

Senate Council
November 15, 2010

The Senate Council met in regular session on at 3 pm on Monday, November 15, 2010 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a voice vote unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Hollie I. Swanson called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:07, when quorum was reached. Those present introduced themselves. The invited guests were (in order of introduction): Charlie Smith (director, Magnetic Resonance Imaging and Spectroscopy); Harold Kleinert (director, Human Development Institute); Linda Van Eldik (director, Sanders-Brown Center on Aging); Jim Cobb (director, Kentucky Geological Survey, or KGS); Gerry Weisenfluh (KGS); Charlie Carlson (Endowed Professor in the Center for Research on Violence Against Women, or CRVA); and Carol Jordan (director, CRVA).

2. Redefining Educational Units

The Chair explained that the day's discussion was a result of the ongoing process to revise *Governing Regulations VII*, which defines educational units. The discussion started over a month ago, and the SC broke into different groups with an approach focused on how the proposed changes impact education and research, etc. Several SC members are talking to department chairs, and it was also mentioned that the SC needed the input of center directors, as well. Noting the complexity of the issue, she said that it had been framed and reframed a few times to try to offer direction, but it was still elusive. She asked Davy Jones, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, to offer some comments about the issue, as it pertains to centers.

Guest Jones said that from the perspective of the University's regulations, from an academic perspective, there are departments, schools, colleges and graduate centers, which have educational activities going on, that typically include courses and degree programs. Those are known as educational units. There is another type of educational unit, called a multidisciplinary research center or multidisciplinary research institute (hereafter, MRC/I), which currently is ill-defined. An MRC/I is not allowed to have courses or degree programs, but, as with the Spinal Cord and Brain Injury Research Center (SCoBIRC), there is funding from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) for post-doctoral students, and the MRC/I is the home center for those students. They are getting education and educational training in SCoBIRC, yet doing so without courses or degrees.

Jones continued. There are a variety of entities with the term "center" attached, some with formal structures, and others named just by slapping a word on paper and taping it to a wall. The Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) wants universities to identify the entities that are and are not educational units. Jones said that the Sanders-Brown Center on Aging was an example of a MRC/I that is an educational unit. He noted that some of the guests may be conducting stellar research activities, but those activities may not be classified by the University as MRC/I – some are fee-for-service research centers that support educational activities that go on in other areas, but not under their own auspices. The SC is trying to get its arms around the types of centers and the activities going on there – if it is an administrative center, what needs to be in the proposal to create that administrative center? During those discussions, a fundamental question was asked: "What is the niche of an educational unit?" Jones opined that the purpose of the day's discussion is to give the SC an idea of what centers are out there, and their particular niches and what they do. Randall commented that another issue to consider is that of where faculty of which titles series can have primary appointments.

Jones said that there was no authoritative list of which MRC/I on campus were educational or administrative. Grossman added that when talking about students, there were three basic categories – undergraduate, graduate and post-doctoral. The post-docs used to be referred to as employees, although the national trend is to treat them like students. Even if a research faculty member is working on soft money, earns a grant, hires a post-doc, and is not involved in instruction in any way, the post-doc can still be considered to be a student.

Jones said that residents, and interns, post-MDs, were still getting training. When submitting NIH grants, there is a new classification of mentorship training plans for post-docs. He said that UK needed to get ahead of the curve on that issue.

Moving back to personnel aspects, in terms of hiring faculty lines, a department can have a faculty line. There could also be a situation in which a person's line does not reside in a department, but has a joint appointment. Some secondary appointments have 0% time, and are courtesy appointments. He opined that faculty will begin to hear more about showing time on the Distribution of Effort Form (DOE) for the donated and/or received time, as well as budgeted time on DOEs. Schools, departments, colleges and graduate centers can house lines, or by joint appointment can confer academic rank. In joint appointments, maybe someone starts as assistant professor both here and there. The promotion in rank is separate from one appointment to another, and can have two rankings independently. Now, a MRC/I cannot house a line, or confer a joint appointment. Now, with SCOROBICOR, they can home grants and hire post-docs, and that gets them into an educational description. If the MRC/I has more of a transient nature, tenure lines should not be there. If the center is a department in gestation, then maybe having tenure lines reside there is acceptable.

The Chair asked for clarification regarding if the proposed changes *Governing Regulation (GR)* would allow a center director to hire a tenure-ineligible faculty member directly into the MRC/I, such as clinical title series (CTS) or research title series (ResTS), and have a primary appointment there. Jones said that under the proposed changes, a MRC/I would be able to do that. The Chair then referred to the MRISC center, and Jones replied that as a fee-for-service center, there could be no primary faculty appointment in any title series.

