

Senate Council  
July 25, 2007

The Senate Council met for its annual retreat at 10 am on Wednesday, July 25, 2007 in the Bingham-Davis House. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless otherwise indicated.

Chair Kaveh A. Tagavi called the Senate Council (SC) to order at 10:16 am.

1. Minutes from May 29 and Announcements

The Chair asked for input regarding the first meeting date of the SC for the fall 2007 semester. SC members decided to hold the first meeting on August 27.

SC member Thelin was recognized by the Chair for his recent appointment to the advisory and editorial board for the National Collegiate Athletics Association's "Scholarly Colloquium on College Sports."

The Chair shared that he had met the new assistant provost for integrated academic services, Randolph Hollingsworth. He said that at one point in the past, she had been a member of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee.

Moving to approval of the May 29 minutes, the Chair asked if there were any revisions. There being none, the minutes stood as approved.

The Chair explained to SC members that it had been brought to his attention that in the most recent incarnation of the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees (UJCHD) there was no Board of Trustees (BoT) member included in UJCHD membership. In the prior committee responsible for nominating individuals for honorary degree, there had been a BoT member. The Chair added that since the ultimate approval of the nominees was in the hands of the BoT, input from a BoT liaison (who could be a member of the UJCHD) would be a valuable addition to the deliberative process.

SC members engaged in a lengthy discussion regarding adding a BoT member to the UJCHD. There was also discussion about how to address the situation in which previous nominations could be "rolled over" for consideration in the subsequent year in order to be fair to nominators who currently have to go through the nomination process again to re-nominate an individual.

After extensive discussion, Randall **moved** that the Chair bring a recommendation and rationale regarding additional members on the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees to the first August meeting of the Senate Council. Piascik **seconded**. After additional discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion, which **passed** unanimously.

[University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees Committee Vacancies](#)

The Chair then asked SC members to identify faculty members who could replace one outgoing member and one member on sabbatical, on the UJCHD. A few names were offered. The Chair said he would ask again, over the listserv, to allow additional names to be suggested.

#### Renewal of Provost's Liaison

A discussion was then had on requesting service for a Provost's liaison for the 2007 – 2008 year. The Chair said he would circulate last year's letter on the listserv for input.

With respect to the change in title for the senior research administrator, (Executive Vice President for Research to Vice President for Research), the Chair asked if SC members were inclined to suggest voting rights for the new position of vice president for research. Because only executive vice presidents (not vice presidents) are granted voting rights in the University Senate (Senate), SC members concurred with Thelin's statement that the voting rights be consistent and the incoming vice president for research not have a vote in the Senate.

#### Senate Parliamentarian

After a brief discussion, the Chair said he would contact Brad Canon, the parliamentarian who served the Senate at the end of the spring 2007 semester, to ascertain if he was able to continue to serve.

Those present broke for lunch with President Todd and Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Heidi Anderson.

Subsequent to lunch and the departure of President Todd, the meeting reconvened around 1:15.

The Chair suggested Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Heidi Anderson introduce the items she wished to share with SC members.

#### 6. Implementation of Delay in Probationary Period

Guest Anderson thanked SC members for their help during the 2006-2007 year, and said she had returned to seek further input on a variety of issues. Anderson added that the tenure clock delay proposal (alternatively referred to as the delay in probationary period) had a first reading at the June 12, 2007 BoT meeting and she expected the BoT to approve the proposal at its September 2007 meeting. She said she would send out an announcement to faculty and chairs post-BoT approval, to explain the new section in *Governing Regulation X*, its application, and implementation.

Anderson referred SC members to the second page of her handout, which outlined tenure clock procedures put forth by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), explaining that the gist of the recommendations

was to ensure faculty of both genders were treated fairly and that the process regarding a tenure clock delay was clear. She said that there would be forums for UK faculty that would explain the delay in more detail, assuming the BoT approved the addition to the *Governing Regulations (GR)*. In addition, there would be a flow chart for faculty and department chairs to reference.

Anderson then said that at the behest of Provost Subbaswamy, she was researching benchmarks with regard to a possible faculty ombud at UK. She said the Provost supported a go-to person with whom faculty could meet if the faculty member was not comfortable talking to college administrators, or who had exhausted college resources. She said she would continue reviewing benchmarks to learn more about the details, specifically the types of cases an ombud would review, etc. Anderson asked for input and added that she would like to work with a committee to help her work through the details.

Anderson said that the associate provost for faculty development at the University of Florida explained to her that the ombud was useful at times merely as a listening ear, not necessarily as an office that was constantly involved in grievances.

