

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

MARCH 8, 2010

3:00 P.M.

* * * *

* * * *

W.T. YOUNG LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY CAMPUS
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

* * * *

* * * *

DAVID RANDALL, CHAIR
HOLLIE SWANSON, VICE-CHAIR
KAVEH TAGAVI, ACTING PARLIAMENTARIAN
SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR
LISA E. HOINKE, COURT REPORTER

* * * *

* * * *□

CHAIR:

Time

to begin. We have

a beautiful
afternoon.

Hope you have enjoyed it.
A number of events have conspired
to make today's meeting different, and I
think it will be informative and maybe even
enjoyable.

We have relatively little business
to accomplish today, so we're going to have a
-- a discussion of some issues that the
Senate Council thinks are important, so there
will be an opportunity for everyone to chime
in and give us your ideas here. So that's
where we're heading today.

The usual admonitions as it were;
no minutes are ready, so we'll have those for
you the next meeting. And I expect the April
and May meetings will be very busy with --
with business, so we'll look forward to that
too.

We'd like to inform you of the
Lotsa Helping Hands. You can find this on
the web. It's a mechanism the University has
for giving assistance for caregivers. So

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt
call that to your attention there.

We need a Senator representative for a workgroup to recommend policies and procedures relative to online teacher and course evaluations. If this something that interests you or you know someone in your department that might be interested, please have them call or contact Sheila Brothers by e-mail and volunteer for that.

If you have comments on the New Student Code of Conduct, if you would get them to Richard Greissman. You can see this document, and it's something that we'll be vetting and discussing throughout the campus over the coming weeks, so the Revised Code of Conduct.

The Senate Council has charged me with putting together a small committee from the council to meet with the chair of the staff senate and with SGA in an attempt to work out a resolution to bring these three representative bodies together regarding the financial status and, in particular, looking at the Athletic Association's budget and its responsibilities to the University.

So Senate Council has heard from any number of individuals on campus looking at the general issue with the budget and what promises to come, and one of the issues that we are exploring has to do with the role of the academic program with that. So just to inform you, we're -- we're rather aggressively looking into those -- to those issues. I think that's repeated there on the bottom. So, again, to Richard Greissman.

So you're probably aware that the Senate Rules specified that the final grades shall be filed with the registrar within 72 hours after the final exam is administered.

Many of our faculty interpret that as their grades are due on the Monday following the -- the final exam week, and we would like you to encourage all of the faculty to get their grades in as quickly as possible. They are -- they should not interpret that as waiting until a Monday. One of the major issues has to do with getting all these data assembled and to advisors and the students and so forth in time for graduation and -- and the beginning of the holiday.

So just an encouragement to you to encourage your constituents to get their grades in as quickly as possible and no later than 72 hours after their exams.

So we were supposed to have had a -- a presentation here, but something has happened and -- and we're not going to have that presentation on Lotsa Helping Hands, so you may go to the website for -- for that.

So our first order of business is the proposed change for admissions requirements for Master of Art and Master of

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt
Science and Library and Information Science.
Our guests are Jeff Huber and Dennis Carrigan.

HUBER: would you come forward please and summarize what we're about here.
I'm Jeff Huber. I'm the Director of the School of Library and Information Science.
What we propose is changing our requirement for admissions for our undergraduates GPA from a 2.75 to a 3.0. Basically, most of our applicants already are coming to us with a 3.0 or higher undergraduate GPA, so it wouldn't be a hardship on anyone; it really just set things in form.
Questions?
(NO RESPONSE)
HUBER: Thank you.
CHAIR: Then this comes as due all of the business items today with a positive recommendation of Senate Council.
If someone would, please, we need a motion.
ESTUS: Steve Estus, move to approve the recommendation.
CHAIR: And a second, please?
SNOW: Diane Snow. Second.
CHAIR: Discussion of the motion?
(NO RESPONSE)
CHAIR: All right. All in favor aye?
(COUNCIL VOTES)
CHAIR: Opposed nay?
(NONE OPPOSED)
CHAIR: Motion carries.
We have a proposed new University Scholars Program, Bachelor of Science in Merchandising, Apparel and Textiles and a Bachelor of Science and a Master of Science. Guests are Ann Vail and Kim Spillman.
SPILLMAN: Hi. I'm Kim Spillman. I'm from merchandising, apparel and textiles. I'm the Director of Graduate Studies. We are proposing a University scholars program since roughly 50 percent of our graduate students are -- or undergraduate students to dual enroll their last semester for 12 credit hours in consultation with the graduate -- undergraduate studies and the DGS so that they can fast forward their graduate program by one semester.
CHAIR: Questions?
(NO RESPONSE)
CHAIR: Thank you. Everything that comes before you here has been vetted at numerous levels, so want of questions, want of discussions I would hope reflects the care that's been put into bringing things forward for you to here.
So I need a motion, please.
HAYES: Jane Hayes, College of Engineering, move that we accept the proposal as stated.
CHAIR: Any second?

