

Senate Council
February 27, 2012

The Senate Council met in regular session at 2 pm in Room F/G on the 18th floor of Patterson Office Tower on Monday, February 28, 2012. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Hollie I. Swanson called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 2:29 pm.

1. Minutes from February 7, 2012 and Announcements

The Chair asked SC members' opinion about retroactively adding students to degree lists that have already been approved by the University Senate (Senate). If a clerical difficulty has prevented the addition of the student to a degree list in a timely manner, the Chair customarily approves that inclusion on behalf of the SC and Senate. After discussion, SC members agreed that students who claimed they were left of a degree list due to clerical error should be retroactively added to the most recent, Senate-approved degree list.

The term of the Academic Ombud is over at the end of the semester. Per the *Senate Rules*, the academic ombud may be reappointed to a second term, with the agreement of the Academic Ombud, the SC and the Provost. The Chair asked if there were any objections to Sonja Feist-Price serving a second term.

Grossman **moved** that the SC approve the reappointment of Sonja Feist-Price to the position of Academic Ombud, for a second term. Wasilkowski **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair told SC members that Provost Kumble Subbaswamy recently sent an email to deans explaining that, similar to President Eli Capilouto's recent activities, the Provost will be undertaking a review of the administrative structure of the Provost's office.

Regarding the proposed metrics/scales for an evaluation of President Capilouto, Coyne said that he and Wasilkowski will incorporate the oral input received from the last SC meeting. Wasilkowski urged SC members to send in additional input.

2. Old Business

a. Action Items

b. Recommendations from Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) on Proposed Revisions to *Senate Rules 3.3.2* ("Procedures Governing Creation, Consolidation, Transfer, Discontinuation, or Significant Reduction of an Academic Program or Educational Unit")

Guest Davy Jones, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), explained the proposed changes to SC members. He noted that this particular section of the *Senate Rules* had not been revised since the 2005 omnibus *Governing Regulations* revisions. Jones added that with the looming budget cuts from the state, it was important to have clear regulations regarding creation, consolidation, transfer, discontinuation, or significant reduction of an academic program or educational unit.

The bulk of discussion centered on how to ensure sufficient faculty input into organizational changes that are described as administrative, but could be seen to have an academic impact. (For example, merging two departments but not changing any degrees, courses, faculty appointments, etc.)

Jones explained that Provost Kumble Subbaswamy wished for additional time to review the proposed changes, so he asked that the SC not vote on the changes during the day's meeting.

Jones then offered some brief, introductory comments regarding SACS Comprehensive Standards on Coherence of Increasing Program Rigor, to be discussed more fully during the SC meeting on March 5. It was clear that a subgroup of the SC or a Senate committee will need to vet the issue and bring a proposal to the Senate no later than the May 7 Senate meeting.

c. Senate Syllabi Requirements

The Chair asked for SC members' input on how to enforce the requirements in the *Senate Rules (SR)* regarding the required components of a course syllabus. After lengthy discussion, the sense of the SC was that syllabi that are submitted as a part of the course approval process are included only to show a general sense of what the course syllabus will look like.

Therefore, it is not necessary for any academic council or the SC's office coordinator to request any modification to a course syllabus that accompanies a proposal to create a new course or change an existing course.

It is the department chair's responsibility to ensure that syllabi conform to the *SR*. Grossman suggested that the Office of the Senate Council send out a reminder to department chairs at the beginning of each semester to remind them of that responsibility.

3. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) - Raphael Finkel, Chair

ii. Change to Existing Admission Requirement for BHS in Medical Laboratory Science

Guest Raphael Finkel explained the proposal to SC members. There were essentially two aspects to the proposal. Because the degree program's courses are no longer classified in the professional-level series (800 – 900), language about the program in *Senate Rules 5.3.2.2.1* ("College of Health Sciences," Clinical Laboratory Science Professional Program") needs to be removed. The second aspect was more substantive, as it changed the admissions requirement from 2.75 (changed from 2.5 to 2.75 in 2004) back to 2.5. He briefly shared the rationales for changing.

