

Senate Council  
October 31, 2011

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, October 31, 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 3:06 pm. She said she expected the meeting to adjourn around 4 pm, due to the light agenda and other factors.

1. Minutes from October 24, 2011 and Announcements

The Chair solicited a motion to approve the SC minutes from October 24, 2011. Wood **moved** thusly and Blonder **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The only announcement the Chair had was that she met with President Capilouto and they discussed a few things, including UK's method of budgeting. There was some discussion among SC members about the failings of UK's current system and accommodating future pedagogical and technological needs into residence hall building projects.

Grossman suggested that there be a faculty member on the building design committees if there are to be classrooms inside the residence halls. The Chair suggested she mention to the President's Chief of Staff, Bill Swinford, during the next University Senate (Senate) meeting.

2. Old Business

a. Action Items

SC members discussed some Action Items, making decisions about a few.

- Action Item (AI) 53 ("Investigate "Quality Matters" with respect to distance learning courses. (1.10.11)": SC determined this would be met through the activities of the ad hoc Committee on Best Practices for Distance Learning.
- AI 63 ("Invite UofL employment ombud to SC meeting after joint ombud committee visits the University of Cincinnati. (2.22.11)": SC determined this was no longer necessary, since the proposal for the creation of an employment ombud was well underway.
- AI 67 ("Invite Associate Provost for Academic Affairs to share information and discuss distance learning courses. (2/21/2011)": SC members agreed that they would like to hear this information.
- AI 72 ("Discuss the status of department chairs and directors of interdisciplinary centers during the August Advance. (6/15/11)": SC determined that the issue was largely a result of language in the Kentucky Revised Statutes (KRS) and UK's interpretation of those particular KRS laws largely gave way to the current system in which faculty who assume administrative positions above a certain level do not have voting rights in Senate-run elections. Grossman volunteered to draft some language to explain the current situation and run it by the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, for posting on the Senate's website. **[AI]**

- AI 73 (“Ask each college dean’s office to submit information about their faculty council, as part of the SACS reaccreditation effort. (6/15/2011)”): the Chair said she would take care of this.
- AI 76 (“Develop metrics for faculty input into president’s performance during August Advance. (6/15/2011)”): the Chair reported that Coyne and Wasilkowski were working on this item. Coyne asked for five minutes during the next SC meeting to request some guidance from the SC on a particular matter.
- AI 81 (“Meet with each college’s faculty in the fall, and also reinforce the importance of identifying a senator to communicate with college faculty. (6/15/2011)”): the Chair reported having met with a couple of college councils. These activities will be wrapped up by the Chair with other communications to college faculty councils.
- AI 86 (“Determine by late August the messages(s) the Chair should relay when she visits college faculty councils.”): this will be wrapped up by the Chair with other communications to college faculty councils.

The Chair commented that President Capilouto will look to the Senate and beyond for the faculty representatives to serve on the recently recommended by the Board of Trustees athletics advisory committee.

- AI 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.”): the Chair reported that she had discussed this issue briefly with President Capilouto during their recent meeting. After some discussion, SC members asked that she again bring up the subject with the President.

### 3. Proposal from the Joint Committee of the University and Staff Senates on the Proposed Creation of Employment Ombud Program

SC members discussed the report of the Joint Committee of the University and Staff Senates on the proposed creation of an employment ombud program. The Chair said it was her understanding that the President’s primary concern with the proposal was that it would treat symptoms, but not the real problem of interpersonal relationships.

SC members engaged in about 30 minutes of discussion regarding the report. The beginning of the discussion was spent on explaining the contents of the report and how the office would function. A couple of current, anecdotal examples of why such an employment ombud is needed were shared. SC members were somewhat divided regarding support for the proposal. Some agreed with the opinion that the proposal merely addressed symptoms of real problems. It was suggested that the money to be spent on an employment ombud could be better spent on fixing existing problems. There were also questions about exactly how the office would function, specifically interactions with existing Human Resources offices and policies.

SC members generally agreed with the idea that the office would be a good centralized reporting location that could more easily identify offices/units where there are an inordinate number of complaints. Funding for the proposal has not been solidified, but rather offered verbally from the Provost, the Executive Vice President for Financial Affairs, the Executive Vice President for Health Affairs and the Athletics Director.

Additional opinions are below.

- Education about how to be a better supervisor will not solve all of UK's personnel problems, particularly because of UK's size and lack of free market pressure to ensure good management of employees.
- Adjustments to Human Resources could be implemented with the budget for the employment ombud, instead.
- The money to fund an employment ombud office would be better spent on a hard push for training of supervisors, including instruction on how to identify problems and prevent issues from arising. Such a program was implemented in the medical center about 10 years ago and has made improvements.
- Improvements to UK's supervision policies should be made, including requirements for continuous supervisory education, but that is separate from the issue of an employment ombud.

Grossman **moved** that the SC recommend that the Senate endorse the report of the Joint Committee of the University and Staff Senates on the Proposed Creation of an Ombud's Program. Wasilkowski **seconded**.

There was discussion among SC members about endorsing the report and what it would mean, practically speaking. It was acknowledged that many details would have to be ironed out when the language was codified into a University regulation.

McCormick stated that she would have to abstain from a vote, since she had not yet read the report. Wood **moved** to table discussion on the report. Pienkowski **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 4. Proposed Changes to the Business Procedures Manual

The Chair asked SC members to turn their attention to the proposed changes to Business Procedures Manual (BPM), specifically BPM E-1-3 ("Fiscal Roles and Responsibilities") and BPM E-1-4 ("Internal Control"). Mrs. Brothers explained that the proposed changes to the BPM will involve requirements for all employees, which was why it was on the agenda. The Chair asked SC members to review the changes and let her know of any concerns.

There being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 4:05 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: Blonder, Coyne, Grossman, Kelly, McCormick, Peek, Pienkowski, Swanson, Wasilkowski, Wimberly and Wood.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, November 2, 2011.

#	√	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.		Invite Associate Provost for Academic Affairs to share information and talk about distance learning courses. (2/21/2011)	Mrs. Brothers	
72.		Discuss status of department chairs and directors of interdisciplinary centers during the August Advance. (6/15/11) Create informational page that shows KRS language on faculty administrators and UK's interpretation that they cannot vote in elections for faculty representatives (10/31/11)	Grossman	
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	
90.	Post Senate cmtc 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	
92.	Post the slides from the October Senate meeting's QEP presentation, along with the other presentations. (10/24/11).	Mrs. Brothers	