

Senate Council  
November 21, 2011

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, November 21, 2011 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Hollie I. Swanson called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:04 pm.

1. Minutes from November 7, 2011 and Announcements

Wasilkowski **moved** to approve the SC minutes from November 7, 2011 and Wood **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair asked SC members to offer their opinions on the past Monday's SC meeting and some of the comments are listed below.

- It may be feasible to move from having every single word of a University Senate (Senate) meeting transcribed to having pertinent sections of a Senate meeting transcribed.
- More information is needed about how the Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness functions and how it relates to the Senate. Of particular interest are the results of six-year program reviews across the University. The Undergraduate Council recently realized that it has formal responsibilities for involvement in program reviews. There is still a (related) concern that there is no regular method to close a center or institute that has reached its potential.
- There was a good balance of decision-making agenda items and informational presentations.
- The President's Chief of Staff will attend Senate meetings on a regular basis.
- The search for a new Dean of the College of Engineering is well underway, according to information shared by Pienkowski.
- The Chair explained that the search for a new Dean of the College of Health Sciences is underway, but in the early stages.
- The Appalachian Center is moving from the area of the Vice President for Research to the College of Arts and sciences. After discussion, it was agreed that the proposal would be sent to the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee for review. **[AI]**
- It would be interesting to host a panel discussion on responsible cost management with knowledgeable staff and faculty. **[AI]**
- The Alumni Association has changed its by-laws to include a faculty senator on the UK Alumni Association Board of Directors. The Chair will serve in that position for the time being, but the SC will need to identify some type of selection process for the future. **[AI]**

- The SC has not heard back about the type of input it might have into President Capilouto's selection of a faculty representative to the SEC and NCAA.
- The Chair is involved with an effort to review human capital at UK. She asked SC members for input into a possible charge. After some time, Wood suggested that there were two questions that needed to be answered: "Does UK offer adequate and effective professional development?" and "Is UK's current employee evaluation system successful at rewarding people for exemplary service?"
- The President has asked for a faculty member to serve on the Facilities Transformation Workgroup, which is charged with creating a detailed financial and physical blueprint for transforming campus in alignment with a strengthened emphasis on undergraduate education. SC members suggested four names the Chair can send forward.
- Mrs. Brothers reported that Ms. Ellis was currently working on a project to identify all the UK Core courses that received final Senate approval and the UK Core courses that received provisional approval from the Chair.
- The Chair will ask a representative from the College of Arts and Sciences to offer an update on the new document handling system during the December Senate meeting.

1. b. Nominees for Tobacco-Free Committee, Staff PE Evaluation Committee, Work-Life Committees on Career Development and Burnout

SC members identified a handful of individuals to serve on the Tobacco-Free Committee, Staff PE Evaluation Committee, and the two Work-Life Committees, Career Development and Burnout.

2. c. Administrative Activity Review Committee

SC members discussed the very small committee, comprised of the Chair and Peek, and the data to be used. Wood volunteered to be part of the small committee, and was welcomed by the Chair.

The Chair reported that about 20 faculty members attended the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) charter information meeting the past Saturday.

2. Old Business

b. SC ad hoc Committee on Faculty Productivity and Accountability

SC members opted to hold off on having the discussion until Provost Subbaswamy arrived.

d. Discussion on Transcriptionist and Personnel Hours

Grossman reported that he had not yet had an opportunity to listen to the recording, but that he understood it had captured the sound of Mrs. Brothers' typing very well. He noted that, in his opinion, there was nothing during the November Senate meeting that required transcription. When a reliable recording mechanism is identified, only pertinent, action items will be transcribed. Mrs. Brothers confirmed that meeting recordings are retained for posterity. The next pilot attempt will involve placing the multi-directional microphone farther away from the laptop.

The Chair said that when she next meets with Chief Information Officer Vince Kellen, she will mention the need for the W. T. Young Library Auditorium to be better equipped to record meetings. **[AI]** The

Chair will also check with Legal Counsel as to if and/or when it is necessary to announce to meetings attendees that a meeting is being recorded.

### 3. Honors College/Academy – Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mike Mullen

The Chair invited Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mike Mullen to explain the proposal to change the content and name of the Honors Program.

Guest Mullen answered a variety of questions from SC members. Grossman asked Mullen to identify the home faculty of the existing Honors Program. Mullen explained that prior to 2005, there was an Honors Program with faculty appointments, but at that time, appointments were moved back to colleges. The current Honors Program is administratively housed in Undergraduate Education. SC members asked a variety of questions, the vast majority of which were answered to SC members' satisfaction. Grossman stated that the Honors Program's home faculty had to be identified to ensure they were in favor of the proposed changes.

There was lengthy, informative discussion about various aspects of the proposal, including the planned, near-future advertising campaign for a revised Honors Program. SC members were generally satisfied with the rationale and proposed changes. Grossman was adamant that a unit faculty be identified prior to implementing any change to the name or content/structure of the Honors Program. Provost Kumble Subbaswamy arrived at 4:30.

Mullen shared some information about the search for a new director for the revised Honors Program (the proposed name being "Honors Academy"). In response to queries about faculty membership on the search committee for a new director, Mullen said there were a few already on it. The Chair asked SC members to send her suggested faculty names.

Provost Subbaswamy confirmed that the University Senate (Senate) was in control of the Honors Program and had purview over its changes. He respectfully requested that the SC consider the importance of the changes to UK's student population while determining how to review the proposal. There were some suggestions about how to move the proposal forward, specifically how to formally identify the Senate as the home unit of the Honors Program.

