

Senate Council
October 5, 2009

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, October 5, 2009 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a voice vote unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Dave Randall called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:09 pm.

1. Minutes from September 21 and Announcements

The Chair said that Chappell was absent and Provost's Liaison Greissman would leave early. He offered a few announcements.

- Agendas for SC meetings will be posted on the Thursday prior to the meeting, instead of on Wednesdays.
- The Chair asked SC members to begin to think about the logistics of revising all of UK's undergraduate programs in the event that the Senate approved a new general education (Gen Ed) plan.
- The SC will be having breakfast with President Todd on Tuesday, December 15. After brief discussion about possible topics for discussion during the breakfast, it was determined that there was no need to set any formal agenda. The Chair said that if anyone were interested in seeing the budget presentation that Vice President for Planning Budget and Policy Analysis Angie Martin gave during a presentation for the University Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities (UCAPP), he would be happy to arrange for such a presentation during a future SC meeting.
- The Chair reported that he approved a parallel review of the first web course and program transmittal. Although that tended to deprive the SC of certain prerogatives, he said that issue could be discussed later during the meeting.
- The Librarians' Faculty Council had contacted him and formally suggested that each vetting team include one librarian.
- UCAPP was in need of a replacement for a departing member from the College of Design, and that the SC needed to identify a faculty member for that position. There was some conversation about UCAPP and its functions.
- SC members were informed that there was a vacancy on the Web Advisory Committee; Mrs. Brothers was asked to inform senators and solicit a volunteer.

- The Chair asked Kelly to give an update on preliminary discussions pertaining to a joint faculty/administration instructional telecommunications (IT) committee. Kelly did so, saying that as a result of concerns received last spring about faculty involvement and decision making regarding IT support of academics on campus. The new head of IT, Vince Kellen, supports faculty participation in decisions pertaining to functionally critical IT issues. Along with Kelly and Kellen, a couple of faculty from the Department of Computer Sciences were attending meetings where the attendees looked at the current regulations. Kelly said that the plan was to craft a draft revision to existing *Administrative Regulations*, and give them to the SC and others for feedback. Greissman added that Kellen had a dual reporting role, to an administrator as well as to Provost Subbaswamy.

SC members asked a few questions, and Kelly explained that the thought was for faculty to have input in setting short-term and long-term IT priorities, as well as helping to develop processes for submitting faculty IT concerns.

The Chair solicited a motion for approval of the minutes from September 21, 2009 as distributed. Jensen **moved** thusly and Steiner **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair asked SC members to offer names of Design faculty for possible inclusion on UCAPP. SC members offered six names, and Mrs. Brothers said she would contact them.

2. Parallel 10-Day Review of Transmittals for AY 2009 - 2010

The Chair said that the SC was being asked to consider formalizing the practice of putting web transmittals (for approval of anything pertaining to courses, changes to degree programs, and a few other curricular matters) out for review for the SC and for the Senate on parallel 10-day reviews, instead of sequential 10-day reviews. He reminded the SC members that parallel transmission had been used last semester.

In response to a question from Jensen, the Chair replied that doing so would deprive the SC of the privilege of pre-reviewing some curricular proposals before the Senate saw them. Mrs. Brothers explained that the *Senate Rules (SR)* were not strictly adhered to – some practices were no longer adhered to due to changes in technology and organizational structure – but certain items were still processed via sequential 10-day web transmittals. If the web transmittals for the SC and Senate were posted simultaneously, or in parallel, the approval time for such transmittals would shorten from just under a month to a little over a week. Mrs. Brothers added that, to her knowledge, web transmittals did not typically receive much, if any, attention from SC and Senate members.

SC members engaged in a somewhat lengthy conversation about the approval process, including how to improve upon current practice, as well as the merits of parallel review instead of sequential review. Jensen suggested posting web transmittals online according to a specific schedule, but Mrs. Brothers explained that the nature of the flow of business in the Office of the Senate Council was not conducive

to a prescriptive schedule. Mrs. Brothers suggested that web transmittals be announced during SC and Senate meetings.

After additional brief discussion, Jensen **moved** to sustain parallel 10-day reviews of web transmittals for the remainder of the academic year and Ford **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. [2008 – 2009 Annual Report from the Senate’s Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure](#)

Swanson, who served as chair of the Senate’s Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure (SACPT) during the period during which the report was created, explained that every year, the college dean sends a letter to each lecturer to say that the position would last another year, contingent upon the availability of funds. In one particular case, that letter was sent, but the lecturer felt that the contract was not renewed because the position was filled by another person. The SACPT felt that the action taken by the dean was legally appropriate, but brought to their attention how fragile lecturer positions are.