SC members and all guests then participated in a lengthy, collegial and in-depth question-and-answer discussion of how the centers currently function, how directors viewed the proposed changes and the affect on their areas, as well as a variety of other considerations, including differing opinions about whether certain centers could be “educational” or not. At one point during the discussion, the Chair encouraged those who had remained silent to feel welcome to offer their opinions.

Towards the end of the discussion, Chappell asked if any of the center director guests had been consulted regarding the proposed changes to *GR VII*. Guest Eldik said that she was not aware of any of the changes until it had already been given to the SC. The remainder of the guests also indicated to Grossman that they had not been solicited for input. Guest Kleinert (WHO) said that about three years ago, a final recommendation to the President's Cabinet was that ResTS faculty be allowed to be appointed to research centers and institutes. Kleinert said he had been trying to keep an eye on that issue, and did think that there was some relationship there. Chappell asked again to clarify that none of the guests were consulted recently about offering input into the proposed draft, and all guests agreed.

After some final comments, Grossman, noting the long-term nature of deliberations, commented that prior to any vote by the SC, the SC would ensure that the guests and others would see a draft and be asked for input prior to any vote.

6. Religious Holidays/Syllabi - Vice President for Diversity Judy "JJ" Jackson

The Chair introduced Vice President for Institutional Diversity Judy "J. J." Jackson, and suggested she explain the issue. Guest Jackson shared that she was participating in the development of a policy about religious holidays and absences. Several months ago a couple of faculty raised the issue of UK not having a formal policy about religious holidays and absences; as a result, Jackson and Assistant Provost for Program Support Greissman endeavored to draft some language. Provost Subbaswamy then suggested that she first share the language with the SC.

The Chair asked where the language should be located. Mrs. Brothers suggested that since there was language in the *Senate Rules (SR)* about excused absences, the SC would be reviewing the language for possible inclusion into the *SR*. Jackson then explained the proposal, and answered questions from SC members.

After discussion wound down, the Chair suggested that she could ask the Ombud to circulate the language to faculty, or the SC could move to send the language to the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) to work on draft language for a formal policy. Steiner **moved** that the SC send the proposed policy description to the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) to create draft language for a formal policy, and Anderson **seconded**. Peek commented that the policy should also apply to faculty employees, as well. Grossman said that the SC could not do anything regarding employees' policies, but could choose to state that faculty must accommodate students with regards to religious holidays.

After some additional discussion about specific language to codify, Grossman **moved** to table the motion to send the proposed policy description to the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) to create draft language for a formal policy until after a small group (comprised of Grossman, Jackson and Kirk) comes up with draft language for codification. Anderson **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Change in Degree Type – Bachelor of Arts in Architecture to Bachelor of Architecture

After a brief explanation, Chappell **moved** that the SC rescind the Bachelor of Arts in Architecture previously awarded to the student Stacy E. and instead confer to Stacy E. a Bachelor of Architecture. Steiner **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Addition of College of Social Work Student & College of Arts and Sciences Student to December 2010 Degree List (clerical errors)

Anderson **moved** that the elected faculty senators of the SC approve the addition of CDH (Bachelor of Arts in Social Work) and JDD (Master of Arts in Philosophy) to UK's December 2010 degree list. Chappell **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Old Business

a. Action Items: Regarding action item number six ("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/post-doc education and related issues.""), the Chair noted that the Senate's

Committee on Committees would be meeting on November 23 to discuss the issue of creating a faculty employee grievance policy. A group of staff employees from the Staff Senate were already involved in creating an employee ombud process, so those individuals took the lead in organizing the meeting.

Grossman asked about the associated review of “graduate student/post-doc education and related issues.” There was a question about which committee was charged with investigating that issue, perhaps the Senate’s Research Committee, and it was agreed that it would be clarified [AI].

SC members agreed that Jensen should be removed from the group responsible for action item number five (“SC subset to examine and revise the description of the administrative coordinator’s job duties with a view towards increasing compensation.”).

Grossman commented that action item number 25 (“Review Senate meeting attendance policies.”) had caused a fair amount of consternation among senators and SC members, and suggested a work group look at the current policy in the SR. It was agreed that the Chair and Steiner would look into possible language to present to the SC to review, for possible future transmission to the SREC for codification [AI].

The Chair said that she would be meeting with Provost Subbaswamy on the following Tuesday, and would bring up the issue brought up in the Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure’s 2009 – 2010 Annual Report, that of an automatic leave of absence in the event that there is a finding of procedural error [AI].

There was another issue, that of distance learning (DL) courses. After a couple of comments, Grossman said that he wondered if the problem is a rumor that is going around that says that the way money is distributed for DL courses is going to change, with a much larger percentage staying in central administration, meaning less for a college. He added that he didn’t know if the rumor was true or not. Steiner said that he asked at a chair’s meeting that Dean Kornbluh (College of Arts and Sciences, AS) be queried about the issue. Steiner said he was told that that rumor was untrue. Grossman wondered if AS had negotiated a different deal with the Provost. Peek opined that the discussion, as it pertained to revenue, was very misleading. Some students might have taken the course at a community college instead of via DL, but also many choose to take a course via DL instead of on campus. Therefore only part of the revenue was new.