The Chair noted that Mullen would return the following week to continue the discussion and suggested SC members ask remaining questions at that time.

McCormick **moved** that the SC recommend that the faculty of record for the Honors Program is a University Senate committee appointed by the elected faculty members of the University Senate, appointed in consultation with the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education. Wasilkowski **seconded**.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. Mullen asked for clarification of next steps. Wood replied that he needed to have the Honors Program Review Committee recommend the name change, so it could be placed on SC and Senate agendas.

## 2. Old Business

### b. SC ad hoc Committee on Faculty Productivity and Accountability

SC members engaged in a discussion about how to move forward with the issue of establishing criteria for post-tenure review of productivity and accountability.

Grossman **moved** that the SC charge the SC ad hoc Committee on Faculty Productivity and Accountability with examining *Administrative Regulations 3:8* ("Appendix II: Faculty Workload Policy Statement - University System (Approved by Board of Trustees)", *Administrative Regulations 3:10* ("Policies for Faculty Performance Review"), and *Administrative Regulations 3:11* ("Tenured Faculty Review and Development Policy") and making recommendations. Wasilkowski **seconded**.

There was additional discussion. SC members were clear that they intended the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Productivity and Accountability to look at best practices from benchmarks and include in its composition a member of the Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure. SC members also discussed that while *Administrative Regulations* are within the purview of the President, but any final decision requires consultation with the faculty.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The meeting was adjourned about 5:15. [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: Blonder, Coyne, Grossman, McCormick, Peek, Pienkowski, Wasilkowski, Wimberly and Wood.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman

Invited guests present: Mike Mullen, Kumble Subbaswamy and Lynda Brown-Wright.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Monday, November 28, 2011.

#	v	Item	Responsibility	Completed
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	
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)	Document Handling System	
40.		Draft changes to <i>Senate Rule</i> language on Senate meeting attendance policies for review by SC. (8/30/10 & 11/15/10)	Chair, Steiner	
42.		Discuss with the Provost the method of allocating resources from distance learning courses. (11/15/10)	Chair	
44.		Create ad hoc committee (perhaps with VPR and Provost) to look at what constitutes an administrative or an educational unit, and if there is a continuum or a sharp difference. (11/22/10; 12/6/10)	Chair, SC	

46.		Discuss election of officers, specifically who is eligible to cast votes. (12/6/10); Solicit opinions from the Senate. (2/28/11)	SC	9/2011 &
57.		Look into creating a Senate committee on assessment. (1/31/11)	SC	
62.		Determine how to address the issue of the proportionate representation of appointed Board of Trustees members. (2/7/11)	SC	
66.		Invite Associate Provost for Undergrad Ed to offer "State of Undergraduate Education" address to Senate. (2/21/11)	Chair	
67.		<b>Invite Associate Provost for Academic Affairs to share information and talk about distance learning courses. (2/21/2011)</b>	<b>Mrs. Brothers</b>	
73.		Ask each college dean's office to submit information about their faculty council, as part of the SACS reaccreditation effort. (6/15/11)	Chair	
76.		Develop metrics for faculty input into president's performance during August Advance. (6/15/11)	SC	
77.		Draft a report on the perceptions of the faculty reps on the Presidential Search Committee on the process, and include relevant info from similar universities' recent presidential searches. (6/15/11)	Chair & Steiner	
81.		Meet with each college's faculty council in the fall, and also reinforce the importance of identifying a senator to communicate with college faculty. (6/15/11)	Chair	
82.		Request that the chair of the Senate's Academic Facilities Cmte be invited to attend meetings of the Capital Planning Advisory Group. (6/15/11)	Chair	
85.		Find out if the Senate has an approving or endorsing vote on proposed changes to post-tenure review policies.	Chair	
86.		Determine by late August the message(s) the Chair should relay when she visits college faculty councils.	SC	
89.		Ask the President to hire an outside agency to review the Office of the Senate Council, specifically procedures and staffing levels. (8/5/11)	Chair	
89.	√	Invite Libraries Dean Terry Birdwhistell to discuss open access at SC meeting. (8/22/11)	Mrs. Brothers	09/2011
90.		Post Senate cmte final reports on their websites. (8/22/11)	Mrs. Brothers	
91.		Ask the President to nominate a faculty representative to the SEC/NCAA from a list of names forwarded to the President from the Chair of the Senate Council.	Chair	
94.		ask the Provost examine the possibility of consolidating all registrar positions into the University Registrar's office, and report his decision and rational to the SC. (9/26/11)	Chair	
95.		Post the slides from the October Senate meeting's QEP presentation, along with the other presentations. (10/24/11).	Mrs. Brothers	
96.		Seek final resolution on UAB jurisdiction questions through a meeting with Legal Counsel and the Provost's Office. (11/7/11)	Chair & Mrs. Brothers	
97.		Ask SREC to deliberate on changing SR so that an appeal to the SACPT must be completely submitted within 75 days. (11/7/11)	Mrs. Brothers & SREC	

98.	Send proposal to move Appalachian Center to SAOSC for review. (11/21/11)	Mrs. Brothers	
99.	Host panel discussion on responsible cost management with knowledgeable staff and faculty. (11/21/11)	SC	
100.	Identify mechanism to select senator to represent University Senate on the Alumni Association Board of Directors. (11/28/11)	SC	
101.	Discuss with IT the possibility of equipping the Auditorium of W. T. Young Library with the technology to record and live stream events. (11/21/11)	Chair	