Senate Council
June 27, 2012

The Senate Council met for its annual summer retreat on Wednesday, June 27, 2012 at 8:30 am in the Hilary J. Boone Center. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Lee X. Blonder called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 8:48 am. Those present introduced themselves.

1. Minutes from and Announcements
The Chair said that the SC minutes from April 16, 2012, April 23, 2012, April 30, 2012 and May 14, 2012 were ready for approval; no corrections had been received. There being no objection, the four sets of minutes were **approved by unanimous consent**.

2. Presentation on Preliminary Executive Summary from Faculty Committee on Review, Reward and Retention
The Chair reiterated that the report from the Faculty Committee on Review, Reward and Retention (FCR3) was preliminary and had been sent to all faculty via a mass email. SC members offered their thoughts on a variety of aspects of the report.

Swanson said that she will organize the feedback being received. FCR3 received a lot of input, indicating that the comment box on the FCR3 webpage worked well. She said the most consistent comments involved opinions that the evaluation of faculty is not constructive and does not really matter since there are no regular raises or rewards.

There were a variety of comments offered by SC members, including the topics listed below.

- Teaching.
- Teaching evaluation.
- Peer evaluation.
- Raise distribution.
- Teaching development.
- Professional development and advancement from associate professor to professor.
- Benchmark comparisons.
- College size and gender considerations in the promotion process.
- Special Title Series.
- Post-tenure review.
- Distribution of Effort (DOE) forms and how teaching percentages are calculated from college to college.
- Assessing administrative activities.
- Campuswide teaching evaluation.

Swanson invited SC members to contact her with additional input and she departed.

3. Charges to Senate Committees for 2012 - 2013

The Chair explained that the SC needed to review each Senate committee and determine a specific charge for the 2012 – 2013 year. SC members did so.

Senate's Academic Advising Committee
- Survey current advising practices including the appropriate balance between faculty advisors and professional advisors; and create a best practices manual for advising.

Senate's Academic Facilities Committee
- Investigate how to incorporate faculty consultation on building priorities in the regular process and calendar of capital projects proposals.

Senate's Academic Organization and Structure (SAOSC)
- Work with the Regulations Review Committee, co-chaired by Richard Greissman, to review and develop Governing Regulations regarding academic structure; and whatever charges within the Senate Rules that the SAOSC has time to pursue.

Senate's Academic Planning and Priorities Committee
- Establish mechanism(s) for effective two-way communication with University faculty and staff to solicit opinions related to academic priorities and new ideas for plans to achieve academic goals.

- Look into the impact of a new budgeting system on existing programs and in particular on the changes that such a budgeting system will have on existing programs and academic priorities and solicit college faculty council input on the same.

Senate's Academic Programs Committee
- Examine the balance of online courses that make up a program of study, and assess the balance's academic merit. Included in this is to determine the synchronous / asynchronous balance within the online component.

- Register the growth of certificate proposals and assess the academic merit of such growth.

- Propose standards and procedures for assessing the effectiveness of programs, especially interdisciplinary centers and institutes and certificates.

- Address the issue of overlap of courses for concurrent certificate programs (double dipping).

Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee
- Work with the Senate Council's ad hoc Committee on Best Practices for Distance Learning to determine academic standards for courses presented as "distance learning," categorizing various presentation methods and opportunities for student-instructor interaction and providing guidelines that newly proposed courses should follow.

- Report on the costs and benefits of scholarships and the appropriate balance between need-based and merit scholarships.

- Work with Senate's Admissions Advisory Committee to identify any overlap in the two committees' charges.

Senate's Admissions Advisory Committee
- Present a report to the Senate Council on current activities.

- Work with Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee to identify any overlap in the two committees' charges.

Senate's Institutional Finances and Resource Allocation Committee
- Identify a faculty member to serve on the Financial Systems Accountability Committee, chaired by interim Provost Tim Tracy.

Senate's Library Committee
- Investigate what other universities are doing to address the increased costs of journals and other academic materials, and see if UK can align its efforts with other universities.

Senate's Research Committee (SRC)
SC members suggested that the co-chairs of the SRC be contacted to determine what parts of the charges for 2011 – 2012[*] were accomplished.

Senate's Retroactive Withdrawals Appeals Committee
- Consider proposing a revision to the *Senate Rules* governing the membership of the committee.

- Investigate the process for "withdrawing" versus "dropping" all courses so students who attempt to withdraw online are better informed that they cannot withdraw from the last class online.

Senate's Rules and Elections Committee
- Develop *Senate Rules* language for the new process used starting last fall for election of SC Chair.

