Senate Council
August 15, 2016

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, August 16, 2016 in 330 Gatton College of Business and Economics Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Katherine M. McCormick called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:04 pm.

1. Minutes from June 17, 2016 and Announcements
The Chair said there were a few changes to the minutes; SC members reviewed the proposed revisions via hard copy. Wood **moved** to approve the minutes from June 17, 2016 and Schroeder **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair had a variety of announcements.

- The Chair reported that the reorganization of Undergraduate Education was well underway. At the present time, 21 positions had been eliminated, 15 of which were in Student Affairs. The Chair added that Kraemer would give a more detailed update at the next SC meeting.

- Provost Tim Tracy expressed an interest in partnering with the University Senate to review the status of the Graduate School. The Chair said she assumed that membership would be comprised of members appointed by the SC and members appointed by the Provost. The intent is to have a blue-ribbon panel or committee to engage in a thoughtful review of the Graduate School and its functions.

- Provost Tracy asked for additional guidance with respect to implementing the two reports from the Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher-Course Evaluations [March 2015] and the Ad Hoc Teacher-Course Evaluation Implementation Committee [May 2016]. The Chair said it would make sense to revisit the two issues of the TCE window and penalties for not submitting, to better provide the Provost with direction.

- President Eli Capilouto expressed to the Chair that he would like to have a more interactive, question-and-answer session with senators. The Chair and SC members discussed possible ways to provide that type of meeting and came up with a variety of suggestions.

  o If the President provides his presentation well in advance of the meeting, it can be distributed to senators and be an impetus for questions.

  o The session could be scheduled for a meeting date when there is no other pressing business for Senate to attend to.

  o Faculty receive the President's email messages and they are aware of what is in the news so senators do not need a presentation to respond to – they can just ask questions without the guidance of a PowerPoint presentation.

  o The President could send his presentation in advance, go over just four or five slides in detail during the meeting and then take questions from senators.

- o Having the interaction occur outside of a regular Senate meeting would automatically make it less formal.

- o The President can inform senators about a specific topic he wants senators to focus on.

- o The President should not set a specific topic, but rather should just take questions from senators about whatever happens to be on their minds. His administrative support team could be on hand to field questions that he cannot answer himself.

- o Senators could submit written questions on index cards to promote anonymity of the question asker.

- There were some appointments to various positions over the summer. Former senator Bruce Webb (AG) was included in the membership of the Honors College Transition Committee. Brian Jackson was appointed as interim dean of the Graduate School. Phil Harling was appointed interim dean of the Honors College.

- Schroeder, the Chair, and Ms. Brothers participated in an initial meeting on curriculum process during the prior week. The Chair said she saw the SC spending time deliberating on the approval process for curriculum, partnering with diversity and inclusivity initiatives that appear to be guiding some of the President's work, and remaining involved in the title series review initiated by the Provost.

- The Chair was asked to provide feedback and input on the search for someone to fill the new position of associate provost for academic and student life.

- The Chair, Faculty Trustee Grossman, and Wood met with the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees regarding the faculty's survey on the president's evaluation. One of the lowest areas on that evaluation pertained to faculty morale. One of the Board's Executive Committee members asked for more information about the morale issues so Wood said she would review the statistical information again to see what she could discover.

Wood explained that due to limitations of the survey design, she could not stratify data by college or by title series. She looked to see if there were associations among responses; she cross-tabbed responses and went from a five-point scale to a three-point scale (agree, disagree, or neither) to make things simpler. Wood cross-tabbed responses to the statement "the President has been successful in building faculty morale" with the rest of the questions and the association between all the responses and "building faculty morale" were statistically significant ($p < 0.001$). She explained that there was a strong positive association with all the questions. In particular, with respect to listening to faculty concerns, of the faculty who disagreed about his ability to build faculty morale, a large proportion also disagreed that he was successful in listening to faculty concerns; that had a particularly high phi coefficient value of $p < 0.0001$.

