University Senate
September 8, 2008

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, September 8, 2008 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.

University Senate Chair Lee T. Todd, Jr., called the meeting to order at 3:04 pm.

1. State of the University Address – University Senate Chair Lee T. Todd, Jr.
Senate Chair (and President) Todd spoke for about an hour as he updated senators on the current state of the university. Afterwards, he asked if there were any questions.

Hallman asked Senate Chair Todd to comment, in the context of academic budget cuts, on recent news article regarding a proposal for a new basketball stadium. Senate Chair Todd replied that the university had not solicited the proposal, but rather it was proposed to UK by the university's sports marketing group. No taxpayer or UK funds would be involved – the buildings would be "paid for" through future marketing rights, special seating suites and other marketing ventures. Such a plan could also allow for the construction of a new baseball facility, which would allow the current baseball facility to be used by the softball teams. Senate Chair Todd said that he was committed to keeping UK's basketball facility in downtown Lexington.

Snow asked Senate Chair Todd to elaborate on the freshman-to-sophomore retention rates. Senate Chair Todd noted that he did not have access to firm numbers, but Dean Blackwell was able to tentatively report that retention rates for African-Americans and women were good.

Senate Chair Todd thanked senators and departed. Senate Council Chair Randall (hereafter "Chair") introduced a variety of individuals involved with the University Senate (Senate). He also urged senators to take information from Senate meetings back to constituents.

2. Minutes from April 14 and May 5 and Announcements
The Chair asked senators to turn to the sets of minutes in the handout. Bollinger **moved** to approve the minutes from April 14. Yanarella **seconded**. There being no comments, a **vote** was taken and the minutes from April 14 were unanimously **approved** as distributed in a voice vote.

Regarding the minutes from May 5, the Chair noted that one change had been noted, that of the location of the meeting. D. Williams **moved** to approve the revised minutes from May 5 and Steiner **seconded**. There being no further revisions, a **vote** was taken and the minutes from May 5, as amended, were   **approved** without dissent in a voice vote.

The Chair then went over a variety of announcements:

- The winter holiday Senate reception with the Board of Trustees and the Staff Senate has moved to October. The 2008 Annual UK Stakes Reception will take place on Tuesday, October 14, from 2 – 4 pm in the Lexmark Public Room (room 209) of the Main Building. He said more information would be available as the date neared.
- Faculty had been named to the University Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities (UCAPP) and were meeting. The Chair noted that while the SC and Provost each proposed half of the membership, the reality was that both the SC and the Office of the Provost agreed on the majority of nominees, regardless of which entity did the nominating.
- The effort to approve revisions to college and departmental rules was moving along, under the leadership of Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs (and Senator) Heidi Anderson.
- A group of individuals would be reviewing the current academic approval procedures and would recommend changes in the process to the SC and Senate in the coming months.
- Colleges have until September 30 to complete their elections for senators.

The Chair then noted that when any rule is waived or action is taken on behalf of the Senate, it is required that the action be reported at the subsequent Senate meeting. The Chair directed senators to the PowerPoint slide with the waivers that had occurred over the summer. [The list from the slide is below.]

- *SR 5.2.4.8.1.A* to allow common hour exams for BIO 153.

- Nursing early provisional admissions – one-year pilot; will be reviewed by cmte and taken to live meetings in academic year 08/09 for final action/approval.

- Repeat option – Project Graduate (A&S – allow returning student to use repeat option and graduate).

- Change to Dentistry calendar.

- Two special summer (August) degree candidate lists approved in May and August.

- Provisional approval (fall 2008) for two B&E undergraduate admissions policies (from list of various changes): 1. credit for UK 101; and 2. make ENG 203 graduation requirement instead of pre-major requirement.

  o Will be reviewed by cmte and taken to live meetings in academic year 08/09 for final action/approval.

- Instructor Feedback From requirement waived due to extreme hardship on student and administrative delay in dean's office.

- Project Graduate student's request to use repeat option (1989 & 1991) while not enrolled.

- Distance learning - Many depts unaware of requirement of Senate approval prior to offering via DL.

  - Accommodated depts by giving provisional approval for summer and fall only & will go through full process in fall 2008: EPE 620; EPE 670; GEO 330; HDI 600; HDI 602; HDI 603; HDI 604; MAT 600; PLS 395; HMT 120; AED/FCS 535; COM 287 (study abroad); ENG 330 (study abroad**).**

The Chair then moved to the next agenda item.

3. General Education Reform Update - Susan Carvalho, Convener, General Education Reform Steering Committee

The Chair reminded senators that the design principles had been approved by the Senate during the previous academic year and that work had continued over the summer due to the efforts of the General Education Reform Steering Committee(GERSC). He invited Susan Carvalho [Arts and Sciences/Hispanic Studies] to offer an update.

Guest Carvalho (and GERSC convener) explained that a group of faculty, jointly chosen by the SC and Provost Subbaswamy, had been at work over the summer to develop a set of Learning Outcomes (LO) and articulate the major components of a revised general education (gen ed) curriculum. A next, future step will be to establish faculty curricular teams to illustrate how the 30 credit hours (10 courses) will be distributed across the curriculum.

