

Senate Council
May 12, 2014

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, May 12, 2014 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Lee X. Blonder called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:03 pm.

1. Minutes and Announcements

There were no minutes ready for approval. There were a few announcements.

- SC members are invited to go to Pazzo's after the meeting to celebrate a successful year.
- The President's office requested names of faculty to be contacted as part of the Board of Trustees' annual evaluation of President Eli Capilouto. SC members deliberated on names and agreed on six faculty. At the request of the President's office, none of the nominees has been involved in this part of the process in the past.
- The Senate recently approved wording for an In Memoriam posthumous degree, with the specific change to "chair" from "chairman." The Registrar's office noted that regular diplomas used "chairman" and asked if SC wanted to change the language to "chair" to be in parallel with the In Memoriam degrees. No decision was made by SC members.

2. Old Business

a. Proposed Change to 2014-15 and Tentative 2016-17 Calendar - Dates When Students Cannot Change Majors

The Chair invited David Timoney (associate registrar) and his associate Matt Patterson (Admissions and Registrar's office) to explain the proposed change and Timoney did so. SC members asked a few questions about the proposed change. The entry in the calendar is to prevent a student from declaring a certain major just to get into a certain course and then switching back to the original major. After brief discussion, SC members asked that the revised calendar entry be changed to remove the days of the week but keep the month/date references. Watt **moved** to approve the proposed change to the 2014-15 and Tentative 2016-17 calendars, with the revision that the days of the week be removed. Day **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

There was additional brief discussion about nominees for the president's evaluation.

Due to the presence of invited guests, the Chair recommended moving to the agenda items for which guests were present. There were no objections.

3. Proposed New Undergraduate Certificate in Leadership Studies - Change Home Educational Unit

The Chair reminded SC members that when the proposed new Undergraduate Certificate in Leadership Studies was presented to SC, it was originally to be homed in Undergraduate Education. Due to changes in the organizational structure of the Provost's office, the degree was changed at the last minute to be homed in the College of Education. The Senate approved the content and its home, but she received a communication from Guest Jayson Richardson (ED/Educational Leadership Studies) requesting that it not be housed at the college level, but that it be housed in the Department of Educational Leadership

Studies, within the College of Education. She said there were letters of support from the College of Agriculture. Richardson and Guest Gary Hansen (AG/Community and Leadership Development) were present to answer questions. The Chair reiterated that the SC could approve the change to the home unit on behalf of the University Senate (Senate) or it could send it to the Senate for approval in the fall. After brief discussion, McCormick **moved** that the SC endorse the placement of the proposed new Undergraduate Certificate in Leadership Studies in the Department of Educational Leadership Studies, in the College of Education. Anderson **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstaining.

4. Update on Revised New Program Form

Ms. Brothers explained the content and arrangement of the revised New Undergraduate Program form. The majority of SC members who spoke were concerned that the inclusion of questions required by the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) and the Southern Association on Colleges and Schools – Commission on Colleges (SACS) caused the form to be very long. Also, the length of the form could lead to the perception that the Senate approval process was becoming even more complex. After discussion, SC members agreed that the questions on the form should be separated based on whether the questions were for the Senate, or for one of the two external bodies (CPE and SACS). In addition, the only required questions will be those the Senate requires, not questions that external bodies require.

5. Update on Foreign Language Requirement

The Chair invited Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education to offer some background comments on the foreign language requirement. Guest Withers explained that when the former general education program, the University Studies Program, was phased out the then-current foreign language requirement was also phased out because it was considered a graduation requirement. When the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) visited UK last time, the organization was concerned that UK allowed students to use high school foreign language experience to count towards the foreign language graduation requirement. In 2010, the University Senate (Senate) passed a new foreign language requirement that called for a competency-based approach for entering students. The levels of competency and implementation issues were to be judged by an advisory committee. The resources necessary for such a requirement are highly technical. At the time, UK thought of testing proficiency with an implementation date of 2012. In the interim, the Bulletin language has essentially been an extension of the old University Studies Program requirement. Jeff Rogers (AS/Modern and Classical Languages, Literature, and Cultures) is chairing the committee that is looking at issues surrounding the foreign language requirement and its implementation. Issues include whether the requirement is an entrance requirement or a graduation requirement and is the requirement based on seat time or competency. Withers explained that he anticipated Rogers' committee having something put in place during fall 2014, with it being in place for the incoming class of fall 2015.

