

Senate Council
October 2, 2017

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, October 2, 2017 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 Katherine M. McCormick called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:11 pm.

1. Minutes from September 25, 2017 and Announcements

There were no requested changes to the minutes. There being **no objections**, the minutes from September 25, 2017 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair referred to Bailey's recent participation in an activity sponsored by the President's office; two other faculty members also participated, but were not present to share their experiences. The Chair explained that President Eli Capilouto was preparing for an activity at the upcoming Board of Trustees retreat where trustees will be given opportunities to talk with faculty and staff on "disruptive technologies." As a test run for the Board-related conversations, Bailey and the other two faculty employees, along with some staff employees, participated in a "pilot" conversation with members of the President's council. Bailey described his participation, the files that were sent in advance for him to read, and his perspectives of the conversation.

The Chair asked for additional faculty nominees to participate in the Board of Trustees' 2016-17 evaluation of President Eli Capilouto. SC members identified four additional faculty to suggest as possible participants in the evaluation.

SC members engaged in a brief discussion about the prior week's discussion on the memorandum and proposed *AR* changes from SC's Ad Hoc Committee on *Administrative Regulations 6:2*. She reminded SC members that she was charged to write a letter to accompany the two files when she forwarded them to President Capilouto. She asked SC members to offer their thoughts about whether she should write the memo and include the concerns raised during the September 25 SC meeting, or if she should wait until SC holds another discussion before drafting the memo. During the discussion, Cross apologized for an error in the motion to call for stopping debate on an agenda item. This motion requires a two-thirds vote to pass, not a simple majority. In response to a question from Tagavi, the Chair reiterated that she would share the memo with SC members and invite input prior to sending it. Mazur suggested the Chair draft the letter and share it with SC members; that activity might help frame the discussion and help determine if another discussion was necessary.

2. Old Business

a. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 1.4.2.11* ("Senate Committee on Committees")

The Chair explained that the SC had requested changes to the language that was originally on the prior week's agenda. There were no comments from SC members. Blonder **moved** to approve the proposed changes to *SR 1.4.2.11* and Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) – Davy Jones and Joan Mazur, Co-Chairs

i. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules* Regarding Changes in Provost's Area

The Chair reminded SC members that the proposed changes were proposed by Provost Tim Tracy in response to the prior year's reorganization of Undergraduate Education. One aspect of the changes was

to provide greater clarity regarding how curriculum is processed, i.e. through the faculty. Mazur referred to the document being handed out and explained that she and her co-chair, Davy Jones, reviewed the proposed changes independently and had similar comments (documented in the handout) about the general level of significance for each proposed change. She noted that two changes, pertaining to membership in the Senate, would require a change to *Governing Regulations IV* ("The University Senate").

The Chair stated that after conversations with Provost Tracy and Associate Provost for Finance and Administration Lisa Wilson, the Chair was assured that financial support and resources that are currently available will continue to be available after the *SR* language changes. Regarding the need to change *GR IV*, the Chair suggested that the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) carve out the two *GR* changes and process them separately. There were additional updates needed to the language on to ex officio membership, such as the addition of the dean of the new Lewis Honors College as an ex officio member of Senate.

Mazur stressed that the SREC as a body had not reviewed the changes, but rather she and Jones had shared their preliminary thoughts [the handout] with SREC members at their Friday meeting. There were additional comments from SC members. The Chair thanked Associate Provost for Academic Excellence Operations Kirsten Turner for attending and said that proposed *SR* changes would continue to move towards approval.

b. Ad Hoc Committee on Technology – Mark Lauersdorf, Chair

i. Request for Renewal (per *SR 1.4.5* ("Ad Hoc Committees"))

