

Senate Council
January 11, 2010

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, January 11, 2010 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a voice vote unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Dave Randall called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:03 pm. The Chair announced the new SC members – Bob Grossman, Sue Nokes and John Thelin. Individuals present introduced themselves for the benefit of new members and guests.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The minutes from December 7 were not ready for review. There were no announcements.

2. TurnItIn (TII) Presentation

The Chair noted that Randolph Hollingsworth had been called away on a family matter, and that Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mike Mullen would share information on TurnItIn (TII) on her behalf.

Guest Mullen explained that there had been TII pilots during the spring 2009 and fall 2009 semesters. He noted that Provost Subbaswamy had provided funding for one final trial semester. Mullen went on to share information about the product with SC members. Guests Becky Kellum (AS/Biology) and Ann Eike (BE/Economics) shared their experiences with TII and answered questions about how the product works, how they had used it, and their opinions about the product's usefulness. Questions from SC members pertained to how TII functioned and the uses for various modules. Comments from Kellum and Eike were almost entirely positive.

The Chair thanked Kellum and Eike, and they departed.

3. Gen Ed Discussion

The Chair said that the SC must be able to inform the University Senate (Senate) on how the Gen Ed process will be continued. Mullen explained that he had prepared a summary of comments from the chairs of the vetting teams (VT). He summarized that the aspect most in need of attention was that of concrete guidelines (syllabi, checklist of required items, etc.). Mullen added that a process for approving Gen Ed courses also needed to be determined.

SC members engaged in a lively discussion on various aspects of Gen Ed. Below are a few of the comments offered.

- An electronic review of courses could be done more quickly than using the current council/live meeting process.
- Mullen said he had warned the Undergraduate Council (UC) that they would be meeting twice a month during spring 2010, as opposed to the customary monthly meetings.
- Live, in-person meetings offer an opportunity for faculty to discuss a Gen Ed proposal, but an electronic review could hamper informed discussion and review.

- Grossman opined that new Gen Ed courses should receive the same review as any other new course, yet each also requires a Gen Ed review in accordance with the Senate's intent.
- The VT could be set up to review the Learning Outcomes aspect of a proposed Gen Ed course, and the UC could then be responsible for the other academic aspects of the course.
- The process of reviewing any Gen Ed course should be done in such a way that the course proposal is digested prior to the meeting date/time, and not two- to three minutes just before the meeting is called to order.
- A long-term process for Gen Ed courses needs to be established, along with the process to be used in the short run.
- Utilizing seven VT was suggested by many faculty early in the process, so such a structure should be maintained.
- The VT as a whole should be structured to ensure that there is coordination among the VT, not seven VT working separately.
- Any formalized use of the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) should be vetted first by the Senate, even though faculty who have used CLA have been relatively happy with it; more information is needed.
- A firm proposal for the process and procedures of reviewing Gen Ed courses must be prepared, including how the VT and UC will interact and a listing of their respective responsibilities.

It was determined that Anderson, Jensen, Mullen, Randall and Swanson would form a small group to look at the process and procedures for Gen Ed courses. Mullen added that he would like to include an administrative member of his team, Nikki Knutson.

Changing topics, Chappell then brought up the legislation pending in Frankfort regarding the transfer of students and of their course credits / grades among the community colleges and the four-year colleges. He opined that it was a slippery slope if the legislature began to meddle in academic matters that were solely within the purview of the faculty.

Mullen commented that he was asked to sit on a panel in Frankfort in August, during which he was sternly reprimanded by at least one legislator on the issue of transfer credits. He said that anecdotal evidence was primarily used to support arguments for legislation, but thought it would be best not to argue. SC members then discussed the issue.

Chappell **moved** that the SC have an opportunity in two weeks to determine whether or not the proposed legislation should be reviewed at the level of the Senate. Jensen **seconded**. In response to Swanson, Chappell clarified that the intent was to give the SC an opportunity to decide if the issue should be discussed further, or if no additional action was warranted at this time.

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

4. September 2009 KCTCS Candidates for Credentials

Steiner **moved** to send the September 2009 KCTCS Candidates for Credentials to the Senate for a vote by the elected faculty senators. Chappell **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Final Exam Scheduling of Evening/Weekend Classes

The Chair invited Grossman to explain his concern, which he did. Essentially, the final exam schedule for all undergraduate classes is very well defined and explicit and includes some exam times scheduled in the evening. The exam schedule for evening/weekend classes, though, is set up in such a way that exams are arranged about 30 minutes apart from the undergraduate classes' exam schedule. Grossman experienced a situation during fall 2009 in which a student in his class also was in an evening/weekend class, and there was a conflict pertaining to the respective exams. The situation was rectified fairly easily, but he thought that it would be more sensible that both sets of exams be coordinated together.

Mullen said that he would be meeting with the University Registrar in the coming days, and suggested he bring up the issue at that time. He said he would report back to the SC.

After a few more comments, the meeting was adjourned at 4:52 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Dave Randall,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Chappell, Grossman, Jensen, Kelly, Kirk, Nokes, Randall, Steiner and Swanson.

Invited guests present: Ann Eike, Becky Kellum, Mike Mullen, Terry Runyon.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, January 21, 2010.