

Senate Council  
July 14, 2010

The Senate Council met in special session for a retreat on Wednesday, July 14, 2010, at 8:30 in the Lexmark Public Room, 209 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise. All action items (indicated by "AI") are outlined at the end of the minutes.

Chair Hollie I. Swanson called the Senate Council (SC) retreat to order at 8:42 am. SC members and guests offered general comments about the University's budget. Vice President for Research Jim Tracy said that the budget would be the number one topic at the annual deans' retreat August 3-4. The Chair noted that she had also been invited to attend. She asked that any SC member with questions about the budgeting process email her, and she would try to find answers.

1. Vice President for Research James Tracy: Presentation on "Competing in the Era of Big Bets: Achieving Scale in Multidisciplinary Research"

Guest Tracy said that the challenge with the fiscal year (FY) 2010 budget was not knowing what money the state would have to contribute to UK. For FY 2011, about \$17 million was backfilled from federal stimulus funds, approximately 7% of the budget. Fixed costs will increase, along with insurance and retirement costs, etc., and the University is loathe to go another year without raises, which cost a large amount of money. Tracy said that while firm numbers would not be available for awhile, he was trying to think of various scenarios. For example, if the federal Office of Management and Budget issues an order to all federal agencies that non-discretionary spending must be cut, President Obama could say that those cuts should not be across the board. Tracy opined that agencies will then identify their weakest areas and cut those entirely, as opposed to trimming around the edges. High-priority research programs will probably remain, but he was not sure which ones those would be.

In response to a question from Grossman, Tracy replied that the National Science Foundation (NSF) puts in a budget request like all funding agencies. If the NIH must cut 5% from their budget, that would be a lot of money for them to lose, particularly after having lost so much already. There will be fewer grants due to the loss of stimulus funds. While there were comments about how well President Obama spent the stimulus funds, the NSF simply looks differently than the NIH. For the NIH, if funds are committed, they can be spent over any period. The NSF gave five-year grants, and the NIH offered only one no-cost extension for shorter grant periods.

Tracy then offered a presentation entitled, "Interdisciplinary Research Centers: Promises and Problems."

During the presentation, he answered a few questions from SC members. In response to a question from Grossman about how faculty could help keep down costs, Tracy replied that it was most important to find ways to provide services more cheaply. Randall asked about the number of administrators at UK. He explained that he had heard that benchmark comparisons showed UK to have fewer administrators than other schools. Tracy said that the number of research administrators was smaller than it should be. Positions were being added slowly, but turnover was another problem. Such jobs are tough, and the average salary at UK is far below that of peer institutions, sometimes making it hard to hire enough skilled persons. He noted that 65% of people at UK make less than \$50,000 per year. He said that various services provided internally could be done more efficiently.

Tracy went on to say that if you use the example of someone earning \$100,000 per year, and add in costs for retirement and benefits, that person costs the University approximately \$1 per minute. If one considered a 40-hour work week, with 18 deans, and 12 provosts, and they all sit through deans' meetings, and Board of Trustees meetings, that amounts to a lot of money spent on sitting. He summed up by saying that people are a real resource that must be used effectively.

Grossman commented that education was not a money-making endeavor, but rather an investment in the future. Education will cost money, and politicians needed to be reminded of that. Randall shared that his department had done a computation regarding the number of hours taught versus the tuition income, and realized they generated \$1.9 million in tuition income from what they taught. He said that when programs were evaluated, that type of number was something people could understand, showing the real impact faculty have on tuition income. Grossman countered with a question about the cost of delivering that education.

Thelin referred to the Delta Cost Project, a study that tracked for 10 years where state dollars went in terms of educational and non-educational costs. The results generally show increasing dollars for non-educational things. Grossman wondered what constituted "non-educational," and said that he would consider research being part of that. Tracy said that sometimes recreational activities were considered to be co-curricular. Tracy said that he did not think that a University should be a business, but acknowledged that due to budget constraints the University should be working somewhat more like a business.

Commenting on a cost calculation in Tracy's presentation, Thelin said that he doubted most faculty would realize the cost required to run a center. He wondered if that would be a good idea for center proposals to be submitted with that cost calculation. SC members discussed various scenarios and past center proposals. Also discussed with Tracy was whether or not centers attract grants; what to do with "necessary" centers that are exceptionally non-profitable; the creation of centers to retain star faculty; the benefits of informal yet detailed collaboration; reporting structures; and the general need for increased openness with regard to finances and budgeting.

