

Senate Council Minutes
July 24, 2006

The Senate Council met in a special meeting on Monday, July 24, 2006 at 3:00 pm in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired.

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 pm.

1. Minutes from June 5 and July 10

The minutes from June 5 were approved as distributed. Also, the minutes from July 10 were approved as distributed.

The Chair, referring to Provost Subbaswamy's attendance, suggested that other agenda items be deferred until later. Senate Council (SC) members agreed.

3. Chief Academic Officer Evaluation – Administrative Regulations (AR)

The Provost confirmed that the separate handout contained Jones' suggested changes. Provost Subbaswamy agreed to the "cosmetic changes" and noted there were two substantive issues that he believed should be addressed. The Provost stated that when he arrived on campus, he thought the changed policy was a fait accompli, blessed by the deans and the SC. After learning that some individuals wanted to see additional changes, he took the opportunity to reopen the issue.

Provost Subbaswamy suggested a change to the language that ties the schedule of a summative review of the dean with the college's review. The Provost used the College of Health Sciences Dean Gonzalez as an example. Dean Gonzalez was appointed just last year but, under the current proposed language, would have to be reviewed, with the College of Health Sciences, in the coming year. This time frame would be too short for a dean, such as Dean Gonzalez, to demonstrate or exhibit substantive improvements. The Provost suggested disentangling the chief academic officer (CAO) review from that of the college's review. He thought the same committee could be used if it were convenient, but that it should not be mandatory.

Another concern of the Provost's was the short time frame for a CAO's formative review. He stated that it would take at least two full years to enact any type of meaningful change, not the year and a half or three semesters referred to in C.III.B.2. He opined that the formative review should occur at the beginning of the third year after the date of appointment. The Provost also suggested making the summative review occur five years from the date of appointment.

Provost Subbaswamy stated that his major concern was a thorough opportunity for review. He stated that no feedback to involved faculty/staff employees was not acceptable, but stated his belief that a CAO review, essentially a personnel matter, must still be treated with discretion and confidentiality. He said he would

be discussing this issue with deans in the near future, and suggested that the Provost would be responsible for creating a brief, boiled down public summary to include numerical representation of survey responders, and comments pertaining to what the dean was complimented on and also what the dean could pay more attention to for the next review. Provost Subbaswamy again stated that he wanted to discuss the level of appropriate public dissemination with deans.

Provost Subbaswamy expressed concern that the inserted Section III.C.6.i (see attached) language was not the best solution to the dissemination of information. While no feedback would be unacceptable, there should be opportunities for input from those employees in the CAO's chain of command. He stated that his experience with major review meetings was such that the majority of individuals attending had an axe to grind with the individual being reviewed, resulting in a less-than-positive review process. Provost Subbaswamy offered to develop language in Section III.C.6.g to allow and encourage more meaningful feedback, such as including the elected college faculty council in the group meeting with the CAO's direct reports. Provost Subbaswamy also suggested that a summary of a CAO's review, written by the Provost, be made accessible to faculty and staff.

Jones noted that an academic leader should expect a semi-public conversation regarding a performance review and that it could be hard-hitting, referencing the public forum held in Memorial Hall with President Todd. Jones wondered how there could be any opposition to a dean discussing future plans with the college faculty, stating it should be mandatory. The Provost replied that he was not agreeing or disagreeing with Jones regarding a dean discussing future plans.

Lesnaw expressed disagreement with Jones' support of a public meeting as the means for input into a CAO's review. She supported the Provost's suggestion of separating the CAO and college reviews. Lesnaw referred to the College of Arts and Sciences' Dean Hoch, who yearly presents a strategic plan in public forums and to departments, which she categorized as extremely productive. Lesnaw expressed concern that Section III.C.6.i did not capture a sense of goodwill or a positive approach.

Provost Subbaswamy agreed that there was a need to foster a positive, collaborative approach as opposed to an adversarial one. He stated that as a result of a review on a five-year cycle, it would be obvious if a dean were performing very well or if it was time for a change. He reiterated the need for feedback. Thelin stated that it was not the extremes of excellent or sub-par performance that were of concern, but rather the grey areas in between. Thelin also stated his belief that UK faculty were fairly supportive of deans, not necessarily hostile.

