

Senate Council
March 2, 2009

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, March 2, 2009 in 103 Main Building. 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 pm. Those present introduced themselves.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair noted that Chappell, Ford and Swanson would be absent; the Chair had to leave early to teach, but Vice Chair Aken would preside in his absence.

Turning to announcements, the Chair reported that a faculty member had inquired as to whether the SC would consider the recent opinion rendered by UK's Ethics Committee regarding a faculty member's use of his or her authored textbook in a course, and associated royalties. The Chair explained that, essentially, the Ethics Committee opined that if a faculty member requires students to use a textbook of their own for which they receive royalties, the royalties for that usage should be turned over to a charity.

SC members engaged in a discussion of the opinion, and ultimately decided that the matter should be more fully discussed at a subsequent SC meeting.

There were no minutes ready for approval.

2. [Proposed Changes to College of Engineering Probation and Suspension Rule](#)

The Chair invited College of Engineering Associate Dean for Administration and Academic Affairs Richard Sweigard to explain the proposal, which he did. Guest Sweigard then answered a variety of questions for SC members.

Jensen **moved** to approve the proposed changes to the College of Engineering Probation and Suspension Rules and send them to the Senate with a positive recommendation. Anderson **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** without dissent.

3. [Change to Graduation Standards: BS Merchandising, Apparel and Textiles](#)

The Chair asked Vanessa Jackson, from the Department of Merchandising, Apparel and Textiles, to explain the proposal. Guest Jackson did so, saying that the intent was to prevent students whose grades had slipped from entering the Merchandising, Apparel and Textiles (MAT) program, improving their GPA, and then subsequently returning to the department from whence they originally came. Jackson also answered questions from SC members.

SC members expressed concern that requiring a C grade or better in all courses could set a precedent; they wondered if faculty in MAT would be agreeable to a modification of the wording so that students would be required to have a C average in all classes. Jackson thought the suggestion was acceptable, but thought that she should check with departmental faculty before agreeing to a change in the language. Jackson said that she would send a revised proposal to the Office of the Senate Council.

The Chair recognized Guest Davy Jones, who had asked to share some information about the process by which the UK degree list was created, for graduate students, in particular. Jones explained that the Graduate School had moved to an online system for students to apply for graduation in the given semester. With the past paper application system, the Graduate School had relied upon Directors of Graduate studies (DGS) to proactively check and approve that the listed students have completed all other necessary respective program requirements such that there is a reasonable anticipation date in that semester. However, a recent communication from the Graduate School to DGS faculty stated that no action had to be taken by the DGS if the names were correctly on the list, i.e. no positive affirmation of record from DGSs back to the Graduate School was required. Jones noted that the position of DGS was created by the Senate as a category of Graduate Faculty member, and was intended to be an interface of the Senate with graduate program faculty regarding graduate students.

Jones reported that after discussion with individuals involved, he was assured that that future emails to DGS faculty would require an affirmative check and response back to the Graduate School to ensure that sufficient quality controls were in place.

4. Preliminary Discussion on Engagement

The Chair invited Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Heidi Anderson, Associate Provost for University Engagement Phil Greasley and Associate Dean for Extension Jimmy Henning to share information on the issue of [engagement](#).

Guest Anderson began by offering some background information. She explained that this past fall, [Provost Subbaswamy asked a committee to look at the promotion and tenure regulations and bring them up to date as they pertained to engagement issues](#). All the members of the committee are tenured faculty members with at least 100 years of combined UK experience. She said that she was asked to work with the committee, and that they met on a biweekly basis since October. (The Chair and Wood departed at this time. Vice-chair Aken assumed responsibility for chairing the remainder of the meeting.)

Anderson went on to say that [the committee looked at privilege and tenure policies at UK's benchmarks, from which their suggestions came](#). She added that the purpose for the day's visit with the SC was to identify any concerns of the SC, as well as look at how the document could be disseminated to faculty across campus for broader input, prior to bringing back a revised version for SC and Senate approval.

Guest Greasley went over six aspects of [engaged scholarship](#) and promotion with SC members:

1. Faculty would not be required to participate in engagement with the community.

2. Engagement is not a new mission, but rather parallel's UK's existing three missions in ways that respond to community (external partner) needs.
3. Faculty would not be rewarded with promotion and tenure for engagement work.
4. Those doing engaged scholarship must meet the same standards as those faculty doing traditional scholarship.
5. The evaluation of engaged scholarship will still remain with faculty in their discipline.
6. Engaged scholarship would be conducted in accordance with the mission of the educational unit.

SC members discussed the various aspects of such a cultural change; some of the points of view are listed below.

- The overall concept of university engagement is a very worthy pursuit.
- Untenured faculty might not benefit from participating in engagement activities because of the possibility that any outcome would be marginalized or dismissed as being outside the current, traditional mold of scholarship.
- It is not clear in the informational documents that "engaged scholarship" refers to the product produced through "engagement."
- Such a focus might be better centered on tenured faculty, rather than assistant professors, since a faculty member's desire to follow their disciplinary passion into engagement would not necessarily lead to tenure.
- The result of a faculty member's engagement is not portable, i.e. the product cannot be taken with him/her if a faculty member leaves the university.
- Some faculty members have not been promoted in the past specifically because they had, according to others, too much service/community engagement.
- Librarians already interact with the community on a regular basis, but this activity is considered a normal part of one's responsibilities.
- If engagement is not addressed or valued by the promotion process, it will be hard for faculty to take it seriously.
- Unless faculty members receive some type of recognition for engagement activities, faculty may be unwilling to put forth the extra effort required.

The invited guests thanked SC members for the comments made and concerns raised.

5. [Revisiting Summer School Courses](#)

When the SC last discussed the issue, Provost's Liaison Greissman was asked to take concerns/comments back to Provost Subbaswamy. Greissman said that he had two major items to report on. Guest John Thelin expressed his appreciation for the SC revisiting the issue.

The first pertained to graduate courses that contribute to in-service and professional development for teachers. Within reasonable terms, such graduate course offerings will not be held to a minimum of 14 students, the principle being to ensure adequate offerings for the students with the least flexibility. Secondly, while Thelin had wanted any department to be able to offer a course to fewer than the minimum 14 students, it was not possible. The university's budget is built with the understanding that summer school tuition contributes handsomely; if there were an arrangement made which resulted in summer school courses not generating sufficient income, UK's budget would have to be recalculated.

In response to a question from Tagavi, Greissman explained that it was his understanding that the number 14 was more or less reverse engineered, e.g. the percentage of money that had to be derived from summer school was identified, and then numbers were plugged into to arrive at a profitable level. He added that the rigidity of the minimum number of 14 was also set to ensure fairness, so that faculty members in less affluent colleges would not have different standards than those faculty in more wealthy colleges.

SC members engaged Greissman in discussion throughout his explanation. It was ultimately decided that Greissman would suggest that the Provost attend a future SC meeting to address concerns.

9. [Tentative Senate Agenda for March 9](#)

SC members talked about the proposed agenda. It was decided to change the item regarding *Administrative Regulations II-1.0-1, Parts I-III* [Version B] to an announcement, to alert senators to the item being placed on either the April or May Senate meeting agenda.

SC members agreed to the proposed agenda.

There being no further business to attend to, the meeting was adjourned shortly after 5 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Dave Randall,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Aken, Anderson, Jensen, Kelly, Piascik, Randall, Steiner, Tagavi, Wood and Yanarella.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guests present: Heidi Anderson, Vanessa Jackson, Jimmie Henning, Rick Sweigard and John Thelin.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, March 11, 2009.