Finkel opined that the position might not need to be full time, but that it was a good idea. In response to Wood, Anderson agreed that a reporting relationship similar to that of Anderson and the Provost was not the best arrangement for an ombud position – a faculty ombud would need to be removed somewhat from the Office of the Provost. Wood said it was likely faculty would be willing to interact with an ombud, in the same way a student could go to the Academic Ombud, as opposed to talking with the college dean. A free-standing office without direct ties to the Office of the Provost would prevent the perception that a discussion with the faculty ombud was inappropriately jumping ahead of the standard administrative hierarchy.

In response to Aken, Wood said that in the early 1980s, there was a non-academic ombud, but Wood was unsure when that position was done away with. Wood said it had been good to have a person with whom faculty could discuss issues that were not academic in nature.

Lesnaw stated that there was also a need to establish a faculty mentoring system. Anderson replied that the Provost had asked for research into that topic, as well. Randall opined that most departments had some type of mentoring system, but Anderson said not all departments had a formal, structured system. The Provost had already asked Anderson to gather information about well-structured faculty mentoring programs and then share that information with other departments, whose programs were less robust.

In response to Harley, Anderson replied that at UK's benchmarks, some faculty ombuds were linked with a human resources department, but others were not.

She said that at the University of California at Los Angeles, there was one office of ombuds responsible for faculty, student and staff ombud issues.

Thelein spoke in favor of the idea of a faculty ombud. Among other benefits, it would allow for further consideration of a situation if there was no resolution at the decanal level. Piascik thought that it would also allow the collection of information without identifying the parties who contacted the faculty ombud – it could help identify a problem pandemic to campus, if the issue arose multiple times in various areas. Anderson agreed, saying that she would be the logical person to react to perceived patterns of problems.

Wood noted that not all disagreements pertained to academic matters – it would be a benefit to department chairs and college deans who might not feel comfortable weighing in on a non-academic dispute.

Anderson thanked SC members for their input. She already had a bipartisan faculty group to help with the concept and said she would return with a more structured proposal in the future.

Anderson then moved to various upcoming faculty initiatives. With respect to new faculty orientation, Anderson recalled that when she attended in 2002, it was an informative but very overwhelming experience – by the end of the day, her head was swimming with facts and faces and names. Anderson said she had been talking with Provost Subbaswamy about utilizing a practice that occurred at some of UK's benchmarks; there was a one-day (or half-day) orientation followed by a series of more focused discussions over the course of the semester or academic year. Instead of an orientation, it would be more of a faculty development series.

Anderson said that the series (as described in her handout) was approved by the Provost. The various sessions would be offered from September through May and be open to all faculty members. RSVPs would be necessary to gauge attendance and the specific sessions would allow more concentration on specific details. In addition, it would also alleviate the need for a faculty member not overly interested in research to sit through an orientation on faculty research.

Addressing the leadership series, Anderson said she envisioned a series for department chairs and for aspiring faculty leaders. She said she was forming an advisory committee to flesh out the details. She mentioned a book club for faculty at Morehead State University as another example of bringing faculty together.

Wood said that an introductory UK-budget course would be one of the most crucial things for faculty. Department chairs and other administrators would benefit if faculty as a whole had an appreciation for what it actually meant to try to manage and be responsible for millions of dollars. She spoke in favor of such a series, especially a budget session that would explain the budgeting process,

how funds can and cannot be used, and how state law affects UK's financial expenditures.

Wood also mentioned a department chair academic workshop held every February in Orlando, FL – she was sent when she became a chair and found it very helpful to attend. She said it was unlikely that there would be a large cohort of new department chairs every year, so if the Provost could fund their attendance at the workshop, the information could also benefit the department chair leadership sessions. Anderson replied that the Provost allocated some funds for books and travel for leadership issues, and that this was a good idea to look into further.

Lesnaw supported the idea of the revised faculty orientation series, as well as the department chair and faculty leadership series. She also applauded the idea of rudimentary budget sessions for all faculty members, regardless of years of service. Lesnaw added that it was very important for all faculty members to be involved in the research sessions. She said that a great disservice was done to young faculty in the non-NIH fields by not encouraging them enough and not actively helping them to obtain funding. While grants in the humanities are not numerous, there are grants out there. Lesnaw said the faculty development series might be more effective if the list of topics was shortened somewhat, with the remaining sessions being mandatory.

Anderson said that the list was not complete, but that she would need to prioritize the sessions. Lesnaw thought some of the sessions would be best led by UK's incoming director of work-life or a faculty ombud. Anderson said that with respect to the research sessions, she wanted to also develop a series on non-medical research.

Wood said that a session for new faculty on how to prevent plagiarism and cheating would be beneficial. She said that new faculty unintentionally created situations that were conducive to cheating or plagiarizing.