Thelin referred to emails from deans and vice presidents that faculty replied to – there was rarely a corresponding reply to a faculty member from the dean or vice president. Thelin offered some support for Jones's concerns about one-way

information. Provost Subbaswamy said that the language of Section III.C.6.i was set up to be an event where a CAO received negative comments; the Provost wanted to see a forum event where the topic of conversation involved positive suggestions for improvement.

Thelin asked if a public forum could be considered at the formative stage. Provost Subbaswamy expressed a lack of understanding as to the importance of a public forum. Thelin stated that as a leader, the role of dean within a public institution is a public role – employees are dependent upon a CAO's decisions. The Provost said his point of concern was why there was importance being placed on a public forum, as opposed to a private communication.

Randall stated that a faculty council could call for a forum at any time, and had every right to do so in the context of an evaluation. He agreed that the language of Section C.III.6.i was more combative than supportive, and supported the idea of a written public statement by the Provost, summarizing the evaluation. Assuming the CAO were performing appropriately, the public statement would reflect any problems with performance. Lesnaw stated that the real challenge would be getting the evaluative comments by faculty. She said, as discussed many times in the SC, untenured faculty seeking promotion would be loathe to jeopardize their positions by honestly critiquing a CAO's performance. Lesnaw said this problem would be exacerbated by a public forum. She said the formulation of a written survey and the process by which the survey would be constructed would be of utmost importance.

Provost Subbaswamy stated that the survey should be constructed by an impartial third party, perhaps via a contract between the Provost and UK's Survey Research Center (SRC). The SRC could create standard questions, as well as college-specific questions appropriate for the survey. It would be incumbent upon the SRC to ensure a sufficient quantity of responses. Lesnaw said that the problem would be to have genuinely evaluative responses; special attention should be given to novel concepts for input. The Provost agreed that those types of issues would need to be considered.

Jones opined that after years of leadership under former UK president Charles Wethington, faculty learned that the time spent in such an evaluative process would not be worth the input offered. As Thelin asked, Jones wondered when and how the comments of faculty would be shared. Jones expressed appreciation for Provost Subbaswamy's suggestion of including elected faculty bodies in the evaluation process, saying such inclusion would go a long way toward convincing him to participate in such a survey. Randall pointed out that the College of Medicine holds four faculty council meetings every year, at which Dean Perman is always present to answer questions. The Provost said he was trying to disseminate best working practices, and that there were always colleges where transparency functioned far better than in others. He added that currently,

for the first time, all 18 deans meet with the Provost at the same time, helping to begin establishing that uniformity.

The Chair thanked Provost Subbaswamy for his generosity of enabling further input into the proposed CAO review process, which would allow for the issue to be presented to the University Senate before being finalized. The Provost said he had been unaware that the proposed CAO review process had not been adequately vetted, and added that he had had some concerns himself.

Discussion then turned to the timeline for the proposed 2006-2009 Strategic Plan (SP). Liaison Greissman added that SC members had also received the provisional SP prior to the July SC retreat.

Provost Subbaswamy stated that the concept of a SP was a standard practice at universities. The goal was not to tell individual colleges what to do, but rather to offer an articulation of a university's broad goals. The SP should reflect where UK should be. The next step in the process would be the real work of the University, finding out how to translate the goals into a plan of action for lower administrative and academic levels. The allocation of resources (personnel, facilities, etc.) must be done with action plans and the vetting of said plans. The Provost expressed an eagerness to move to this stage.

Provost Subbaswamy explained that there was a need to mesh the Top 20 Business Plan (BP) with the targets in the SP. By looking at one parameter of the BP, one could then do an analysis of how to close a gap. Instead of merely stating a goal to increase enrollment by 3%, it will be important to go to individual colleges and ask them how they can increase enrollment, to make it a bottom-up approach, provided it can be done quickly enough. The process will only work if the deans and department chairs can offer input in a reasonable time frame, and then fold that information up to the college and then university levels, with the hope of having targets identified by the end of the year. The Provost said he hoped to hold a few more University Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities (UCAPP) meetings and meetings with deans. Subsequent to those events and with UCAPP and the deans' blessings, a draft document would be distributed to faculty and staff. The Provost mentioned he had already received some suggestions, but there had not yet been time to vet them with UCAPP. Since the deans and UCAPP have been intimately involved in the process, the Provost expressed hope that there would not be substantive changes to the SP. The SP will be presented to the Board of Trustees in October, with a tentative date of mid-August for distribution to faculty and staff.