There was discussion among some SC members, Finkel and Guest Michelle Butina (HS/Clinical Science) about the proposed changes. Among the concerns were:

- There is language in *SR 4.2.2.2.E* ("College of Health Sciences Professional Program," "Medical Technology: Admissions Policy") about a Medical Technology Program. It was unclear if this language refers to the current BHS in Medical Laboratory Science but using an old name, or if the degree program mentioned in that section is a completely different program from the BHS in Medical Laboratory Science.
- Having an overall GPA admissions requirement may mean that students with one poor grade may have to take a lot of classes to raise their GPA, whereas having a minimum grade requirement for a course still requires students to have understood the material but not have the extra work of bringing up their GPA.

In response to Butina, the Chair suggested she work with Finkel about any proposed revisions to the proposal. Grossman **moved** that the proposal be returned to the department for: identifying language to

use in the *SR* pertaining to the BHS in Medical Laboratory Science; clarifying language needed for the Clinical Laboratory Science Professional Program referred to in *SR 4.2.2.2.E*, including ensuring that is indeed the former name of the BHS in Medical Laboratory Science; and consideration of changing the GPA requirements to grade requirements for certain courses. Brion **seconded**.

Wasilkowski commented that the department could also change the requirement to be that of a specific GPA in specific courses.

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

i. Proposal to Replace Graduation Writing Requirement (GWR) with Communication Requirement in the Major (CRM)

Finkel explained the proposal, saying that that the proposed new Communication Requirement in the Major is intended to replace the Graduation Writing Requirement.

There was extensive, detailed discussion among SC members, invited guests (Deanna Sellnow, Karen Badger and Scott Yost) regarding the proposal, as well as some changes that have already occurred. SC members were largely unaware of recent changes to course offerings from the Department of English, which were perceived to have a significant affect upon degree programs across the campus. Many SC members expressed significant concern about the proposal and possible unintended consequences. The GWR and associated processes to identify a course as a GWR course was also the subject of a lot of confusion. There were also concerns about what language would be used to codify (in the *SR*) a proposal that was very flexible in nature. Some SC members questioned the extent to which faculty members were aware of the changes and possible effects on their degree programs.

After some time, Grossman **moved** that the SC request the GWR ad hoc committee draft specific language for the *Senate Rules* to replace *SR 5.4.3.1*; and that the place the proposal and draft rule language on the University Senate agenda for the March Senate meeting, for discussion only. Wasilkowski **seconded**. After additional discussion, Grossman **withdrew the motion**.

Davis **moved** that someone from the GWR ad hoc committee make an informal presentation on the current situation of the Graduation Writing Requirement at the March University Senate meeting. Anderson suggested that Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mike Mullen be asked to attend the next SC meeting to offer a similar presentation to SC members. There was no objection to that suggestion. Davis **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Grossman **moved** that the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee be asked to determine if there is language about the Graduation Writing Requirement in the *Senate Rules* and if so, where. Brion **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Outstanding Senator Award

Grossman **moved** that the SC endorse the presented criteria for the Outstanding Senator Award [below], understanding that it may apply to senators who have recently completed their term, with the Outstanding Senator Award Committee to determine what "recent" means.

Selection Criteria for University Senate Award

Purpose: to recognize a Senator for her or his outstanding contributions to the University of Kentucky

1. Nominee has contributed to the University Senate by showing active and exemplary service on one or more Senate committees during his/her tenure.
2. Nominee has made notable substantive contributions in communicating with the Senate and while working with the faculty at large on important issues that impact the faculty as a whole.
3. Nominee has consistently given strong voice to faculty issues in Senate meetings, public events, and/or local/regional news media and actively defended the principle of shared governance in University forums and debates.
4. Nominee is effective in generating and effecting the Senate's larger agenda and goals. Nominating letters or emails should include specific evidence and examples of how the candidate has met the above criteria.

The Senate Council will send the criteria and a request for nominees for this award via email later this week.

There was brief discussion. Davis **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. Grossman confirmed that the Committee size would be three. He added that he would present information on the Award during the March Senate meeting.

Wasilkowski **moved** to approve the minutes from February 7, 2012 and Anderson **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The meeting was adjourned around 4:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Hollie I. Swanson,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Brion, Coyne, Debski, Grossman, McCormick, Swanson, Wimberly, Wilson, Wood and Wasilkowski.

Invited guests present: Karen Badger, Lee Blonder, Michelle Butina, Raphael Finkel, Davy, Jones, Deanna Sellnow and Scot Yost

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Friday, March 2, 2012.