

Senate Council  
November 23, 2009

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, November 23, 2009 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 3:09 pm.

1. Minutes from November 2 and Announcements

The Chair reported a few announcements. The SC will have breakfast with President Todd on December 15, in the Lexmark Public Room of the Main Building.

Kirk explained that a proposal involving changes to the academic calendar, including the addition of a fall break would come to the SC prior to the end of the semester – it was going to go through the Student Government Association following the Thanksgiving holiday.

A student emailed the Chair requesting a waiver to allow his grades from a community college factor into his UK GPA. The Chair wondered about the authority required in order to grant the request. He said he would email the request to SC members and asked that they reply back with comments on how to proceed; he would also request input from the Office of the Registrar.

There was a meeting of COSFL (Coalition of Senate and Faculty Leadership) representatives on Saturday, which Vice Chair Swanson attended in place of the Chair; he asked her to give SC members a recap. Swanson said that there were a lot of things discussed, but there were also a few general issues.

Swanson shared that many of the COSFL representatives were of the opinion that faculty have been remiss in activities of shared governance; there is a move afoot to get faculty governing bodies to step up to the plate. At a future meeting, COSFL will hold a workshop for the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE). In addition, COSFL may ask university provosts to help educate the CPE on the role of shared governance. Faculty need to acknowledge that there are problems, and then step up to the plate and note shared goals, but maintain authority. There is also a strong desire to avoid legislative micromanagement.

Regarding the proposed transfer legislation, Swanson said that the general perception was that the impetus behind the bill was dependents of some legislators having experienced difficulties with transferring credits from a community college to a four-year institution. The current legislative bill deals with transferability and has already been to the CPE for edits. There were some particularly troubling aspects of the bill – the legislation involves mandating that bachelor's degrees shall not exceed 120 credit hours, demanding that all institutions across the state have comparable course titles, and developing policies for statewide admissions criteria. In addition, there was wording about any change in learning outcomes for the general education component at a regional institution needing to be communicated with the Kentucky Community and Technical College System (KCTCS).

Another issue that concerned COSFL members was a closer legislative look at how textbooks are required. Swanson said that the feeling of COSFL was that a response was necessary, perhaps with some suggested guidelines that would still allow flexibility. In response to a question from Steiner, Swanson replied that the textbook issue pertained to situations such as an instructor requiring a \$200 textbook but then only using two chapters of the book and other cost-related issues. Swanson offered to type up her notes and send them to the SC.

Those present introduced themselves. Ford **moved** to approve the minutes from November 2, 2009 and Steiner **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

## 2. Proposed New Graduate Certificate - Vocal Pedagogy

Professor Noemi Lugo (Department of Music) explained the proposal, and then answered questions from SC members. The Chair thanked her and she departed.

Swanson **moved** to approve the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Vocal Pedagogy and send it to the University Senate with a positive recommendation, with an effective date as soon as possible. Rohr **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

## 3. Proposed New Graduate Certificate - Lean Systems

Richard Sweigard (associate dean for administration and academic affairs, College of Engineering) shared information about the proposal for a new Graduate Certificate in Lean Manufacturing Systems. SC members asked a few questions and then he departed.

## 5. Update on Code of Conduct Issue - College of Pharmacy Senator

Professor Dan Wermeling (College of Pharmacy senator) shared information with SC members about the issue of the College of Pharmacy's Code of Conduct and provided a handout to the SC members that listed the specific concerns of the College of Pharmacy (PH) faculty. He explained that faculty in PH first learned about the Code of Conduct (COC) in June, and were told at that time that July 1 was the effective date. Something even more troubling was learning that another COC, effective since 2004, had been applied to PH faculty without their knowledge – Guest Wermeling said that even though he had chaired a practice plan committee, he, too, was unaware of it.

Another issue of concern related to industry-related UK HealthCare policies that are perceived to infringe upon the academic rights of the health care colleges' faculties. The COC prohibits faculty from listening or talking with various industry speakers. Wermeling outlined his concerns regarding the entire process of implementation in detail and the varied unintended consequences for SC members. He noted that he was concerned with both the lack of faculty input into the development of the COC, as well as the actual policies therein. He was asked and responded to a number of questions.

Greissman noted that when the time came to develop and implement an *Administrative Regulation* to regulate conflicts of interest and commitment for all colleges, it would be properly vetted and the University Senate would be responsible for advising Provost Subbaswamy. Wermeling commented that part of the problem was the need for the business side of the medical center to move quickly, which did not mesh all that well with the deliberative nature of shared governance.

Wood asked Wermeling to outline the specific purpose of the day's discussion; she opined that part of Wermeling's concerns was that an administrative implementation of a policy should not negatively affect academic needs and rights of the academic portion of the unit involved. Wermeling also said that there was a third rail of regulations being developed by UK HealthCare, above and beyond the *Administrative Regulations* and the *Governing Regulations*. It seemed clear to all that the concerns also involved the process for policy implementation and ensuring that UK follows its own rules, as well as the conflicts between the ARs and the UK HealthCare policies.