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt
WERMELING: Wermeling, pharmacy.
CHAIR: Discussion of the motion?
(NO RESPONSE)
CHAIR: All in favor, aye?
(MEMBERS VOTE)
CHAIR: Opposed nay?
(NO RESPONSE)
CHAIR: Thank you. Motion carries.
We knew we would have time today,
and a number of events, again, have conspired
to raise the issue of the role of the Senate;
what is joint shared governance and how can
we improve the situation.
So we have invited Professor Kaveh
Tagavi -- excuse me Kaveh -- our former Chair
back to help us, as a resource individual,
and Chair elect -- Vice-Chair -- current
Vice-Chair and Chair elect, Hollie Swanson
has volunteered, as it were, as a
volunteering role to the Senate Council to
moderate this part of the program. So,
Hollie?
SWANSON: I'd like to thank the Council in
their wisdom for allowing myself to
volunteer.
So what we wanted to do is we
wanted to bring you up to speed on a number
of conversations that are ongoing, not only
our Senate Council but also at the national
level.
And as you can see, they have many
-- there are many events that have brought
about these ideas. Why do we need faculty
government? What is our role within the
institution?
And so, for example, in getting
ready for this presentation I went through a
number articles from Academe, and the AAUP
and looking at chairs of other faculty
senates to see what kinds of issues they're
dealing with.
And so what Dr. Tinberg says is
that the efforts are needed of the faculty
because in the face of decreasing academic
administrative resources, the faculty must be
fully engaged in the struggles to allocate
resources.
And then she goes on to say that a
crisis is an opportunity, and I'm not saying
we're facing an intermediate crisis, but a
crisis is an opportunity of the shared
governance to succeed because it brings
together all members to be reinforce the
institution's central issue; that all
constituents should have a working knowledge
of the institution.
And, finally, she says that
effective institutional governance during
this time needs to address three key
questions. One, how is a crisis being
described in the community in the context of
the University and its resources; two, how
are viable proposals and solutions being

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt
gathered and with whom; three, what happens
in the aftermath of the crisis.

And so that's the general idea;
what we do now is very instrumental in
determining what happens next.

And then finally Dr. George
Blumenthal, Chair at the University Academic
Senate in 2005 -- I don't know what he'd say
now, but in 2005 he says: A healthy shared
governance environment has no surprises.

So that means that we know what's
going on. So these are the issues there that
we're looking at, and what I'd like to draw
your attention to is really the fourth one.
This is where we'll have our talk -- our
discussion today is this fourth one, thinking
about what we do here in this room; how do we
make that more effective. But in order to
bring you into that conversation, I thought
it would be helpful to cover these first
three, thinking about what is our purpose.
What is shared governance, and what are the
key responsibilities?

Then as we consider this -- again
this is an ongoing conversation. You are
welcome to provide input. I encourage to
provide input.

Sheila has graciously volunteered
to gather any input, and if you could just
put in the subject line to your e-mails to
her, improve senate, then we'll put those
into a file and we'll go through those. So
part of my homework before I officially take
the position in June 1st, we'll be gathering
these kinds of information trying to get a
better sense of what's going on nationally,
perhaps grabbing some phone calls of leaders
at other institutions. And then when we
retreat as a Senate Council -- and we haven't
set our date yet, but we're thinking perhaps
July/August, then we can start looking
together at this information, start to make
some plans of how to move forward and then
we'll present that with you in September.

All right. So if you look at our
GRs, this is what the GR says we're suppose
to do and so we are elected faculty
representatives of our campus and we perform
particular functions.

And so, what functions? And what
would be the purpose? Well, I stole this
from the University of Washington's website,
and when you look at this long list here,
there are some words that I put in bold that
literally jump out and one word is quality,
academic quality, institutional quality,
quality of life, academic life, campus life,
curriculum, academic programs.

The other word that jumps out is
integrity, excellence and then academic
freedom. It's also a means by which we can
speak with a unified voice.

And then finally enhance

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt
communication between all of our different
departments and divisions.

So what are our responsibilities?
Well, state law -- and I borrowed this from
Davey Jones because, see, I don't have an
original thought today. I borrowed this from
Davey Jones, and he says by state law this is
what we are charged with and so this is when
we go through our degree list, when we
approve the honorary degrees like we did last
time we met, so this is what, by state law,
we're charged with.

And then from the Board of
Trustees, then, this is what we're charged
with. We're charged with educational policy
making; so it starts at the department and it
moves up.

And then you'll see here at this
end of things, the management policy making.
And so here are our administrators. And this
is the part where we have dialogue back and
forth. We communicate back and forth and
share governance in this way.

And so then again, here again is
what we typically do then. We look at our
degree list, so again, honorary degrees, and
then we can be communicating with the Board
of Trustees on these matters.

Now, I'd like you to pay particular
attention to this first point, determine the
broad academic policies of the University.
How often do we do that? Many times our
activities are within these realms. And so
what Kenneth Stuka, who is currently the
chair of this specific faculty Senate says is
that every faculty Senate should develop a
set of guiding principals or statement of
values, and that would highlight the core of
what faculty value, as Bernie has said.
Where an institution places its money
indicates what they value most.

What is shared governance then?
Shared governance assumes that administrators
and faculty members are peers, but Dr. Bruno
Biordani, University of Michigan, has said:
The traditional model of shared governance is
at the heart of a great university, it
reflects commitment of the faculty.

And one of the problems that we've
seen through the years then is many of our
universities have assumed more of a
corporate structure for information and
decisions are made in top down manner.

