wilson, Wiseman, Witt, Wyatt*, Yanarella, and Young.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, January 20, 2011.

* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.