Guest Rogers began by thanking all the effort put forth by committee members. Rogers reported that the committee was concerned with operationalizing the foreign language requirement without making it too onerous, as well as ensuring the integrity of UK Core and the degree. Rogers said that the committee was aware that one degree program, such as biology, has different concerns from a degree program in a foreign language. The committee's solution was to first split the requirement and have clear entrance requirements, which is two years of foreign language in high school. He commented that that language was in the Bulletin but was missing from the *Senate Rules (SR)* and the committee would like to see formal codification of that requirement in the *SR*. The "two years of foreign language in high school" would put UK on par with peer institutions. He thought that bit was relatively simple and the more

difficult part was the graduation requirement and associated competency questions. The terms “proficiency” and “competency” were used interchangeably in deliberations but the committee will settle on one term to use. In order to facilitate the simplest implementation, Rogers said the graduation requirement could be fulfilled in a number of ways. When the issue was first discussed a few years ago, the anticipated required competency would be novice high or an equivalent competency, which is what students are expected to have fulfilled in high school. Rogers said it was important for students to understand the difficulties that language presents when working globally, in terms of understanding position, translation, and working and studying in a foreign country. Cultural and political components of a foreign language were also important. While it may not be feasible to have the language skills to discuss a foreign country’s political environment, it might be sufficient to ensure students understand that there is a difference between speaking and communicating in a foreign language. Rogers suggested that one way a student could meet the requirement would be by having taken two years of a foreign language in high school, coupled with a set of exams given after arrival on campus, such as an AAPPL exam (ACTFL (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages) Assessment of Performance Toward Proficiency in Languages), Advanced Placement test, or STAMP test (STAndards-based Measurement of Proficiency). Another way a student could meet the requirement would be for a student to complete three credit hours of a foreign language at the 200-level or above, after coming to campus (in addition to the two years of foreign language in high school). The third way a student could meet the requirement would be completion of a study abroad program that includes a foreign language requirement. The last and final way that a student could meet the foreign language requirement would be to complete two consecutive semesters of a foreign language that differs from what was taken in high school.

The Chair thanked Rogers for his in-depth report. There were a few questions from SC members. The Chair asked about the timeline for the future. Rogers replied that the committee had prepared an initial draft of their report to share with some constituencies around campus. Withers added that a more final version of the report would be shared with the Senate Council and other areas and individuals. Withers said he would like to have a report to give to SC by late in the fall semester.

The Chair suggested moving to agenda item number seven and there were no objections.

7. Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher-Course Evaluations (extend deadline)

The Chair explained that the Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher-Course Evaluations did not begin meeting until late March, but have since met weekly. The committee chair asked for an extension of their original deadline, which was fall 2014. After brief discussion, SC members agreed that December 15 was an appropriate deadline for receipt of a final report.

2. Old Business

b. Faculty Evaluation of President Capilouto

The Chair thanked Vice Chair Wood for all her work on the faculty survey of President Eli Capilouto. She asked Wood to update SC members on the evaluation and Wood did so. There were a variety of comments and questions from SC members. The Chair said she would be willing to hear a motion to accept the results, but it was determined that it was not necessary. There were no objections.

9. Provost Christine Riordan

The Chair welcomed Provost Christine Riordan. Provost Riordan discussed four issues with SC members: fall enrollment; the new financial model; the new strategic plan; and the interim dean of the Graduate School and graduate student scholarships. There were a variety of questions and comments.

6. Discussion on Retreat Agenda Items

The Chair suggested that Hippiisley (chair-elect) share his thoughts about the retreat with SC members, which he did. There were a few comments and suggestions from SC members.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:27 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Lee X. Blonder,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Blonder, Brown, Christ, Debski, Harling, Hippiisley, McCormick, Pienkowski, Watt, and Wood.

Invited guests present: Gary Hansen, Matt Patterson, Jayson Richardson, and David Timoney.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, August 13, 2014.