Senate Council
December 15, 2014

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, December 15, 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 Andrew Hippisley called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:02 pm.

1. Minutes from December 1, 2014 and Announcements
The Chair reported that he had not received any corrections to the minutes from December 1, 2014. There being no changes, the minutes were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**. There were a few announcements.

The Chair met with Provost Christine Riordan and discussed teacher-course evaluations and the recent preliminary report from the SC's ad hoc Committee on Teacher-Course Evaluations (TCE). While the questions the Committee proposed were very broad and almost unobjectionable, there were complaints from some areas about various aspects. The Provost reported to the Chair that the concerns could be addressed and managed and the new questions implemented and enforced. She was keen to have questions that were standardized across campus. Regarding SC's request that TCE not be used as the sole instrument to evaluate teaching effectiveness, the Chair reported that the Provost wondered if such a move would require new administrative machinery to incorporate peer reviews, etc. The Chair suggested a joint Provost/Senate committee to look at the idea of other instruments to evaluate teaching and she seemed amenable to that.

While meeting with the Provost, the Chair also talked about the Senate's role in reviewing college and departmental rules to ensure they are in compliance with the *Senate Rules*. The Provost liked the idea of the Senate's participation in the process of checking rules for compliance with existing University regulations, specifically the *Senate Rules* (*SR*). The Chair said that in the spring semester he would propose an expansion of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) to include checking college and departmental rules for consistency with the *SR*. The Chair added that the former SREC chair created a template for college and departmental rules that he will bring to SC for a review prior to use.

The Chair opined that there were more senators at the Stakes Reception than in the past and he was pleased with that. He tried to introduce as many senators to the Board of Trustees Chair, O. Keith Gannon and it seemed that senators liked him and found him affable. The Chair reported that Gannon was willing to meet with SC in the spring semester; the Chair will arrange that meeting.

The Chair asked if the faculty trustees had comments to share about the recent Board of Trustees (Board) meeting. Wilson said that the pre-Board meeting discussions focused heavily on issues of violence against women and sexual violence and UK's efforts to have coherent responses. Wilson said UK was ahead of most institutions in the way of policies. Wilson thought it interesting that UK's reliance on faculty to develop campus climate survey instruments will result in good baseline data. The Board's agenda was rather sparse. In closing, Wilson commented that the next Board meeting would be in Hazard, KY. Grossman reported on the strong financial standing of the hospital and the discussion on student athletes, compliance, and academic degree programs. He said he suggested that programs with a lot of student athletes have a more rigorous six-year program review to ensure student athletes have as much rigor in their programs as other programs.

The Chair reminded SC members that President Eli Capilouto would arrive at 4 pm and would likely ask SC members for input into the questions below:

1. What should the next provost's priorities be?
2. What should the qualities and attributes of the next provost be?
3. What should the process for finding the next provost be?

The Chair added that he reviewed the rules about vacancies in administrative positions, which refer to an acting provost, not an interim provost, and defines them as serving for 12 months or less. In addition, he thought the President would ask SC members for input on who the next provost should be.

The Chair reported that three SC members were rolling off SC as of the end of December: Debra Anderson, Liz Debski, and David Pienkowski. He thanked each of them for their service on SC. The Chair invited SC members to Pazzo's after the meeting and said the SC office would cover the costs of celebrating and honoring the departing SC members.

2. Old Business
a. Update from Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Disciplinary Action
Watt explained that the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Disciplinary Action had been busy. He noted that three of the Committee's members were present (himself, Debski, and Wilson); the other members are Pienkowski and Marcy Deaton, associate legal counsel. Watt said they spent the first meeting discussing the issues they wanted to tackle. Watt gathered a number of faculty "codes of conduct" from a host of institutions and shared them with the Committee, which then discussed which aspects of which codes they liked, did not like, and why. Watt said he then wrote a draft report and when the Committee reviewed it, there were a number of suggestions from Committee members. Watt said that the Committee plans to do more writing, but before that is undertaken, the Committee would like to know more about what the President wants the Committee to tackle, specifically. In the minds of Committee members, Watt opined that there were some substantive issues that needed to be addressed, such as UK's poor system of dealing with faculty with mental health issues or bad behavior. Watt said that when he and the Chair meet with the President after the SC meeting, Watt intends to let the President know there is a draft report, and that the Committee identified substantive issues. Once the President responds to that, Watt said he and the Committee will have a better idea of how to continue moving forward. Watt said he anticipated several meetings in January and February, after which the report will be shared with the SC.

