**Minutes SREC April 8, 2015**

**Present:** Gail Brion, Roger Brown, Bob Grossman, Joan Mazur, Kaveh Tagavi, Connie Wood

The SREC discussed several matters referred it by the Senate Council. The recommendations and rationale are given below.

1. **GS 708 Doctoral Internship in Psychology**

**Recommendation:** SREC recommends that SC decline to approve this course.

**Rationale:** The Director of the Counseling and Testing Center is proposing an Internship for visiting doctoral level clinical psychology students. Regardless of the prefix, this is an attempt to place a discipline specific, doctoral level course in the Counseling and Testing Center which is not an educational unit. Further, the persons offering this course and assigning grades are not faculty, much less graduate faculty in Psychology.

SREC members discussed the fact that establishing this course did not solve an existing problem because visiting students are currently enrolled in PSY 708. The instructor of PSY 708, Greg Smith, confirmed that he is willing to allow these visiting students to continue enrolling in PSY 708 and that he will review the evaluations of the students’ work and assign grades

1. **Undergraduate Certificates**

**Recommendation:** The following Interpretation be inserted at the end of SR 4.2.8, concerning Undergraduate Certificates:

“\*Students enrolled in graduate degree programs or professional programs may pursue an undergraduate certificate program.”

**Rationale:** The Registrar’s Office posed the question “must a student have a degree at the same level as the certificate; is a higher level degree appropriate for the issuance of a lower level.” The committee determined that the existing description of who is eligible to pursue an undergraduate certificate did not intend to prohibit either students enrolled in a graduate degree program or students enrolled in a professional program from pursuing an undergraduate certificate.

1. **College of Health Science Student Appeals Process**

**Recommendation:** SREC recommends that SC return the proposal to CHS for major revision which address the issues listed below. Specifically, SREC recommends that this process be revamped as an optional, mediation process to facilitate the current due process available to all students. Any revisions should be sent to SREC for initial review.

Furthermore, SREC notes that, according to current CPE definitions, the existing CHS Policy on Probation and Suspension (SR 5.3.2.2) pertains only to their professional program, Doctor of Physical Therapy, but not to their bachelor’s and graduate degree programs. CHS has no Dismissal Policy on file with the Graduate School.

**Rationale:** The committee identified major inconsistencies with SRs and University policy. These include, but are not limited to the following:

* The Grade Appeal process given in the proposal implies that the Program Director, the Assistant Dean, or the Academic Standing Committee can cause a ‘change of grade’. The Instructor of Record has the sole authority to assign grades with the exception that a grade may be changed by the UAB if it finds that the ‘grade was assigned other than in good faith’.
* The proposal is not clear regarding whether or not this Appeals Process would be optional or mandatory. This raises the question of whether or not a College Faculty has the authority to force students through this process when SRs guarantee the student’s right of appeal through the Academic Ombudsman (SR 6.4.4).
* The proposed process does not recognize the role and authority of the Dean of the Graduate School in the dismissal of graduate students.
* Limiting participation in campus activities other than classroom meetings may require action by the Dean of Students

.

1. **Proposals for New Graduate Certificates**

**Recommendations:**

 1. SR 3.2.2 requires that a Senate Council-approved form exist and be used for proposals to create or change Graduate Certificate programs. However, such a form does not currently exist. SREC recommends that a ‘Form For New GRADUATE CERTIFICATE’ proposals be developed, similar to that which has been developed for undergraduate certificates and posted October 2014.

2. SREC recommends that ‘Graduate Certificate Guidelines’ referenced in SR 4.2.9 be (a) changed to include the date on which the guidelines document was approved by the Graduate Council and (b) amended to require the process for appointing *Graduate Certificate Associates or Affiliates*; i.e*., Faculty of Record*, including selection criteria, voting status, term of service, and method for adding/removing members.

**Rationale:** 1. The new proposal form for undergraduate certificates is very clear regarding the requirements for such programs, but no corresponding proposal form currently exists for graduate certificates. 2. Graduate Certificate Guidelines posted by the Graduate School do not provide documentation of approval by the Graduate Faculty or a history of its modifications. The Guidelines say that ‘A graduate certificate requires a viable group of faculty who participate in delivering the courses comprising the curriculum or who are otherwise associated with the curriculum or its topical area. At all times, a minimum of three of these Associates shall be members of the Graduate Faculty.’ No process is required for establishing such a body or changing its composition.

**Other Discussion:** SREC raised questions about whether or not records concerning the *Faculty of Record* and *Graduate Certificate Associated or Affiliates* are being maintained appropriately and the current composition is readily available to the University community.This issue is becoming increasingly acute as the University Senate more frequently receives proposals for interdisciplinary certificates to be homed in an organizational location other than an academic department or graduate program.

1. **Non-educational Units Housing Courses and Programs**

**Recommendation**: SREC recommends that SC charge a Senate Committee, e.g., Academic Organization and Structure, to recommend changes in academic college structures and/or the Governing Regulations in order to bring the University into compliance with SACS regulations.

SREC recommends that the following possibilities be considered:

* Formation of a cross-college University-wide undergraduate educational unit that is equivalent to a college
* Formation of an Honors College
* Change in GRs to reinstate the Dean of Undergraduate Studies as equivalent to a college dean for certain purposes
* If a cross-college University-wide undergraduate educational unit is established, what types of programs and courses should be housed in this entity? Who are the respective Faculty of Record?