And what Biordani has recommended
is that when that happens the faculty start
to become -- feel like hired hands. They
become disengaged and we lose this thing,
quality of our institution.

All right. So this brings us more
to our discussion point for the day. How are
we going to enhance effectiveness of the
University of Kentucky Senate? How can we
assure that our meetings are well organized,

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt
allow for appropriate participation and
decision making.

And what I'd really like to focus
your attention to is our agenda. How can the
agenda of the Senate Meetings to be approved?
And so to get us going on this discussion
what I'd like to draw your attention to is
what's happening at other universities.

And so it has been said that
Rutgers has a highly effective form of shared
governance, and here it's... Two weeks ago
-- two weeks ago they pulled this up. Oh,
this is a perfect example, put it into my
slide show. So -- well, they had a little
snow.

Now, one thing different about
Rutgers is they're coming from different
campuses, and so they're getting on the bus,
they're arriving, they have budget problems
and lunch is not provided. But that's not
really what I want you to pay attention to.

All right. Here's the agenda, so
I'll give you a few minutes to look over it
and I thought we could start the discussion
here. I also put in here that the agenda
from Penn State, just as an example. And so
to call the order determination of a quorum,
report of the secretary, administrative
report by the president. And then here's
from the different campus.

Now, here are the committee
reports. How often have we had committee
reports? Old business, new business,
executive committee report, reports of
representatives to boards of governors and
trustees and then finally adjournment.

So I'd like to just open up the
floor, get your input.

HAYES:

Jane Hayes, College of Engineering.
So one thing I wanted to mention before I'm
done with my time, is that I think that Dave
and Kaveh and Sheila and the folks who worked
on this are just unbelievable, and I want to
thank you guys for everything you put into
this.

One of the things that I've noticed
in my time is that the faculty are very
responsive when you send out the minutes from
the meetings, and some things really catch
their attention and they're very responsive,
but that in general volunteering to serve on
the committees is not that way.

And I came here from industry, and
one of the things that I noticed that's very
different is people actually viewed it as an
honor to be put a corporate committee and the
organization really valued that; therefore,
the employees valued it.

And I was wondering if there wasn't
some way that we could maybe get the
department chairs, the deans or whoever to
really value this as a really important
service activity that somehow is better than

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt
other service activities, and I think you might see a change in people's attitude toward that.

SWANSON: That's an excellent idea.

WERMELING: Wermeling, in Pharmacy.
One of the things that I noticed on the committees when I served on one was that we actually didn't have a charge, and so the purpose of the committee was missing and there weren't guidelines and rules on what we were to review, under what conditions or context and what it is that you wanted to know from us in reporting back?

And that just seems so unusual to me.

SWANSON: Would you mind naming the committee?

WERMELING: I'll pass.

SWANSON: That's all right. That's one thing we --

WERMELING: They'll figure it out.

STEINER: In addressing that issue, I think the Senate Council is due to have a retreat during the summer. This is a major issue. Committees -- when I get a charge, they covered every aspect of university life; buildings, do we think the buildings are correct? Input from every important aspect from -- any -- any aspect you want. The committees are largely moribund because they don't have a charge, and there's some very important -- if you look at the titles, like I volunteered for a committee that dealt with benefits. That was four years ago. It hasn't met yet. It's a committee, but it hasn't met yet, not once and there are so many important things going on with regard to benefits.

When we talk about a top down, that's the problem we have in my -- in my opinion. It's assumed; it's nobody's fault but we have evolved into inactivity basically because of the fact that we charge our committees to come up with ideas.

SWANSON: And --

STEINER: And the brains are out there, not in the administration -- they're very in administration. They're ten to one, and we're a hundred to one. That's what we do for a living, we think.

SWANSON: Different skill set. Dan go ahead.

WERMELING: well, it sort of runs off of that a little bit, and that is there is a perception about top down relative to the administration for a lot of things that are more corporate oriented. But the faculty aren't really here to think that way, so there's a cultural sort of difference in thinking about that.

Do you want to have faculty actually spend time thinking that way, and so do you have administrators who represent the faculty or do faculty would have to start

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt
thinking like administrators to develop some of the structure and tools and reporting and information systems and communication that's necessary.

So our structures are operating in two different ways. And is there an adaptation that we need to make that's more forward thinking and -- and just developing policies for itself, for example, versus reacting to the policies that we have. Have them handed to us in a way that is timely or that we can react to it.

Do we even have a sense of what's coming in terms of policy and then flow down into these other areas. Are we developing policies for ourselves versus reacting to them.

SWANSON: That's right. How can we intervene in the process?

NADEL: Alan Nadel, A&S. I want to say a lot more when we get to the issue accountability. The only thing I want to point out about the agenda there is you'll note that everything on it pertains to the Senate's business; that is, the Committees of the Senate, the people who are answerable to the Senate. There are no Lotsa Helping Hands or non-smoking reports or reports from the bookstore or the counseling. It's not like a classroom introduction to UK. But the -- but all the kinds of reports are put in a order and a priority based on the importance to the business of that Senate.

So that -- I was told when I signed up for this -- I got an e-mail when I was elected, that this represents five percent of my DOE. If I calculate that across the board, if there are a 100 members here and we figure that the average five percent of the DOE is \$3500, we're talking about \$300,000 being spent by the University on our time. It ought to be devoted to the things on the agenda and that's all -- that's all I'm saying.

