

Brothers, Sheila C

From: Jones, Davy
Sent: Wednesday, November 23, 2011 2:02 PM
To: Brothers, Sheila C
Subject: FW: SREC Please do mock SC nominations now...

Can be posted now...Tx.

Davy

Senate Rules and Elections Committee

November 16, 2011

Present: Davy Jones (Chair), Lee Blonder, Robert Grossman, David Pienkowski, Gail Brion

The SREC discussed the following items:

1. The SREC noted the administrative announcements of a guarantee of new educational content of the Honors Program, and of a change in organizational structure of its unit from the name "Honors Program" to "Honors Academy," were (improperly) issued by the administration prior to submission of the programmatic and structural proposals to the Senate. The SREC agreed that the University Senate is the final decision-maker on changes to the educational content of the program, and its opinion must also be sought on changes to the structure of the unit before the Board of Trustees acts on changes to the unit's structure. The SREC noted with much animation the procedural missteps of the administration in these announcements. Bob Grossman will ensure that this matter gets onto the agenda of the next Senate Council meeting, and the SREC may consider writing to the President and Provost, with copy to the Senate Council Chair, elaborating the assessment of the SREC on the situation.
2. The SREC discussed that the SACS and CPE have particular definitions now for what educational programs constitute "professional programs." The SREC noted that because the University Senate is responsible in the eyes of SACS/CPE for University-level oversight of all educational programs, the Senate Rules need in all places to use the term compliant with SACS/CPE. The issue was discussed that there are still several programs that are not professional programs under the SACS/CPE definition, but which still use the 800-999 course number series that the University Senate Rules reserves for "professional programs." The SREC discussed, but did not yet resolve, what recommendation it will make as to whether some 'grandfathering' language will be introduced to the Senate Rules for these programs, or whether the programs ought be directed to convert their course numbering system to course numbers not reserved for "professional" programs.
3. The SREC discussed that it is necessary to make more visible to external agencies (SACS/CPE) that the University Senate is exercising its role of oversight of the proper rigor of the University's educational programs. Jones related that Drs. Heidi Anderson (SACS) and Jeannine Blackwell (CPE) described that the University Senate Rules need language prescribing that the respective academic councils of the University Senate (UC, GC, HCCC) will promulgate guidelines for program proposal writers. These guidelines from each Senate academic council must be effective in eliciting that the program proposals contain the necessary information as to how the program will ensure quality and effectiveness in attaining learning outcomes, and ensure the appropriately increasing rigor of the graduate vs. undergraduate programs, and professional vs. undergraduate programs (professional residency programs are also expected to have rigor beyond the professional doctorate, but Anderson/Blackwell said that for SACS/CPE purposes this oversight responsibility

can be delegated to the college faculties instead of Senate academic councils). The SREC will resolve how this specific Senate Rule should be worded, that assigns responsibility to the academic councils to develop the respective guidelines for increasing degree program rigor.