Senate Council
Agenda
Circulated on July 21, 2003

The Senate Council will meet on Monday, July 28, 2003 from 1pm to 3pm in the Gallery of the W.T. Young Library. The following items will be considered:

Announcements: Letters were sent to gubernatorial candidates, inviting them to attend a debate this fall at UK. The invitation was issued jointly by the Senate Council, Staff Senate and Student Government Association.

1. Existent Distance Learning Policy and the SACS "substantive change" rule (LCC's proposal to offer STA 200 in a Distance Learning format and Statistic's objection).

2. Faculty representation on search committees.

3. Approval of Minutes from April 28, May 19 and Summary from July 2 retreat, 2003.

4. Reorganization of Center for Health Services Management and Department of Health Services Management.

5. SPA 313 Review (requested by Senator Tagavi)

6. SPA 413 Review (requested by Senator Tagavi)

7. Categorization of Senate Council Office items, for review by Senate Council.

8. Suggestions for the processing of summer transmittals while the Senate is not in session.

9. Suggestions for the review and approval of old minutes from the Spring semester (minutes are currently under review by the Chair).

Announcement

UK UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
Staff Senate

July 3, 2003

Chandler for Governor
P.O. Box 3250
Frankfort, KY 40603

Dear Attorney General Chandler:

The University of Kentucky's Student Government Association, the University Senate, and Staff Senate cordially invite you to a gubernatorial convocation Wednesday, October 8, 2003, at the Worsham Theatre in the University of Kentucky Student Center at 3:30 p.m. Each of the three candidates for governor has been invited to attend this important event to present their platform to an audience of the university community.

Each candidate will be allowed a brief oral presentation to highlight his views on the future of higher education in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. This event will also provide an opportunity for you to answer questions from representatives of the three aforementioned organizations. These predetermined questions will reflect the concerns of each group regarding the future of higher education. Journalism professor, Buck Ryan will moderate the rotation of the presentations and the question and answer periods. Guidelines governing the flow of our convocation will be forthcoming.

If you have any questions, please contact

Sincerely,

Bill Adkisson Bill Adkisson, LTC
Chairman of UK Staff Senate

Dr. Jeff Dembo Jeff Dembo
Chairman of UK University Senate

Rachel Watts Rachel Watts
President of the UK Student Government

Item 1

ACTION ITEM 5 - Proposal to amend University Senate Rules, Section 1.3.0 Councils of the Senate

Proposal: Add the following wording to the functions of each of the Senate's Councils, including the Graduate Council (1.3.2.1), the Undergraduate Council (1,3,3,1), the Academic Council for the Medical Center (1.3.4.1) and the Academic Council for the Lexington Community College (to be codified)]

Off-campus Courses and Programs-The Council shall review distance learning activities for quality and effectiveness, in keeping with Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) substantive changes criteria.

Procedure and Rationale:
When substantive change reporting is indicated in a new or existing course or program, it will be communicated to the Senate Council by the appropriate Council. The information will include the type of substantive change planned, the name of the program(s) or course(s) involved and the proposed date when the change is to be implemented. The substantive change information will be a part of the Senate Council's circulation to the members of the University Senate. The Special Assistant for Academic Affairs will receive the University Senate communication from the University Senate Council stamped approved. The President will be notified of substantive changes that require a report to SACS.

The emergence of the Southern Regional Electronic Campus, the Kentucky Commonwealth Virtual University along with our present satellite, interactive video and other distance learning course and program offerings require our vigilance. We are obliged to use principles of good practice and to assure that all of our offerings are of excellent quality. Adding the function above to each Academic Council seems appropriate because they already have a role in reviewing and evaluating courses and programs and in approving them.

Implementation Date: Fall, 1999

Note: If approved, the proposal will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification

Professor Meyer said this was a proposal to have the rules catch up with technology. Through emergence of Southern Regional Electronic Campus, the Commonwealth Virtual University, and those kinds of satellite interactive video distance learning courses there has been no procedure to insure that courses meet generally accepted standards of the University. This proposal is to add wording to the functions of the four Senate Councils that have jurisdiction over course work to assure that those courses meet criteria for quality and effectiveness. He recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

Ray Forgue (Family Studies) asked if the last part -- "substantive changes criteria" -- was a major course change if it is an existing course. So if you were going to offer a distance learning course that has been offered on campus does this have to be put through as a major course change?

The Chair said, as he understood it, it was only when there were substantive changes in the course itself, not just changes in the site.
Lee Meyer asked Cindy Todd for the criteria for substantive course changes. She stated that they had a brochure from the Southern Association.

Louis Swift said that the Undergraduate Council discussed this and it was their understanding that what the Southern Association is concerned about is that the quality of the distance learning courses match the quality of the classroom course. The understanding they have is that if you were going to teach a course through this method, the University has to tell the Southern Association that the course is equivalent to the classroom course. What Dr. Fleming did was to get the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils together to establish some procedures whereby a department could present a course and say, in effect, this is the same course with the same quality and standards. The intent of the Undergraduate Council was to simply review these and, in effect, say there are no problems here. They could then present the information to SACS; this is part of their rules, which they have established, to maintain quality across the system.

Ray Forgue said he was worried about what the codification would be. If it would put such an onerous barrier to these things that it would be a difficult task to get them through in a timely manner. The schedule comes out in March for the fall term. Is that sufficient lead-time to be able to get them done?

Lee Meyer said that this brings courses taught through distance methods under the same criteria. Any new course has to go through this procedure. It just makes sure those courses go through the same procedure and is done through those four councils.

The proposal passed in a voice vote.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - OFFICE OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

Approval Guidelines for Delivery of Undergraduate Courses in Multi-Media Format

In recent years, the University has expanded the number of undergraduate courses and programs offered at off-campus sites - be it under the name of distance learning, extended campus, extension, or outreach. Faculty across campus are increasingly adapting courses for delivery using newer technologies, particularly via the Internet/World Wide Web. Participation in the endeavors of the Commonwealth Virtual University will only increase the level of these activities. During this process, it is important to adhere to the reporting and approval procedures established by the University, the State, and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) concerning courses and distance-learning activities.

The purpose of this document is to provide faculty and administrators with guidelines for the delivery of undergraduate courses (100- through the 400-level) *wholly or largely* via multi-media format. Clearly, these do not apply to courses in which, for example, materials on the Internet, film media, or electronic communications are merely used as a supplement to a more or less traditional course.

New or Significantly Altered Courses and Programs

Entirely new courses or programs, or those that are to be *significantly changed* from existing approved ones follow the standard chain of approval processes within the University applicable to the situation. For example, there are standard routes and forms for proposing new courses and programs or for major course changes. These are used whether the course or program will be delivered on or off campus. In these cases, the information needed to meet SACS reporting and approval requirements is routinely transmitted to the President's Office. This requires approval by the appropriate Undergraduate, Graduate, or Medical Center Council and then the University Senate, after having first been approved by the appropriate department/program and college councils. New programs must then continue on to the Council for Post-secondary Education (CPE) for approval.

When an existing, previously approved course or program is merely *adapted* to delivery off-campus, whether by traditional means or by using one or more of the newer learning technologies, the University needs to ensure that procedures are followed that will meet SACS reporting requirements in a timely manner.

Adaptation of an Existing Course or Program

If an existing, approved (traditional "on-campus") course is being (a) delivered to an off-campus site for the first time or (b) is being adapted to a new "delivery system" such as television, satellite, compressed video (CV or ITV), or web instructional forms, the adaptation needs to be reported by the program through its college or school to the appropriate council(s) - the Undergraduate, Graduate, or Medical School Council.

In this case, the burden on the unit making the adaptation is to demonstrate that the adapted version is "equivalent" to the approved one. After being reviewed by the appropriate Council, the Council will report its approval to the Senate and transmit this approval to the President for purposes of SACS notification.

The minimum documentation for an adapted course is a short description of the adaptation, accompanied by representative syllabi of the traditional and the adapted course. The reason for this requirement is to demonstrate that it is the equivalent course being delivered via different formats or off campus. SACS requires that the students completing such a course (or program) have acquired the same skills or knowledge and that there is an equivalency in how students are evaluated. Some specific points:

If a course is delivered "off campus" by traveling or on-site faculty, essentially the means of delivery is the same. Delivery by compressed video (CV/ITV) technology or live satellite is also widely regarded as being "the same" as the traditional version. These two situations seem rather clear. However, there are still SACS *reporting requirements* because it is being delivered at an off-campus site or by a significantly different delivery system, respectively.

- An off-campus site is defined as one more than 30 miles from the main campus. A course taught by a traveling instructor at a high school in Versailles need not be reported. A course taught by a traveling instructor in Louisville would need to be reported.
- If a standard course normally offered for three 50-minute periods a week is offered in one 150-minute stretch on one afternoon or night each week during the semester, this is not a *significant* change and need not be reported/approved. If, however, such a course were to be compressed into three weekends spaced across the semester, as might be the case in an "executive" degree program, then this is a significant change and must be reported/approved.

Whether a unit is delivering off-campus graduate courses by traditional means or by using modern technologies, the initiation of distance-learning technologies and any *significant* changes in the scope and magnitude of these efforts must be reported to SACS, after wending their way through University channels. The primary requirement is to show that the academic program that is delivered is equivalent to the on-campus version and that resources are available to deliver it. The following are examples of when the reporting/approval process is necessary.