CONNERS: I guess I have a couple of comments. First of all, he made the comment --

BROTHERS: Name, please?

CONNERS: I'm sorry. Terry Conners, Forestry.

He made the comment that the administrators are the ones who should be rewarding us for our efforts here; whereas, that speaks for itself that this is a top down organization.

Secondly, I guess the point I have here is that I'm a first-year member, but I have yet to see any inclusion of a call for any action. For example, any opinions, any work on items, any discussion of the state of the University and how to respond to that through committees from this body.

Every meeting I've been to has

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt

been: here are a list of relatively mundane course authorizations and change in the subject and so forth. There's nothing to involve the Senate as a whole.

If you're not a member of the Budget Committee, you don't know what's happening, but we have no way of bringing that report to them and for every other committee. That's a problem in my view.

SNOW:

Diane Snow, College of Medicine.
Is this mission based on wanting to take our Senate and making it an even better Senate or is being effective meaning that there are outside indicators of some sort that we have not been effective. If that's the case, I'd like to hear about those or is it just an internal device for improving ourselves.

SWANSON:

I think there's a general sense that we are not (unintelligible).

ROHR:

Jurgen Rohr, College of Pharmacy.
I think the Senate is too big personally. I mean, for a committee, it's just too many people to do something effective. I mean, our work at the Senate Council level was highly effective because it's a small committee. So, one thing I would do, I would try to think how to make it smaller.

SWANSON:

Yeah. Go ahead.

SNOW:

The question was not what people's opinions in here are. I'm sure there are lots of those. But is there some kind of outside body who has said to us as a Senate, we're coming to you because you have not been effective?

SWANSON:

No.

SNOW:

Is that the case?

SWANSON:

No.

SNOW:

Or is this just a continuing effort like everything else, to make us a better well oiled machine?

SWANSON:

It's really coming from us, and it's coming from what's happening at universities. And so one of the examples, let's -- would be, say, Michigan State where programs are being cut. Who makes those decisions? And so the thinking is that if we are involved now and if it gets to that, then we can be responsive and effective.

SNOW:

So this is sort of being initiated by the Senate Council --

SWANSON:

Right.

SNOW:

-- because we want to be prepared for the future because we're seeing indicators around us --

SWANSON:

Yeah.

SNOW:

-- if we're not ready it's going to be disastrous?

SWANSON:

That's right. Davey, do you have (unintelligible)?

JONES:

I have just some thoughts; some string of consciousness here, and nothing of

importance -- not you, me. I'm (unintelligible). Just one thought that comes to my mind has somebody who's been in the mix of all this for a number of years and has been here during the Wethington years, we have tightened up quite a bit on a lot of hemorrhaging that was going on in the loss of our control influence on -- on courses, curricular programs, educational units were being, you know, sent by without proper vetting through faculty.

We've tightened up on that quite a bit in the last few years. There's not a lot of hemorrhaging going on in things escaping what are areas of our final decision making in educational policies.

Where I sense a lot of hemorrhaging is going on is, on that chart that we showed earlier, when the administration is making its managerial policy, where's the solicitation for input coming in and -- where they made their managerial decisions: salary, retirement, health insurance. These are things that we don't make final policy on; they do.

But -- but I -- it looks like there's a symmetry there, but there's not really as much symmetry as we think. Because we can see the deans and the chairs and the president are wearing two hats. They're involved in presiding over the department faculty or the college faculty or the -- or the Senate.

So they have their chance to input to us to make educational policy but there's not a symmetry on the other side. The department faculty is not wearing a hat where it's helping the chair make a managerial decision or co-making that decision. So there -- there's an asymmetry there. And I don't think the solicitation for our input is coming in the way it needs to be.

SWANSON:
CHAPPELL:

Joe.

Joseph Chappell, College of Ag.

I basically agree with much of what has been said. I disagree a little bit with Jurgen Rohr in the sense that the senate is -- this body here is to be representative of the entire community, and what -- what I think is really missing is -- and this is going to sound a little too light maybe, but when you're elected to the Senate -- and someone already mentioned it -- there isn't a guidebook as to what should be the expectations, what should you do.

I think a lot of us Senators struggle with how do we communicate back to our units that we come from; so we're elected from College of Agriculture or wherever, but we don't have in place a means of just effectively communicating with our own units and soliciting input; so we fail, I think, really at the basic level of trying to engage

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt

the faculty community.

SWANSON:

Right.

CHAIR:

If I could just note with respect to Davey's issue, there's so much that individual Senators don't see, and perhaps that's my fault. At least it seems to me the Provost doesn't sneeze without checking with either the Senate Council or me.

Davey and Hollie and I, for example, were at a meeting this morning where we discussed, within a week or two after I think it began to be an issue, whether or not we're going to do something with respect to graduation.

And so these issues are vetted back and forth between the administration and the -- and -- and us in ways, perhaps, that you're not aware of as -- and -- and would have been culpable of me for not having informed you of those, but...

NADEL:

Well, if that's the case, then what's the --

BROTHERS:

Name please?

NADEL:

-- point of the rest of us. Alan Nadel, Arts & Sciences. I understand our job is not just to be informed of what other people do on our behalf.

