

Senate Council
August 22, 2011

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, August 22, 2011 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. No votes were taken because quorum was not met.

The Chair called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:10 pm. There was an insufficient number of elected faculty members present to meet quorum.

Those present introduced themselves.

1. Minutes from August 5, 2011 and Announcements

The Chair offered a variety of announcements.

- The Office of the Senate Council received a request for faculty members to serve on a program review committee and two summative dean reviews. The solicitation for members will be emailed to senators and faculty council members.
- SC members should begin thinking about the SC and faculty in general could better engage with the Board of Trustees (Board), specifically with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board. Those present discussed various ideas. The Chair suggested that ideas be sent to her, with the September 2011 Board meeting as the deadline for submissions.
- The Office of the Senate Council has hired a new employee to fill the half-time position, Janie Ellis.
- The Chair met with Dean of Libraries Terry Birdwhistell and discussed the idea of a group to look at the issues surrounding open access. SC members discussed this idea. Provost's Liaison Greissman suggested that Dean Birdwhistell be invited to a SC meeting to discuss the matter and SC members agreed [AI].
- In response to action item number eighty-five, the Chair discussed with Provost Subbaswamy the vetting process for as-yet-unproposed changes to the *Administrative Regulations (AR)* regarding post-tenure faculty performance reviews. Provost Subbaswamy intends to simultaneously pre-vet it with the SC and deans, after which the reviews will be more formalized with input from faculty councils, etc. Greissman said that the general principles would very likely be discussed among faculty in the fall semester, with the spring semester bringing a vetting of language.
- As chair of the recently composed review committee for President Capilouto, the Chair said their first meeting was about one week earlier and another was coming up on Wednesday. The purpose is to offer President Capilouto, and through him the Board, sufficient information on where "we" are as a University in preparation for strategic planning.

4. Proposed Changes to Senate Rules 6.2.1.1, 6.5.1.2 and 6.5.1.3

The Chair asked Grossman to explain the issue, which he did. A question arose as to how a student appeals a grade, as per the *Senate Rules (SR)*. Language was found in the section on the Academic

Ombud that describes the functioning of that office, but there is no specific language on grade appeals. The section of the *SR* that addresses the University Appeals Board also does not have specific language on appealing a grade. Grossman wrote down the accepted, existing practices – there is no change in policy in the proposed changes. Academic Ombud Sonja Feist-Price added that she agreed that the language was consistent with current practice, but was not clearly outlined in writing.

No action was taken on the agenda item. The Chair thanked Feist-Price and she departed.

8. Discussion on Interpretation of *Senate Rules 5.2.4.7*

Grossman explained that the current interpretation of the existing language was that an instructor must offer a student exactly two hours in which to take their final exam. Grossman, however, thought that the language implied that a student must complete their final exam at some point within the two-hour block assigned by the Registrar's Office. He discussed the matter with Davy Jones, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), and Jones asked the SC to offer specific input as to what the SC believes the language to mean. Because of the impending start of the semester, the SC was asked to offer its input quickly.

SC members discussed the agenda item. Because of the emergency nature of the request from the SREC, a straw poll was held. A majority of the voting members present engaged in a straw poll, which indicated assent with the following: Grossman will draft some language that clarifies that the default length of time for a final exam is a two-hour exam, unless indicated otherwise in the syllabus, as long as it is within the time allotted by the Registrar.

3. Replacement Member on SC

The Chair explained reminded SC members that Wermeling's resignation from the SC and Senate left a vacancy on the SC. The Chair said that her inclination was to leave the position open and fill it during the next round of elections for SC members in December 2011.

10. Identification of Senate Parliamentarian for 2011-2012

SC members discussed possible faculty members to serve as parliamentarian for the University Senate (Senate). After brief discussion, an individual was identified as a possibility and the Chair said she would initiate a conversation.

5. Composition of Reinstatement Committee

The Chair reported that she, Grossman and Wimberly were the members of the Reinstatement Committee.

7. Clinical Title Series Annual Report

SC members discussed the report on numbers of clinical title faculty in various colleges.

2. Old Business

b. Senate Committee Charges

SC members engaged in lengthy discussion regarding the proposed charges to Senate committees.

SC members engaged in lengthy discussion regarding the proposed charges to Senate committees.

Senate's Academic Facilities Committee (SAFC): SC members discussed how the SAFC could review efficiency, pricing, etc. in the Physical Plant Division (PPD). The SC also wordsmithed the language on

building priorities procedures – the intent is to identify the current practices, and determine how faculty should be involved.

Senate's Academic Advising Committee (SAAC): Those present thought that it would be helpful for the SAAC to evaluate the quality of academic advising.

Senate's Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (SAPPC): The SC had asked the SAPPC chair for some suggested charges for the SAPPC. He sent in five suggestions – SC members thought that two of the suggested charges (3. Refine, vet and support new strategic initiatives related to academic priorities.; and 4. Proactively meet with the SC Chair, the Provost, and the President to discuss academic issues, broadly defined, that impact the University's growth and development.) were too broad for the year, given the other three charges.

Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC): Those present thought that the SAASC could investigate the issue of transfer credits, the role of faculty in making those decisions, and how its impact can be measured, in addition to determining the answer to “what is a credit hour” for the 13 different course meeting patterns.

Senate's Academic Advising Committee (SAAC): It was suggested that the SAAC merely report on its activities to the Senate.

Senate's Institutional Finance and Resource Allocation Committee (SIFRAC): The suggestion was for SIFRAC to work with UK's president to make UK's current budget process more transparent.

The Chair said that she would invite Libraries Dean Terry Birdwhistell to talk to the SC prior to possibly charging the SLC with looking into open access.

Those present wanted Grossman to suggest wording and an appropriate committee to look into different ways to fund teaching assistants.

They made a variety of suggestions, which will be incorporated into the proposed charges presented to the SC on August 29.

The meeting was adjourned about 5:20 pm. [The Action Items are a part of the minutes, but fall at the end.]

Respectfully submitted by Hollie I. Swanson,
Senate Council Chair

SC members in attendance: Blonder, Grossman, Peek, Steiner, Kelly, Swanson, Wasilkowski and Wimberly.

Provost's liaison present: Greissman.

Guest: Sonja Feist-Price.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Friday, August 26, 2011.

#	√	Item	Responsibility	Completed
20.		Charge Senate's Academic Programs Committee with creating processes for substantive change issues (teach-out, contractual/consortium process, off-campus sites, how to reopen a suspended program). (8/23/10)	SC	
31.		Ask the Provost to submit a statement of financial and administrative feasibility for proposals prior to the proposals being sent to cmte. (10/4/10)	Document Handling System	
40.		Draft changes to <i>Senate Rule</i> language on Senate meeting attendance policies for review by SC. (8/30/10 & 11/15/10)	Chair, Steiner	
42.		Discuss with the Provost the method of allocating resources from distance learning courses. (11/15/10)	Chair	
44.		Create ad hoc committee (perhaps with VPR and Provost) to look at what constitutes an administrative or an educational unit, and if there is a continuum or a sharp difference. (11/22/10; 12/6/10)	Chair, SC	
46.	√	Discuss election of officers, specifically who is eligible to cast votes. (12/6/10); Solicit opinions from the Senate. (2/28/11)	SC	1st reading 5/2011
53.		Investigate "Quality Matters" WRT distance learning courses. (1/10/11)	SC	
57.		Look into creating a Senate committee on assessment. (1/31/11)	SC	
62.		Determine how to address the issue of the proportionate representation of appointed Board of Trustees members. (2/7/11)	SC	
63.		Invite UofL employment ombud to SC meeting after joint ombud cmte visits the University of Cincinnati. (2/21/11)	Mrs. Brothers	
66.		Invite Associate Provost for Undergrad Ed to offer "State of Undergraduate Education" address to Senate. (2/21/11)		
67.		Invite Associate Provost for Academic Affairs about distance learning courses. (2/21/2011)	Mrs. Brothers	
71.		Invite Dean Kornbluh et al to present "A&S Wired" to the Senate in fall 2011. (5/2/11)	Mrs. Brothers	
72.		Discuss status of department chairs and directors of interdisciplinary centers during the August Advance. (6/15/11)	SC	
73.		Ask each college dean's office to submit information about their faculty council, as part of the SACS reaccreditation effort. (6/15/11)	Chair	
74.	√	Form an ad hoc committee charged with formulating a document describing best practices regarding distance learning practices, with membership of said cmte in the purview of the Chair. (6/15/11)	Chair	06/2011
76.		Develop metrics for faculty input into president's performance during August Advance. (6/15/11)	SC	
77.		Draft a report on the perceptions of the faculty reps on the Presidential Search Committee on the process, and include relevant info from similar universities' recent presidential searches. (6/15/11)	Chair & Steiner	

78.	Create checklist describing most common problems encountered during reviews of curricular proposals and disseminate to colleges. (6/15/11)	Mrs. Brothers	
79.	Contact deans and academic council chairs to let them know that incomplete/incorrect curricular approval forms will be returned (with detail on the problems) to the previous academic council for fixing. (6/15/11)	Chair	
81.	Meet with each college's faculty council in the fall, and also reinforce the importance of identifying a senator to communicate with college faculty. (6/15/11)	Chair	
82.	Request that the chair of the Senate's Academic Facilities Cmte be invited to attend meetings of the Capital Planning Advisory Group. (6/15/11)	Chair	
83.	Send list of existing senators and list of new senators to chairs of Senate's Academic Facilities Committee and Senate's Academic Planning and Priorities Committee. (6/15/11)	Mrs. Brothers	
84.	Deliberate on the idea of recording meetings and posting the video (with time markers of important discussions).	SC	
85.	Find out if the Senate has an approving or endorsing vote on proposed changes to post-tenure review policies.	Chair	
86.	Determine by late August the message(s) the Chair should relay when she visits college faculty councils.	SC	
87.	Invite Mia Alexander-Snow to give her presentation on assessment to the Senate.	Mrs. Brothers	
89.	Invite Libraries Dean Terry Birdwhistell to discuss open access at SC meeting. (8/22/11)	Mrs. Brothers	