- A program offers its first credit courses via distance learning.
- Any time the number of individual courses in a degree program offered at an off-campus site exceeds 25% of the total requirements for that degree or certification program.
  A program wishes to deliver its degree or certification program completely or nearly completely via distance learning.
- There is a significant increase in the number of courses offered or in the number or location of the sites serviced, whether this occurs in any one year or is the result of slow change over several years.
  A program significantly changes existing delivery systems in distance-learning programs, such as moving to televised, satellite, or compressed-video instructional forms when these were not previously used.
- A program significantly changes the specialty area of the program being offered. For example, the program may initially offer one particular specialty area available within a degree program at several sites; and later the program begins to deliver a different specialty area at the same or other off-campus sites.

Sources of Information and Assistance

The Office of Undergraduate Education is available for advice and assistance to individual faculty who are considering adaptation of courses (or an entire degree program) to non-traditional technologies and/or for delivery to extended-campus locations. SACS defines the latter as sites more than 30

miles from the main campus. SACS guidelines are contained in *Substantive Change Procedure C: The Initiation of Off-Campus Programs, Branch Campuses, and Other Distance Learning Activities*, Commission on Colleges, December 1997. Single copies are available on request. SACS reporting requirements, however, are rather complicated and frequently unknown to many academic units. The Office of Undergraduate Education will assist faculty in understanding and complying with these requirements as they apply to undergraduate courses and programs.

The Distance Learning Technology Center in the W.T. Young Library offers advice, assistance, training, and some financial support directly to faculty who are contemplating the preparation of courses in multi-media format.

The Teaching and Learning Center offers instructional technology support services to assist faculty in developing course materials. Information on creating or upgrading a Web site, producing Power Point presentations and color overhead transparencies, taking digital photos or scanning images, and using discussion lists or chat rooms to promote interaction is available.

In *synchronous* communication, students and the course instructor interact simultaneously in time, even though students may still be separated from on-campus resources. Synchronous course delivery to extended-campus sites includes traditional classroom instruction by traveling instructors or on-site instructors, and by compressed video (CV/ITV). With these means of delivery, it is much easier to see and to demonstrate that they are roughly the same as traditional on-campus courses.

Asynchronous course delivery can be defined as the situation in which course content is not delivered by the instructor and received by the student simultaneously in time, as is the traditional manner in lecture or seminar courses. In asynchronous communication, students experience a separation in both time and place from the instructor, from other students, and from on-campus facilities. Examples of asynchronous delivery include computer media (such as the World Wide Web), printed media, and by satellite and TV media.

The Commission on Colleges
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
1866 Southern Lane
Decatur, Georgia 30033-4097

DISTANCE EDUCATION: DEFINITION AND PRINCIPLES

- A POLICY STATEMENT -

In order to facilitate the evaluation of distance education throughout the United States, the regional accrediting associations have agreed upon the following definition and principles. This agreement is based on an extension of the Principles developed by the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education.

DEFINITION:

Distance education is defined, for the purposes of accreditation review, as a formal educational process in which the majority of the instruction occurs when student and instructor are not in the same place. Instruction may be synchronous or asynchronous. Distance education may employ correspondence study, or audio, video, or computer technologies.

PRINCIPLES:

Any institution offering distance education is expected to meet the requirements of its own regional accrediting body and be guided by the WICHE Principles.

In addition, an institution is expected to address, in its self-studies and/or proposals for institutional change, the following expectations, which it can anticipate will be reviewed by its regional accrediting commission:

Curriculum and Instruction *

Programs provide for timely and appropriate interaction between students and faculty, and among students.***(Section 4.2.4, p. 28, lines 30-34; Section 4.3.5, p. 35, lines 21-30; Section 4.8.2.4, p.46, lines 11-17)***

The institution's faculty assumes responsibility for and exercises oversight over distance education, ensuring both the rigor of programs and the quality of instruction. ***(Section 4.2.3, p.26, lines 35-39; Section 4.8.8, p.49, lines 10-11)***

*** Section citations refer to the Criteria for Accreditation, 1998 version (2000 reprint).***

The institution ensures that the technology used is appropriate to the nature and objectives of the programs.*(Section 4.1, p.22, lines 2-6; Section 5.1.4, p.56, lines 27-29; Section 5.2, p. 58, lines 3-13; Section 5.3, pp. 58-59, lines 14-28 and 1-24)*

The institution ensures the currency of materials, programs and courses. *(Section 4.2.2, p.25, lines11-20; Section 4.2.3, p.26, lines10-14)*

The institution's distance education policies are clear concerning ownership of materials, faculty compensation, copyright issues, and the utilization of revenue derived from the creation and production of software, telecourses or other media products. *(Section 4.8.6, p.48, lines 23-26)*

The institution provides appropriate faculty support services specifically related to distance education. *(Section 5.2, p. 58, lines 3-13; Section 5.3, p. 58, lines 18-23 and p. 59, lines 9-13)*

The institution provides appropriate training for faculty who teach in distance education programs *(Section 5.2, p. 58, lines 3-13; Section 5.3, p. 58, lines 18-23 and p. 59, lines 9-13)*

Evaluation and Assessment

The institution assesses student capability to succeed in distance education programs and applies this information to admission and recruitment policies and decisions. *(Section 4.2.1, p.22, lines 24-28; Section 4.3.2, p.30, lines 32-39)*

The institution evaluates the educational effectiveness of its distance education programs (including assessments of student learning outcomes, student retention, and student satisfaction) to ensure comparability to campus-based programs. *(Section 3.1, pp. 18-19, all; Section 4.5, p.37, all; Section 5.4.1, p. 59, lines 25-34; Section 4.1, p. 22, lines 9-12)*

The institution ensures the integrity of student work and the credibility of the degrees and credits it awards. *(Section 4.2.4, p. 28, lines 7-10; Section 4.3.5, p. 36, lines 3-6)*

Library and Learning Resources

The institution ensures that students have access to and can effectively use appropriate library resources. *(Section 5.1.1, p. 54, lines 1-25; Section 5.1.2, pp. 54-55, lines 26-34 and 1-10)*

The institution monitors whether students make appropriate use of learning resources. *(Section 5.1.1, p. 54, lines 15-23)*

The institution provides laboratories, facilities, and equipment appropriate to the courses or programs. (*Section 4.1, p.22, lines 2-6; Section 4.5, p. 38, lines 1-5; Section 5.2, p. 58, lines 3-13)*

Student Services

The institution provides adequate access to the range of student services appropriate to support the programs, including admissions, financial aid, academic advising, delivery of course materials, and placement and counseling. *(Section 5.4.1, p. 59, lines 25-34)*

The institution provides an adequate means for resolving student complaints. *(Section 1.2, p.7, lines 31-32)*

The institution provides to students advertising, recruiting, and admissions information that adequately and accurately represents the programs, requirements, and services available. (***Section 4.4, p. 37, lines 5-30)***

The institution ensures that students admitted possess the knowledge and equipment necessary to use the technology employed in the program, and provides aid to students who are experiencing difficulty using the required technology. ***(Section 4.2.1, pp.22-23, lines 24-28 and 1-5; Section 5.3, p. 59, lines 3-5; Section 5.4.1, p. 59, lines 32-34)***

Facilities and Finances

The institution possesses the equipment and technical expertise required for distance education. ***(Section 5.3, pp. 58-59, lines 18-23 and 9-13)***

The institution's long range planning, budgeting, and policy development processes reflect the facilities, staffing, equipment and other resources essential to the viability and effectiveness of the distance education program. ***(Condition of Eligibility Eight, p.12)***

Adopted: Commission on Colleges, June 1997
Updated: May 2000

SACS Accreditation Criteria

4.2.4 Undergraduate Instruction

Instructional techniques and policies **must** be in accord with the purpose of the institution and be appropriate to the specific goals of an individual course. Instruction **must** be evaluated regularly and the results used to ensure quality instruction.

Students **must** be provided written information about the goals and requirements of each course, the nature of the course content, and the methods of evaluation to be employed. Methods of instruction **must** be appropriate to the goals of each course and the capabilities of the students. Experimentation with methods to improve instruction **must** be adequately supported and critically evaluated.

4.5 Distance Learning Programs

The Commission recognizes the legitimacy of distance learning, such as that conveyed through off-campus classroom programs, external degree programs, branch campuses, correspondence courses, and various programs using electronically-based instruction offered geographically distant from the main campus. An institution **must** formulate clear and explicit goals for its distance learning programs and demonstrate that they are consistent with the institution's stated purpose. Further, an institution **must** demonstrate that it achieves these goals and that its distance learning programs are effective and comply with all applicable *Criteria.* (See Commission policy statement "Distance Education: Definitions and Principles.")

4.8.8 The Role of the Faculty and Its Committees

Primary responsibility for the quality of the educational program **must** reside with the faculty. The extent of the participation and jurisdiction of the faculty in academic affairs **must** be clearly set forth and published. Much of their business will normally be conducted through such structures as committees, councils, and senates, operating within the broad policies determined by the administration and governing board.