Our job is to have input into that process, whether it's through a committee structure or initiations from the floor or any of the normal things that a Senate does.

So if that's the case -- and I believe you completely that you are involved in these things, but it sort of makes it pointless for other people to show up.

CHAIR:

And they will. In other words, this is preparatory to bringing issues to the Senate. But, lots of things happen.

SWANSON:

Susanne.

ARNOLD:

Susanne Arnold, College of Medicine. I agree, my impression has always been that most of the gets done at the Senate Council level, and then we're alerted to it and we rubber stamp it and that never has felt right to me.

I don't think it's appropriate, but also I understand that I'm not on any committees. I'm doing the hard work that you're doing. I'm not walking across the campus to meet the Provost. I've been invited but (unintelligible).

Regardless, that -- that is a problem because the committee memberships is all volunteer, and that means you people that don't volunteer, and I'm -- I'm one of those people. I probably should volunteer more. We need to have more of a sense from you before you've made decisions, what the decisions are (inaudible).

SWANSON:

Perhaps what the issues are?

ARNOLD:

Yeah, and what the decisions we're making are. Not just what the issue is, but when the decision needs to be made and what

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt

the decision is.

SWANSON: Peter, you have a comment?
PERRY: Peter Perry, Mathematics.

I would like to echo several of the comments that have been made here. Again, as a freshman member of the Faculty Senate, I also collect the impression we come here, we vote on stuff on which the decisions has already -- have already been made and then we go home. And that -- that is not the kind of format that encourages engagement or enthusiasm.

Also, something of that also not seen here, although it may be my -- my -- my lack of awareness or maybe I missed the meeting where it happened.

When was the last time we had serious decision about budgetary priorities at the University where we were seriously consulted?

All of these good things, academic programs, priorities, future development, eventually comes down to money. And my question is: Should we discuss and is the administration interested in our participation in that process?

SWANSON: I forget who the author is, but somebody suggested that -- and I was thinking about -- and I haven't run it by the Council yet, so this is a free-form thought.

I was thinking that perhaps in September we have the president come in and give his address and we could have the budget come in right after that.

PERRY: If I may, let me just point out one more particularly egregious instance of ways in which the message was communicated our opinion doesn't matter.

Last fall the Faculty Senate was invited to evaluate the president in August when almost none of us were here, and the basis we were given for that evaluation was a self-evaluation written by the president with no external or independent data.

That was almost by definition a meaningless exercise.

HAYES: Jane Hayes, College of Engineering. So in a sense I agree with the things people are saying. On the other hand, I know from messages we've had from Sheila that when she asks us for input, she doesn't hear back from anyone.

So you can't really have it both ways. If we want to be involved and -- you know, poor Dave will never be able to get anything done if he's waiting on people to respond if it goes like it normally does with these requests that Sheila makes to us.

NADEL: I would like to add to that questionnaire we had evaluating the president based on some criteria, that we were also not given any guarantee of anonymity and we were given two days to respond and we were given

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt

no guarantee that -- maybe there was one, but it certainly wasn't in the message.

But more significantly, there are structural ways to raise the discussion here. If you're on the University Senate we can say there are going to be committees doing these things, like setting the criteria by which the president shall be evaluated.

By evaluating his report against objective things, these are the committees, you can sign up for them or you can sign up for some other committee. It's part of your job on this thing, and that's just one of the many structural watch-dog ways in which the structure of the organization can account for things; whatever decisions we make. The top -- where's the Top 20 committee.

The president explained to us, in what has to be one of the greatest pieces of chutzpah I've ever seen, that the trustees accept that we're moving to a Top 20 by our criteria even if they don't match the national criteria.

That's like saying Indianapolis won the Super Bowl, they didn't get more points, but that's not the criteria we're using. We have these other criteria, see, and it was really a tie.

If -- if Top 20 status is not recognized externally, it's a meaningless category and, therefore, we have a role in saying what comprised the Top 20.

SWANSON: Kaveh, I hate to put you on the stop like this but didn't we have that discussion a year or two ago about the evaluation and the criteria?

TAGAVI: Yes, we did. I want to make one correction. And maybe I misheard, but the criteria for president evaluation is not decided by the president. It's decided by the Board of Trustees, and they -- they evaluate the president.

SWANSON: But I remember there's that one spot on there where it was something that to keep us out of NCAA violations, and we put an "X" through it because for us it wasn't academically relevant.

ARNOLD: Susanne Arnold, Medicine. Do we have a report of how often the committees meet? And like, you know, let's hold each other accountable a little bit. I know some committees are really active, and some meet once and never meet again, and some have never met. We should probably post that on our website.

SWANSON: I think now you have a regular report, so you'd know -- as a chair you would know when you come before the Senate.

ARNOLD: Well, if the committee is not meeting, why do we have committees?

CONNERS: Terry Conners, Forestry. In response to the talk about lack of reaction to Sheila's solicitations. I'd like you all

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt
to think about Ph.D defense, where everyone on the committee has this little niggling doubt about page 37, but no one mentions it to the student until we all get together face-to-face. I think the same dynamics should work here. We're all so reluctant to put an idea first into the minutes or -- for Sheila; whereas, as a body we all just sit and nod our heads and say, yes, I think that's right. That's pretty much what we're doing here today.