After the Chair confirmed that there were no additional questions for Wermeling, he thanked Wermeling for attending and he departed.

#### Proposed New Graduate Certificate - Lean Systems

Wood **moved** to approve the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Lean Systems and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation, effective immediately. Ford **seconded**. There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### Update on Code of Conduct Issue - College of Pharmacy Senator

Anderson **moved** to invite Wermeling to present to the University Senate a status report on the current Code of Conduct for the health care colleges and the process by which it was implemented. Yanarella **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 8. Discussion - Should Late Additions be Allowed to the Degree List, and Under What Conditions?

The Chair asked Associate Registrar Jacquie Hager to offer her perspective on late additions to UK's degree lists. Guest Hager explained that the deadline for accepting applications for undergraduate degrees for the fall semester was June 30. There is currently no deadline for graduate degrees – when the Senate revised the rule on degree list deadlines, wording for graduate degree deadlines was removed, so the language only applies to undergraduate degrees. Hager said she works with target dates to get colleges to collect applications and enter them into the computer system; this then allows her to prepare the Senate and Board report in the typical format for SC and Senate approval, followed by approval by the Board of Trustees (BoT). The SC gets the report about two weeks before the Senate sees it, and the Senate sees it about a month before the BoT – it is a process that must necessarily run on time. It is difficult to stay on track with the schedule when there are repeated instances of students complaining that they didn't know they had to apply or didn't know when the deadline was. Hager said that earlier in the day she received yet another request from a college to add a student to the December degree list.

Susan Skees (College of Agriculture) commented that when the College of Arts and Sciences (A&S) proposed the revised deadlines, it pushed the deadlines back from September/February/June to allow A&S more time to process all their students applying for a degree. Those in smaller colleges, however, do not find the new deadlines helpful since that additional time for processing application cards is not needed. Guest Skees said that she meets with seniors during the semester prior to graduation, which is a sufficient amount of time for her. She added that she currently had two students who would complete their degree requirements in December, but the degree would not be awarded until May.

Cleo Price (Graduate School) said that he ran into similar situations, but that the Graduate School did a pretty good job of talking to DGSs about deadlines and communicating that information to them. He said that they, too, had students who failed to meet the graduation application deadlines for whatever reason, and he works with Hager about adding them. Guest Price noted that the Graduate School provides students with a letter of certification that the student had met the degree requirements and would receive the degree in late spring instead of December. Skees noted that she did the same.

Davy Jones (Senate's Rules and Elections Committee chair) commented that students and advisors come out of the woodwork in the week before Senate meetings when the degree list has been sent out for review. He opined that students needed to be responsible for the degree deadlines.

The Chair reported that he had received three requests to waive the deadline and have students added to the list, but that he did not feel comfortable routinely approving students to appear on the list after

the deadline. SC members then engaged in a discussion on the matter – the general consensus was that deadlines were appropriate, but that they should not hinder students' graduation rates, either.

Steiner asked if there was a subcommittee that could review the issue. Guest Jones said that as chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), he would gather the information gleaned from the meeting. The Chair confirmed that the SC would like the SREC to consider graduation deadlines and whether the rules should be changed.

#### 4. Steiner Committee Report

Steiner explained that the Senate's committees needed to review big issues and deal with issues of importance to the campus and governance. For example, there is one Senate committee that is named to deal with physical facilities and the curriculum [Senate's Academic Facilities Committee]. The SC could serve a great function of directing questions to committees made up of faculty, who would be better suited to conducting academic reviews of various issues, being closer to the various disciplines. Steiner said that faculty, and the Senate committees in particular, should offer input into pertinent issues confronting the University. He added that the word "should" in his previously submitted motion will change to "shall."

Steiner **moved** the following:

1. Provost ~~should~~ shall be asked to identify emerging issues affecting faculty and students. During the spring semester, the Senate Council ~~should~~ shall identify issues of importance for consideration for the following academic year. Sources ~~should~~ shall include the reports and recommendations of Senate Committees, Senate Council deliberations, and an e-poll of Senators. The
2. At the summer Faculty Council retreat, identified issues, and specific issues, requiring consideration and action ~~should~~ shall be identified. On the basis of the specific issues identified, charges for the appropriate Senate committees ~~should~~ shall be drafted. Each committee's charges ~~should~~ shall include a projected timetable for the committee's dealing with its charges, provision of timely updates and specified date of submission of a final report (or interim report) for each charge to the Faculty Senate.
3. These draft charges ~~should~~ shall be circulated to the faculty at the beginning of the fall semester, with a request for faculty comments and suggestions.
4. Soon after the draft charges have been circulated (e.g., 10 days), the Senate Council ~~should~~ shall meet with the chairs of all the standing Senate committees, and finalize the charges.