5.3 Information Technology Resources and Systems

Information technology resources and systems are essential components in higher education. An institution **must** provide evidence that it is incorporating technological advances into its operations.

Information technology resources **must** support the planning function and the educational program component of the institution at appropriate levels. These resources include computer hardware and software, databases, communication networks, and a trained technical and user services staff.

Although the diversity of educational programs and goals will be a major determining factor in the selection of information technology resources by an institution, there **must** be a reasonable infusion of information technology into the curricula so that students exit with the fundamental knowledge and basic ability to use these resources in everyday life and in future occupations. Institutions **must** provide the means by which students may acquire basic competencies in the use of computers and related information technology resources. A reliable data network should be available so that students, faculty and staff may become accustomed to electronic communication and familiar with accessing national and global information resources. There **must** be provisions for ongoing training of faculty and staff members so that they may make skillful use of appropriate application software. These requirements **apply** to all programs wherever located or delivered.

Item 2

FACULTY REPRESENTATION ON COMMITTEES (Draft of a document in response to a University Senate resolution)

The following shall pertain to search, appointment, and reappointment committees for senior academic administrative officers at the level of Dean or above up to the President (e.g. dean, associate provost, provost, and vice president), and to university-wide committees, task forces and administratively-formed working groups related to academic affairs.

1.The elected representatives of the unit shall be asked to recommend half or close to half the total number of faculty participating on the committee.

2. The total number and distribution of faculty shall be proportionate to the impact of the position, the academic process in question, or the charge of that committee on the faculty.

3. The request from the [redacted] appropriate office shall include the composition of the committee (i.e. how many representing students, staff, faculty, alumni, etc), the number of names to be selected by the elected faculty representatives, and a reasonable deadline, allowing at least 2 weeks for submission of names to the requesting office.

The above proposal once approved by the joint committee and the Senate Council will then be presented to the full Senate. Upon approval by the Senate the proposal will be sent to the President and Provost for incorporation into the appropriate Administrative Regulation.

Item 3

MINUTES
SENATE COUNCIL
April 28, 2003

The Senate Council met at 3:00 p.m. in the Gallery of W. T. Young Library and took the following actions.

1. Announcements
The Chair indicated to the Senate Council that Bill Pfeifle and two other members from the Committee for the Design of an Academic Support and Technology Center would join the meeting at 3:30 to discuss the proposal that the committee was planning on recommending to the Provost. The Chair indicated that since the proposal will affect academics in some ways, the Senate Council should provide input. The Chair invited the Council to ask questions of the committee members, but noted that the committee members would be unable to respond to certain questions pertaining to personnel issues. In response to a question from Enid Waldhart, the Chair indicated that the meeting with the committee members would most likely be the last opportunity for the Council to ask questions.

2. Introductions
The Chair introduced Rebecca Scott, the new Administrative Coordinator in the Senate Council Office. The Chair then introduced the members who were present to Ms. Scott.

3. Proposal for name change for Ophthalmology
The Academic Organization and Structure Committee forwarded this proposal with a positive recommendation. Kate Chard indicated that since the Medical Council had seen and approved the item, but that the College of Medicine had not, the proposal was approved with a note to that affect. Input was sought from the College, according to Chard, but no complaints about the proposal were encountered. Peggy Saunier moved, and Waldhart seconded, to send the proposal to the Senate floor with a positive recommendation. The motion passed unanimously. The proposal will appeal before the Senate at the May 5, 2003 meeting.

4. Routing Sheet for Proposed Changes in Academic Organization and Structure
The Academic Organization and Structure Committee forwarded this proposal with a positive recommendation. Chard called the Council's attention to the example form in the hand-out. Chard asked for the Council's approval of the form, and suggested that other programs institute forms of their own to track faculty and student input. Elizabeth

Debski asked that some of the form be filled in with example information. Chard agreed to do so. Cibull asked when the form would be effective. Chard indicated that the form would go into effect this coming fall semester. Tagavi moved to approve the form, with the addition that it be effective immediately. Waldhart seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Guideline for Discontinuation of Programs

Chard presented guidelines from the Special Committee for Creation of Guidelines for Discontinuation of Programs. The guidelines were sent to the Senate Council with the approval of the Committee. The subject of program discontinuation prompted questions from the Council regarding the reorganization of Human Environmental Sciences. Chard indicated that the proposals from Provost Nietzel had not been received. Saunier questioned whether or not Provost Nietzel was aware that this item was on the agenda of the next University Senate meeting. Cibull noted that such proposal at this date would not meet the minimum time criteria for the review of proposals. Debski wondered if it would be better to waive the 10-day rule or not. After extensive discussion, it was decided that the item would be left on the agenda for discussion in case the proposal is received in time, and that the faculty from the College of Education, College of Agriculture and College of Human Environmental Sciences should all be invited in the event that the item will be discussed.

The Council turned its attention back to the proposal at hand. Jones suggested that the word "procedures" be used instead of "guidelines". Other members of the council suggested other editorial changes, including the following:

a. Saunier suggested that a line be added to include how the program changes get forwarded to Senate Council.
b. Saunier asked from what point in time the 120-day time limit became active. Chard responded that the count started after Senate Council received the item.
c. Chard said that the wording could be changed in I. to include "programs or units" and in II. to include the example of centers and institutes.

Cibull suggested that the Senate Council should send their comments on the document to the Chair, who will forward editorial changes to Chard. Dembo indicated that once the document was ready the Council will vote on the proposal via e-mail. Waldhart suggested that this item should be included on the University Senate agenda as an announcement for the May 5th meeting.

6. Committee for the Design of an Academic Support and Technology Center

The Chair introduced Bill Pfeifle, Chair of the Committee. Pfeifle introduced Chris Havice and Tad Pedigo, the two committee members

who were present. Pfeifle went on to say that the proposal that was going forth from the Committee to the Provost recommended the combination of all technology and instruction services into one office. Pfeifle reported that the office did not yet have a name, but that the new office would meet two goals:

a. To increase the access of faculty to certain technical assistance and other support services. Access is currently not consistent between departments. Access to such services is currently largely dependent on departmental/unit resources.
b. To have "one-stop-shopping" for faculty support services.

The Chair asked the two committee members who were present if they had anything to add. Havice commented that the aim of the Committee was to examine the functionality of the new office/center, which was difficult to do in light of cost-effectiveness issues, personnel and personalities. Pedigo added that many perspectives had been heard by the Committee, but that ultimately the recommendation came down to issues of synergy and efficiency. Cibull expressed concern that the high service to which some faculty had become accustomed would suffer as a result of the proposed reorganization. Pfeifle said that quality control should remain unchanged, and that some work may be outsourced. Waldhart asked if faculty would have to pay for the services offered. Pfeifle responded that some charges may apply. Waldhart asked where the proposed center would be located. Pfeifle replied that Bowman Hall was one possible location. Waldhart expressed concern that not enough time had been spent in preparing this recommendation. Pfeifle said that the fact that the new fiscal year is approaching necessitated the short amount of time spent. Pedigo pointed out that employment issues were at stake and that employees had already been uncertain of their futures for too long. Debski expressed concern that services that she currently uses will no longer be offered while services that she doesn't need will be available instead. She added concern that the employment issues involved were just an excuse to cause the rush in implementing the new center. Pfeifle indicated that if nothing was done then the budget next year would be even worse. Cibull expressed concern that this hasn't been addressed before, especially since it was evident that faculty use had been declining over years. Pfeifle indicated his agreement. Jones indicated his agreement with Debski's comments. The Chair thanked the Committee and they left.

7. Graduation Contract Follow-Up

Tony Stoeppel said that the Graduation Contract Committee met the Monday following the last University Senate meeting. Waldhart said that her question about resources is still unanswered. Cibull expressed concerns about the computer programming requirements and the expense. He added that he thought the curricular map was a good idea

and hoped that the half-time person mentioned by Provost Nietzel could help with the map. Saunier doubted whether the maps could be in place by Fall 2003, but thought that maybe six months was more realistic. Waldhart agreed, noting that publications such as the Schedule of Classes are printed well in advance of the semester in which they are used. Bailey said that he didn't think one person would be enough to oversee the implementation and use of maps. He added that perhaps each college needed a person do this within the college. After further discussion the Chair called for a request to go forth to the Senate floor. Bailey moved for the creation of a pilot program to be implemented for Fall 2003. Second by Debski "to pilot programs with a representative cross-section of the University for a four year period. All departments should begin work on curricular maps this coming Fall semester". The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15.

Respectfully submitted by Jeffrey Dembo
Chair, Senate Council

Members present: Jeffrey Dembo, Enid Waldhart, Peggy Saunier, Elizabeth Debski, Lee Edgerton, Ernie Bailey, Mike Cibull, Davy Jones, Kaveh Tagavi. Guests: Kate Chard, Tony Stoeppel, Bill Pfeifle, Chris Havice and Tad Pedigo.

Minutes
Senate Council
May 19, 2003

The Senate Council met at 3:00 p.m. in the Gallery of the W.T. Young Library and took the following actions.