Lesnaw expressed support for the timeline, but added that it raised questions of outreach and interdisciplinary questions. She asked for additional information on the mechanism by which novel ideas for extended outreach and interdisciplinary programs would be shared with appropriate leadership, as well as how ideas could be evaluated and the individuals making the suggestions be rewarded.

Provost Subbaswamy noted that the structure of UK had changed dramatically in the past 10 years; in the past, the medical deans were not included in discussions with main campus deans. In terms of facilitating further conversations, the Provost stated he still did not have a good idea of what would work best and where centers and institutes fit into the picture. Since some centers and institutes were being divested of their academic homes, he said he needed to understand the issue better before hearing suggestions. Jones suggested that the University Senate, being a super-college entity, could provide a framework for those types of discussions. Lesnaw suggested a committee could funnel ideas to the Provost.

Provost Subbaswamy did not object to such suggestions, but stated he needed a better understanding of various issues before making suggestions and starting initiatives. In time, at the Provost level, it would be relatively easy to see intersections between suggestions offered by various entities, and see how those ideas/concepts could offer benefits to UK as a whole.

Thelin expressed concern that if UK locks itself into money generated from revenues brought in by increased enrollment, UK could lose its distinctive undergraduate experience, adding that the huge enrollment increases could be hard to merge with that distinctive experience. Provost Subbaswamy acknowledged Thelin's concerns, but added that UK could work with K-12 institutions and the Kentucky Community and Technical College System to capture better-prepared incoming freshmen. If there were well-prepared students enrolling and if UK could capture more Kentucky high school graduates, there would be a logic that could be supported by the Commonwealth of Kentucky. If the goal of becoming a top-20 institution were aligned with the concept of UK being Kentucky's land-grant, flagship University with an obligation to the Commonwealth, then the enrollment goals could be easily seen as legitimate.

Due to the time, Provost Subbaswamy finished by saying he was very respectful of faculty governance and looked forward to future meetings with the SC. He also invited individual communication from SC members should the need arise. The Chair thanked him for attending and the Provost departed.

The Chair reminded SC members that he would make sure that those members who had yet to offer a comment would be recognized before another member who spoke previously on an issue, even if the one who spoke previously had their hand raised first.

Thelin opined that a lot of ground had been covered in the discussion with the Provost, and that due to Jones' and others' requests to resurrect previous discussions, the SC had diplomatically and fairly gained ground with good will. The Chair asked for input as to how the SC should proceed. Discussion followed as to exactly what and how would be communicated to the Provost regarding the

CAO review discussion. It was decided that the Chair would prepare a memo of understanding to send to the Provost, outlining what was discussed.

The Chair asked for and received support from the SC to include in the memo of understanding a statement indicating that if the suggestions included in the memo were adopted, the SC would support removal of the “rule of 65.” That would also mean the SC endorsed the proposed *Administrative Regulation* regarding the CAO evaluation and review process.

SC members discussed what would be incorporated into a memo of understanding to send to Provost Subbaswamy, to summarize the discussion with the Provost regarding the review of CAOs.

Lesnaw **moved** to include in the memo of understanding, as the first point of understanding, a suggestion to disentangle the timing of the review of a chief academic officer from that of a prospective unit review, as discussed in Section III.C.3. Jones **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Lesnaw **moved** to include in the memo of understanding, as the second point, that the timing of the formative review in Section III.B.2 be changed to the beginning of the third year, post appointment. After brief discussion regarding the specific time frame, Jones **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Lesnaw **moved** to include in the memo, as the third point, that the timing of the summative review in Section III.C.4 be changed to at least every five years post appointment. After a discussion on semantics of the time frame, Jones **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Duke **moved** to include in the memo, as the fourth point, that Section III.C.6.g be amended to include an elected faculty group in the meeting scheduled and that the summary report be made available in some semi-public place. Jones **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Lesnaw **moved** to include in the memo, as the fifth point, that Section III.C.6.g include a statement that the Provost will prepare a summary of the review, suitable for viewing by faculty and staff. There was discussion about whether or not it would be appropriate for individuals of one college to access the review of a CAO of a different college. Lesnaw suggested changing the motion to state that the document would be available to faculty and staff but not to the general public, including newspapers. Jones suggested it be amended to be available to the faculty and staff supervised by the dean. Thelin thought the language should not include a reference to the press.