In response to a question from Wood, Swanson explained that the issue had more to do with when a faculty member would know when one’s contract would not be renewed. After additional comments, Swanson said that the SACPT just wanted the SC to be aware of the situation; although the SACPT ruled against the lecturer in the case referenced above, it did have concerns about the process followed.

Swanson then said that there was a separate situation in which a faculty member received positive performance reviews but was not awarded tenure – it seemed to be a surprise ending. In conversations with Provost Subbaswamy, the SACPT wondered if the annual review served to mentor, or was an evaluation. SC members engaged in a lengthy discussion of the performance review and tenure system. There was a general consensus that a knowledgeable department chair was critical to a positive outcome of a tenure review, which was considered somewhat unfortunate, since the tenure review should hinge on the faculty member. During discussion, Swanson added that at least one letter in the case contained irrelevant personal information.

The Chair said that the SC could accept the recommendations of the SACPT, and could also perhaps create a working group to look into the matter. Steiner **moved** that the SC form a committee to examine the issues raised in the SACPT’s 2008-2009 annual report, with a specific emphasis on the relationship between the annual performance review and the tenure decision process. Wood **seconded**.

SC members discussed the matter further. Ultimately, concern was expressed about the possible ramifications of a quick review by committee of such a large issue as tenure process, which included significant administrative aspects. Swanson, Wood and the Chair agreed to sit down and look at the issue and discuss how best to begin to proceed. Swanson noted that she liked the idea of focusing on process. The Chair noted that Steiner’s motion was still on the table.

Anderson **moved** to table Steiner's motion about the SACPT work group until November and Wood **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Report from SREC Chair on Recent Changes to *Administrative Regulations 11:4* ("University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees")

The Chair invited the chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, Davy Jones, to explain the matter. Guest Jones noted that the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees (UJCHD) in its current composition arose from changes to the *Governing Regulations* during 2005. The current composition is four members chosen by the SC and four members chosen by the President, of which two must be traditional faculty members. The other two members identified by the President are the Provost and the dean of the Graduate School. Names approved by the UJCHD are then sent forward to the Senate, which has the authority to approve, disapprove or add names.

Jones explained that the elected faculty voted to use the UJCHD as described in the *Administrative Regulations (AR)* and codified that action by virtue of such language in the *SR*. Deaton explained that President Todd had requested a general overhaul of regulations that speak to specific positions, to allow more flexibility. Recent changes to the *AR* pertaining to the UJCHD were made with that in mind, but the end result showed the need for additional revisions. Additional changes in the language are described below:

- The dean of the Graduate School remains the chair of the committee, unless unavailable. If unavailable, the chair of the SC and the President together designate the UJCHD chair. That person must be a faculty member.
- Although the voting and ex officio status of various members is struck through in various places, the rights remain the same; the changes are a result of standardizing the order of certain descriptions.
- The pending departure of Terry Mobley resulted in a need to remove the inclusion of his position on the UJCHD.
- The terms of members can now be staggered.
- A specific reference to quorum was added.

Jones also reminded SC members that they had the right and responsibility of naming specific individuals to serve on the committee, and should also take current composition into consideration when putting forward faculty names.

Jones answered a few questions. The Chair thanked him for attending.

5. Senate Committee Compositions, Round 2

The Chair explained that two additional senators needed to be added to Senate committees. Swanson **moved** to accept the first addition, to the Senate's Academic Advising Committee and Wood **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Wood **moved** to accept the second addition, to the Senate's Academic Facilities Committee and Anderson **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

8. Tentative Senate Agenda for October 12

SC members discussed the tentative Senate agenda, and Yanarella said that as a part of the SC agenda item on cliff vesting he was going to suggest that Frank Butler, Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration, offer a presentation on cliff vesting to the Senate during the October meeting. After some discussion, the Chair recapped, saying that it seemed that SC members wanted the agenda item on vetting teams to fall immediately after minutes and announcements and that senators will be given ballots to sign for upon arrival. Wood **moved** thusly, and Yanarella **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. Cliff Vesting Issue

Yanarella said that the change to cliff vesting was a relatively small change, one that faculty would likely survive if the changes is made, but that it was also the next step in a very copious review of faculty benefits by the administration in which easy targets were being picked off. Yanarella suggested that Frank Butler, or his designee, be invited to attend the October Senate meeting to explain the proposed changes to senators.

After some brief discussion, Wood **moved** to invite Frank Butler to present the current cliff vesting proposal to the Senate, and also explain the rationale for changes and the benefits to the University. Yanarella **seconded**. There were a few comments, after which a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The meeting was adjourned about 5 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Dave Randall,
Senate Council Chair

SC members in attendance: Anderson, Ford, Kelly, Kirk, Randall, Rohr, Steiner, Swanson, Yanarella, and Wood.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guests present: Deaton and Jones.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Friday, October 16, 2009.