The Chair thanked the Committee for all its hard work; there were no questions for Watt.

b. Update on Foreign Language Requirement - Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Ben Withers
The Chair welcomed the three invited guests, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Ben Withers, College of Arts and Sciences Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs Anna Bosch, and Jeff Rogers (AS/Modern and Classical Languages, Literatures and Culture), and invited them to the table. Withers offered historical information about how the foreign language requirement came to be revised. Rogers, who chaired the Foreign Language Requirement Committee, explained the proposed foreign language graduation requirements. The Committee first recommends having a foreign language competency entrance requirement, which can also be satisfied after enrollment if the student does not fulfill the requirement prior to admission to UK. The Committee then recommends a foreign language graduation requirement that a student could satisfy in a variety of ways:

- Recognized foreign language assessment (APPL, AP, STAMP) at novice high or equivalent;

- Completion of a three-credit foreign language course at or above the 200-level;

- Completion of a UK Core-approved study abroad program with a foreign language component;

- Completion of UK's global studies certificate; or

- Completion at UK of two consecutive semesters of a language other than that which was completed in high school.

After the presentation, the guests and SC members engaged in a question and answer session. As discussion wound down, the Chair recapped the discussion and then offered his thoughts about next steps. The Chair opined that the main issue was that Undergraduate Education and the College of Arts and Sciences (AS) wanted approval to move forward by piloting (just within AS to begin with) the

competency testing and then report back to SC on the outcomes, including issues of scalability and what the process will look like and how long it will take once it is implemented across campus. The report will also need to include the results of discussions with the provost regarding dedication of resources. Grossman **moved** that the SC encourage continued development of a competency testing pilot program within the College of Arts and Sciences with a view towards full implementation if possible. Christ **seconded**. There was additional discussion. Anderson offered a **friendly amendment** to remove "if possible," which was **accepted** by both Grossman and Christ.

A **vote** was taken on the **motion** that the SC encourage continued development of a competency testing pilot program within the College of Arts and Sciences with a view towards full implementation and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Officer Elections
Guest Davy Jones, chair of the elections subcommittee of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), reported that the current Chair, Andrew Hippisley, was willing to serve for an additional year. Because there was only one person willing to serve in the position, the *SR* did not require a formal election.

Jones also reported the outcome of the recent election for SC members. The new members will be Ernie Bailey (AG/Veterinary Science), Phil Kraemer (AS/Psychology), and Joan Mazur (ED/Curriculum and Instruction). Jones said he would send those individuals an email in the near future suggesting they touch base with the Chair.

Regarding the vice chair position, Jones explained that only one person was willing to serve. In contrast to the *SR* language about the chair, the *SR* required a vote to finalize that position of vice chair. The Chair put on the floor a **motion** to approve the election of Katherine McCormick as SC vice chair. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair said the President would be arriving soon, so he suggested reordering the agenda. There were no objections.

5. Determining First SC Meeting in January
The Chair explained that the tradition was for SC to hold its first January meeting on the Monday prior to the start of the classes. That would put the SC's first meeting in the new year on Monday, January 12, 2015. There were no objections

4. Senate Meeting Roundtable
The Chair opined that the University Senate (Senate) meeting did turn out to be somewhat tricky. He asked SC members to go around the room and comment on the recent meeting. Below are representative comments.

- IT was good to have senators involved in the substance of the discussion on the nondiscrimination language. The confusion about the *In Memoriam* posthumous degree could have been avoided if more information was shared with SC. Perhaps a dean should present an *In Memoriam* posthumous degree to SC as well as to the Senate.

- The *SR* require the most recent version of Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised to be used, which is the 11th version. Unfortunately, the most recent version available entirely electronically is the 4th version. Therefore, it might be helpful to have a parliamentary action cheat sheet posted on the Senate's website.

- Senators were active and participatory. Larger attendance at meetings is good.