**Rationale:** Recent proposals have sought to establish multi-disciplinary programs and courses which reach across college boundaries in administrative units that are not defined to be educational units by GR VII.A.1; e.g., Division of Undergraduate Education. In addition, Honors (equivalent to a department) that contains the Honors Program is housed at the Provost’s Office which is not an educational unit, instead of being contained in a college as required by GR VII.B.7. In order to be in compliance with SACS, this long standing issue has to be addressed. A summary of the issues and the history of the organizational and regulatory changes pertinent to this issue is attached. See APPENDIX.

**APPENDIX: Prepared by Davy Jones, Secretary SREC**

1. The "Division of Undergraduate Education" is not an "educational unit" within the Board of Trustee’s definition at GR VII.A.1.

2. Beginning in May 1970, the Board’s GRs required that courses only be offered in the ‘regular educational units’ (i.e. departments, graduate centers, schools and colleges) with the exception courses of an Interdisciplinary Instructional Program (of which Honors has forever been the only example of a Board-approved educational unit that is an IIP = a department level).

3. The University does not at this time have a 'cross college' University-wide educational unit at the undergraduate level, that would correspond to the Graduate School (= a college) at the graduate level.  Whether UK should currently have an equivalent 'college' at the University-level topic has been a long and fitful, stop-and-start academic conversation for many years at UK, decades actually.

4. At one time, e.g., early 1970s, the Board of Trustees did officially establish that the person in the (now equivalent of) Provost's office with the title "Dean of Undergraduate Studies" was the equivalent of dean of a college (including ex officio voting in the Senate along with other deans) for the purpose of that the department-level equivalent unit "Honors" (housing the "Honors Program") would report to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies and not report to the dean of a 'regular college.'  Honors in fact used to have tenured faculty lines. (see:  <http://www.uky.edu/~djones/Hayse_CasePDF.htm>). This Board action did not create a “college” within the Provost’s office (e.g., such a college is missing from the list of Board-created colleges in GR I.A.2, <http://www.uky.edu/regs/files/gr/gr1.pdf>)

5. The Board of Trustees later (I think in the early 1980s) amended its Gov. Regs to remove the provision establishing a "Dean of Undergraduate Studies" as equivalent to a college dean for certain purposes, but the Board has not acted to cause Honors to instead be homed inside a 'regular college'.  I.e., Honors as an official educational unit (= department) has remained housed at the Provost (i.e., not in a college).

6. Unfortunately complicating the matter was that GR VII.B.7 continued to state (and still states) that IIPs ‘report to the dean of a college.’  Thus, there has remained a contradiction in the GRs, that Honors (the only Board-established educational unit IIP = a department) must report to the dean of a college, but the Board never created a college within the Provost’s office and the Board abolished the regulatory equivalency between “Dean of Undergraduate Studies” and ‘dean of a regular college.’

7. Further complicating was that beginning during when there existed “Dean of Undergraduate Studies” as equivalent for certain purposes to a college dean, the Senate began to be approve (for content) certain courses under the proviso that the course would be housed in the Provost’s Office under the “Dean of Undergraduate Studies” but outside of Honors (e.g., UK 101 type courses).  This practice started a trajectory in which more and more educational content began to be approved by the Senate to be housed in the Provost’s office, even though that office contained no college educational unit.

8. During the ensuing decades, a title of “Dean of Undergraduate Studies” has by administrative action oscillated back and forth between not existing and existing.

9. In 2005, the Board amended GR VII.A.1 to remove the restriction that courses (and, obviously then, programs comprised of courses) could only be offered in 'regular educational units.'  Therefore, after 2005, the only place codifying an expectation that courses/programs would be housed in "educational units" is the University Senate Rules.  The Senate has approved exceptions to this (its own) Senate rule by its approval of content of courses (or programs made of courses) that are or continue to be housed at the Provost’s Office (but not within Honors), i.e., the Senate has endorsed that these specific courses are not housed in an educational unit within a college.  These educational activities might be administered by a particular suboffice of the Provost, e.g., Division of Undergraduate Education, that is headed by an individual who possesses titles, one of which is “Dean of Undergraduate Studies.” However, that administrative responsibility and that title does not convert that office into an “educational unit” absent Board of Trustees action.

10.  The Senate has become particularly sensitive to the increasing amount of educational and academic activity occurring under the auspices of the Division of Undergraduate Education, especially when former Provost Riordan abolished the title “Dean of Undergraduate Studies” from the officer who heads the Division of Undergraduate Studies.  In order that these educational/academic activities continue to be overseen by an individual who has at least the title  of “Dean of Undergraduate Studies” (even though no Board-established college for that dean exists) the Senate Council acted on a recommendation of the SREC (  <http://www.uky.edu/Faculty/Senate/files/Meetings/1_2013-2014/20140428/Dean%20of%20Undergraduate%20Studies%20Summary_TOSC.pdf>)

to restore the title “Dean of Undergraduate Studies” to the officer who is the chief administrative officer for the Division of Undergraduate Education. (see item i at:

<http://www.uky.edu/Faculty/Senate/senate_council/minutes/2013-2014/SC%20Minutes%20April%2028%202014_TOSC_rev.pdf> ).  Provost Riordan then restored the existence of “Dean of Undergraduate Studies”, but, again, that administrative action does not create a “college” within the Provost’s Office, because only the Board of Trustees can create that still-not-existing college.

I hope the above (somewhat lengthy) summary is of assistance. Please let me know if I can be of further help. I have consulted with the current SREC Chair on the above (Connie Wood), cc'd here and she concurs with my summary above.