1 Proposed Reorganization of the College of Human Environmental Sciences

Due to the number of visitors who were present, the Chair elected to bypass the Announcements and Introductions for the time being. The Chair drew the attention of the Council to the motion, passed by the full Senate in the May 5, 2003 Senate meeting, which charged the Senate Council with reviewing the findings of the Committee on Academic Organization and Structure and then deciding which proposal to recommend to the Provost. The Chair then called upon Kate Chard, Chair of the Committee, to present the Committee's findings.

Chard reported that the Committee voted in support of Proposal One and read the recommendations of the Committee, which are as follows:

1. HES is due to have a College review in two years. We recommend that this review still take place regardless of the placement of the various HES departments. This would provide an opportunity to review the success of the HES placement(s) and make changes as necessary.
2. The missions of the three departments do not fit equally well with the College of Agriculture. If HES were moved to Agriculture it would be very important to quickly begin reworking the mission statements to make them more compatible.
3. Regardless of the HES placement, curriculum impacts need to be addressed very early in the process.
4. There was some concern expressed that Proposal 2 would lead to further erosion of the College as some programs in Family Studies would certainly be more effective for faculty and students in teaching, research and grant writing if placed in the College of Education.
5. The committee agrees that the Center for Families and Children needs to be a College level center if the center is placed in Agriculture or in Education.
6. The committee strongly suggests that regardless of the HES placement, the current students in HES should keep their current major, degree title, and college through their graduation and diploma receipt.

Chard entertained questions from the Senate Council, including questions regarding faculty preferences, accreditation issues, and the main support bases for Proposal One. Ray Forgue spoke to concerns about the history, philosophy and mission of the College. Scott Smith answered questions about the benefits and detriments to the College of Agriculture in regard to each of the proposals in question. Katherine McCormick and Kim Talley spoke to the importance of

moving programs like Early Childhood Education to the College of Education rather than to the College of Agriculture. Chard noted the benefits of Proposal One to the College of Education regarding grant writing, student and faculty recruitment and the importance of issues addressed in Family Studies for effective teacher training and preparedness. After further discussion and debate over the charge of the Senate, Enid Waldhart moved to recommend Proposal One to the Provost. Elizabeth Debski seconded the motion. Debski proposed an amendment to state that the decision was based on faculty recommendations. Debski then withdrew the proposed amendment. Chair Dembo called for discussion on the motion. After brief discussion Ernie Bailey proposed an amendment to state the Senate Council could support Proposal Two as well. Waldhart rejected the amendment. The Chair asked if Bailey would seek a consensus to force the amendment. Bailey declined. Bailey suggested an alternate amendment, to state that the Committee on Academic Structure and Organization and the Senate Council found merit with both proposals, but that the Senate Council recommended Proposal One. Mike Cibull noted that the Senate Council could include language to that affect in the rationale. Bailey withdrew the proposed amendment. After additional brief discussion Edgerton called the question. The motion passed by a hand count of five to one with Edgerton opposed. There were no abstentions.

Chair Dembo asked the Senate Council for any secondary motions or rationale wordings they wished to include. The suggested wording follows:

- The Senate Council, acting on behalf of the full Senate, was charged by the Senate to send its recommendation to the Provost.
- Both the Committee on Academic Structure and Organization and the Senate Council found both proposals acceptable in that both had full input from all affected parties with multiple opportunities for input from faculty.
- Administrative support of interdisciplinary cooperation will be a critical factor, no matter which proposal is adopted.

Waldhart suggested that in addition to a letter to the Provost a second letter be sent to the President requesting that the Senate Council's recommendation reaches the Board in the event that the Provost chooses to recommend Proposal Two. The other Council members agreed.

2. Approval of the Minutes

Chair Dembo asked the Senate Council to review the Minutes from the April 28, 2003 meeting and offer and suggestions or changes, including formatting suggestions. Cibull asked if the Minutes could be reviewed and approved at a later time. The Chair agreed. Saunier suggested that the Administrative Coordinator forward a copy to Kaveh Tagavi, who was not present and could therefore not comment. The Administrative Coordinator agreed.

3. Proposals for Additional Faculty Lines: Medical Center

Chair Dembo said that David Watt and the Provost wanted to solicit proposals for additional faculty lines in the areas of strength in the Medical Center. Watt requested Senate Council representation on a committee to evaluate the proposals. Cibull asked if the representative should be from within the Medical Center. The Chair responded that the letter did not specify, but that he thought that it would make sense for the person sitting on the committee to either be from the Medical Center or to have some working knowledge of it. Cibull volunteered to sit on the Committee.

4. Evaluation of President Todd

Chair Dembo drew the Council's attention to the e-mails received by the Senate Council office regarding the request from Steve Reed for input in the upcoming evaluation of President Todd. Waldhart expressed concern that the four e-mails received were not substantial enough for the Senate Council to form an evaluation. Waldhart suggested that formal evaluation criteria were needed. Other Council members expressed agreement. Waldhart suggested withholding a recommendation until criteria have been established. Debski commented that the Senate Council should speak to how the faculty has been affected by the President's performance. Overall, the Senate Council decided to withhold recommendation until formal evaluative criteria have been established. The Chair will send a letter to Reed. Suggested wording for the letter includes the following:

- Owing to a lack of criteria the SC believes it not possible to make a recommendation at this time. The SC is aware that an Ad Hoc Committee for the Evaluation of Chief Administrative Officers is currently working to develop criteria. As soon as the criteria are in place the SC would be happy to work across campus to seek input from faculty as to how those criteria were met.

5. Recommendations from the Ad Hoc Senate Council/Administration Committee on Faculty Participation on Committees

Chair Dembo indicated that this item should not be discussed due to Tagavi's absence. Waldhart asked if this matter could be taken care of via e-mail. The Chair expressed his consent. The Chair indicated that he would compile a draft including the feedback which he would then distribute to the committee of six one last time before the Senate Council discussed the matter.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:10.

Respectfully submitted by Jeffrey Dembo
Chair, Senate Council

Members present: Jeffrey Dembo, Peggy Saunier, Mike Cibull, Davy Jones, Enid Waldhart, Ernie Yanarella, Ernie Bailey. Guests present: Ray Forgue, Scott Smith, Kate Chard, Kim Talley, and Katherine McCormick.

Summary
Senate Council Retreat
July 2, 2003

The Senate Council gathered on July 2, 2003 in the conference room of the Bingham-Davis House of the Gaines Center for the Humanities. The following is a brief synopsis of what occurred.

The members of the Senate Council who were present included Chair Jeff Dembo, Vice-Chair Lee Edgerton, Ernie Yanarella, Kaveh Tagavi, Mike Cibull, Peggy Saunier, SGA President Rachel Watts, Student Senator Brafus Kaalund, Ernie Bailey, Davy Jones, and Liz Debski. Rebecca Scott, Administrative Coordinator for the Senate Council, was also present.

The Chair welcomed the group and briefly presented the items up for discussion and outlined how he hoped the retreat might proceed.

Davy Jones presented his PowerPoint presentation on the history of shared governance and, more specifically, faculty governance at the University of Kentucky. There were a few questions and comments and a brief discussion regarding the need for continued attention on the part of the Senate and Senate Council to maintaining and improving the faculty's role in educational policy development.

Jones and Jeff Dembo conversed back and forth for a few minutes regarding an e-mail received by Jones from Steve Reed regarding the problem of faculty salaries. Jones reported that a committee of the Board will be created to examine the faculty salary issue, and invited the Senate Council's input and possible participation on that committee.

The Chair presented a chart of the usage of time and attention paid by the Senate Council during its meetings to a variety of issues to determine where the most stream-lining was needed. Mike Cibull commented that too much time was being allotted to discussion of the minutes. He suggested that an electronic circulation of the minutes would help solve the problem. Ernie Bailey commented that he thought some small amount of time, even five minutes, would be nice for discussion of the minutes during the Senate Council meetings, but agreed that the amount of time being spent was superfluous. Dembo asked the Administrative Coordinator to present her ideas regarding the minutes to the group. Rebecca Scott reported that she would like to see a two-day turn around time on minutes and would like to circulate the minutes electronically for approval. Liz Debski brought up the point that this has all already been discussed before and she was under the impression that the minutes were supposed to be reviewed and edited by the Chair before being circulated to the Senate Council for approval. Some other members of the Senate Council agreed with Debski. Cibull suggested that the minutes be prepared by the

Administrative Coordinator, reviewed and edited by the Chair, be circulated electronically by the Chair prior to the Senate Council meeting, and that no more than five minutes be allotted to the discussion of the minutes during the Senate Council meetings. There seemed to be a consensus of agreement, so a trial run of this plan will commence with the circulation of this summary of the retreat. The Administrative Coordinator should include in her e-mail the use of the function in Outlook that will request that the receiver of the e-mail notify her of receipt upon opening the message. If the receipt notification has not been received by a particular member by the Friday prior to the Senate Council meeting, the party who has not been heard from will be contacted by phone by the Administrative Coordinator to confirm receipt.

The Chair also noted that the method by which Reinstatements were being heard is going well. The Senate Council agreed to continue the use of the Reinstatement Committee in this capacity. Jeff Dembo asked the Senate Council if the current method for the posting and approval of proposals was satisfactory. The Senate Council seemed to agree that it was not satisfactory and presented numerous suggestions for how the proposals could be better circulated. All were in agreement that the postings to the Senate site could continue as it has in the past, but suggested that some guidelines be developed to sort between those items that should be brought to the attention of the Senate Council versus those items that are standard and normal enough that they can continue to be posted to the Senate Council web site for the current ten-day review process. Jeff Dembo suggested that he and Ms. Scott sit down and develop a list of all of the types of changes that come to the Senate Council Office and try to determine some distinguishing characteristics between those changes. This list and possible suggestions will be presented to the Senate Council at the next meeting.