Lesnaw **amended** the motion to state that the Provost will prepare a summary of the review and that the document will be made available to faculty and staff

supervised by that CAO. The Chair requested clarification concerning who would be able to access a Provost's review – would the “supervised faculty and staff” include just the Provost's employees, or deans, or faculty? Lesnaw suggested using the term “appropriate” but there was concern that word could be interpreted differently by different individuals.

After additional discussion along these same lines, Harley pointed out that the Provost specifically mentioned posting the review on the Senate Council website, so he probably did not intend for the summary review to be viewed by only certain employees.

Lesnaw **amended** the **motion** so that, as the fifth point of the memo of understanding, in addition to the current language in Section III.C.6.g, a statement that the Provost will prepare a summary of the CAO's review and make it available to faculty and staff be included. Jones **seconded**. A **vote** was taken on the motion, which **passed** unanimously.

Lesnaw **moved** to include in the memo that, as the sixth point, if points four and five of the memo of understanding are accepted as suggested, the inserted Section III.C.6.be deleted. Jones **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Baxter asked if there was a rationale behind there being no mention of a summative review of vice presidents (VPs) and associate/vice provosts (A/V Ps). He thought VPs and A/V Ps should be on the same schedule of reviews. Lesnaw suggested that this question be posed in the memo of understanding as an observation, with a question as to whether or not it should be reconciled.

Baxter then **moved** to include in the memo of understanding a comment (after the seven points) that Section III.C.3 and Section III.C.4 proposed different schedules for deans and provosts, and inquire as to whether or not the two times should be reconciled. Jones **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Jones **moved** to include in the memo of understanding, as the seventh and final point, that the Senate Council understood the Provost was in accord with the “cosmetic changes” (in blue font) in Section I, Section II, Section III.C.3, Section III.C.6.h, Section IV and Section V. Thelin **seconded**. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** unanimously.

3. Planning for Senate Council/Senate Analysis and Response to (DRAFT) 2006-2009 Strategic Plan

The Chair asked if there were any objections to the [timetable](#) for distributing, receiving input, and approving the 2006-2009 Strategic Plan. Jones expressed concern that there would not be enough time left in the meeting to adequately discuss those issues. At the Chair's request, Jones agreed to initiate a discussion on the SC listserv.

1. Announcements

The Chair announced that individuals could go to www.uky.edu/Faculty/Senate and get to the University Senate's web site. Any links within the pages would still utilize the current www.uy.edu/USC/New address, but those subsidiary pages were being worked on. He stated he would announce the new address at the September 11 Senate meeting.

At Jones' request, Mrs. Brothers agreed to send to SC members the list of committee membership included in the handout.

The Chair noted that Professor Gifford Blyton, University Senate parliamentarian, would be turning 98 years old in September. If SC members agreed, the Chair said that President Todd, who will be attending the September 11 Senate meeting in his role as Chair of the University Senate, was more than willing to be a part of any recognition for Professor Blyton, and noted Professor Blyton's 35 years of continuous service as the Senate's parliamentarian. President Todd also agreed to participate in a group picture with the senators present at the September meeting.

2. Status of Assistant Provost for Program Support as the Provost's Liaison to Senate Council

The Chair asked if there was time left to discuss the continued role of Associate Provost for Program Support Greissman's role as liaison to the SC. Technically, Greissman's status as liaison expired on June 30. Baxter asked if Greissman would remain in his current position under the new Provost. The Chair replied that he had not heard otherwise. Duke stated that his continued employment in that position was very relevant. Lesnaw suggested that the issue was not Greissman's continued service, but rather service from someone designated by the Office of the Provost to act as liaison. Other SC members disagreed, stating it was the person, and not the position, that made the continued inclusion of a liaison in SC meetings so very important.

Jones **moved** that if Greissman continued his employment in the Office of the Provost, he be invited to continue as Provost's Liaison to the Senate Council for the period July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2006. Lesnaw **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

There being no time left for discussion of remaining agenda items, the meeting was adjourned at 5:03 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh Tagavi,
Senate Council Chair

Members present: Baxter, Duke, Harley, Jones, Lesnaw, Randall, Tagavi, Thelin.

Provost's Liaison to the Senate Council present: Greissman.

Guest Present: Provost Kumble Subbaswamy.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on July 25, 2006.