WERMELING: David mentioned earlier about the Provost cooperating and communicating with you readily, but he's just one member of the administration.

So many of the other vice-presidents also take initiative to write policies that overlap into our own domain as we discovered with the code of conduct issues. And I can see that Len Heller's issues or Frank Butler's issues would all overlap back into us.

And so while our main point of contact is with the Provost, virtually every member of President Todd's administration actually impacts us.

JONES: The -- at this time we have a number of administrators at the Dean's level and the central administrative level. They see every meeting what we're talking about. There is a Provost liaison to the Senate Council. Our meetings are open.

It's my understanding there's a meeting that the Provost holds regularly with the deans. Back in the 1990s the Senate Council Chair was invited to observe at least that meeting to see what's -- what's happening with mid-level management and the discussions.

Are we privy to that discussion nowadays?

CHAIR:
NADEL:

No.
Alan Nadel, Arts & Sciences.
It may be that the criteria for evaluating the president was set by the trustees, but shouldn't we be communicating with the trustees about what criteria with think are important to us, and shouldn't we have an ongoing committee that has an opportunity to assess the validity of the report that the president likes about himself?

Even if I'd read the whole thing -- I had a publication deadline that was pressing against me in the one day I had to read it. Even if I read it cover-to-cover I had no way of measuring the accuracy of any statement in it, and that means if -- and, therefore, if I responded, which I would not, I would have been rubber stamping this and undermining the very role of watchdog that this body is charged with.

Why should we respond if we don't

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt
know the validity of what we're reading.
Shouldn't there be a committee that monthly
evaluates those criteria and gives an
independent report to this body before it
votes on the president's report?

THELIN: John Thelin, Policy Studies.

In response to that, I know of no
chartered college or university in the United
States that does not vest ultimate power in
the Board of Trustees or board business and
their primary role/responsibility is to
evaluate and appoint presidents, for better
or worse.

So the role of the sen -- or the
faculty senate is minuscule, and I know of no
way of by body of statutes to really alter
that.

Now, there are a handful, probably
less than five, universities in the United
States where there is strong enough faculty
culture to exert much influence on that, but
I don't think -- I don't think that culture
exist here and certainly the statutes don't
provide much faculty input.

NADEL: Alan Nadel, Arts & Science. So
please let's not insult the faculty by asking
them to rubberstamp in two days something
which it -- it -- it has been pointed out to
us is totally perfunctory and irrelevant.

But I would disagree, because
nothing can stop our speech. We can still
express our opinions; we can still give the
reports. We can't force the trustees to read
them or listen to them, but we can still
express them and if we started doing that
maybe there would be a reporter from the
Kernel or the Herald-Leader here when we
debated certain issues or issued certain
reports. And maybe the trustees, if we acted
like a responsible body evaluating the things
we were rubber stamping, would take notice of
what we said; and maybe they wouldn't.

But if you're saying that there's
no point because they're in charge, and we're
wasting our time, then I don't have to show
up. You're talking me out of coming here.

SWANSON: Debra.

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.

I wanted to just to respond a
little bit about the evaluation of the
president, if I can. Hollie, tell me if I've
forgotten something.

But in the last couple of years I
know that the Senate Council has had a
meeting specifically for the evaluation of
the president and going through step-by-step
-- now, grant it, we too receive the material
very late and have a very short turnaround
time to submit that information, but we are
very deliberative about it, and we go through
the items that are listed and as Hollie said,
if we thought they weren't appropriate for
evaluation from us, like the athletic piece,

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt
we would mark it off.

It is discouraging because the senate has one vote or one -- I forget exactly how it says, but one vote regarding that evaluation; whereas, each Board member has -- their -- their response is -- one board member is the same as the entire Senate. Is that right?

SWANSON:
TAGAVI:

Kaveh?

A few years ago when we solicited comments from the faculty regarding the president's evaluation -- in fact, we received a lot of comments; some of them very harsh and critical, and we put it altogether and it was many, many, many pages.

By no means I want to be defensive and defend the process. The process has some shortcomings, in my opinion. One of them is that our numerical evaluation of the president is one out of -- is it 30 or 25. So our number adds to 35 other numbers -- or 20, at least, and then it's averaged.

That was one of the things that bothered our council at the time, but I want to go back to the comments that we sent to the Board Chair. Now, I didn't meet with the Board Chair. Maybe that would have been nice. But I can tell you for sure when -- when the Board then met to discuss the results or to give a report, their -- their phraseology used by the Board Chair was on our report, and I knew he read every -- must have read every single word that we sent to him.

So it doesn't go into a black hole, at least it doesn't always go into a black hole.

MITCHELL:

Richard Mitchell, Dentistry.

I heard earlier, and I just want to put in another vote for it, is that I think we should expand our role in trying to be advisory on budget. I think that's where we really can be effective, and we need -- we need to be proactive on that. I agree with other people who have spoken to that.

SMITH:

Scott Smith, College of Agriculture and an administrator.

I've been a faculty member, a dean and a provost here; and from all those perspectives it's my belief that the line between faculty and administrators is stronger and more deliberately drawn at this institution than any other institutions of similar mission and caliber.

I don't think I feel that line is crossed, and you can blame it on whoever want, but I don't think until that line is crossed, either the faculty or the administration are optimally able to share governance on the institution.