The Chair asked the Administrative Coordinator to present her plans for the next few months regarding the operation of the Senate Council Office. Ms. Scott reported that a number of things need addressing, some of which are already underway. These items include the overhaul of the web sites, development of a tracking database, becoming current with archiving, updating the on-line minutes, keeping better track of agendas, the development of a procedures manual, and a variety of other items.

The Chair asked what other items might need to be addressed. Debski and Saunier expressed concern over an item that had been presented to the Senate Council as having been approved by the Undergraduate Council which was later contradicted by Phil Kraemer on the floor of the Senate. Debski was concerned that this sort of thing might happen again and asked what sorts of measures were in place to ensure that they would not. Ms. Scott responded that the new tracking system would help, and suggested that if each item was approved by all entities involved before being submitted to the Senate Council Office, there would be fewer opportunities for error and confusion. Saunier noted that such a

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

Item 4

Office of the Provost
106 Gillis Building
Lexington, KY 40506-0033
(859) 257-2911
Fax: (859) 257-1333
Email: provost@email.uky.edu
www.uky.edu

JUL 17 2003

MEMORANDUM

To: Jeff Dembo
Senate Council

From: Michael T. Nietzel
Provost

Subject: Organization of Center for Health Services Management and Department of Health Services Management

Date: July 16, 2003

I have received a request from Tom Samuel, Acting Director of the School of Public Health, and Tom Robinson, Dean of the College of Health Sciences, that the Center for Health Services Management (CHSM) and the Department of Health Services Management (DHSM) be moved to the School of Public Health as soon as possible. In fact, both of them have proposed a Memorandum of Understanding that would implement such a transfer, effective July 1, 2003 on an interim basis until we are able to complete the full process by which the Senate would make its recommendation on such a change and the Board of Trustees would officially consider it.

The Center for Health Services Management and Research is a non-academic research unit currently assigned to the College of Health Sciences. It offers no degree programs and has no primary academic appointments. The current assignment of this Center to the College of Health Sciences was made by former Chancellor Holsinger some time ago. Both Thomas Robinson and Thomas Samuel agree that it makes the most sense from the perspective of administering active grants and contracts for this center to be assigned to the School of Public Health. All of the investigators who hold grants through this Center are appointed in the School of Public Health. Continuing to administer these grants and contracts through the College of Health Sciences rather than the School of Public Health adds an unnecessary burden on the investigators and the business officers in each of these units.

The Department of Health Services Management in the College of Health Sciences has primary faculty appointments and delivers programs principally designed to support the degrees offered through the School of Public Health. The faculty in this Department unanimously voted to leave the College and join the School of Public Health. This relocation was also supported by the faculty of the entire College in a vote during the 2003 academic year. It is my understanding that following this college-wide vote, the Department and the College were separated operationally, even if not officially. Tom Samuel and Tom Robinson have recommended to me that I assign the Department of Health Services Management administratively to the School of Public Health

in the College of Medicine subject to the provisos that the Department and the College collectively begin the formal process for this transfer according to the policies of the Faculty Senate. This formal process must be completed sometime in the 2003-2004 fiscal year at which time the lines and budgets will officially transfer to the School, with the exception of one line that will be retained by the College of Health Sciences. Until such time as this transfer is completed, the School of Public Health would assume administrative responsibilities for administering these faculty lines including salary increases, promotion and tenure decisions, requests for sabbatical, etc.

I understand the rationale and need for these changes at this time, changes that I have been assured have the support of the faculty involved. I am writing to request that you determine if Senate Council would be willing to endorse this provisional assignment of responsibility for CHSM and DHSM, consistent with the agreement that would be commemorated in a formal MOU between Drs. Robinson and Samuel. As soon as possible, the two units will start the formal University process to effect such a transfer officially. I would add that, to the best of my knowledge, the impetus for this change originates completely in the Center, Department, and College involved.

kh

cc: Dave Watt
Tom Robinson
Emery Wilson
Tom Samuel

Scott, Rebecca M

From: Tagavi, Kaveh A
Sent: Tuesday, July 15, 2003 9:41 AM
To: Scott, Rebecca M
Subject: Re: SC transmittal site/ SC meeting

Item 5

I would like to see SPA 313 to come to the council for our consideration.

Best,
Kaveh

APPLICATION FOR CHANGE IN EXISTING COURSE: MAJOR & MINOR

Submitted by College of Arts and Sciences Date 11/20/02

Department/Division offering course Hispanic Studies

2. Changes proposed:
   (a) Present prefix & number **SPA 411G** Proposed prefix & number **SPA ~~311~~ 313**

   (b) Present Title **Advanced Spanish Language**

   New Title

   (c) If course title is changed and exceeds 24 characters (including spaces), include a sensible title (not to exceed 24 characters) for use on transcripts: **Adv Spanish Language**

   (d) Present credits: **3** Proposed credits:

   (e) Current lecture:laboratory ratio Proposed:

   (f) Effective Date of Change: (Semester & Year) **Fall 2003**

3. To be Cross-listed as:
   (Prefix & Number) (Signature: Dept. Chair)

4. Proposed change in Bulletin description:
   (a) Present description (including prerequisite(s): **A course designed to practice language skills at an advanced level. Preparation of oral and written presentations in Spanish. Selected readings will be treated for their language content. Conducted primarily in Spanish. Prereq: SPA 210 and 211, and a 300-level Spanish course**

   (b) New description:

   (c) Prerequisite(s) for course as changed:

5. What has prompted this proposal? **Students need more language proficiency training in grammar, writing and speaking before proceeding to a 400 level.**

6. If there are to be significant changes in the content or teaching objectives of this course, indicate changes:

7. What other departments could be affected by the proposed change?

8. Is this course applicable to the requirements for a least one degree or certificate at the University of Kentucky? **Yes XX No**

9. Will changing this course change the degree requirements in one or more programs? * **Yes**
   If yes, attach an explanation of the change.*

10. Is this course currently included in the University Studies Program? **Yes**
    If yes, please attach correspondence indicating concurrence of the University Studies Committee.

11. If the course is a 100-200 level course, please submit evidence (e.g., correspondence) that the Community College System has been consulted. **n/a**

*NOTE: Approval of this change will constitute approval of the program change unless other program modifications are proposed.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
APPLICATION FOR CHANGE IN EXISTING COURSE: MAJOR & MINOR

12. Is this a minor change? ☐ Yes ☑ No
(NOTE: See the description on this form of what constitutes a minor change. Minor changes are sent directly from the Dean of the College to the Chair of the Senate Council. If the latter deems the change not to be minor, it will be sent to the appropriate Council for normal processing.)

Within the Department, who should be consulted for further information on the proposed course change?

Name: Inmaculada Pertusa Phone Extension: 7-7097

Signatures of Approval:

Department Chair	12-2-02 Date
Dean of the College	FEB 14 2003 Date
UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL **Undergraduate Council	JAN 28 2003 Date of Notice to the Faculty
	04-01-2003 Date
**Graduate Council	Date
**Academic Council for the Medical Center	Date
**Senate Council	Date of Notice to University Senate

*If applicable, as provided by the Rules of the University Senate.

ACTION OTHER THAN APPROVAL

The Minor Change route for courses is provided as a mechanism to make changes in existing courses and is limited to one or more of the following:

a. change in number within the same hundred series;
b. editorial change in description which does not imply change in content or emphasis;
c. editorial change in title which does not imply change in content or emphasis;
d. change in prerequisite which does not imply change in content or emphasis;
e. cross-listing of courses under conditions set forth in item 3.0;
f. correction of typographical errors. [University Senate Rules, Section III - 3.1]

Rev 8/02

Print Form Clear Form

OLD SYLLABUS for SPA 411G

Advanced Spanish Language

COURSE REQUIREMENTS:

This course aims to fulfill several objectives simultaneously. You should review this paragraph weekly and determine if these objectives are being met. Obviously, meeting them will require full cooperation on your part.

1) To increase the fluency of your communication skills in Spanish by increasing and refining your vocabulary, and by allowing you to use the new vocabulary orally in class and in written exercises.

2) To review and solidify your knowledge of the grammatical structures that make Spanish syntax comprehensible. Obviously, this course assumes that you already have a solid grasp of the major grammar points. We do not spend more than 1 ½ hr. (per week) on grammar review. If your knowledge of some tricky points of grammar is particularly week, you may need to get a tutor to help you with particular chapters. The book has excellent explanations (in English) of the grammar points reviewed. You will need to read the explanations and review all the examples before coming to class. Class exercises assume that you've already studied the pages assigned.

3) To introduce you to short literary pieces by Spanish and Latin American authors. We will use these texts as a starting point for discussions using the new vocabulary. We will also use them to note how socio-cultural details (often pertaining to the author's country or region) find their way into these passages.

