

Senate Council Meeting
January 28, 2008

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, January 28, 2008 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Kaveh A. Tagavi called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:03 pm. He noted that due to the presence of invited guests, his announcements could wait until later in the meeting.

1. Minutes from January 14 and Announcements

The Chair noted that no corrections had been received. There being no additional corrections, the minutes from January 14 were approved as distributed.

2. [Proposed New Center: Center for Muscle Biology](#)

The Chair referred SC members to the various letters of support for the proposed new Center for Muscle Biology (CMB). He invited College of Medicine Dean Jay Perman to offer some background information.

Guest Perman thanked SC members for the opportunity to share information about the proposal. He explained that the chair of the Department of Physiology, Michael Reid, had research interests related to muscle biology. Reid approached Perman almost a year ago to mention that there was a rare opportunity to bring together various faculty members in various colleges into one area with a focus on efforts related to the knowledge of muscle biology. It was a rare opportunity because very few research universities have the level of interest in muscle biology that is present at UK. Those at UK who have been approached about the CMB have all responded positively. He then suggested Reid make additional comments.

Guest Reid said that the other investigators of the proposed CMB were spread across campus. The idea for the CMB bubbled up from various collaborative efforts and recent faculty recruitments to UK. Without a concerted effort, UK has recruited a top-notch group of muscle biologists who look at muscle biology from the cellular level. The proposed CMB would also be a good opportunity for training. As far as the rationale for the CMB, Reid said that it would promote UK's reputation nationally and internationally and also would give muscle biology researchers a home for that intellectual enterprise. With the creation of the CMB, the investigators would have a place in UK's administrative structure and would allow for more efficient cross-departmental efforts.

Finkel asked about the long-term prospects of the CMB and what would happen if in the future there was no core group of muscle biologists – would the CMB fall apart or would the CMB keep the researchers at UK? Reid replied that he saw

the CMB as a strong and positive mechanism to keep faculty at UK and also to attract other investigators, perhaps some senior investigators with associated laboratory staff. He said that two recent arrivals came with a complete laboratory staff and five to six NIH grants. A physician scientist in the Department of Internal Medicine agreed to come to UK in part due to the muscle focus. Assuming the expertise is managed appropriately, Reid believed the CMB would continue to grow.

In response to a question from Swanson about a graduate core curriculum, Reid replied that he did not see any such curriculum being developed within the next two to three years, but that future development would depend upon how the CMB evolved. He said that all the faculty interested in being a part of the CMB had appointments in graduate programs with allegiances to those programs in various departments. He did not rule out the idea of the CMB being home to doctoral candidates in the future, however, which would be a unique attraction for UK.

Chappell asked for more information regarding being competitive for grants. Reid noted that RO1 grant funding was down and there was stiff competition for the available grants. He said that although the CMB was not yet formed, faculty were still applying for grants and that one training grant had already been approved, which would be the CMB's first training grant. He mentioned a couple of other nationally-known grant organizations and said that they offered grants to other entities that also had a focus on muscle biology.

In response to Wood, Reid confirmed that the "funds equal to 10% of the indirect costs from extramural grants" was in addition to the \$25,000 that the College of Medicine would provide to the CMB on an annual basis.

In response to a question from Finkel about collaborating with Athletics Department (Athletics) and the Department of Kinesiology and Health Promotion (KHP), Reid explained that while there were existing collaborations with KHP, faculty members in that department were primarily focused not on research, but on education. He said that the founding cadre members of the CMB were chosen in large part to their existing NIH funding, but that inclusion would be open to anyone with an interest in muscle biology. He said that with respect to collaborating with Athletics, the departments of Sports Medicine and Orthopaedic Surgery usually had more interaction with applied research. He said that the choice of the College of Health Sciences Associate Dean for Research Charlotte Peterson as a co-director would offer faculty in that college opportunities to do more research, since many Health Sciences faculty were educators not necessarily trained in research.

Chappell asked a couple of questions about the indirects going back to the CMB and was satisfied with the explanations given by Dean Perman and Reid.

Wood **moved** to send the proposal for a new Center for Muscle Biology to the University Senate with a positive recommendation. Chappell **seconded**. A **vote** was taken on the motion, which **passed** with seven in favor and one abstaining.

The Chair thanked Dean Perman and Reid for attending and they departed. The Chair then turned to announcements. He said that Michael had let the Office of the Senate Council know that he would be absent from the meeting.

1. Announcements

The Chair noted that at the last SC meeting, SC members were unable to identify individuals to serve as liaisons to the Graduate Council and the Undergraduate Council (UC). He noted that John Thelin, whose SC term ended in December 2007, agreed to continue as SC liaison to the Graduate Council. The Chair added that if there were any objections he would be happy to revisit that liaison position. Hearing none, the Chair said that Thelin could continue to serve.

