

Senate Council
May 11, 2015

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, May 11, 2015 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Andrew Hippisley called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:03 pm.

1. Minutes from April 27, 2015 and Announcements

The Chair reported that he sent the President the final draft of the Senate-endorsed *Governing Regulation (GR)* on Faculty Disciplinary Action. He informed SC members about the upcoming search for a Vice President for Research.

There were a couple of changes to the minutes from April 27. Hearing **no objection**, the minutes from April 27 were **approved** as amended by **unanimous consent**.

Regarding the recent meeting of the Board of Trustees, Grossman explained that the *GR* on the University Appeals Board was approved. There was discussion among trustees about the proposed new Code of Student Conduct, but no vote. Grossman said it was not clear to him if the Code would be an *Administrative Regulation* or a *GR*. He opined that the document was more of a code of student discipline than it was a code of conduct.

Grossman applauded the University's recent change to a minimum of \$10/hour for employees. This will be effective for UK Healthcare employees on October 1, but will be effective as of July 1 for the remainder of campus. It will affect about 600 employees.

The Chair commented that the next iteration of creating a group to review teacher-course evaluations would be a subcommittee of the Teaching Effectiveness Committee. The SC approved a number of nominees for the subcommittee, many of whom were opposed or concerned about the implementation of the new teacher-course evaluation.

Results from college elections for senators have been coming in; more are expected in the near future.

2. Old Business

a. Faculty Survey of President Capilouto

The Chair asked Guest Connie Wood (AS/Statistics, Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) chair) to give SC members an update on the faculty's evaluation of President Eli Capilouto.

Wood offered some basic facts about the survey results.

- 2,631 invitations to participate in the survey were sent.
- 691 responses were received.
- The overall response rate was 26.3%.
- The response rate for all faculty minus clinical faculty was 29.8%.

Wood went over the results for SC members. She noted the inclusion of response rates for each college and for various title series, as well as a comparison of this year's results with those from

2012-13 and 2013-14. Overall, the President's scores trended upward; for the few areas that showed a lack of improvement or decreases, SC members discussed possible causes as well as other aspects of the survey.

The Chair invited Wood to accompany him to the meeting of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees when he presented the results and Wood accepted.

One item of particular interest to SC members and Wood was the perceived rapid growth in the clinical title series (CTS). Wood noted that there were supposed to have been limits on the proportions of CTS faculty relative to other title series. Wood said she could run a cross-tab query to see what colleges have CTS lines and how many. Brown thought there was a requirement that the Provost annually report percentages of lecturers and CTS to the SC.

3. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Institutional Finance and Resource Allocation Committee (SIFRAC) - Jeremy Crampton, Chair

The Chair said he was pleased to have an opportunity for SC to discuss the recent activities of the Senate's Institutional Finance and Resource Allocation Committee (SIFRAC). Guest Jeremy Crampton (AS/Geography) thanked the Chair for the invitation and said he was a co-chair of SIFRAC; George Scott (Robinson Scholars Program) was the co-chair from the Staff Senate side. Crampton said that SIFRAC met a number of times during the academic year and worked with Vice President for Financial Planning Angie Martin, Associate Provost for Finance and Operations Lisa Wilson, and Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration Eric Monday.

Crampton noted that SIFRAC's most recent meeting occurred just prior to President Eli Capilouto's address to the University Senate (Senate) on May 4; he said the talking points were essentially the same. He and other SIFRAC members thought senior administrators were keeping a fairly tight narrative about budget. Several members thought that SIFRAC could be used as a sounding board for financial allocation and resource decisions. Currently, however, SIFRAC is more of an information-seeking body than a consultative one. Given that it is Crampton's last year on SIFRAC, the thought was that above all else, the year's forward momentum should be maintained. SIFRAC identified four points/suggestions on what SIFRAC should concentrate on in 2015-16. 1. Better channels of communication: What advice the Committee can give to Senate Council to clarify charge for future Committee (2015-2016), and reciprocally, what Senate Council would like the Committee to focus on; 2. Information flow to the Committee: whenever information is distributed between university officials (e.g. from the Budget Office or Provost's Budget Office to Deans) relevant to the Committee's charge, the information should be passed by the IFRA Committee as well; 3. Follow-up on \$50 million, five-year plan incentive in next academic year; and 4. Role of the Committee: The role of the Committee can be more than just retroactive information-seeking. The Committee recommends that it have more role as active participant in an advisory capacity for administration on matters of resources and finances relevant to the Committee's charge. This includes, but is not limited to, expenditures of funds on external contracting with educational implications (e.g. elements of the Strategic Plan). In general, the intent is for the role of the Committee to be less information-seeking and more decision-making.

There were a variety of comments and questions from SC members. As discussion wound down, Crampton opined that SIFRAC's activities in 2014-15 changed institutional awareness about SIFRAC, which may be an achievement in and of itself. The Chair noted that while

Crampton's Senate term would end soon, there was no requirement that SIFRAC be chaired by a senator.

There were no objections to Grossman's suggestion that agenda item number four be discussed next.