Piasek said that the revised format of the sessions created a problem with attendance – the reason new faculty attended new faculty orientation in the past was because it was mandatory and it was also an event from which they could not get side-tracked because of the day-long format. If the sessions were offered throughout the semester, it would be harder for some faculty to find the time to get away from their work responsibilities, no matter how relevant or necessary the session topic. She said that heavy buy-in from department chairs was necessary for the changed format to succeed. Anderson commented that the college deans were aware of and supported the new session format.

Piasek suggested that the presenters at such sessions be fellow faculty members who could be highlighted for their ability to do X in a creative Y fashion. She said it would be more effective than having the sessions led by

administrators who might concentrate on regulations and policies. It would be a good way to highlight faculty who do things well – it could help others learn, too. Anderson said she had no intention of leading more than a handful of the sessions – she said she would welcome suggestions for faculty who could lead the sessions.

Lesnaw said that with the changes in technology over the years, long-term faculty would also benefit from the courses. She suggested that one way to encourage attendance would be for department chairs to have the new faculty report back to the department on what was presented at the sessions. It would support attendance as well as help the new faculty member interact with departmental faculty. In addition, having to report back to the department would almost guarantee an active participation in the session.

Anderson thanked SC members for their valuable input and exited the meeting shortly thereafter.

#### 4. Department Chairs' Role in Senate Council Membership

The Chair asked SC members to consider whether or not there was a problem if a department chair were to become a member of the SC. SC members discussed the issue at length, including the aspects below.

- Integrity/independence of department chair
- Perception of integrity/independence of department chair
- DOE percentages, whether 49% or 50% or some other number
- Disservice to department chairs by not allowing them to serve on SC or as SC chair
- Divided loyalties of a department chair (between that of administration and that of the faculty)
- Workload of a department chair and duties of a SC member or SC chair
- Comfort level of faculty bringing problems (which regularly occurs) to SC chair if that person were also a department chair
- Openness of SC discussions if a member were a department chair

No formal action was taken.

#### 2. Deadlines for Committee Deliberations

The Chair asked SC members to think about giving committees a deadline by which deliberations and decisions on a curricular item must be communicated to the Office of the Senate Council.

After discussion, SC members decided it was appropriate to let Senate committees know when a curricular item would be placed on a Senate agenda. In that way, a committee would know in advance when the item would be heard by the Senate; the committee would have a timeline by which to submit the review to the Office of the Senate Council.

### 3. Listserv Participation and SC Attendance

The Chair asked SC members about the current use of the listserv. Were requests from the chair posted too frequently? Were discussions too involved?

SC members expressed satisfaction with the listserv.

### 5. Summer School Pay

The Chair referred SC members to the discussion at the May 14 SC meeting about the problems with summer school pay.

Wood suggested that the Chair follow up with the Provost and request that during the summer school budget process (likely in January), the Provost share guidelines for faculty reimbursement, payment, etc., and also request the privilege of giving input. The Chair agreed to do so.

### 7. Definition of “Privilege” as it Relates to Appeals by Faculty Members and the Charge of the SACPT

The Chair explained that the Senate’s Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure (SACPT) had wished for guidance regarding the definition of “privilege.”

The SACPT met twice to try to determine a working definition of “privilege” but was unable to do so. The Chair asked for input.

Wood noted that the original name of the committee including “Promotion and Tenure.” She suggested going back to the time when the name changed to try to determine if there was a conscious decision to broaden from “promotion” to “privilege,” and to see if there was a rationale for the change in terminology.

In response to Piascik, the Chair said that the SACPT routinely received cases by faculty in which the faculty member invoked “privilege” and said it was denied. The SACPT wondered if “privilege” was actually defined somewhere. Piascik opined that the definition of the word itself was less important than the charge of the SACPT.

Wood said that on one occasion, a professor claimed a violation of privilege because the department required the professor to use a standard, specific textbook in class, against the desire of the professor. Thelin said it could also be stretched to include a professor’s wish to hold class at a time other than the one assigned to that professor for a specific class.

The Chair stated he would invite Lee Blonder, chair of the SACPT, to participate in a SC at a future meeting. Piascik reiterated that the important question to define was not “privilege” but rather what types of issues were under the jurisdiction of the SACPT to decide. The Chair noted that that was part of the SACPT’s problem – should they be moderating a disagreement about, for example, textbook choices or was that not in their realm of influence?

Wood noted that with her textbook choice example, the faculty member went on to dispute a poor merit evaluation due to being forced to use a textbook with which he was unfamiliar. If a faculty member did not act particularly rationally, then a minor textbook choice question could snowball into the larger issue of an appropriate merit evaluation.

The SC retreat was adjourned at 3:02 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh A. Tagavi,  
Senate Council Chair

Members present: Aken, Finkel, Harley, Lesnaw, Piascik, Randall, Tagavi, Thelin, Wood and Yanarella

Invited guests present: Heidi Anderson and Brittany Langdon.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Monday, August 20, 2007.