A brief discussion followed regarding the position of SC liaison to the UC. Due to schedule conflicts with the UC meeting schedule, no SC members were able to volunteer. D. Anderson said that although her current schedule would not allow it, she was willing to do so beginning in fall 2008. The Chair accepted her gracious offer but noted that the issue would be brought up again at the next meeting.

The Chair then referred to the Health Care Colleges Professional Student Behavior Code (Code) that had been tentatively placed on the last meeting's agenda. He said he had received a query from a faculty member regarding the status of the Code. Since Provost's Liaison Greissman had updated the SC at its last meeting about the status of the Code, the Chair asked Greissman for more information.

Greissman explained that just prior to the December break, Provost Subbaswamy had concluded discussions with deans of the Health Care Colleges (HCC) about a separate appeals process for HCC students. Language to affect such a change was currently being worked on and would then go to Legal Counsel, the HCC deans and would then be incorporated into the Code.

In response to Swanson, Greissman explained that because of differences in the student body of the HCC, particularly that HCC students were working towards professional degrees involving licensure and other certification, some felt that in cases where a student appealed some type of decision, the appeals board should be made up of their peers. SC members expressed curiosity about the proposed appeals board change and other aspects of the Code.

Provost Subbaswamy arrived during the discussion and offered a few words about the Code and the intent. It was clear, though, that the Code still required vetting by many individuals prior to being ready for a vote by the SC.

3. How to Proceed with the Provost's White Paper on Faculty Policies – Provost Subbaswamy

The Chair reminded SC members of the email he sent to them recently with the Provost's white paper on faculty attached. After a short discussion during the January 14 meeting, it was determined that the Chair would meet with the Provost and plan next steps. The Provost asked to attend the next SC meeting to discuss the white paper personally with SC members. The Chair then introduced the new SC members to the Provost and to Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Heidi Anderson.

Provost Subbaswamy began by saying that the Top 20 challenge intrigued him, which was part of the reason he returned to UK. No university had been audacious enough to make such a declaration with financial benchmarks along the way. As a part of moving towards being a Top 20 research university, however, UK's processes and standards and methods of organization also needed to be looked at closely. It was fair to inquire as to whether or not such aspects were aligned with leading UK to Top 20 status. In addition, having identified benchmarks made it reasonable to look at those institutions' processes, etc. to see what they were doing and why, not necessarily to copy but rather to investigate.

The Provost then spoke about how to proceed. He said that he had a few ideas but he really desired input from SC members. For the complex issues, he said it might be effective to put together a joint task force to talk to colleges and faculty councils, etc. For the process issues, such as changes to the *Administrative Regulations (AR)*, the SC might not need to lead the discussion, but rather be very involved in the vetting of proposed changes.

In regard to a question from Wood about the overall intent, the Provost stated that the intent was to have a faculty review process that would allow UK to recruit and keep the best faculty, since he was not convinced that the current tenure/promotion process was aligned with meeting Top 20 goals. He said that UK had to move away from a mind-set in which departments assumed a particularly outstanding candidate would not accept a position so there was no point in interviewing the best and brightest.

Wood wondered if a lack of flexibility was part of the problem. The Provost replied that the changes were, in part, to increase flexibility. He opined that the creation of the STS had not been in keeping with the aspirations of a research-intensive university. Chappell wondered if the changes would create a more equitable situation, especially if the STS was limited. Chappell said he thought that creating more commonality amongst faculty was important. The Provost agreed, and said that the changes would mean different things to different colleges. It would take time and care to sort through those types of issues to see what will work best for UK and will be consistent with UK's benchmarks. He stated, though, that merely because a benchmark had a certain practice did not

mean it was best for UK to follow it – UK needed a reason to change its processes.

Swanson said that from a practical aspect, in a research-intensive department, teaching niches needed to be filled she said that in her area, an STS faculty was utilized to do teaching. She wondered aloud how a new faculty member in such a position would be treated – perhaps brought to UK in the regular title series with a different DOE.

Provost Subbaswamy said that he did not want to discuss specific situations just yet – such topics required faculty forums to flesh out discussions. He said he was asking that he and other faculty members learn together about practices at benchmarks and how they might be applied to improve UK's processes.

In response to a question from Aken about fast-tracking some aspects of the white paper, the Provost said that with the SC's permission, the procedural and process questions could be handled through the typical process used for changing the ARs. He thought the theoretical issues about title series should be reserved for a task force.

Wood noted that many institutions of top quality had a much more individualistic review process than UK's – she asked about including academic area advisory committees in the review by a task force. The Provost said he was open to such a suggestion. The task force would be open to taking up other questions of interest – his white paper hit the prominent points that he had noticed at UK since his return.

In response to a question from Dembo about when college councils would take up the issue. The Provost replied that faculty at the College of Medicine retreat were eager to begin deliberations. He said that the urgency of the issues was greater for some colleges than for others, so it would not be fair to hold some areas back while other colleges were just starting their discussions. He said that the extent to which autonomy was desired at the college level could be discussed first. He referred to the College of Agriculture and their extension title series (ETS) faculty and their engagement mission, which imposed restrictions on some expectations. He said it was fine for some colleges to move more quickly and present a college's point of view for other colleges to look at during their own deliberations.

