

Senate Council
December 1, 2008

The Senate Council met in regular session on Monday, December 1, 2008 at 3 pm in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands, unless indicated otherwise.

Chair David Randall called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:10 pm.

1. Minutes from November 24 and Announcements

The Chair noted that the November 24 minutes were not yet ready. Turning to announcements, he shared that he had approved the inclusion on UK's December degree list of an Engineering student who would be graduating with a master's degree. He also said that SC should plan on attending a SC meeting on December 15 – the meeting could be cancelled if no agenda items developed. After some brief discussion, it was agreed that the first SC meeting of the new year would be January 12. Finally, he noted that a discussion on Gen Ed and the Learning Outcomes was inadvertently left off the day's agenda.

Learning Outcomes

The Chair drew SC members' attention to two emails, one from an Engineering senator concerned about a possible increase in programs' credit hours, and one from the Department of Philosophy.

Susan Carvalho, General Education Reform Steering Committee (GERSC) convener, made a few introductory comments. Guest Carvalho said that GERSC would be meeting the following morning to discuss the proceeding's of the SC conversation on the Learning Outcomes (LO) and also to begin thinking about the curricular teams. She said that there was a lack of clarity regarding what would happen next, assuming the LO were approved – she asked for input from the SC on next steps.

Wood asked about a resolution to the concern that a revised Gen Ed would increase the hourly requirements for some majors, specifically for Engineering. Carvalho replied that every department had been asked to review their programs and alert GERSC if a revised Gen Ed was likely to increase a programs total credit hours, since GERSC had no intention of increasing the credit hour requirement for any program past 120 hours. She thought that "giving back" 15 credit hours [a 15-credit-hour decrease as a result of moving from the current University Studies Program to the proposed new Gen Ed] would compensate for any double-dipping issues. She reported that the College of Engineering had found no increases, and even found decreases in four departments' programs. The suggestion on the part of the Engineering professor to require a deadline for departments to object and show evidence that a revised Gen Ed would increase the number of required credit hours for a program seemed reasonable to Carvalho. She said

such reviews should be the responsibility of DGS and DUS faculty, since it was in their area of expertise.

Carvalho suggested that if the University Senate (Senate) held a discussion on the LO in March and then held a vote in April, a deadline to report problems with increases in the number of required credit hours could be set for a date between March and April. It would be exceedingly impractical for the curricular teams to do such research, so it would have to be the responsibility of individual programs to do such checking.

After additional discussion, the Chair said that he would invite the concerned Engineering professor to the December Senate meeting, so that the professor could have a chance to voice his concerns to the Senate.

Moving to the email from the Department of Philosophy (Philosophy), the chair asked SC members to comment. The LO could be returned to GERSC, or the LO could be sent forward to the Senate as is. Chappell opined that the SC had already stated the LO would be on the Senate's December meeting agenda; the SC would consider all suggestions during the day's SC meeting, since there was a tentative plan not to allow amendments to the LO on the Senate floor. Regardless of how the SC felt about Philosophy's concerns, the SC had an obligation to send the LO to the Senate for a December deliberation.

The Chair clarified, and said that because there was a GERSC meeting scheduled for the following day, it was within the purview of the SC to request additional tweaks to the LO. He said his previous statement was intended to determine if the SC wanted to request GERSC make additional changes to the LO, or not. In response to Michael, Carvalho explained that all the concerns raised by Philosophy had been vetted by GERSC, and responded to via the written rationale submitted to the Senate. In addition, the concerns of Philosophy had been discussed in a meeting between GERSC and Philosophy, via emails, and also via the discussion at the November Senate meeting. GERSC member (and invited guest) Ruth Beattie commented that none of the concerns raised by Philosophy were new. Carvalho said that the email from Philosophy stated that GERSC had refused to offer justification for not changing LO#3, but said that was not true – justification was offered in the rationale sent to senators prior to Thanksgiving.

SC members discussed the matter further. The Chair determined that the overall consensus of the SC was that although Philosophy still had concerns about LO#3, the LO should indeed be sent to the Senate for the December meeting.

SC members then engaged in a very lengthy discussion regarding the best way to present the LO to the Senate, as well as how to proceed with the ten curricular teams. SC members agreed that at the present time it would be most appropriate for opponents of the LO to spend their energies not on changing the LO, but on urging defeat of the proposal when the Senate held a

vote. Carvalho suggested that there be an update to the Senate in February regarding the efforts thus far of the curricular teams, with a robust discussion in March, followed by a vote in April.

2. Turnitin Discussion – Ruth Beattie, Chair, Instructional Computing Committee

The Chair asked Beattie to share information about Turnitin. Guest Beattie explained that the Instructional Computing Committee was in the process of piloting Turnitin, which is marketed as plagiarism detection and prevention software. She went on to give additional information regarding the pilot period, training for faculty, and some possible issues that need to be addressed prior to any “go-live.” It was determined that she should offer a similar presentation to the Senate in December.

3. New Program: BS in Equine Science and Management

The Chair asked Mike Mullen, College of Agriculture’s associate dean for academic programs, to offer information on the proposed new program, which he did. Guest Mullen also answered a few questions.

Wood **moved** that the Senate Council approve the new BS in Equine Science and Management and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation. Swanson **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. New University Scholars Program: BS Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering and MS Biomedical Engineering

Sue Nokes, the DUS in Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering, was asked by the Chair to explain the proposal; guest Nokes did so. SC members had a few questions.

Wood **moved** to approve the new University Scholars Program between a BS Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering and an MS Biomedical Engineering and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation. Anderson **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed**, with one abstaining.

5. Academic Calendars (2009 - 2010 Calendar; 2011 - 2012 Tentative Calendar; 2009 - 2010 Dentistry; 2011 - 2012 Tentative Dentistry Calendar; 2009 - 2010 Law Calendar; 2011 - 2012 Tentative Law Calendar; 2009 - 2010 Medicine Calendar; 2011 - 2012 Tentative Medicine Calendar)

SC members had a couple of questions. Aken asked about the Winter Intersession; Mrs. Brothers said she would find out the date of the last SC-approved Winter Intersession and report back to the SC.

There being no further discussion, Chappell **moved** to approve the following academic calendars: 2009 – 2010 Calendar; 2011 – 2012 Tentative Calendar; 2009 – 2010 Dentistry Calendar; 2011 – 2012 Tentative Dentistry Calendar; 2009 – 2010 Law Calendar; 2011 – 2012

Tentative Law Calendar; 2009 – 2010 Medicine Calendar; and 2011 – 2012 Tentative Medicine Calendar. Aken **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. [Tentative Senate Agenda for December 8](#)

SC members engaged in a lengthy discussion about the Senate's December agenda. They ultimately decided that due to the length of the agenda, it would be more appropriate to share information about Turnitin with senators via an announcement, rather than a full-fledged agenda item with time for questions; senators would be given Beattie's contact information during the announcement.

SC members engaged in a lengthy discussion about possibly suspending the rules during the discussion on the LO, so that no amendments would be allowed from the floor. It was ultimately determined that any suspension of the rules would need to be a separate agenda item, immediately prior to the agenda item for the LO.

SC members agreed that the SC would put forward a motion to suspend the rules (to disallow amendments from the floor) for the LO discussion.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:07 pm.

Randall,

Respectfully submitted by David
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Aken, Anderson, Chappell, Michael, Randall, Swanson, Wood, Yanarella.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guests present: Ruth Beattie, Susan Carvalho, Mike Mullen, Sue Nokes, and Joe Quinn.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Monday, January 12, 2009.