- The change to the non-discrimination statement changed the focus to be more about students than employment. The SC should have caught the error in the master's proposal that the Senate

returned to committee. The *In Memoriam* posthumous degree discussion was embarrassing in that the name of the deceased student had to be added to the regular degree list during the meeting. Also, many faculty and administrators were unaware of the proposed retirement changes.

- Issues with broader implications for faculty should be at the top of the agenda, not at the end.

- The increasing engagement among senators is good. The retirement changes seem to be already decided upon, which is frustrating.

- SC needs to develop a mechanism to prevent confusion regarding the *In Memoriam* posthumous degree process.

- The dean should have known to say the student should have received a regular degree, not an *In Memoriam* posthumous degree; SC and Senate are not to blame as much as the dean. The master's proposal was an embarrassment. The Graduate School should never have sent through such a proposal without having the associated courses already in effect.

- The retirement changes have already been implemented, which follows a general University pattern of implementation without consultation. The changes seem to benefit employees, but the point is that if a change affects employees, it should be discussed with employees.

- The point about needing to have employment language retained was important.

6. Discussion with President Capilouto - Provost Next Steps (4 pm)
The Chair welcomed President Eli Capilouto and turned the meeting over to him. President Capilouto thanked SC members for the opportunity to meet about the next provost. The President said that after all his discussions are over, he will have met with over 60 people; he is asking everyone the same questions. Because he already has meetings scheduled with the trustees in the room, he asked they refrain from commenting to give SC members full opportunity to share their thoughts with him. Same with the SC chair.

The President said he wanted to hear from everyone in the room. While he would be taking notes, the comments would not be attributed to an individual. If someone particularly wants their name associated with a comment, they would need to say so explicitly. He said that rereading his notes about the comments offers him a helpful way to synthesize comments. The President said he had three questions.

1. What should the priorities for the next provost be?
2. What should the attributes of the next provost be?
3. What should the process to identify a provost look like?

President Capilouto said he would like to go around the room and have each person share one priority. If someone else had the same idea, he asked that it be repeated. He said he would go around the room as many times as necessary for everyone to participate fully.

Below are the comments by SC members for each question.

1. What should be the priorities for the next provost?

- Budget model and its limitations (mentioned by four SC members).
- Come up with new ways to solve problems.
- Continue the work and effort put forward regarding the Women's Leadership Program.
- Improve the four-year graduation rate and reduce the loss of freshmen in their first year. The budget model serves as a distraction from focusing on problems.
- Represent the values of traditional academic disciplines and achievements.

- Broader campus-community engagement, particularly between UK and local and regional partners and how UK's research improves the lives of Kentuckians.
- Create a vision for what UK will look like in 10 years. How will teaching be done and how teaching be credited? Without that information, it is hard to plan a career.
- Pay attention to the land-grant mission. (mentioned by two SC members)

The President interjected that at the end of the meeting, if anyone had a name of someone who could serve as provost, they should write it down on a piece of paper and give it to the Chair, who would give it to the President.

Priorities, continued.

- A shared vision for UK being an engine for innovation and ideas for solving the world's problems. That vision should drive the budget and academic success.
- Reduce the friction between the medical campus and main campus.
- Develop undergraduate degree programs that are present at most other major research institutions, but are missing here. Use them to recruit more out of state students and tie the undergraduate degree programs directly to professional degree programs.
- Balance the land-grant mission with other priorities via the budget model.
- Emphasize diversity.
- Instead of giving students a degree, market careers by showing students that the degree is the key to the career.

When SC members did not have any further comments on priorities, the President asked them to consider the next question.