When discussion wound down, the Chair thanked Tracy for his presentation and participation in the discussion, and he departed. The Chair suggested SC members take a short break before moving to the next agenda item.

## 2. Minutes from April 26, May 10, and May 27 and Announcements

Grossman **moved** to approve the SC minutes from April 26, 2010, May 10, 2010, and May 27, 2010 and McCorvey **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The Chair offered a handful of announcements.

The first SC meeting of the new academic year will be on August 2 at the regular time, when proposed changes to *Governing Regulations VII (GR VII)* will be discussed. Provost's Liaison Greissman will explain the revisions. In addition, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mike Mullen will offer an update on Gen Ed issues. Randall commented that the changes to *GR VII* were a major revision, and agreed with the Chair that there were proposed changes to academic appointments to centers, as well as which units may offer courses that bear on degrees.

Peek advised SC members that revisions to *Administrative Regulations 1:2* were being discussed.

The Chair announced that upon the request of Mullen, she granted provisional approval for UK 090 for one semester. The remedial course was required by statute, and it would complete the customary approval process in the fall.

There was no need to extend the oral communications suspension, so the suspension was not renewed, and incoming fall 2010 freshmen will have the oral communications requirement to fulfill.

President Todd is unavailable to attend the September University Senate (Senate) meeting, so there was discussion about inviting the Executive Vice President for Financial Affairs (EVPFA) to give a “State of University Financials” address in September. After a couple of brief comments, Anderson **moved** to ask the EVPFA to attend the September Senate meeting, and McCorvey **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed (**AI**).

The Chair explained that future SC minutes will contain an “action items” section to ensure timely follow up on various matters.

There are hard copies of UK’s budget available in the Office of the Senate Council (and also online), and the Board of Trustees (BoT) agenda booklet will be available to review upon its release. Anderson suggested that a link to the budget be included in the email to senators with the September meeting agenda (**AI**).

The Chair then led SC members in a brief discussion regarding the President’s annual evaluation, specifically the request for it to be completed by mid-July, and the corresponding reply drafted and circulated among SC members. Grossman **moved** to send the letter with grammatical changes to Board of Trustees Chair Pro Tem Billy Miles. Nokes **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed (**AI**). There was subsequent discussion regarding the timing of the annual evaluation, as well as the President’s salary structure.

The Chair announced that Professor Lee Edgerton was reappointed as Ombud for the 2010 – 2011 academic year. SC members will be asked to identify members for an ombud search committee (for 2011-2012) in January.

Finally, the Chair expressed her gratitude for Professor Kate Seago’s contributions to the last SC retreat. After having received the permission of her dean, Professor Seago will continue as parliamentarian for 2010 – 2011, and will also begin attending the SC meeting prior to a Senate meeting.

### 3. Proposed Ad Hoc Committees from May 27, 2010 Retreat

SC members discussed the proposed ad hoc committees from the May 27 retreat (ad hoc committee to identify a faculty member with legal expertise to advise the SC, subset of SC to examine and revise administrative coordinator’s job duties, ad hoc committee to determine which Senate committee should address graduate education concerns, and ad hoc committee on committees to review Senate committee structure). SC members opted to wait until fall to suggest possible members for the “legal expertise committee” (**AI**). It was decided that Jensen, Grossman and the Chair would comprise the committee to review the administrative coordinator’s job duties (**AI**).

It was determined that there was an existing standing committee, the Senate Committee on Committees (SCoC), that could review Senate committee structure – all that is needed is to develop a

charge for that committee **(AI)**. The Chair suggested that the SCoC also determine what committee should review the issue on graduate education.

There was discussion amongst SC members regarding a request from a faculty member that the SC look into the issue of air quality, particularly around the physical plant buildings. SC members were made aware of the steps taken thus far by the faculty member (contacting UK and Lexington city officials). After some time, SC members determined that air quality was somewhat out of the purview of the SC's charge. It was decided that the appropriate next step would be to contact the faculty member with recommendations about who/what to contact **(AI)**.