There is -- there's a culture of distrust that applies to perhaps both sides. And I -- I disagree slightly with Dr.

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt

The lin's statement about faculty culture, and I would add a somewhat related comment that I think that there are places at this institution where there is an incredibly strong faculty culture. But it's not realized through the faculty senate. It's realized primarily through the governance of the departments, and in some cases the college.

BLONDER:

Lee Blonder, College of Medicine.
I'd like to follow-up on Davey's comment earlier regarding the possibility of the Senate Council Chair attending the deans meeting with the Provost. I think that that would be very useful if we could reinstate that and perhaps have the Senate Council Chair report back to this committee as to what was discussed; that would open the lines of communication. Is that possible to reinstate that practice?

SWANSON:

We can certainly try.

CHAPPELL:

I think we're -- we're all saying lots of -- we're kind of all over the map as far as I'm concerned as to concerns and issues, and -- and I don't think that the Senate is necessarily broken in a sense. I think there -- there's lots of functions that aren't fully abided to.

For example, committees all have little charges to them. They're clearly stated in their -- in the committee statements. We just don't happen to exercise them in -- in a way that might be empowering to the -- to the Senate in many cases. So I -- I feel a little bit wary that we're going to end this -- this discussion today with a sense of there's so much going wrong here. I -- I think we have a great opportunity -- wow, and here's an org chart that's second, right below the --

SWANSON:

I knew you wanted to see.

CHAPPELL:

Yeah. But I believe we can start with some very modest changes maybe in the structuring of the agenda so that we allow for committee reports, that takes care of accountability and having us get in -- more engaged, that's -- those are simple things that we can do and I would hope that -- I would hope that we would get a charge from this discussion to further the conversation. But also a charge to the Senate Council to try and make a little short list of the two or three changes that we could make to really help better empower the participation of the faculty as a whole.

SWANSON:

Greg.

WASILKOWSKI:

Greg Wasilkowski, Engineering.
College of Engineering.

There are a number of very, very important activities in this University that we faculty are an expert to make decision, and I wonder if Senate or anybody or faculty have been consulted before the decision was

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt
made to lower the admission standards.

Another question, we are sinking down with retention. We were listed in the U.S. News at the very last position. We dropped by a number of places as far as evaluation of our undergraduate programs is concerned.

I wonder if any of us has been consulted with what to do to improve the -- the retention. We are the expert, not administrators who don't know about teaching.

There's very important things and I'm afraid, I'm sorry to say, but I see the -- the arrogance of the administration towards the faculty still persists. I was very unhappy with the previous president, but I was hoping that there would be a change and I don't see much change.

SWANSON:
ROHR:

Go ahead.

Another thought that -- that's says no, I mean all the arrows come together at the Senate Council. That is where the action takes place and the Senate is really, what someone said before, rubber stamping the action of the -- so I was suggesting it would be better to reduce the Senate to smaller number and use it, and no Senate Council, use -- use the senate (Unintelligible) Senate Council and put them both together in one and I think we will have much more interaction that would more effective. And I mean, the U.S. Senate there's only two representatives per state no matter how many people are -- are in each state, so why don't we just have one or two representatives per institution no matter how big they are and put them all in the Senate Council.

STEINER:

Shelly Steiner, Biology.

I think what's very important is the cascade of things to do; and the questions you're raising, I have the same questions. So regarding undergraduate education, we got it, and basically this building was put up but we're not in the flow. And it's not so much a challenge, as I see it, but there's a lot of wisdom is what I was trying to say before.

(Unintelligible) we have people who are smart. That's the name of the game; maybe not mature, maybe this or that; that's fine, and we're not -- you know, we're not drawn on for this -- for this function.

What I see as one possible approach, and -- and the Senate -- the Senate Council can pick it up, is to -- although there are general charges to committees, that's -- they're just too general. Things are going on on campus in which the charge has to be a lot more specific for what's -- what the action is for that year, and that's what must be done.

And if people see -- you know, if you look at the committee structure,

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt
everything's covered, everything; the academics are covered, the view of admin -- committees that deal with administration.

Basically, everything's covered and it's -- I think the most functional way to do is, at least to start with. We're due to have the -- we're having retreat, have the Senate Council charge each committee with things to look into; could be certainly benefits; things come out of nowhere, and we have no focus-study on -- we got a ten-year health plan with -- the Senate comes up with the idea -- great idea that we're going to, you know, not allow retirees more than ten years of -- so on and so forth. We know that.

When the Senate came into the action, it was very effective in showing weakness in the system. But, at any rate, I think we need to charge specific committees, specifically -- if people think they'll be heard, you'll get action. We'll get -- you'll get some action. You know, they're charged with a specific thing. Dropped -- our undergraduate rating has dropped. We have committees that can deal with that. How do we approach this? Is what we're doing right? And so on and so forth. (Unintelligible) contemporaneously but I think that we've got to charge them specifically focused.

NADEL: Alan Nadel, A & S. I just wonder or (unintelligible) that the general Robert's Rules allow for the creation and use of ad hoc committees. They don't only have to be standing committees. You need a constitutional amendment for a new charge. If something comes up -- I -- I don't know the constitution of this body, but if we use Robert's Rules of Order, I'm sure the executive council or the chair or this body itself on a motion can create ad hoc committees to address specific issues, and that's a -- a normal activity in most senates and it's something I think we can use.