Carvalho said that the Design Principles were used as a firm foundation. She invited senators to visit the home page for gen ed work [http://ww.uky.edu/gened] and also to leave informed comments; through October 17 the General Education Reform Steering Committee (GERSC) would be soliciting comments on the LO. Carvalho explained that she was present to discuss the timeline for future vetting and the process. Throughout the summer, four subcommittees of the GERSC were formed to address each of the LO and met with approximately 60 faculty members in various areas. Carvalho noted that it was important to the GERSC to go to faculty for input and not ask faculty to come to the GERSC. She also asked senators to take this information back to their home departments and disseminate it among colleagues.

The GERSC was working with each college dean for input as to how to best organize a meeting of the colleges' faculty; if a college was small and homogeneous, one meeting could suffice but if there was vast differentiation or large numbers, a logical smaller grouping would be identified. The expectation was to conclude discussion on LO by October 17 to allow the GERSC time to accommodate comments into the LO that would be presented to the Senate in November, as well as to ensure the LO are in a format useful to later faculty curricular teams.

For the November Senate meeting, the LO and a division of credits would be prepared and discussed for a first reading; it was anticipated that a final vote on LO would occur during the December Senate

meeting. After that point and assuming the Senate votes to approve the LO in December, broader faculty teams will need to meet to discuss exactly what rubric would be necessary to make a course "count" towards a particular learning rubric. Carvalho said it was likely that there will be existing courses that will fit very well, that there will be existing courses that are okay but will benefit from some revision, and that there will be a need for new courses to be developed. Carvalho noted that the SC suggested that there be a final vote on implementation in the spring semester after the teams outline rubrics in more detail. A final timeline would also include the implementation of the revised gen ed.

The Chair opened up the floor for comments. He reminded senators that Carvalho and the GERSC wanted input not on the merit of the LO, but rather on the proposed timeline of a first reading of the LO in November and a second reading and possible vote in December, while in the interim there would be many opportunities for faculty to offer input.

In response to Calvert, Carvalho explained that there would be rubrics available for review prior to the spring semester vote – it would not be useful to try to prepare rubrics for November/December if the LO had not yet been finalized. There would be one rubric for each course type. Carvalho noted that assessment was very much at the fore – the verbs in the LO had been highlighted, along with assessment-oriented verbs. She explained that the outcomes to project must be assessable.

Hayes commented that the November/December timeline seemed fine, but wondered if it was possible to look as far forward as spring. Carvalho replied that a spring vote would be within the purview of the Senate to determine. In the meantime, though, the GERSC would continue to work with faculty to continue forward efforts. She reiterated that comments could be left electronically on the gen ed website and urged senators and their faculty colleagues to make comments.

The Chair said this was an important opportunity to take information back to home departments and he urged senators to encourage faculty to attend their college's gen ed meeting(s). He thanked Carvalho for attending.

4. June 2008 BCTC Candidates for Credentials
The Chair asked senators to turn to the June 2008 Bluegrass Community and Technical College list of candidates for credentials in the handout.

Jones **moved** that the elected faculty senators approve the June 2008 BCTC 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. Wood **seconded**. There being no comments or questions, the Chair called for a voice **vote**. The motion **passed** without dissent.

5. UK August 2008 Degree List
The Chair then turned to the UK degree list. Jones **moved** that the elected university faculty senators approve the August 2008 list of UK degree candidates, for submission through the President to the

Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Aken **seconded**. There being no discussion, the Chair called for a voice **vote** and the motion **passed** without dissent.

6. Health Care Colleges Student Professional Behavior Code (second reading)
The Chair reminded senators that the Senate discussion on the Health Care Colleges Student Professional Behavior Code (Code) began during the May 2008 Senate meeting. The Code was an attempt to define appropriate professional behavior for students in the health care colleges. He invited Provost's Liaison to the Senate Council Richard Greissman to present the changes.

Guest Greissman noted that the two principle objections to the Code that arose during the May meeting pertained to an overly elastic "prohibited conduct" section and a lack of language stating explicitly that academic offenses would continue to be dealt with under the University Senate Rules, through the University Appeals Board (UAB). Greissman thanked Tom Garrity and Connie Wood for working with him extensively to revise those two aspects of the Code. Greissman added that Tagavi had also offered some corrections, which he would go over shortly.

Greissman explained where the changes could be found. Regarding types of prohibited conduct, he said that the previous items number nine and number eleven (stricken through in the handout) were too elastic and gave the Code a sort of amorphous purview. The stricken sections were replaced with new language that limited the Code to clinical and patient settings and those actions in clinical and patient settings that were inappropriate and egregious. The example he gave was something that occurred in the past – a fourth-year medical student was asked to do a patient history over the weekend, but the student just made up a supposed history for the patient.