Lauersdorf, chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Technology, explained the Committee's activities during the prior year. There was extensive discussion surrounding Lauersdorf's request that SC renew the ad hoc Committee's charge for another year. The SC members who were most vocal during the discussion raised the following concerns: the ad hoc Committee should have presented its recommendations for revising the *Administrative Regulations* in chapter 10 ("Information Technology") to SC and should not have sent them directly to Brian Nichols, UK's chief information officer (CIO) without any SC or Senate involvement; the ad hoc Committee functioned for a full year without making any reports to SC; lack of clarity regarding why another committee on technology is needed given that there are two such campuswide committees that are codified in *Administrative Regulations 10:2* ("University Information Technology Advisory Committees"); a revised charge to the Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLLeL) could possibly accommodate the charge to the ad hoc Committee; and while the ad hoc Committee appeared to work extensively with the CIO to fulfill the ad hoc Committee's first charge ("Review the structure of and relationship between existing technology committees" (defined in AR 10:2 – <http://www.uky.edu/regs/files/ar/ar10-2.pdf>) and Senate committees and propose changes to: ensure effective faculty and student input; streamline processes; and reduce redundancy."), the ad hoc Committee had not undertaken any activities to meet its other two charges ("Review technology proposals that affect faculty and students and endorse or propose changes to them" and "Provide a channel for communication between faculty/students and campus IT and administrative units about technology proposals and technology infrastructures").

As discussion wound down, Schroeder **moved** to table the request for renewal until the October 16 SC meeting when the SC can review the changes to *Administrative Regulations 10:2* that the ad hoc Committee proposed. Mazur **seconded**. There was additional discussion. In response to a question from Lauersdorf about the ad hoc Committee being shuttered if it were not renewed, Cross indicated that the ad hoc Committee could easily be recreated if SC opted to do so.

Given a variety of factors, SC members briefly discussed rearranging the agenda. Schroeder **moved** to address agenda item number six, next. Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. Update on Parking and Transportation Initiatives - Director of Parking and Transportation Services Lance Broeking and Executive Director for Strategic Analysis and Policy Melody Flowers

Guests Lance Broeking (director of Parking and Transportation Services) and Melody Flowers (executive director for strategic analysis and policy) provided SC members with an update on the recent changes to parking policies. There were a handful of questions and comments from SC members. When discussion wound down, the Chair thanked them for attending and suggested that SC members send additional questions via email.

c. Ad Hoc Committee on Title Series – Sharon Lock, Chair

i. Discussion on Preliminary Report

Guest Sharon Lock (NU, chair of Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure (SACPT)) and Provost Tim Tracy spoke with SC members about a preliminary report on title series submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee on Titles Series, which was comprised of the members of the SACPT and the chairs of Academic Area Committees. Lock reiterated that the ad hoc Committee was charged jointly by the Provost and SC and was asked to review the feasibility of changing to a system with two title series (tenure track and non-tenure track), with ranks in both series at assistant professor, associate professor and full professor, as well as the possibility of including multi-year contract for faculty in the non-tenure track series. There was a lively, collegial discussion among all those present.

As discussion came to a close, there was a brief discussion about next steps. There were no objections to the suggestion that the matter be the subject of some campuswide town hall forums. The Chair noted that while the ad hoc Committee had fulfilled their charge and had presented a report which also identified challenges to the proposed restructure of the title series, additional effort would be required to develop a final report which could be presented to the Senate by the Provost and his staff. The Chair concurred with Mazur's statement that there was a need for broad faculty input prior to any further work by the ad hoc Committee.

Given the time, the Chair suggested that SC next review the tentative agenda for Monday's Senate meeting.

5. Tentative Senate Agenda for October 9, 2017

SC members discussed the tentative agenda and agreed to remove one item. They also asked if Provost Tracy would be able to attend the Senate meeting and share some information about UK's spot in national rankings. Mazur **moved** to approve the agenda as discussed and Bailey **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:36 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine M. McCormick,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bailey, Blonder, Childress, Cross, Lauersdorf, Marr, Mazur, McCormick, Schroeder, and Tagavi.

Senate Council
October 2, 2017

Invited guests present: Sharon Lock, Tim Tracy, and Kirsten Turner.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, October 4, 2017.