The Chair said that she would check with the Provost about the resource issue [AI].

1. Minutes from November 1, 2010

Chappell **moved** to approve the minutes from November 1, 2010, and Steiner **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair thanked SC members for their team effort in putting on the faculty town hall meetings to offer input into for the faculty trustees regarding the Presidential Search process. She said that about 100 faculty members attended in total, and offered her thanks to Mrs. Brothers. She stated that Mrs. Brothers had quickly organized all aspects of the town hall meetings, produced a well-designed final document summarizing the comments from the meetings and from email. SC members offered their appreciation via a round of applause for Mrs. Brothers.

The Chair said that she would circulate the document created by Mrs. Brothers among SC members. Peek circulated it among Board of Trustees members during the November retreat. The Chair added that she gave a copy to Cheryl Truman (reporter, Herald-Leader), as well as to the search firm consultants. Kelly asked for information on how Board members responded to the document, and Peek offered his opinions on the matter.

7. Round Table Discussion of November 8 Senate Meeting – Comments on Gen Ed Curriculum First Reading

Randall commented that it needed to be clear that the final University Senate (Senate) vote was on approval implementation of the curriculum, not approval of the curriculum itself, as that had already been accomplished by the Senate. Randall also said that the Senate needed to see data regarding a student’s perception of the first year of Gen Ed. That type of evidence is what was supposed to be reported, to show evidence that the first course offerings accomplished what they were supposed to accomplish. He strongly supported requiring that information in the data presented during the second reading.

The meeting was adjourned approximately shortly after 5 pm.

[The Action Items are a part of the minutes, but fall at the end.]

Respectfully submitted by Hollie I. Swanson,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Blonder, Chappell, Grossman, Kelly, Kirk, Peek, Randall, Steiner and Swanson.

Provost’s Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guests present: Charlie Carlson, James Cobb, J. J. Jackson, Davy Jones, Carol Jordan, Harold Kleinert, Linda Van Eldik and Gerald Weisenfluh.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, December 2, 2010.

#	√	Item	Responsibility	Completed
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, 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/post-doc education and related issues.” (7/14/10; 8/30/10)	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	8/2010
	√	Discuss expansion of EEP with Provost Subbaswamy (6 credits per semester). (8/16/10)	Chair	9/2010
		Clarify with Provost Subbaswamy the term "cost-neutral" WRT a pilot for graduate credit EEP transfer to partner/spouse/dependent.	Chair	

17.	Create web-based mechanism for faculty to offer input into the President's annual evaluation; evaluation process will occur during April. (8/16/10)	SE Anderson	
20.	Charge Senate's Academic Programs Committee with creating processes for substantive change issues (teach-out, contractual/consortium process, off-campus sites, how to reopen a suspended program). 8/23/10	SC	
24.	Review Senate meeting attendance policies. (8/30/10)	SC	
26.	Query VP IRPE Connie Ray about number of administrators at UK vs. benchmark institutions. (9/20/10)	Mrs. Brothers	
27.	Send SC's spring evaluation of President Todd to all Board of Trustees members. Share SC's spring evaluation of President Todd with faculty members. Create numerical ratings for the Board's evaluation in early fall and submit those privately. (9/20/10)	SC	
28.	Invite the Board of Trustees' chair to a SC meeting. (9/27/10)	Chair	
31.	Ask the Provost to submit a statement of financial and administrative feasibility for proposals prior to the proposals being sent to cmte. (10/4/10)	Greissman/SC	
32.	Solicit input from department chairs regarding changes to <i>GR VII</i> .(10/4/10; 10/18/10)	Steiner	
34.	Invite Dean Blackwell to discuss changes to commencement ceremonies. (Invite Tony English.) (10/4/10)	Chair	
35.	Inquire about openness in the president search process. (10/18/10)	Chair	
36.	Send solicitation for Commencement Cmte Co-Chair to college associate deans. (10/18/10)	Mrs. Brothers	
38.	Identify committee to review "graduate student/post-doc education and related issues." (11/15/10)	SC	
39.	Draft changes to <i>Senate Rule</i> language on Senate meeting attendance policies for review by SC. (11/15/10)	Chair, Steiner	
40.	Discuss with Provost the possibility of an automatic leave of absence in the event there is a finding of procedural error in a promotion/tenure decision. (11/15/10)	Chair	
41.	Discuss with the Provost the method of allocating resources from distance learning courses. (11/15/10)	Chair	