

Senate Council  
September 24, 2012

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, September 24, 2012 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Lee X. Blonder called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order 3:02 pm. She explained that Davis resigned from the SC due to anticipated meeting absences. Pienkowski was the runner up from the last SC election and has agreed to serve out the remainder of her term, through December 2014. Then, those present introduced themselves.

1. Interim Provost Tim Tracy – Budget Issues, Including Metrics Committee

Interim Provost Tim Tracy (Provost Tracy) began by saying he would like to periodically attend SC meetings to answer questions and keep lines of communication open. He then shared some general information regarding the budget process and answered a variety of questions during his explanation.

The Provost explained that President Capilouto has begun a two-year budget process and we are in the middle of the first year (2012-13). The second year will be 2013-14. Provost Tracy has asked colleges and units to budget for reallocations that will occur in January 2013, in anticipation of July 1, 2013. The President said that units must make adjustments by January 2013 and can keep any cost savings from the January-June 2013 period as non-recurring funds, which can roll over into fiscal year 2013-14 (FY 14). Provost Tracy said he has been speaking with deans and other offices in the Provost's area (Student Affairs, Enrollment Management, International Affairs) and walking through their plans to accommodate the previously announced 4.2% cut for academic units and 6.4% cut for administrative units. He is asking units to evaluate if, at this point into the fiscal year 2012-13 (FY13), they are projecting anything differently or want to make any changes. Semi-final plans will be discussed again in October, when the final tuition numbers will be available.

Provost Tracy said he had put forward a proposal to the President requesting that some share (perhaps 70-80%) of the anticipated additional tuition revenues from 2012-13 enrollments be returned to units that helped generate the extra tuition or that are affected by the increased enrollment (e.g. a non-academic unit that has a larger burden directly assisting students due to higher enrollments). He reiterated that nothing had been approved, yet – he was just sharing information on his proposal to the President.

The Provost added that some of these monies may be used to support existing or new initiatives to aid student success. He thought that, if approved, the proposal could allow for 20-30% of the portion of anticipated additional tuition revenues to be directed to colleges with the remaining being allocated to cover deficits or begin new student success initiatives. In addition, beginning FY 14, colleges will begin taking responsibility for former deans' salaries, so those monies may also be applied to this new expense. Provost Tracy repeated that the numbers he mentioned were part of a proposal which had not been approved. Additionally, this is an unapproved proposal for a one-time action.

Regarding the first round of budget cuts, Provost Tracy said that colleges made their own, individual decisions about accommodating budget cuts.

The Chair asked for additional information on how faculty and the SC can participate fully in discussions about budgetary allocations and the proposed new budget model. The Provost said there is a budget metrics committee that is charged with developing University-wide metrics by which colleges measure internal college improvements, which can help prevent across-the-board cuts. The metrics committee is comprised of deans, department chairs and center directors.

Provost Tracy said the metrics can help identify the value of quality learning at all levels and for units to use as a measure of improvement. Such evaluations can be done in a variety of ways, including intercollegiate peer evaluations and reviews of classes; retention rates; and graduation rates. He indicated a desire for evaluation methods that go beyond measuring seat time. Collaborative teaching should be rewarded at all levels, along with other forms of teaching, research and service. Though not all efforts may necessarily succeed, colleges should be encouraged to continue being innovative and try new initiatives aimed at increasing student learning and success.

Regarding the metrics committee composition, SC members indicated that while some department chairs held their departmental faculty's regard, others did not. Provost Tracy's suggestion that the SC identify three faculty members to serve on the metrics committee was received well. Additionally, it is acceptable if the final metrics are similar to the top 20 plan metrics, as long as the new metrics are determined by a contemporary review of UK.

A few SC members asked about how layoffs (associated with the second round of budget cuts) will be conducted. Provost Tracy said that in some contrast to the first round's layoffs, the second round's layoffs will be conducted with greater sensitivity to the impact on the affected individuals and their units. The Provost said he was also spreading the word regarding value- or incentive-based budgeting. He said costs and revenues would be associated with the units that incur them, although monies will be set aside for areas whose functions are important for the University's goals but may not generate revenues.

Edwards expressed his and other students' appreciation for the recent realignments in the Provost's area. He commented that he and other students in his college (Education) received all kinds of information from their dean about the budget discussions. He asked if there was any type of website with that type of information for students whose deans did not share that information regularly. Provost Tracy said that he tried to avoid sending information out via mass email but would consider doing so, and he would remind deans again to share information as it becomes available.

The Chair said that given the time, the SC needed to move on to other agenda items. SC members thanked Provost Tracy for attending.

## 2. Minutes from September 17, 2012 and Announcements

The Chair drew SC members' attention to one correction made to the minutes. She said there were no additional changes. There being **no objection**, the minutes from September 17 were **approved** as amended.

The Chair offered announcements. She said she spoke with the Provost about the associate provosts for faculty advancement chairing the Health Care Colleges Council (HCCC). She said that the Provost preferred that position concentrate on faculty advancement, so the SC will need to review its suggestion that that position chair the HCCC.

The Chair discussed with both the President and Provost the issue of improved diversity in administrative positions.

### 3. Old Business

#### a. Academic Approvals Workgroup Report

The Chair asked Grossman to explain the proposal, with a focus on the three recommendations.

Grossman shared some background information regarding the Academic Approvals Workgroup (AAW) and explained the three first two recommendations:

1. Require academic councils (Graduate Council, Health Care Colleges Council, Undergraduate Council) to adhere to a specific list of review requirements to which they adhere during the review process.
2. Disband Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC). With the establishment of specific checklists from each academic council, the review of new programs by the SAPC could be eliminated. Another alternative would be for the charge and focus of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee to be modified.