Randall referred to past SC discussions regarding STS and other title series and said he was under the impression that current members of the STS would not be negatively affected. The Provost said that he wanted to be very clear about his intent – he believed it to be a time-honored principle that all changes would be prospective, not retroactive. He said that any changes would apply only to new faculty hires; current faculty employees would continue under the rules that were

in force when they were hired and would continue to be evaluated under the current regulations.

Piascik opined that the current system was cumbersome and needed to be looked at and streamlined. She also thought that the academic area advisory committees should be reviewed. She said that she believed UK utilized the STS because of a cookie-cutter view of what a tenure-track faculty member should look like. She supported valuing different types of scholarship but expressed concern that certain types of scholarship were not getting that support. Piascik said she recently heard someone suggest that only dollar- and publication-generating faculty should be in the tenure track, since those measures were important denominators for Top 20 status. That sentiment concerned her.

Provost Subbaswamy said he opposed dollar counting. He thought a strong emphasis on publications could be appropriate for some areas, but said he thought a system that focused on dissemination of knowledge was better. Piascik noted that she was concerned that some people would only look at publications and dollars to the detriment of other aspects of scholarship. The Provost replied that at a land-grant institution, on one level applied research is normal and very applied research was a part of the customary landscape at UK. He said UK needed to support its own scholarly mission.

Greissman noted a reference in the white paper to Section VII in the *Governing Regulations (GRs)*. He paraphrased language in that section that said departments “may” articulate what evidence constituted excellence in their area, and said that perhaps the language should use “must” instead – that would move away from a cookie-cutter description of scholarship and to a minute level at the department level. Although such discussions might be argumentative, they would take place among say the 20 faculty members in a given department, not discussions about what scholarship should look like for campus as a whole.

The Provost noted that it would take some time to change the way that UK looked at things. He said that if the academic area advisory committees were not functioning correctly, it would be better to push the review down to the departmental level. Provost Subbaswamy added that if there would be situations in which it would be appropriate for a tenure review to go all the way through the system, including a review by the Provost.

The Chair asked Associate Provost for Undergraduate Affairs Heidi Anderson if she had anything to add. Guest H. Anderson said she had been looking at benchmarks and private schools to see what those institutions’ tenure series looked like.

In response for clarification by Randall, Provost Subbaswamy said that there were two issues about which he wished for agreement from the SC: 1. the appointment of a joint task with an as-yet-undetermined charge to look at the title

series question, which would be a lengthy process of deliberations; and 2. a parallel look at procedural issues, which did not require weighty or time-consuming deliberations and so could be done through the customary review of *AR* changes.

Swanson asked if area committees at other institutions ever looked at reevaluations based on merit. The Provost replied that it never happened – the system should get it right regarding merit, so the only problem that needed to be addressed should be a procedural issue. He added that universities could make a mistake and not offer tenure to someone who went on to earn a Nobel Prize – unfortunate but not insurmountable; if wrong decisions were made on who to keep, that one mistake could result in a long-term problem. Greissman added that UK was unique in that merit cases stopped at the dean – the process went much further in other universities and merit was more carefully vetted.

The Chair asked if SC members had anything further on the matter to discuss at the current time. Randall noted that faculty in the health care colleges perceived the title series discussions to be a *fait accompli*. He said it would be very important to educate faculty across campus that it was actually an ongoing discussion in which all faculty needed to be involved. Wood noted that on the other end of campus, faculty were mostly unaware of the discussion, so quite a bit of conversation was needed.

H. Anderson said that the Provost was in several stages of conversations with the deans and had given them a couple of versions – the early versions were very different and the Provost had said that previous versions should be disregarded. She reiterated that the issue was in the early stages of discussion, not already done.

In response to a question from Chappell about how best to proceed with the changes that would be proposed to the *ARs*, Greissman said that the Provost would send the pertinent paperwork to the Chair, after which the SC could have its own deliberations and facilitate faculty council and college-level discussions. The comments, opinions, etc. would return to the SC for a deliberative process that would take as long as needed, but more condensed than the title series task force. Greissman said a next step could be to identify members for the task force, after the charge was created.

Moving to another topic, there was general discussion regarding the issue of gen ed reform. It was decided that one last mass email should go out to all faculty to remind them of the four-day's-hence deadline for receipt of comments, along with an email to college faculty councils.

There being no further business to attend to, the meeting was adjourned just before 5 o'clock.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh A. Tagavi,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Aken, D. Anderson, Chappell, Dembo, Finkel, Piascik,
Randall, Swanson, Wood and Yanarella.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guests present: Heidi Anderson, Jay Perman, Michael Reid, and Provost
Kumble Subbaswamy.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, February 13, 2008.