Greissman asked Tom Garrity to comment on the changes. Guest Garrity replied that the language was indeed much more explicit. He noted, however, that while the information regarding the jurisdiction of academic offenses still lay within the Senate Rules, it could be difficult for someone to easily find that information in the Code. Garrity added that he thought there were sufficient numbers of people who could correct any misinformation about how an academic offense would be dealt with. He supported the revisions.

Greissman noted that the Code was sent to the six health care college (HCC) deans, who were asked to vet the changes with their faculty.

There were other changes that needed to be incorporated into the Code but had not been done prior to the day's meeting. Greissman referred senators to page five of the Code, under "Hearing Committee and Procedures." He said that Joe Fink [UAB chair] offered a couple of suggestions.

- Article 6, third sentence of Number 8 (page six of the Code): remove "chair" after "…shared with the hearing panel…."(Page five of the Code, Article 6, Section 2.b states that the hearing panel chair will not share any previous disciplinary record with the hearing panel prior to the conclusion of the hearing. The intent in Article 6, Number 8 was for the chair of the hearing panel to share the disciplinary record with the other hearing panel members.)

- Article 7, second sentence of Section D: replace "hearing officer" with "dean" (typographical error)

A series of other changes were suggested by Tagavi:

- Article 7, Section B.1 (page nine of Code): remove "college's" in seventh line (erroneously used to modify "Student Advisory Council")

- Article 7, Section C. 2.(c) (page 10 of Code): remove all language after "…submitted by the…." In the first sentence and insert "Student Advisory Council or equivalent body in each of the six health care colleges. At least three (3) names shall be submitted from each college." (removes language pertaining to Student Government Association's responsibility for submitting names of possible appointees - mirrors use of Student Advisory Council in Article 7, Section B.1)

- Article 9, first sentence of first paragraph of inserted language: insert "Professional" between "Student" and "Conduct" (insertion will make it clear that the reference is to the HCC Student Professional Behavior Code, not the UK Code of Student Conduct)

- Article 9, first sentence of first paragraph of inserted language: insert ", upon the recommendation of the University Senate" after "Board of Trustees" and immediately prior to the period (will clarify that the Board of Trustees can amend the Code only when the University Senate recommends such a change)

- Article 9, first sentence of second paragraph of inserted language: insert "of Student Professional Conduct" after "HCC Code" (insertion will make it clear that the reference is to the HCC Student Professional Behavior Code, not the overall UK Student Code of Conduct)

- Article 9, second sentence of second paragraph of inserted language: insert "University Senate and then to the" prior to "President" in the third line (requires University Senate approval of any changes prior to the President sending them to the Board of Trustees)

- Article 9, second sentence of second paragraph of inserted language: insert "their" between "for" and "approval" in the third line (makes sentence grammatically correct as a result of addition of language requiring University Senate approval)

H. Anderson wondered what would happen to the language of the current "Health Sciences Student Professional Behavior Code" that exists in *Administrative Regulation II-7.0-6*. Greissman replied that once the Health Care Colleges Code of Student Professional Behavior was approved by the Board of Trustees, the health sciences code language would be removed from the *Administrative Regulations*. The "new" HCC Code would not be in the *Administrative Regulations*, but rather would have the same hierarchical status as the university's Code of Student Conduct.

The Chair noted that all the corrections mentioned during the meeting had been accepted in advance by Greissman as friendly amendments, so no motion was necessary to amend the Code on the floor.

H. Anderson **moved** that the Health Care Colleges Student Professional Behavior Code be approved, with the earliest possible effective date. Wood **seconded**. Dean Johnson referred to professional programs in the College of Communications and Information Studies – he asked if it was necessary to create a non-healthcare student professional behavior code. Greissman said it was a possibility.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to approve the Health Care Colleges Student Professional Behavior Code with the earliest possible effective date. The motion **passed** without dissent in a voice vote.

Respectfully submitted by Stephanie Aken,
University Senate Secretary

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Monday, September 29, 2008.

Absences: Adams[*]; Anderson, H.*; Andreatta; Anyaegbunam; Arnold; Bernard; Bhatt; Blades; Brown; Bush; Cantagallo*; Chappell; Cheng; Crofford; Dawson*; Desormeaux; Diedrichs*; Effgen; Enlow; Ettensohn; Ford*; Fox*; Gonzalez; Graham; Harling; Hazard; Heller; Hertog; Hoffman; Houtz*; Hughes; Jackson, V.; Jackson, J.; Kelly; Knoeppel; Leep; Leibfreid; Lester; Marano; Martin; McCormick; McCorvey; Mendiondo*; Mobley; Moise; Montell*; Nardolillo; Newman*; Nieman*; Parrot; Patwardhan; Perman*; Peterson*; Piascik; Rauf; Ray*; Reed; Remer; Sawaya*; Schoenberg*; Segerstrom*; Shay; Smith; Subbaswamy; Sudharshan; Telling*; Terrell; Thompson; Tracy*; Turner; Watt; Webb; Williams, G.; Wiseman; Witt, M.; Witt, D.; Woods; Wyatt; Yates.

---

[*] Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting