

Senate Council
August 31, 2009

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm in 103 Main Building on Monday, August 31, 2009. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Dave Randall called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:05.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair explained that there were no minutes ready for approval. He then turned to announcements:

- There is an October 1 deadline for a response to SACS regarding how UK will alert SACS to substantive changes. The Chair said that he was likely to request that the President request an extension of that deadline to give the University Senate (Senate) sufficient time to consider the matter.
- Paper remains the second highest cost in the Office of the Senate Council (OSC) – please let the OSC know both when you are attending SC meetings and when you will be absent, for purposes of handout printing.

2. Naming of Subset for Reinstatement Committee

The Chair explained that for the last couple of years he had chaired the Senate Council's Reinstatement Committee. He asked for volunteers to serve on that committee for the 09-10 academic year.

After some discussion, it was determined that Randall, Chappell and Kirk would serve as the subset of the SC that will be responsible for hearing cases of students having been suspended for the second time. Chappell **moved** that a subset consisting of Randall, Chappell and Kirk comprise the Senate Council's Reinstatement Committee and Kelly **seconded**. There being no more discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Replacement for SC Member on Sabbatical

SC members engaged in a general discussion about which faculty senator could be tapped to fill the remained of Piascik's term, which ends 12/31/09. They ultimately offered two names of elected faculty members for the Chair to contact. The Chair said he would let SC members know the outcome.

4. June 2009 KCTCS Candidates for Credentials

Wood **moved** to approve the June 2009 KCTCS Candidates for Credentials and send it to the Senate and Jensen **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. August 2009 UK Degree List

Wood asked about the list, and Mrs. Brothers explained that the list contained in the handout did not contain the names of the August candidates approved by the Senate in May, although one of the summary documents did include total numbers.

Wood **moved** to approve the August 2009 UK Degree List and send it to the Senate. She noted that the chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, Davy Jones, had worked tirelessly to ensure that the online degree application process for the Graduate School conformed to requirements in the *Senate Rules* about the role of faculty in the degree application process.

Jensen asked about the items for which the degree list should be reviewed. Mrs. Brothers replied that regardless of inclusion on any degree list, if a student has not completed the requirements for their degree they will not graduate. What is far more important is ensuring that students who should be on the list to graduate are indeed on the list. If any omissions are identified, they should be emailed to Mrs. Brothers immediately.

Anderson **seconded** Woods' motion. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

8. [Curricular Proposals – Two Issues](#)

The Chair asked Mrs. Brothers to explain the first issue, that of signatures on curricular proposal forms. Mrs. Brothers explained that the need for formal signatures on proposals slowed down the curricular approval process significantly, since requiring a signature essentially “locked down” the document and prohibited future modifications. There were many instances in which the number of credit hours, etc. needed to be changed, but it was more difficult to do on a PDF document. The Academic Approvals Workgroup (AAW) had suggested a move away from signatures, instead using text descriptions of the approving body, the contact person name and contact information, etc. After some discussion, it was clear that while the SC did not object to utilizing emails from individuals as official documentation of approval by a particular entity, it was not sufficient to type the information about approvals onto the document.

Next, Mrs. Brothers discussed the issue of requiring completed syllabi for reviews of courses in the curricular approval process. The Senate had made a motion during its February 2009 meeting that regarding councils' use of the Senate's Syllabi Guidelines when reviewing courses in the academic approval process. The AAW, however, wondered about requiring only the student learning outcomes, teaching objectives and grading policies for the course under review. SC members discussed this, and determined that robust, detailed syllabi should still be required for the course review process.

The Chair noted that the SC needed to remember that approval of the tentative Senate agenda would still need to be done after the discussion on vetting teams.

7. [Small Group Report on Vetting Teams](#)

Jensen, the chair of the small group, passed out a brief outline of possibilities regarding the experimental gen ed faculty vetting teams. SC members engaged in a lengthy discussion of the document, particularly the issues pertaining to the number of experimental faculty vetting teams (“vetting teams”), the number of members for each team, method of composition in the short run and for long term, and the charge of the vetting teams.

SC members spent some time discussing the optimal number of vetting teams. The consensus was that it was a good idea to start out with seven vetting teams, one for each of the four areas in Learning Outcome #1 (LO#1), and one for each of the remaining three LO.