The above timetable ~~should~~ shall not preclude the addition to or modification of charges, based on new developments or situations, as the academic year proceeds.

Yanarella **seconded**. Wood **offered a friendly amendment** that the dangling "the" be moved to the beginning of the section, and both Steiner and Yanarella **agreed**. SC members discussed the motion at length. Members generally agreed with the document and the language of the motion. Kelly commented that as a behavioral scientist, one major issue was that of consequences for the behaviors of committee members; there were no consequences if there was no follow up. Swanson noted that faculty serving on committees were also not rewarded for their effort.

Wood **moved the question**. A **vote** was taken on the following motion:

1. The Provost shall be asked to identify emerging issues affecting faculty and students. During the spring semester, the Senate Council shall identify issues of importance for consideration for the following academic year. Sources shall include the reports and recommendations of Senate Committees, Senate Council deliberations, and an e-poll of Senators.
2. At the summer Faculty Council retreat specific issues requiring consideration and action shall be identified. On the basis of the specific issues identified, charges for the appropriate Senate committees shall be drafted. Each committee's charges shall include a projected timetable for the committee's dealing with its charges, provision of timely updates and specified date of submission of a final report (or interim report) for each charge to the Faculty Senate.
3. These draft charges shall be circulated to the faculty at the beginning of the fall semester, with a request for faculty comments and suggestions.
4. Soon after the draft charges have been circulated (e.g., 10 days), the Senate Council shall meet with the chairs of all the standing Senate committees, and finalize the charges.

The above timetable shall not preclude the addition to or modification of charges, based on new developments or situations, as the academic year proceeds.

The motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 9. Proposed New University Scholars Program - Baccalaureate Economics Degree from Georgetown College and Masters Degree in Agricultural Economics

The Chair noted that the program was erroneously not reviewed during the previous meeting. Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mike Mullen explained the proposal, saying that it was developed while he was still associate dean in the College of Agriculture. SC members did not have any questions for Mullen.

Guest Mullen then offered some information regarding the Gen Ed vetting teams. He said that all the teams were active, had deliberated very hard and were now finishing up. He offered some information about the vetting teams' current activities. He said that he and the Chair would meet with the chairs of the vetting teams after the December Senate meeting to more fully discuss and work through next steps. Mullen said that he hoped to get a proposal to the SC in the next couple of weeks on how to move the new curriculum through the approval process.

Mullen asked SC members to weigh in on a question from the vetting teams regarding credit hours – is it acceptable for a course to carry four credits? Wood said that while she supported flexibility in the long run, it might be wise to keep to three credits per course – she recalled that the Senate passed a set of three hour courses, with a maximum of 30 credits. Yanarella agreed, and there were no objections.

The Chair offered some suggestions for moving the meeting forward.

Wood **moved** to send the proposed new University Scholars Program - Baccalaureate Economics Degree from Georgetown College and Masters Degree in Agricultural Economics to the Senate with a positive

recommendation, effective January 2011. Swanson **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 12. Faculty TDL Policy

Provost's Liaison Greissman said that the discussion last week was very helpful. He subsequently borrowed language from the *Administrative Regulation* on workload policy to explain why the faculty sick leave policy is different from that of staff. He said there was one sentence that was not clear and would be revised. Greissman said that it was important to report faculty sick time even if it seemed minor to begin with. The process would ratchet up from the local level as the person was out longer, to ensure appropriate parties are consulted for more extreme situations.

Swanson said that the revised language was much better, and Wood agreed. Wood said she withdrew all her previous reservations. Greissman thanked the SC for the input, saying that he did not know if the language would have been changed without the benefit of the SC's discussion.

Anderson **moved** that the SC endorse the revised Faculty TDL Policy and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation for endorsement and Rohr **seconded**. Swanson asked if she should take TDL or vacation time if caring for her child. There were a few comments about Swanson's question, but no one was able to answer the question. Greissman said he would find an answer to Swanson's question. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion, and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 6. Issues for Senate's Research Committee

The Chair asked Kelly to explain the matter. Kelly explained that there were a variety of new research-related regulations being implemented that could benefit from faculty input – the policies were not well distributed, nor was the language clear. Kelly opined that the Senate's Research Committee (SRC) could review such policies, starting with the Non-indemnification Clinical Trial RMC Approval Process. He also asked that the SRC create a formal report, due by the end of the spring 2010 semester.

There being no objection, the Chair stated that he, Mrs. Brothers and Kelly would work together to get the issue to the SRC.

There being no additional business to attend to, the meeting was adjourned about 5 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Dave Randall,  
Senate Council Chair

SC members in attendance: Anderson, Ford, Kelly, Kirk, Randall, Rohr, Steiner, Swanson, Wood and Yanarella.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guests present: Davy Jones, Jacquie Hager, Noemi Lugo, Mike Mullen, Cleo Price, Susan Skees, Rick Sweigard and Dan Wermeling.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Friday, December 4, 2009.