REQUIREMENTS:

In addition to homework and reading assignments, informal oral presentations may also be required. Grade evaluation will consist of frequent quizzes dealing with readings, vocabulary, and grammar; three semester exams; a final exam; and class participation. Two compositions will also be required during the semester, in both draft and final versions. The draft version will constitute 70% of the assignment grade, and the revision 30%. Both versions must be typed.

GRADES: Grades will be determined according to the following percentages:

Papers.....20%
Quizzes.....20%
Exams.....30%
Final exam.....15%
Attendance/Participation.....15%

TEXT Ayllón/Smith/Morillo, Spanish Composition Through Literature, 3rd ed.
(Prentice-Hall, 1996; ISBN 0-13-186586-2)
Spanish/English dictionary (Oxford or Bantam recommended)

SPA 311:

By the end of 311, students will be able to:

1) speak more fluent Spanish, with a broader and more refined vocabulary which they can incorporate in oral and written communication;
2) not only speak and write with greater accuracy, but also, from a basic theoretical perspective, elucidate the fundamental grammatical structures that make Spanish syntax comprehensible;
3) read and discuss short literary pieces by Spanish and Latin American authors, in terms of how socio-cultural details (often pertaining to the author's country or region) find their way into these passages.

NEW SYLLABUS **(new number SPA 311)**
Spanish 311
Advanced Spanish Language

Objectives: This course aims to fulfill several objectives simultaneously:

1) to increase the fluency of your communication skills in Spanish by increasing and refining your vocabulary, and by allowing you to use the new vocabulary orally in class and in written exercises.
2) to review your knowledge of the grammatical structures that make Spanish syntax comprehensible. This course will refer to your previous knowledge of the basic grammar points with the purpose of refine them to prepare you for more advanced courses where the study of grammar structures will required a solid understanding of the basic grammatical rules. The book has excellent explanations, in English, of the grammar points that we will review in class. You will need to read the explanations and study all of the examples, and complete assigned written exercises, before coming to class in order to ask instructor for clarification when needed.
3) to guide you through an introduction of short literary pieces by Spanish and Latin American authors; the texts will serve as a starting point for discussions using the new vocabulary, and applying the reviewed grammar points in context. We will also use them to note how socio-cultural details (often pertaining to the author's country or region) find their way into these passages.

REQUIREMENTS: In addition to homework and reading assignments, informal oral presentations may also be required. Grade evaluation will consist of frequent quizzes dealing with readings, vocabulary, and grammar; three semester exams; a final exam; and class participation. Two compositions will also be required during the semester, in both draft and final versions. The draft version will constitute 70% of the assignment grade, and the revision 30%. Both versions must be typed.

GRADES: Grades will be determined according to the following percentages:

Papers.....20%
Quizzes.....20%
Exams.....30%
Final exam.....15%
Attendance/Participation.....15%

TEXT : Ayllón/Smith/Morillo, Spanish Composition Through Literature, 3rd ed.
(Prentice-Hall, 1996; ISBN 0-13-186586-2)
Spanish/English dictionary (Oxford or Bantam recommended)

COURSE SYLLABUS

DATE	AT-HOME PREPARATION	WRITTEN ASSIGNMENTS
8/24 Tues.	Introducciones; verbos con preposiciones	
8/29 Tues.	Ch. 1: Lectura: "La siesta del martes," Gabriel García Márquez (Colombia) Contenido p. 5 Léxico 2-6, 9-13, 15	Práctica pp. 14-16: A: 3-8, 12-17, 19, 21-27, 29-30 B: 2-6, 9-12, 15-20
8/31 Thurs.	Ch. 1: Repaso Gramatical – "to be" pt. 1 pp. 17-21	Práctica A-B, pp. 22-23
9/5 Tues.	Ch. 2: Lectura, "La casa de los espíritus," Isabel Allende (Chile) Contenido p. 30 Léxico 1-6, 9, 11-14	Práctica pp. 42-43: A: 1-18, 25, 28-30 B: 1-8, 11-12, 15-20
9/7 Thurs.	Ch. 2: Repaso Gramatical – "to be" pt. 2 pp. 45-49	Práctica A-B, pp. 50-51
9/12 Tues.	Ch. 3: Lectura, "El túnel," Ernesto Sábato (Argentina) Contenido p. 56 Léxico 1-2, 5-7, 9-11, 15	Práctica pp. 66-68: A: 1-7, 11-18, 21-26, 28-30 B: 1-4, 9-16, 18-19
9/14 Thurs.	Ch. 3: Repaso Gramatical – Simple Tenses, Indicative pp. 69-75	Práctica A-B, pp. 76-78
9/19 Tues.	Repaso de vocabulario y gramática	**COMPOSITION I** 600+ words (2+ pages)
9/21 Thurs.	**EXAM I**	
9/26 Tues.	Ch. 4: Lectura, "Viaje a la Alcarria," Camilo José Cela (Spain) Contenido p. 83 Léxico 1-2, 4-5, 9-15	Práctica pp. 94-95: A: 1-4, 11-13, 15-28, 30 B: 1-2, 4-8, 10, 14-18, 20
9/28 Thurs.	Ch. 4: Repaso Gramatical – Compound Tenses, Indicative pp. 95-101	Práctica A-B, pp. 102-104
10/3 Tues.	Ch. 6: Lectura, "La ciudad y los perros," Mario Vargas Llosa (Perú) Contenido p. 140 Léxico 1-9, 14	Práctica pp. 150-153: A: 1-17, 19-21, 27-28 B: 1-14, 16-17, 19
10/5 Thurs.	Ch. 6: Repaso Gramatical – Subjunctive I pp. 153-160	Práctica A-B, pp. 161-162
10/10 Tues.	Repaso de vocabulario y gramática	**COMP. I REVISION DUE**
10/12 Thurs.	**EXAM 2**	

10/17 Tues.	Ch. 7: Lectura, "La rama seca," Ana María Matute (Spain) Contenido p. 166-167 Léxico 1, 3-7, 9-10, 12-13	Práctica pp. 177-179: A: 1-4, 8-15, 19-24, 26-28 B: 1-3, 6-20
10/19 Thurs.	Ch. 7: Repaso Gramatical – Subjunctive II pp. 180-185	Práctica A-B, pp. 186-188
10/24 Tues.	Ch. 9: Lectura, "Como agua para chocolate," Laura Esquivel (México) Contenido p. 225 Léxico 1, 3-7, 9-10, 12-13	Práctica pp. 235-238: A: 6-11, 13-17, 20-22, 29-30 B: 5-8, 11-14, 16, 20
10/26 Thurs.	Ch. 8: Repaso Gramatical – Subjunctive III pp. 207-217	Práctica A-B, pp. 218-219
10/31 Tues.	Ch. 10: Lectura, "Las ataduras," Carmen Martín Gaite (Spain) Contenido p. 251 Léxico 1-4, 7-11, 13-15	Práctica pp. 263-265: A: 1-9, 13-23, 26-30 B: 1-7, 10-12, 14-15, 17-20
11/2 Thurs.	Ch. 10: Repaso Gramatical, Pronouns pp. 266-274	Práctica A-B, pp. 275-276
11/7 Tues.	ELECTION DAY – no class	
11/9 Thurs.	Repaso de vocabulario y gramática	**COMPOSITION 2** 900+ words (3+ pages)
11/14 Tues.	**EXAM 3**	
11/16 Thurs.	Ch. 11: Lectura, "La sombra del ciprés…," Miguel Delibes (Spain) Contenido p. 280 Léxico 2, 4-5, 7-10, 15	Práctica pp. 291-293: A: 3-4, 6-9, 14-21 B: 2, 4-5, 8-12, 16-17, 19
11/21 Tues.	Ch. 11: Repaso Gramatical, Relative Pronouns pp. 294-298	Práctica A-B, pp. 299-300
11/23 Thurs.	THANKSGIVING – no class	
11/28 Tues.	Ch. 12: Lectura, "La casa de Asterión," Jorge Luis Borges (Argentina) Contenido p. 304 Léxico 1-5, 8, 9, 13-15	Práctica pp. 315-317: A: 1-8, 13-18, 27-30 B: 1-6, 10, 12, 18-20
11/30 Thurs.	Ch. 12: Repaso Gramatical, Prepositions pp. 318-326	Práctica A-B, pp. 327-328
12/5 Tues.	Repaso	COMP. 2 REVISION
12/7 Thurs.	Repaso	
12/14 Thurs.	**FINAL EXAM: 8:00-10:00 a.m.**	

Scott, Rebecca M

From: Tagavi, Kaveh A
Sent: Tuesday, July 15, 2003 9:39 AM
To: Scott, Rebecca M
Subject: Re: SC transmittal site/ SC meeting

Item 6

I would like to see SPA 413 to come to the council for our consideration.