Wood summarized by saying that if faculty disagree with one statement, they are likely to disagree with another statement, and if they agree with one statement, they are likely to agree with another statement. Wood added that she did not include relationships for all 16 questions in the appendix document for the Executive Committee – she only included the ones with very high phi coefficients (involving faculty in decision making, engaging faculty in shared

governance, fostering confidence in future of UK, restructuring UK to be cost effective). While she cannot prove causality, all of them had significant p values.

2. Proposed Changes to *Governing Regulations II* ("Governance of the University")
Guest Marcy Deaton (associate legal counsel) explained the proposed revisions. There were a few questions from SC members. Brown **moved** that the SC recommend that the Senate endorse the proposed changes to *Governing Regulations II* ("Governance of the University") and Blonder **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Proposed Elimination of *Governing Regulations XII* ("The Development Council")
Deaton explained the proposed elimination of *Governing Regulations XII* ("The Development Council"). Grossman **moved** to endorse the proposed elimination and Wood **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Deaton commented that the Board of Trustees would meet again prior to the September Senate meeting but there was a desire to have the two Governing Regulations go back to the Board for their second and final readings in September. After brief discussion, Grossman **moved** that the SC endorse the proposed changes to *Governing Regulations II* ("Governance of the University") and *Governing Regulations XII* ("The Development Council") on behalf of the Senate. Porter **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

SC members engaged Deaton in an unscheduled discussion of the changes to *Administrative Regulations 6:2* ("Policy and Procedures for Addressing and Resolving Allegations of Sexual Assault, Stalking, Dating Violence, and Domestic Violence"). SC members expressed dismay over the number of changes to that regulation that were not vetted by any of major stakeholders on campus (University Senate, Staff Senate, and Student Government Association). Deaton said she could provide SC members with detailed information on the history of changes to that particular regulation, as well as the dates when the President approved them.

4. Provost/SC Partnership: Graduate School
The Chair said she thought her comments in the Announcements portion of the meeting more or less covered the issue. SC members discussed how a blue ribbon committee regarding the future of the Graduate School could be composed. SC members offered the suggestions below regarding membership. SC members generally agreed that the membership for such a committee could be a broad solicitation for nominees, but that the committee as a whole needed some specific characteristics.

- At least one member must be knowledgeable about the activities of the Graduate School and the services it provides to students, directors of graduate studies, and other Graduate School constituents.

- At least one member should also be a member of the Senate's Research and Graduate Education Committee (SRGEC).

- At least one member should have served on a recent-past committee that was charged to review the Graduate School. Because multiple review committees existed, one person from each of them should be on the blue-ribbon committee. Chairs of those committees would be ideal.

To solicit membership, the Chair will need to ascertain additional details about the timing and scope of the committee. The blue-ribbon committee should also be able to access past reports on the Graduate School, as well as individual dean's reports on the Graduate School from the committee of deans. It would also be helpful to know if the Provost is leaning in one particular direction – faculty do not like to be placed on a committee that does not have the freedom to move in whatever direction the committee itself thinks is relevant and appropriate.

5. Discussion on Vice Chair Position
The Chair said that the SC would need to hold an election for a new vice chair in the near future. Kraemer, the current vice chair, has been tapped to serve in an interim associate provost position and he can therefore no longer serve in the Senate or SC.

6. SC Oversight of Course Duplication (resolved prior to meeting, no action taken)
There were no objections to the Chair's assertion that the agenda item was resolved prior to the meeting and did not need to be discussed.

7. Update on New Senate Website
Ms. Brothers gave SC members an overview of the new site and indicated that it would go live the following week. SC members offered some suggestions about the list of senators and how the current version of the *Senate Rules* (*SRs*) was described.

After the discussion on *SRs*, SC members discussed Grossman's intent (as a member of Senate's Rules and Elections Committee) to renumber the *SRs*. The Chair suggested the SREC think about how to educate faculty and other members of the campus community that long-held reference numbers will be changing.

Wood **moved** to adjourn and Schroeder **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 4:46 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine M. McCormick,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Blonder, Brown, Grossman, McCormick, Porter, Schroeder, and Wood.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, August 18, 2016.