- Update *Senate Rules* language per Human Resources Policy and Procedures 4.0 ("Employee Status) for status of eligibility of academic administrators and Clinical Title Series/Research Title Series/Lecturers in elections to University-level faculty representative bodies (currently in Senate Rules only as asterisk interpretations).

- Update *Senate Rules* language for new *Governing Regulations IV.C* language on authority of University Senate (has been updated in *Senate Rules Section 3*, but not yet elsewhere in *Senate Rules*).

- Update *Senate Rules* language where necessitated by changes in SACS/CPE policies.

---

[*] SRC charges from 2011-2012: 1. 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; 2. examine the policies by which grant management is established and determine why the administrative response to faculty concerns is perceived as decreasing; and 3. work with other Senate committees on guidelines and evaluation of multi-disciplinary research centers (MDRC).

- Update Senate Rules generally for changes in University organization (e.g. remaining references to Human Environmental Sciences College; old correspondence course program; transfer of certain graduate centers to new colleges; VP for Research no longer reports to Provost, etc.).

- Identify areas of Rules for which new educational policy-making by the Senate has become needed and recommend pertinent action by Senate Council or other Senate bodies.

Due to the time, the Chair suggested the SC postpone agenda items number four ("Changed CPE/SACSCOC Requirements for New Programs") and number five ("Academic Approvals Workgroup Report") until the end of the day, if time permitted. There were no objections.

6. Order of UK Core/UC Course Reviews
The Chair invited Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mike Mullen and UK Core Committee Chair Bill Rayens to take part in the discussion.

Guest Rayens explained that the UK Core Committee (UKCC) met the previous day and felt strongly that the UKCC should review courses prior to a review by the Undergraduate Council (UC). He said that the primary reason was that if a faculty member submitted a course for UK Core, but it was not approved by the UKCC for UK Core, the faculty member usually did not want the course proposal to be sent forward to the UC. He reminded SC members that in the summer of 2010, UKCC was granted dispensation to serve as a subcommittee of the UC. Also, Ruth Beattie has served as a liaison to and from the UKCC and UC. Also, there is a staff member affiliated with UKCC who is responsible for checking syllabi against the Senate syllabi guidelines, as well as checking all forms. Of course, the area experts also review the proposals.

SC members, Rayens, Mullen and Provost's Liaison Greissman had an hour-long discussion on past University Senate (Senate) and SC decisions regarding the UKCC and how the hierarchical structure between the UC and UKCC affected the order of UK Core course reviews. It was asserted that the language approved by the Senate in May 2012 was sufficiently flexible to accommodate an ordered review from UC to UKCC, or an ordered review from UKCC to UC. Grossman, a member of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, explained that that when the SREC prepared the language, it was under the assumption that the proposal must first be approved as a course prior to approval for inclusion into UK Core.

Mullen said that the UC and UKCC met jointly and talked about the issue of course reviews. The two groups then discussed the issue separately and voted separately. Both the UKCC and UC decided that the way it was operating in the past (UKCC review first, then UC) is the way it should operate in the future. Having a liaison to facilitate communications between the UKCC and UC also worked well.

There was lengthy discussion among those present. Grossman **moved** that the SC ask SREC to decide whether wording of *Senate Rules 3.3.3.A3* requires the Undergraduate Council to make a decision on a course prior to sending it to UK Core Committee, or if the wording allows the Undergraduate Council to pass the proposed course to the UK Core Committee for a decision and then return it to the Undergraduate Council. Anderson **seconded**. After additional, brief discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair explained that there was another, related issue to discuss. A concern had been raised that the acronym of UK Core, UKCC [until May 2012 known as the Interim General Education Oversight

Committee], could be easily confused with being the acronym for the UK Computing Center. After brief discussion, Grossman **moved** to recommend to the Senate that the name of the UK Core Committee change to the UK Core Education Committee. Brion **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Grossman **moved** that the SC thank Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mike Mullen for his years of service at the University of Kentucky as both a faculty member and administrator as he moves to North Carolina State University. Anderson **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The meeting broke for lunch at 11:55. During lunch, SC members, Greissman and Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Lynda Brown Wright discussed the current duties and responsibilities of the position of the associate provost for faculty affairs and how that could or should change in the future. SC members also discussed the office's strategic plan. Brown Wright left after lunch.

The meeting was reconvened about 1:05 pm. SC members continued the discussion on the possible reorganization/restructuring and responsibilities of the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs.

7. Discussion on Office of Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs
The Chair asked SC members to go around the table and offer their thoughts on the position of the associate provost for faculty affairs and its responsibilities.