Best,
Kaveh

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
APPLICATION FOR CHANGE IN EXISTING COURSE: MAJOR & MINOR

Submitted by College of Arts and Sciences Date 11-20-02

Department/Division offering course Hispanic Studies

2. Changes proposed:
   (a) Present prefix & number SPA 311 Proposed prefix & number SPA 413
   (b) Present Title Advanced Spanish Conversation and Phonetics
   New Title
   (c) If course title is changed and exceeds 24 characters (Including spaces), include a sensible title (not to exceed 24 characters) for use on transcripts:
   (d) Present credits: 3 Proposed credits: 3
   (e) Current lecture: laboratory ratio Proposed:
   (f) Effective Date of Change: (Semester & Year) Fall 03

3. To be Cross-listed as:
   Prefix and Number Signature: Department Chair

4. Proposed change in Bulletin description:
   (a) Present description (including prerequisite(s):
   no change
   (b) New description:
   (c) Prerequisite(s) for course as changed: no change

5. What has prompted this proposal?
   Students's level in SPA 311 course is not high enough for a phonetics course.Changing the level will allow broader preparation of students.

6. If there are to be significant changes in the content or teaching objectives of this course, indicate changes:

7. What other departments could be affected by the proposed change?

8. Is this course applicable to the requirements for at least one degree or certificate at the University of Kentucky? ☑ Yes ☐ No

9. Will changing this course change the degree requirements in one or more programs?* ☐ Yes ☑ No
   If yes, please attach an explanation of the change.*

10. Is this course currently included in the University Studies Program? ☐ Yes ☑ No
    If yes, please attach correspondence indicating concurrence of the University Studies Committee.

11 If the course is a 100-200 level course, please submit evidence (e.g., correspondence) that the Community College System has been consulted.

*NOTE: Approval of this change will constitute approval of the program change unless other program modifications are proposed.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
APPLICATION FOR CHANGE IN EXISTING COURSE: MAJOR & MINOR

12. Is this a minor change? ☐ Yes ☑ No
(NOTE: See the description on this form of what constitutes a minor change. Minor changes are sent directly from the Dean of the College to the Chair of the Senate Council. If the latter deems the change not to be minor, it will be sent to the appropriate Council for normal processing.)

13. Within the Department, who should be consulted for further information on the proposed course change?

Name: Inmaculada Pertusa Phone Extension: 7-7097

Signatures of Approval:

Department Chair	12-2-02 Date
Dean of the College	FEB 14 2003 Date
UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL **Undergraduate Council	JAN 28 2003 Date of Notice to the Faculty
**Graduate Council	04-01-2003 Date
**Academic Council for the Medical Center	Date
**Senate Council	Date
	Date of Notice to University Senate

**If applicable, as provided by the Rules of the University Senate.

ACTION OTHER THAN APPROVAL

The Minor Change route for courses is provided as a mechanism to make changes in existing courses and is limited to one or more of the following:

a. change in number within the same hundred series;
b. editorial change in description which does not imply change in content or emphasis;
c. editorial change in title which does not imply change in content or emphasis;
d. change in prerequisite which does not imply change in content or emphasis;
e. cross-listing of courses under conditions set forth in item 3.0;
f. correction of typographical errors. [University Senate Rules, Section III - 3.1]

Rev 8/02

Print Form Clear Form

SPA 411

By the end of SPA 411, students will be able to:

1) elucidate the general theoretical framework, methodology and practices of contemporary Spanish phonetics;
2) speak Spanish with a more accurate pronunciation and oral fluency;
3) acquire conversational strategies such as the interview, the debate, news reports, oral expository techniques, persuasion techniques, etc.;
4) correct their own specific orthographic problems that in the past have been caused by erroneous pronunciation;
5) articulate the functions of the Spanish phonetic system;
6) summarize basic dialectal differences in regional varieties of contemporary spoken Spanish.

OLD SYLLABUS for SPA 311 (new number SPA 411)

SPA 311
ADVANCED SPANISH CONVERSATION AND PHONETICS
DEPARTMENT OF HISPANIC STUDIES

REQUIRED TEXTS AND OTHER MATERIALS:

- Teschner, Richard V. Camino Oral: Fonética, Fonología y práctica de los sonidos del español (Text and CDs). 2nd. ed. Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2000.

- A small tape recorder.

COURSE DESPCRIPTION:

This course is designed to emphasize early attention to pronunciation and oral fluency by introducing students to Spanish phonetics. It provides intensive practice in oral Spanish so that students increase and maintain oral fluency in Spanish by emphasizing refinement of intonation and pronunciation. SPA 311 also provides extensive practice in conversation strategies.

OBJECTIVES:

1. Correct and refine students' pronunciation in Spanish.
2. Explore the relationship between written language and speech in order to correct specific orthographic problems caused by erroneous pronunciation.
4. Learn the functions of the Spanish phonetic system.
5. Learn about dialectal differences in contemporary spoken Spanish.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS:

- Attendance and participation: Successful progress in the class will require that students keep up with assigned materials. Class discussions and exercises are also essential. For this reason, **attendance is mandatory**. Students are only permitted **two (2) excused absences** (University Senate Rules 5.2.4.2) throughout the semester. An excused absence is, as a general rule, one that is accompanied by an official document (obituary, in case of death in the family, hospitalization, university athletic event, etc.) Stamped excuses from the Student Health Services **DO NOT constitute an** excused absence. A faculty member must verify any illness with a Health Service Physician. These strict guidelines will be implemented from the very first day of class. **Unexcused absences will be penalized by two points per absence from final grade.** There will be **No exceptions**.

Late arrivals are very disruptive for both instructor and students, therefore, **DO NOT ARRIVE LATE**. Every two late arrivals will count as an unexcused absence. If, for any reason, a student cannot attend a class, it is the student responsibility to contact a classmate and find out what was done in class and what is due next class.

Because class participation is 10% of the final grade, all students will be expected to participate actively in all class activities, talking only in Spanish

- Class preparation and homework: Homework is an essential part of this course, therefore, students are required to complete each assignment and turn it into the instructor of the class on the day specified in the syllabus. Each homework assignment should be properly identified (name of student, date of the assignment and page number in textbook), it should also be organized and presented in a clearly fashion. The organization and cleanliness (limpieza) of assignments will constitute part of the grade.

- Final project: As a project for this class, each student will interview a native speaker. The student will have to tape this conversation and then analyze it, paying close attention to the most important phonetic aspects that can be detected in the speaker's pronunciation. This report should be, at least, two (2) pages long. (See instructions on page 7 of this syllabus)

- EXAMINATIONS: In order to evaluate students' progress in the class, there will be three (3) exams during the semester. Please, keep in mind that **THERE WILL NOT BE ANY MAKE-UPS FOR THESE EXAMS.** If, for any reason, a student needs to miss during the day of an exam, he/she should discuss his/her case with the instructor in advance.

GRADING BREAKDOWN:

Activity	Date	%
Exam 1 (Caps. 1, 2, 3)	October 3	20%
Exam 2 (Caps. 4, 6)	November 7	20%
Exam 3 (Cap. 8)	December 3	10%
Final Project	November 26	15%
Homework	(See schedule)	20%
Participation	------	15%

The following grading criteria will be used to determine the final grades for this course:

A	90-100
B	80-89
C	70-79
D	60-69
F	59 or less

SPA 311: ADVANCED SPANISH CONVERSATION AND PHONETICS
DEPARTMENT OF HISPANIC STUDIES
FALL 2002

PRÁCTICAS DE CONVERSACIÓN AVANZADA

I. EL DEBATE.

Generalmente en un debate, cada participante expresa su opinión personal, claramente subjetiva, en relación al tema que se está discutiendo, pues los intereses personales y la experiencia propia influye en el modo en que se interpretan y se "recuentan" los hechos. Existen diferentes estrategias que son utilizadas en los debates:

1. Presentar una posición determinada.

2. Intentar convencer a los otros miembros del panel

3. Apoyarse en los hechos y en estadísticas.

4. Criticar la postura de los otros miembros, rebatir sus ideas y defenderse de sus ataques. Una forma de rebatir las opiniones de otros participantes es tomar sus propias palabras como punto de referencia pero dándoles otra interpretación o, simplemente, presentando un punto de vista diferente.

Trabajo para el día 19 de septiembre

Para esta asignación no se formarán grupos diferentes sino que la clase entera participará como un sólo grupo en un debate sobre **la violencia en la sociedad y la relación de la televisión con el aumento de la violencia entre niños y jóvenes**.

Para poder estar preparados para este debate, ustedes deberán investigar el tema y obtener información real a través de revistas, periódicos, etc., preferentemente en español, pero acepto que incluyan alguna fuente en inglés; siempre y cuando presenten sus opiniones única y exclusivamente en español.

Estos serán los diferentes papeles (roles) de las personas en la clase:

1. Mattie Croom será la **MODERADORA** del debate. Como tal, necesitará a) fomentar la participación de todos los panelistas, b) ofrecer su propia opinión y c) aclarar y sintetizar las opiniones expuestas.

2. El resto de la clase se dividirá en participantes a favor y participantes en contra del tema a tratar. La mitad de la clase estará de acuerdo con la premisa de que la televisión y los videojuegos son responsables del aumento de violencia entre los jóvenes, y la otra mitad estará en contra y defenderá la posición de que la televisión no influye en el comportamiento de los individuos en la sociedad.

Cada panelista deberá presentar su opinión y defenderse mediante datos concretos y/o anécdotas. Deberá saber defenderse de los ataques de otros panelistas y criticar las opiniones contrarias.