4. Request to Waive Senate Rules 5.2.4.8.1 ("Common Examinations") for CHE 446G

Guest Carolyn Brock (AS/Chemistry) explained her request to waive *Senate Rules 5.2.4.8.1* ("Common Examinations") for CHE 446G. The Chair noted that the times and dates of common exams must be listed in the Schedule of Classes so this was a request to allow a common exam time without the times/dates being in the Schedule of Classes.

Grossman **moved** to waive *Senate Rules 5.2.4.8.1* ("Common Examinations") for all exams in CHE 446G and Mazur **seconded**. There was brief discussion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) - Margaret Schroeder, Chair

The Chair welcomed Guest Margaret Schroeder (ED/STEM Education), chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), to the table. Schroeder asked if the agenda items could be addressed in a different order; there were no objections.

ii. Final Action for Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Advanced Horticulture (and 13 Associated Courses)

Schroeder explained that the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Advanced Horticulture (and the 13 associated courses) has been with the SAPC for well over a year. Schroeder explained that the SAPC has tried and tried to get a response to their queries; at best, a response will come that the contact person will follow up as soon as possible, but there is no follow up. The last time the SAPC was able to wrangle communication from the contact person was in October 2014. In response to a query from the Chair, Schroeder explained that there were two sticking points. First, there was an issue regarding faculty of record – although there would be a faculty of record for the courses, the proposal allowed for another faculty member who would teach it. The SAPC requested a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding but that was not forthcoming. The second issue pertained to the contact person needing to ensure that non-UK faculty who teach the courses to UK students have affiliated graduate faculty status. The Chair asked about double dipping of courses and Schroeder replied that that issue had been an additional concern. As submitted, a student could earn the proposed Graduate Certificate in Advanced Horticulture during the course of their regular studies for a MS in Advanced Horticulture. Schroeder added that they planned to recruit MS students to participate in the proposed Graduate Certificate.

Schroeder said the SAPC encountered a few contact persons who were tardy in following up. With two notable exceptions, information was forthcoming once Schroeder sent an email saying they had 10 days in which to respond or the proposal would be returned to the Senate Council office. The contact person for the Graduate Certificate in Advanced Horticulture, however, continued being uncommunicative. There was additional discussion about the appropriate next steps to take about the proposed graduate certificate and the associated courses.

In response to Grossman, Schroeder confirmed that the recommendation from the SAPC was that the proposal be returned to the Senate Council office until the required documentation is received. Christ **moved** that the SC accept the SAPC's recommendation, thereby returning the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Advanced Horticulture and the 13 associated courses until the proposal addresses the previously stated concerns. Grossman **seconded**. Ms.

Brothers asked for clarification about the timeline; those present agreed that the contact person should be given 10 days in which to reply, after which the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Advanced Horticulture and the 13 associated courses will be destroyed and any further efforts in that area will need to start from scratch. After additional brief discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iii. Final Action for Proposed Suspension of BS Spanish

Schroeder explained that a similar problem occurred with the proposed suspension of the BS Spanish. SC's concerns at the time included the number of matriculated students and how a student earning a BS degree in a scientific discipline would be affected if the BA Spanish was the only degree offered. Schroeder explained that she emailed the contact person and every response, since August, was that an explanation would be sent "next week." Schroeder added that no email response was actually ever received.

After brief discussion, it was determined that the contact person did send a response, but the recipient list did not include Schroeder. Grossman **moved** that the SAPC review the response in early fall 2015 and Christ **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

i. Intersection of SAPC and CPE Approval Process

Schroeder gave the SC some thoughts and comments about the SAPC's deliberations during the 2014-15 academic year.

- There is an increasing trend toward establishment of undergraduate and graduate certificates.
- A bit of saturation in some areas is evident, e.g. the certificates in biostatistics and applied statistics. The SAPC worked hard to ensure there was no overlap and that the certificates were intended for different groups.
- Units are opting for undergraduate certificates over minors.
- Of the 19 proposals reviewed by the SAPC, only about five proposals included everything necessary – the remainder required additional work on the part of the contact person.
- In the vast majority of cases, it takes a contact person three to four weeks to respond to a request for a revised proposal, even when the revision is for something relatively common or minor.
- The most common issues are ones that ought to have been caught by the college Educational Policy Committee or the Undergraduate Council or the Graduate Council.
- Many faculty do not understand the difference between student learning outcomes and program outcomes.
- Certificates often are proposed with a capstone project that is not tied to a course. When told that such a project must be tied to a course, a contact person is likely to shoe-horn the capstone project into the elective with the best topical "fit." Schroeder wondered if an elective course was the right place for a capstone project.
- Across campus, units are beginning to advertise a new program or certificate prior to a completed Senate review. This results in pressure on the SAPC when it requests edits to a proposal that a unit thought was essentially finished.