- The office's dispute resolution and mediation aspects are critical to faculty morale and to avoiding lawsuits. It performs a critical function for the University.

- The mission of the office is very important and is the voice for faculty. It is a full-time job that really cannot be done half-time – the duties will consume all the time of the individual in the position, not just half their working time.

- Faculty and administrators are well served to have someone to settle misunderstandings. From the faculty point of view the office is good for morale. Having someone who will listen to cases and intercede and facilitate a resolution that prevents retaliation is very necessary.

- The goals in the strategic plan are comprehensive and should be retained; the office should not be limited to faculty development, although that is an important strategic initiative, along with many others. The individual filling the position must be someone with a faculty rank.

As a group, SC members hesitated to endorse the strategic plan as a whole, with at least one member expressing concerns about the ability of any one person to accomplish all the aspects of the strategic plan. There was a suggestion that one individual be assigned faculty development duties, in addition to the existing individual filling the role of associate provost for faculty affairs. There was brief discussion regarding the office's diversity activities. While the University has an administrative position dedicated to diversity and inclusion, SC members were unaware of any diversity/inclusivity activities or initiatives for current faculty employees. There were questions about whether diversity and inclusion now needs to be a core part of the strategic plan for the office of the associate provost for faculty affairs.

Additional opinions were offered.

- The current emphasis on faculty affairs is not well-served by changing the name to "faculty development" for all the reasons already mentioned, although that aspect should continue in an expanded fashion. The emphasis on interactions between faculty, and on mediations between faculty and administrators, is beneficial to everyone. The holistic faculty affairs area should be expanded, not contracted into just "faculty development."

- The functions of the office of the associate provost for faculty affairs are essential to the continued smooth maintenance and running of the University and should not be contracted to focus solely on faculty development. The office saves the University money by preventing lawsuits.

- It is very, very helpful for the office to be able to call on Richard Greissman for input on details of UK's regulations. Having a pair of faculty and staff work together is a good model.

- The position can benefit from working with someone who has extensive and detailed knowledge of UK's regulations on promotion and tenure. The position should have working knowledge of relevant regulations, but it is unreasonable to assume any given faculty member will have the breadth and depth of unbiased regulatory knowledge that Greissman currently provides to the office.

- The University should continue to utilize the model that includes Greissman working with the associate provost for faculty affairs, particularly since that existing partnership structure has benefitted faculty and administrators alike.

- The position should report to the provost, not to any other administrators, since the provost is the chief academic officer.

- Because the provost's responsibilities include ensuring a smooth promotion and tenure process, the associate provost for faculty affairs must report to the provost.

The Chair thanked SC members for offering honest opinions. She said that prior to sending a final letter to interim Provost Tim Tracy with a summary of the discussion, as he requested, she would send it to SC members for input.

The Chair said that Mrs. Brothers would transcribe the discussion and the Chair will send the summary to SC members for comment.

SC members took a brief break at 1:30 and reconvened about 10 minutes later.

8. Multidisciplinary Research Centers - Framing the Discussion for Fall 2012
a. Governing Regulations VII "(University Organization)"
b. Multidisciplinary Research Centers – Ideas

Grossman began by indicating he, Wood and Greissman had met to give some genesis to ideas regarding merging multidisciplinary research centers (MDRC), interdisciplinary instructional programs (IIP) and graduate centers into a single kind of educational unit, a multidisciplinary unit (MU). A great deal of discussion ensued from those in attendance. After the discussion, Grossman **moved** to establish an ad

hoc committee to gather information and consult on the implications of the multidisciplinary unit proposal and suggest modifications from different units to the proposal based on input from these units. Wood **seconded** the motion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

It was recommended the ad hoc committee prepare a recommendation for the Senate by mid-December 2012. Bob Grossman volunteered to chair the group with Richard Greissman serving as an ex officio member. Several potential members were recommended to the Chair, who will contact them regarding their willingness to serve.

SC members agreed to address agenda items number four ("Changed CPE/SACSCOC Requirements for New Programs") and number five ("Academic Approvals Workgroup Report – Definitions/ Recommendations/Narratives") during the first regular SC meeting in August.

9. Chair's Report – Updates
The Chair briefly explained her involvement in her new role since the beginning of June 2012.

Brion made the **motion** to adjourn with Bob Grossman **seconding**. The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 pm.

> Respectfully submitted by Lee X. Blonder,
> Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Bilas, Blonder, Brion, Coyne, Debski, Grossman, McCormick, Swanson and Wood.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guests present: Lynda Brown Wright, Mike Mullen, Bill Rayens.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, August 14, 2012.