SC members talked briefly about the end of the Oral Communications requirement, and the Chair asked Mrs. Brothers to contact Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mike Mullen and ask that he share that information with department chairs and directors of undergraduate studies **(AI)**.

SC members then moved to a discussion regarding how faculty (and staff) file a formal complaint or grievance. After a short period, Grossman **moved** to ask the Senate's Committee on Committees to explore whether a "grievance" committee should be established, and if so, how. Anderson **seconded**. There was brief discussion, and then a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed **(AI)**.

#### 4. Communication between Senators and Home Departments/Colleges

The Chair led SC members in a discussion on how senators and their home units can better communicate. She said she was also working with Chief Information Officer Vince Kellen on the creation of a faculty listserv. It was the general consensus that senators from each college should have a mechanism by which to send out updates, queries, etc. to faculty within the college. Mrs. Brothers volunteered to send information to each senator with the names of other senators in the college (if any), along with departmental affiliation and email address **(AI)**. In that way senators will be given the tools necessary to work with others in the college to come up with an effective college communications strategy. Grossman suggested including language such as "encourage you to work with the appropriate area in your college (dean's office, etc.) to establish a mechanism to communicate with your college constituency" when sending out each college's senator affiliation/email list to senators.

#### 5. Goals for the Senate Council and University Senate

SC members discussed possible goals for the SC and Senate. Randall commented that he would look into the issue of faculty representation in athletics proceedings **(AI)**. Grossman **moved** that the SC establish a list of goals at the August 2 meeting, for the Senate to rank and discuss. Anderson **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed **(AI)**.

At this point, around noon, SC members broke for lunch. SC members resumed meeting around 12:15 pm.

McCorvey offered an update regarding the request made by Past Chair Randall that the Board of Trustees meet after the Senate in December and May. If the BoT meets before the Senate during those months, it means that degree lists for those months must be approved a month before the BoT meets (meaning November and April), which pushes back the application deadline for students. A request was made that the BoT meet after the Senate meets in December and May, which could also improve UK's six-year graduation rate. In short, the newly changed BoT meeting schedule, beginning with spring 2011, will allow the BoT to meet after the Senate meets in the two months (December and May) when the Senate votes on degree lists.

There was as yet no resolution to the request that the BoT identify a subset to deal with off-cycle degree requests. Grossman noted that any such request coming to the BoT would be the result of an administrative UK error, not an "I forgot to apply" situation. SC members then segued into a discussion on BoT agendas and meetings.

After discussion on that matter wound down, Grossman asked if there was a way to explore opening up the transferable portion of the Employee Education Program (EEP) to graduate level coursework. Grossman explained that many faculty spouses already have an undergraduate degree, and could only benefit from the ability to take graduate-level coursework as part of EEP. After some discussion, the Chair agreed to bring the matter to the attention of the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs (AI).

#### 6. Specific Committee Charges

In addition to the long-standing charges to Senate committees in the *Senate Rules (SR)*, SC members also discussed timely, specific matters that the committees could work on over the academic year.

#### **Senate's Academic Facilities Committee:**

1. Solicit input on physical plant needs from senators, faculty, Student Government Association and invite administrators to present their priorities and associated rationales.
2. Develop a list of Senate priorities and associated rationales to be presented to the Senate for approval.
3. Communicate the Senate's facility priorities/rationales to the administration and the Board of Trustees, through the faculty trustees.

#### **Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee:**

1. Offer proactive responses to pending legislation concerning admissions and academic standards. Work with COSFL (Coalition of Senate and Faculty Leadership), a statewide group of university faculty leaders on issues of local and regional interest. (SC members asked that this committee's chair be added to the COSFL listserv (AI).
2. Review program criteria and standards, and admission, probation and suspension policies. Determine how such policies in one college affect other colleges.
3. Review the issue of transfer credit and how its impact can be measured. Identify courses that have been approved in the past for transfer credit and determine how they are reviewed for transfer credit.

#### **Senate's Institutional Finance and Resource Allocation Committee:**

1. Review UK's budget and communicate with the Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration and the University Budget Office.
2. Ensure that detailed information from the administration is received and communicated to the faculty in a proper and timely manner, particularly information pertaining to potential, tentative plans for financial enhancements or reductions.
3. Explore further administrative oversight of the budget for UK Athletics and the relation of the Athletics budget to UK's general fund.
4. Ensure that a schedule of annual fiduciary deadlines/dates, as well as regular reports from pertinent financial areas, is maintained.