A big issue mentioned by Schroeder pertained to the program approval process and requirements from the Council for Postsecondary Education (CPE). The SAPC does not review CPE paperwork, but that paperwork is carefully reviewed by the CPE. In order to create a new

degree, the proposal goes through the Senate process and then is reviewed and hopefully approved by the Board of Trustees (Board). In parallel is the CPE process, particularly the 45-day pre-proposal posting. This posting is on the CPE website and is sent out to colleges and universities across Kentucky, which are allowed to comment on the proposal. It makes for a smoother process and ensures that different institutions have an opportunity to learn about different programs as well as voice concerns. The pre-approval is completed during the Senate review; the Board only reviews new programs that have completed the 45-day review. After Board approval, new degree programs are then sent to the CPE for final approval.

In 2014-15, however, there were two instances of a unit/contact person not having contacted the Office of Institutional Effectiveness prior to starting the new program development process, even though the forms were marked to indicate that such contact did occur. Through sheer luck both proposals finished their 45-day pre-posting a few days prior to approval by the Board. SC members discussed the best way to address the issue.

Grossman **moved** that new program forms be modified to require a letter from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness that confirms that Office's awareness of the proposed creation and that the CPE approval process is in process. Brown **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Schroeder said she had one final item for SC's discussion. She said that the SAPC supported the addition of a question regarding the need for a new program, which was different from the rationale for a new program. During discussion, the Chair pointed out that the charge to the SAPC in the *Senate Rules* includes an assessment of need for new programs. Discussion continued.

Due to the time, the Chair suggested that a motion be made to accept the 2014-15 SAPC report. Grossman **moved** and Brown **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

c. Senate's Academic Advising Committee (SAAC) - Phil Kraemer, Chair

i. Report on 2014-15 Activities

Kraemer gave SC members an update on the activities of the Senate's Academic Advising Committee (SAAC). Kraemer noted that there was a system used by professional advisors to track communications with students. He said there was a real disconnect between the type of advising offered by faculty and advising offered by professional advisors. In response to a question from Blonder, Kraemer said there were plans in the 2015-16 academic year to survey a variety of types of students on what they think about UK's advising.

The Chair noted that if the SC voted to accept the SAAC's report, it would also mean that the SC supported all the bulleted "to do" items in the report:

- Establish as early as possible a full roster of members of the Senate's Academic Advising Committee;
- Review all recommendations regarding changes to the advising process emanating from the recent reform initiative;
- Determine which recommendations require action by the University Senate and draft appropriate recommendations to be considered;

- In collaboration with appropriate offices and individuals develop a brief survey of student attitudes toward advising to be administered early in the fall 2015 semester. Based on survey results, develop additional recommendations for changing advising policies;
- Discuss the feasibility and value of creating an annual process for evaluating advising and advisors similar to the current teacher evaluation process; and
- Present a detailed summary report to the University Senate that describes the status of reform efforts in the context of the University Strategic Plan.

Grossman **moved** to accept the final report and Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Senate Meeting Roundtable

The Chair asked SC members to comment on the recent Senate meeting. A number of SC members offered compliments on a successful meeting, particularly in light of its four-hour duration and plethora of votes.

- It went well, all things considered. The President usually has a slide show, but did not have one this time. It would be nice if he addressed faculty about things of specifically of interest to the faculty.
- The President's stories were interesting, but numbers and data would have been better. The review of the 3+3 degree [College of Arts and Sciences and College of Law] was reviewed too quickly.
- The President brought an entourage, but none of them said anything which was odd. The discussion on the proposed new *Governing Regulation (GR)* was well done and it was surprising that the Senate made it through the whole thing.
- It is hard to balance urgency of getting things done with the need for proper discourse. It was hard to have an email discussion of the 3+3 proposal without the benefit of guidelines to outline how such an email discussion should be done.
- Although there were some sections of the *GR* that some faculty did not like, overall there was a recognition that there is a need for a faculty disciplinary process. It was a miracle that the Senate was able to endorse it, with quorum, after four hours of meeting. Balancing a legitimate need to keep something moving with an appropriate review is difficult but should be done.
- Some of the approved amendments regarding the *GR* were appalling, such as separating a faculty member's public and private life and the deletion of the clause allowing a reduction in salary.
- There were a lot of concerns expressed about the speed at which the Senate reviewed amendments in the last hour or so of the meeting. If the Senate has to deliberate on a similarly complex and difficult proposal in the future, perhaps it could be reviewed over the course of three meetings instead of two meetings. On the other hand, the *GR* issue was on a number of SC agendas and the April Senate agenda so senators could have and should have reviewed the documentation well in advance.

- Trying to wordsmith in real time as well as understand substantive issues made the *GR* review difficult. Some of the more thoughtful issues, such as whether academic freedom applies off campus, were not deliberated upon.

Given the time, the Chair suggested that someone move to adjourn. He reminded those present about the end-of-the-semester gathering at Pazzo's. Watt **moved** to adjourn and Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Hippisley,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Blonder, Brown, Christ, Grossman, Hippisley, Kraemer, Mazur, Porter, and Watt.

Invited guests present: Carolyn Brock, Jeremy Crampton, Margaret Schroeder, Mia Alexander-Snow and Connie Wood.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Monday, June 1, 2015.

6. SC Retreat Planning