II. CÓMO ELABORAR UN REPORTAJE.

En la realización de un reportaje necesitamos utilizar varias estrategias:

1. Seleccionar los hechos:

Cuando un reportero informa sobre cualquier acontecimiento, éste puede seleccionar los hechos que va a incluir dependiendo de los intereses del oyente, el desarrollo de la historia o según su propia actitud hacia los hechos (un punto de vista subjetivo). Su elección afectará la estructura del reportaje.

2. Presentación de dos voces diferentes:

En un reportaje suelen diferenciarse dos voces que presentan diferentes tipos de información: a) la voz del reportero, que cuenta lo que ha dicho otra persona, y b) la voz de la persona entrevistada, quien cuenta lo que ha pasado de forma directa.
El reportero casi siempre controla lo que dice la persona entrevistada, pues sólo deja que el oyente oiga determinada información. Por eso el reportero suele hablar con mayor autoridad y su voz se oye mucho más que la de la persona entrevistada.

3. Escoger una perspectiva:

Es necesario elegir una perspectiva hacia los hechos. De este modo, el reportero necesita investigar la mayoría de las fuentes posibles para ampliar la información referente a un tema en concreto. Al mismo tiempo el mensaje ha de ser coherente.

Trabajo para el día 3 de octubre

En grupos de 4 ó 5 personas, van a preparar un programa de noticias similar a los presentados en televisión por Tom Brokaw, Peter Jennings, etc. Para ello necesitarán buscar noticias diferentes en los varios periódicos hispanos que pueden consultarse a través del Internet. Una vez seleccionados los temas de los que van a hablar, una persona del grupo será el presentador/a del noticiero; el resto, serán reporteros que presenten noticias diferentes ante la clase.
En cada reportaje deberán incluir dos voces: la del reportero y la de la persona que proporciona la información. Al final la clase votará cuál ha sido el noticiero más interesante y mejor presentado.

Grupo 1:	José Binford, Amber Bain, Margaret Fannin, Samieh Shalash y Joy Lanham.
Grupo 2:	Aaron Boone, Jennifer Mickelsen, Sarah Clay y Mary Gaunder
Grupo 3	Mattie Croom, Leslie Ison, Timothy Mahony, Kay Thompson y April Weaver
Grupo 4	Alicia Shiflet, Andrea Smith, Miah Wetzel y Jeremy Wilson

III. EL COLOQUIO.

Un coloquio es una conversación informal en la que cada participante expresa sus opiniones con respecto a un tema determinado. Todas las personas que participan en un coloquio interactúan mutuamente, exponiendo sus opiniones y sus puntos de vista para intentar llegar a un acuerdo. Aunque el coloquio es más informal que el debate, las estrategias a seguir serán básicamente las mismas:

Presentar una posición determinada.

2. Intentar convencer a los otros miembros del panel.

3. Apoyarse en los hechos y en estadísticas.

4. Criticar la postura de los otros miembros, rebatir sus ideas y defenderse de sus ataques

Trabajo para el día 22 de octubre

Nuestra clase va a celebrar un coloquio en el que se tratará de discutir la cuestión del **Evolucionismo vs. el Creacionismo** y su aplicación en las aulas.

IV. TERTULIA LITERARIA (BOOK CLUB).

El día 7 de noviembre, la clase celebrará una reunión para comentar un libro que todos hayamos leído. Yo seleccionaré un cuento, una novela breve o una obra de teatro corta y ustedes tendrán hasta esta fecha para leerla. El día de nuestra clase nos reuniremos y comentaremos lo que nos ha parecido el libro, si nos ha gustado o no y porqué.
Obviamente que todos los comentarios estarán basados en nuestras opiniones personales, en nuestros gustos particulares y nuestra propia experiencia. Sin embargo, cada uno de ustedes deberá ser capaz de hacer referencia a pasajes concretos y específicos del libro para ejemplificar sus opiniones.

En este caso yo actuaré como moderadora para dirigir la clase hacia la discusión de puntos específicos, de manera que vamos a hacer la lectura de la obra intentando determinar:

1. El tema de la misma.
2. La significación general.
3. La intención del autor y el tono que emplea : irónico, trágico, cómico.
4. La caracterización de los personajes.
5. El uso del lenguaje.

PROYECTO FINAL DE INVESTIGACIÓN

Instrucciones:

Busca a una persona de habla hispana e invítala a conversar sobre cualquier tema que te parezca interesante. Pueden hablar sobre los motivos de esta persona para venir a los Estados Unidos, qué hace aquí, cómo era su vida en su país de origen y/o cómo ha sido su proceso de adaptación a la cultura y formas de vida en este país. Graba la conversación y luego analízala con cuidado para determinar cuáles son las características más representativas en la pronunciación del hablante. **La conversación deberá durar, al menos, 20 minutos.**

Escucha la cinta varias veces y elige qué rasgos vas a describir en tu trabajo. Busca ejemplos de palabras que ilustran cada uno de estos rasgos y especifica la frecuencia con que se repiten.

Puedes hablar, por ejemplo, sobre si el hablante aspira o elide la "s", si velariza la "-n" final de palabra, si lateraliza la "r" (lambdaización), si convierte la "l" en [r] (rotacismo), cómo pronuncia las letras "ll" y "y" (rehilamiento de la yod) o si exhibe algún otro rasgo que pueda parecer peculiar en relación con el español estándar. Estudiaremos todos estos procesos fonéticos en el capítulo 8 de nuestro libro de texto.

Con un mínimo de 2-3 páginas, el informe deberá estar escrito en español y constará de 5 partes:

1.- Título
2.- Introducción
3.- Descripción del hablante y método usado
4.- Análisis lingüístico (parte principal)
5.- Conclusión

** **Descripción del hablante** Esta parte deberá contener ciertos datos sobre la persona entrevistada: su origen, la edad, el sexo, su nivel socioeconómico, su nivel de educación formal, su manejo del inglés (es bilingüe o monolingüe) y cualquier otro tipo de información relevante con respecto a su informante.
Además, esta sección deberá describir cómo conseguiste tus datos. Por ejemplo, ¿fue una conversación informal o formal? ¿qué relación existe entre vosotros? ¿Cómo evolucionó la entrevista? ¿Hubo problemas de grabación? ¿Son fácilmente reconocibles (audibles) los rasgos fonéticos que seleccionaste?

SPA 311: Advanced Spanish Conversation and Phonetics
Otoño 2002

Calendario de clases (Tentativo)

Fecha	Material a cubrir en clase	Tarea [1]
Agosto 29 R	Introducción al curso. **El alfabeto español.** **Capítulo 1:** De la ortografía a la pronunciación (pp. 1-3)	------
Septiembre 3 T	Cap. 1: (pp. 3-11)	------
Sept. 5 R	**Conversación 1:** Debate sobre la cumbre de Johannesburgo	pp. 8
Sept. 10 T	**Capítulo 2:** Problemas ortográficos y soluciones prácticas (pp. 12-18)	------
Sept. 12 R	Cap. 2 (pp. 18-24)	pp. 17-18
Sept. 17 T	Cap. 2 (pp. 24-32)	pp. 23-24
Sept. 19 R	**Conversación 2:** Debate sobre la violencia y la influencia de la televisión en la sociedad	pp. 28-29
Sept. 24 T	**Capítulo 3:** El silabeo y la acentuación (pp. 33-40)	------
Sept. 26 R	Cap. 3 (pp. 40-51)	pp. 49, Ej. B y C
Octubre 1 T	Cap. 3 (pp. 51-62)	pp. 58-59, Ej. A
Octubre 3 R	**Conversación 3:** Reportaje de noticias.	pp. 59-61
Octubre 8 T	**EXAMEN 1**	------
Oct. 10 R	**Capítulo 4:** El aparato fonador y la fonética (pp. 63-69)	------
Oct. 15 T	Cap. 4 (pp. 69-76)	pp. 70-71, A-D
Oct. 17 R	Cap. 4 (pp. 76-85)	pp. 80, Ej. D
Oct. 22 T	Conversación 4: Coloquio sobre Evolucionismo vs. Creacionismo.	p. 84
Oct. 24 R	**Capítulo 6:** La sinalefa y el ritmo silábico (pp. 113-121)	------
Oct. 29 T	Cap. 6 (pp. 121-130)	pp. 116, Ej. A
Oct. 31 R	**Repaso para el examen**	-----

[1] No se olviden de revisar y consultar los CDs que acompañan al texto para realizar cada una de las tareas asignadas en el calendario de clases.

Categorization of Items for review by Senate Council

Item 7

New Courses

- New courses that affect degree requirements.
- New courses that do not affect degree requirements.
- New distance learning courses.

Course Changes

- Change in course pre-requisites.
- Change in credit hours.
- Change to variable credit hour course.
- Change in course title.
- Change in course description.
- Change in delivery method (Distance Learning).
- Change in number of times a course may be repeated.
- Change in level (numbering sequence)

New Programs

- Sometimes includes new courses as part of the package

New Certificates

- Sometimes includes new courses as part of the package.

Bulletin Changes

- Calendar changes.
- Removal of untaught courses after 4 years, 8 years.
- Reinstatement of courses.

Program Changes

- Changes in the number of credits necessary for degree.
- Addition/deletion of required courses/language.
- Name change.
- Change in location of program (switching colleges).

College Changes

- Name changes
- Changes in program offerings.