SC members spent a lot of time considering how the composition of the vetting teams would be accomplished, along with how many members should be on each team and whether or not there was a need to specifically include those individuals who were involved in creation of Gen Ed curricular templates. There was a general consensus that there should be no more than five to seven members per committee, and that at least half of any vetting team’s membership should be composed by some mechanism other than SC appointment.

The Chair summarized that the SC seemed to be leaning toward teams of seven members, with three appointed by the SC and three elected through an open nomination process, with the responsibility for appropriate disciplinary representation lying with the SC. In addition, the SC would appoint the chair of the vetting teams.

Chappell asked about the timeline for vetting teams. Provost’s Liaison Greissman responded that the intent was that the vetting teams would report to the Senate in December. With the short time frame, Chappell expressed concern that it would be difficult to get sufficient numbers of faculty involved at this time of the semester, when many faculty members’ schedules had already been planned out.

Chappell **moved** that the vetting teams be composed of five to seven members, with equal numbers appointed by the SC and elected by faculty, and with a chair appointed by the SC. Jensen **seconded**. Wood **offered a friendly amendment** that the motion pertain to a target size of seven, but no fewer members than five, to which both Chappell and Jensen **agreed**. Greissman suggested that a quorum of five be established, to alleviate any concern that just two individuals could show up and conduct formal business. Chappell **revised** his motion to include that language, and Jensen **agreed**.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion that the vetting teams be composed of seven members with five members constituting a quorum, with equal numbers appointed by the SC and elected by faculty, with a chair appointed by the SC. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Next the SC deliberated on who of the faculty would be eligible for membership on the committees. Ultimately, Chappell **moved** that the selection and nomination for representation on the vetting teams

come stem from a complete list of all full-time faculty employees. Yanarella **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** without dissent.

The SC then turned to the method of how to fill the elected positions. The Chair referred to Jensen's earlier suggestion about a brief self-reported description created by nominees, to help aid voters. It was deemed far too unwieldy to conduct elections specific to a vetting team, and there was no sense that there was a need for specific college representation on the vetting teams.

Jensen **moved** that a ballot consist of at least three members nominated from full-time faculty employees, including self-nomination, for the various vetting teams and that once a candidate accepted a nomination, the candidate would be placed on the ballot, along with a brief description of their teaching experience. There was then a short discussion on the method of voting and how to deal with ties.

SC members were also concerned with proposing an election for all full-time faculty on such short notice. Wood suggested that the Senate do the voting during this experimental period, after which the election could be held campuswide. Chappell suggested that there be a broadcast email sent out to solicit nominations, and the SC could make appointments based on those nominations. There was concern about moving too quickly, and also concern about not moving quickly enough.

Chappell **moved** that the SC request nominations from full-time faculty employees to serve on the vetting teams, that the selection of seven members would be made by the SC, and that the members would serve no longer than through May 2010, after which elections will be conducted.

The Chair noted that Jensen's motion died for lack of a second, and so it must be rescinded prior to getting a second for Chappell's motion. There was additional discussion about the method of composition.

Chappell **reworded** his motion to **move** that: the SC rescind the previous motion; the SC will solicit nominations for service on the seven faculty vetting teams (four for Learning Outcome #1 and one team for each of the remaining Learning Outcomes) from full-time faculty employees; three members and the chair will be appointed by the SC and the remaining three selected by ballot at the October Senate meeting; members of vetting teams composed in fall 2009 will serve through May 2010; a quorum of five is required for each of the vetting teams; vetting team meetings will be publicized, open meetings; and that the SC recommends future elections by ballot will involve the entire faculty. Greissman said that notices of vetting team meetings could be posted on the existing Gen Ed website. Steiner **seconded**. There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Jensen **moved** that as part of the experimental vetting process, the chair of each vetting team will be responsible for the assessment of the efficacy of their team's interactions and processes and that recommendations for further vetting processes be developed by the seven chairs (as a group) for the

Senate's review. Wood **seconded**. There was no additional discussion so a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. [Tentative Senate Agenda for September 14](#)

SC members agreed that the tentative Senate agenda for September 14 was appropriate.

The meeting was adjourned shortly before 5 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Dave Randall,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Chappell, Ford, Jensen, Kelly, Kirk, Steiner, Swanson, Wood and Yanarella.

Provost's Liaison Present: Greissman.

Invited guest present: Mullen.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on **BLANK**.