There was extensive discussion about those recommendations.

Grossman **moved** that the SC require the academic councils to publish a specific list of review requirements to which they adhere during the review process and ask the Senate's Academic Programs Committee to review the list and augment if necessary. Brion **seconded**. The criteria will return to the SC when the criteria are ready.

SC members discussed whether the SAPC should create its own review criteria and mesh that with the councils' criteria, or if the SAPC should just review the councils' criteria and revise if needed. Brion said that when she seconded the motion, she was under the impression that the SAPC would review lists created by the academic councils, not create another list.

Grossman **withdrew** his motion.

Brion **moved** that the SC ask the academic councils (Undergraduate Council, UC; Graduate Council, GC; and Health Care Colleges Council, HCCC) to publish by the end of December a specific list of review requirements used during the new program review process, which will be reviewed by the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) for additions, amendments and clarification before consideration by the Senate Council. Anderson **seconded**. Wood **offered an amendment** to include removing of the SAPC's charge to review new program proposals. Grossman **seconded**.

Grossman commented that he thought the SAPC has done very good work and the motion was not intended to insult their work. Once the SAPC can review the academic councils' requirements, the review criteria for academic councils should be such that a review by the SAPC will be redundant. Brion said she thought the amendment should be a separate motion after the criteria were reviewed.

A **vote** was taken on the **amendment** to include removing of the SAPC's charge to review new program proposals. The motion **failed** with three in favor and six against.

A **vote** was then taken on the original **motion** that the SC ask the academic councils (Undergraduate Council, UC; Graduate Council, GC; and Health Care Colleges Council, HCCC) to publish by the end of December a specific list of review requirements used during the new program review process, which will be reviewed by the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) for additions, amendments and clarification before consideration by the Senate Council. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

Ms. Brothers asked that SC members also address the need for updated definitions and new CPE (Council on Postsecondary Education). Grossman **moved** that the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee codify the proposed definitions in the AAW Report, Appendix B, and make them compliant with the most recent CPE rules and return them to the SC. Pienkowski **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 4. Committee Reports

##### a. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee – Herman Farrell, Chair

##### i. Proposed Merger of Department of Merchandising, Apparel and Textiles with Hospitality and Management Program (and Associated Name Change)

Guest Herman Farrell, chair of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee, explained the proposal. He noted that a revised proposal was available and would be sent to the Office of the Senate Council. It was clarified that the proposal intended to change the name of the existing Department of Merchandising, Apparel and Textiles to the Department of Retailing and Tourism Management and move the Hospitality and Tourism Management degree program (and associated faculty) to that newly named department.

SC members asked a variety of questions, all of which were answered satisfactorily. The Chair said there was a unanimous vote from the SAOSC to endorse the proposal; the SC needed to move a motion to recommend approval to the Senate. Wood **moved** that the SC send a recommendation that the Senate endorse the proposed name change of the Department of Merchandising, Apparel and Textiles to the Department of Retailing and Tourism Management and that the Hospitality and Management program transfer from the Department of Dietetics and Human Nutrition to the new Department of Retailing and Tourism Management.

Wood received confirmation that the graduate programs involved remained intact with their current graduate faculty, as did the undergraduate degrees – there was no transfer of programs. Grossman **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

##### 5. Discussion on National Conference on Undergraduate Research - Director of Undergraduate Research Diane Snow

Guest Diane Snow, director of the Undergraduate Research Center, explained the situation at hand. She talked at length about the required components for hosting the National Conference on Undergraduate Research (NCUR) 2104. She answered many, many questions from SC members.

Grossman **moved** that the Senate authorize the Registrar to make scheduling arrangements as necessary for NCUR to proceed and if someone's room is used for NCUR, the Registrar will identify another room for the class; this motion authorizes the Registrar. Wood **seconded**. Edwards offered an **amendment** to ask the entire campus to accommodate the redirection of classes. Grossman **seconded**.

After additional discussion, Edwards **withdrew** his motion. A **vote** was taken on the **motion** that the Senate authorize the Registrar to make scheduling arrangements as necessary for NCUR to proceed and if someone's room is used for NCUR, the Registrar will identify another room for the class; this motion authorizes the Registrar. Edwards **offered an amendment** to add language that the Senate also endorse the NCUR programming committee's request to faculty to redirect undergraduate classes on April 3 -5, 2014 and encourage students to participate in NCUR. Anderson **seconded**. After additional discussion, Edwards **withdrew** his motion.

A **vote** was taken on the **motion** that the Senate authorize the Registrar to make scheduling arrangements as necessary for NCUR to proceed and if someone's room is used for NCUR, the Registrar will identify another room for the class if possible. The motion **passed** with one opposed.

Edwards **moved** that the SC recommend the Senate endorse the request from UK's NCUR programming committee to ask faculty to redirect undergraduate classes on April 3 -5, 2014 and encourage students to participate in NCUR. Anderson **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair reminded SC members of the need to identify three faculty to serve on the budget metrics committee. It was decided to carry on a discussion over the SC listserv on potential nominees.

There was very brief discussion on the SC's upcoming budget forums. The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 pm.

Submitted by Lee X. Blonder,  
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Blonder, Brion, Coyne, Debski, Edwards, Grossman, McCormick, Pienkowski, Swanson, Voro and Wood.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guests present: Kwaku Addo, Desmond Brown, Larry Grabau, Vanessa Jackson and Tim Tracy.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Friday, September 28, 2012.