2. <u>What should be the attributes of the next provost?</u>

- A willingness to listen and communicate with faculty in a way that is open and transparent and consistent; respond to emails/communications within a reasonable time frame. (mentioned by three SC members)
- Respect faculty, which will therefore create a dialogue with faculty as UK goes through challenging experiences.
- Be engaged.
- Someone whose view of their own personal success is based on how well they perform in the position of provost. (mentioned by two SC members)
- Have a conversation and not just lay down laws.
- Good listener, who believes in managing by walking around. (mentioned by three SC members)
- Continue success of provost engagement of Senate committees.
- Can get things done and has executive skills and is familiar with UK and is able to use UK's internal processes and people.
- Has the capacity or interest to consider the needs of all the colleges and be inclusive in college conversations so there are not favorites or targeted areas. Be inclusive when it comes to resource allocations.
- Is energizing and can keep people believing they are moving forward and getting to a better place in terms of the research and education missions.
- Previous leadership experience, perhaps as an associate dean. (Not necessarily as a provost.)
- Someone who is a vertically integrated information seeker who walks around and talks to parking attendants and senior leadership.
- Should not be someone from the medical campus. (mentioned by two SC members; clarified to mean should not be from a medical college that has experienced governance problems) Could be a former dean or department chair.
- Flexibility and ability to recognize that good ideas are not only the purview of the provost – faculty can come up with good ideas, too.

- Be service oriented. Budget discussions have promoted certain responses in terms of incentives, but UK is in danger of losing sight of its role as a public service. (mentioned by two members)
- Balance conflicting claims for priorities and resources to advance the real mission of UK. The budget model has created a number of internal competitions with no guidance on how to balance competitive claims.
- Balance the friction between the land-grant mission and the research mission. For example, is a grant that provides a needed service in a Kentucky county as valued as a grant that may produce more research-oriented outcomes? Does a faculty member spend their time writing a handful of articles that will be read by colleagues and others in that field, or should the faculty member spend time making a difference in a Kentucky community?
- Flexibility with strength. There is still a perception that the College of Medicine utilizes more than its share of resources, so the next provost will have to correct that misperception or correct existing resource disparities.
- Know that revenues must exceed expenses; experience in the business world at some level would be helpful in implementing the new budget model.
- Should come from an undergraduate college and not a professional college. Undergraduates are the core of the University and leaders should come from an undergraduate college.
- Plan and have a vision for what a major university should be and can take care of the 1,001 little daily problems, but not get lost in them.
- Has some knowledge of UK's new budget model.
- Innovation and a demonstrated track record of developing solutions to intractable problems.
- Make decisions based on empirical data.

3. What should the process to identify a provost look like?

- Look to UK's regulations for guidance on process.
- Evaluate if turnover in the Provost's office is natural or if there is something surprisingly challenging about the position.
- Have senior leaders and scholars serve on the search committee; the next provost should come out of a major disciplinary area and have the intellectual credentials to lead by example. (mentioned by two SC members)
- Actively recruit individuals who may not have thought about applying for the position, particularly someone with management experience in industry or the military.
- Include faculty and deans in the search process, as well as medical campus faculty.
- Provide clarity from the outset about whether the interim provost can apply for the permanent provost position. (mentioned by two SC members)
- Provide a longer than usual term for the interim provost, maybe two to three years. (mentioned by two SC members)
- Provide the usual short term for the interim provost.
- Ensure the process minimizes risk of failure and of expense to U by identifying someone who has been a provost before with a demonstrated track record, rather than someone with potential.
- The interim candidate should be able to apply for the permanent position; showing potential may be sufficient, as opposed to having served in a provost position in the past.
- An internal candidate should hit the ground running. (mentioned by two SC members)
- An interim provost will be limited by knowing they will return to being colleagues with the ones they supervise while interim.
- An interim provost might feel awkward about supervising colleagues and then returning to their ranks, but following up on that concern would remove most internal candidates from the pool of potential interim candidates.

When there were no further comments offered by any SC member, the President spoke for a few minutes about the concerns associated with a vacancy in a provost's office, as well as issues unique to UK. At the end of his comments, he reiterated to SC members that if anyone had anything they wanted to communicate with him about, he was available via email and would respond in a timely manner. For a

phone call, just email him the cell number to call, but please be sure to let him know the latest he should return the call.

There being no further business to attend to, Watt **moved** to adjourn and Pienkowski **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The Chair urged SC members to head to Pazzo's; he and Watt would follow soon. The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Hippisley,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Brown, Christ, Debski, Grossman, Hippisley, McCormick, Pienkowski, Porter, Watt, and Wilson.

Invited guests present: Anna Bosch, Eli Capilouto, Kate Seago, Nels Roger, and Ben Withers.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, December 17, 2014.