#### **Senate's Admissions Advisory Committee**

**(proposed name: “Enrollment Management Advisory Committee”)**

1. Offer a written report as per the committee’s charge in the *SR* on the activities/changes that have taken place for the period of academic year 2001-2002 to the present.
2. Review the issue of transfer credit and how its impact can be measured.

**Senate’s Academic Planning and Priorities Committee:**

1. Develop a mechanism to communicate with faculty and staff and offer faculty the opportunity to weigh in on priorities.
2. Proactively meet, with the SC Chair, with the President regarding growth and development, and with the Provost regarding academic issues.
3. Identify a liaison to the Provost-run University Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities (UCAPP). This individual, as well as the SC Chair (who is an ex officio UCAPP member) can provide updates to the SC and Senate.
4. Identify funding for programmatic forums for faculty.
5. Investigate the possibility of establishing an awards program by the faculty, for the faculty.

**Senate’s Research Committee:**

1. Investigate issues pertaining to the Division of Laboratory Animal Resources (DLAR) and the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) and share this information with the Senate. Give special attention to justifications for the exceptionally detailed requirements of IACUC. Foster improved communication between the university research committee and those providing regulatory oversight.
2. Examine the policies by which grant management is established and determine why the administrative response to faculty concerns is perceived as decreasing.
3. Review the overall indemnification process for all of campus, with a specific eye toward the process as it affects non-healthcare areas, and whether non-healthcare areas have an implemented indemnification process.
4. Review health benefits of graduate students and weigh the pros and cons of transferring them to research funding awards.

**Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure:**

1. Investigate Distribution of Effort (DOE) allocations for trends and patterns of all faculty in all title series.

SC members determined that the issue of teacher/course evaluations, including online delivery, should be dealt with by an ad hoc group in August.

**7. UK Research Foundation Update - Chair Swanson**

The Chair offered some information about the UK Research Foundation (UKRF), of which she is an appointed (by the Board of Trustees) member. She said that the UKRF is an umbrella group, which administers and handles indirect costs from grants. The UKRF has also been used as mechanism to transfer money. She answered a variety of questions from SC members. SC members discussed the general matter of start-up and sunk costs, as they pertained to Coldstream Research Campus.

SC members commented on a variety of smaller issues pertaining to current events. There being no further business to conduct, the meeting was adjourned at 1:45 pm.

	<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
√	Invite Executive Vice President for Financial Affairs to the September University Senate meeting. (7/14/10)	Mrs. Brothers
2.	Include link to UK's budget when sending out the September 13 Senate agenda. (7/14/10)	Mrs. Brothers
√	Send letter RE President's annual evaluation. (7/14/10)	Chair
4.	Establish ad hoc committee to identify a faculty member with legal expertise who can advise the SC on various matters. (7/14/10)	SC
5.	SC subset to examine and revise the description of the administrative coordinator's job duties with a view towards increasing compensation. (7/14/10)	Grossman, Jensen, Chair
6.	Develop charge for Senate's Committee on Committees. Include in the charge that it explore need/establishment of committee for "grievances," as well as "graduate student education and related issues." (7/14/10)	SC
7.	Contact "air quality" faculty member with possible areas of assistance. (7/14/10)	Chair
√	Ask Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education to contact department chairs and DUSs about the end of the Oral Communications Requirement. (7/14/10)	Mrs. Brothers
9.	Send each senator a list of his/her college's senators and associated unit affiliation and email address. (7/14/10)	Mrs. Brothers
√	Distribute information on faculty participation in athletics activities. (7/14/10)	Randall
11.	Establish list of goals for Senate to deliberate upon. (7/14/10)	SC
12.	Discuss expansion of EEP with Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs to allow transfer to be used for graduate coursework. (7/14/10)	Chair
13.	Add chair of Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee to COSFL listserv. (7/14/10)	Mrs. Brothers / Chair

Respectfully submitted by Hollie Swanson,  
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Grossman, McCorvey, Nokes, Peek, Randall, Swanson and Thelin.

Invited guests present: Catherine Seago and Jim Tracy.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on August 12, 2010.