SWANSON: That's actually one of the suggestions I read in one of the reports; especially when your legislature is coming down the pike with budget cuts, that's when we would need an ad hoc committee to work quickly.

MEYER: Lee Meyer, College of Agriculture. I've observed this body as a former member of the Senate Council about ten years ago, and now as a returning member. And there's a culture of engagement at council level, and not nearly as much at the other levels. So whatever strategies we're -- we tend to be reactive, and because we're not connected.

And so, you know, as we take responsibility for doing things, it's our responsibility. When we're bringing

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt
something forward, we have ownership and
that's where engagement comes from.

So integrating the subcommittee --
the committees that we have, active
participation is -- I think is the path for
engagement and then more fuller balance
across the -- not just the council but the
whole Senate.

PRATS: Yeah. Armando Prats, English
Department.

At the expense of appearing as if I
want another committee to be created, I would
suggest that one of the things that has been
going on here for the past almost hour, is
that we -- we are assuming that there is a
University as a single body. Where at the
same time, each of us is talking about the
lack of community or alliance between
administrators and faculty.

Could it be the mission of the
faculty senate, I wonder, to continually
define what the University is; to suggest,
for example, that perhaps indeed the athletic
program ought to be more connected to the
University as a whole rather than to be a
separate entity, that -- that is the -- the
Senate should find that this is a problem, it
should register its opinion on these things;
that it should define the University as
probably only the faculty can define the
University.

Instead of constantly calling
attention to how divided the University is
from the Administration, the Athletic
Department, the students, the reigning
bodies, and so on, what is the University of
Kentucky and why should we all assume here
that we're all talking about the same thing
when perhaps we're not; when perhaps there's
something very basic that needs to be
addressed; that when we speak about
University of Kentucky we're speaking with,
so far as possible, one voice.

CHAPPELL: I'd like to go back to a couple of
points that have been raised. First of all,
I think the point about student retention,
there's -- and that's an excellent example of
how we have an ad hoc committee that's been
-- well, not an ad hoc, a standing committee
that's been working very hard in that area
for well over a year and a half. There is
finally some -- something moving out of that
committee forward through council and
hopefully coming forward.

But -- but, again, that just speaks
to the lack of communication back to the rest
of the community. So it really does -- it
really does to me suggest that we have to
have our committees, whether they be standing
or ad hoc, reporting and being held
accountable.

So we do submit -- these committees
-- all these committees are charged to write

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt

a report, submit it to Sheila, who puts in a repository -- an internet repository of some sort. But that's -- it doesn't quite disseminate that way, and so I think that's a -- that's a -- really an important difference in having us give -- present a report to you for a committee you -- you stand on.

The -- the other point I'm going to raise now, a totally different point that's really troublesome to me. And -- and this -- this particular example is past us now, but it really does bother me. I hope everybody appreciates that we just had a law passed that legislated transfer equivalence be accredited at the University.

We lost a huge, important criterion that we use for assessing student performance and qualifying it.

The legislature -- and I'm told, don't worry about it. It's benign, it won't -- you know, it's done for political reasons. I understand all that. But that's a -- if that doesn't really rest with us establishing the criteria, and the quality that we use in evaluating students and giving them credit, well, nothing else stands for -- for students to just play basketball for a degree.

You know, I -- I -- and we never had a real discussion about that, I don't believe, either in council or at the -- at the -- at the senate level. That was let -- that was decided beyond us. It got way out beyond our boundaries and we didn't have -- we didn't have a role to play in that.

Now, I understand all the politics involved, but that -- that should -- if nothing else, that should send a wake-up message to us all that, you know, when you have your legislature telling you what is a class that can be utilized to satisfy the transfer -- the uni -- the university studies requirement, I mean, that's just -- that -- that's just totally against my grain of thinking of how we should operate.

ZENTALL:

Tom Zentall, Arts & Sciences.

I think the basic problem is most of the faculty get their information from the city newspaper or U.S. News & World Report. That is, you're not presented with enough information to know what the problems -- we know that we have a budget problem, but we have no idea -- we're not asked to provide input to administration.

I think this idea of a representative to the Provost, who is in on discussions that the deans have, is -- would be a very valuable contribution, then that member can come and talk to us about the various possibilities; we have to -- we have a certain budget problem, what are the various ways of dealing with that, provide input not after the fact, which often happens.

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt

We get these resolutions that are essentially vote up or down, and we don't know what the alternatives are. And so a lot of it comes from the lack of information. What is a committee suppose to do if it doesn't know what sort of problems are facing the University except in an extremely general way.

So I think we need more information.

THELIN:

I'd like to speak to the problem of the legislation because I just rejoined the Senate Council in January. Feel like Rip Van winkle coming back.

About three years ago on the Senate Council Jim Applegate, who was a long-time UK Professor, who was Chair of the Senate, came to us in his role as Vice-President for Academic Affairs for the Council on Postsecondary Education. And I would say we were a rather civil group, but it was a rather contentious discussion and the message that the Senate Council conveyed, and I'm sure that he went away with, was that the UK faculty did not at all approve or endorse the idea that an outside body would make determinations about transfer of credits, whatever.

So I don't think that we're silent on these issues. It is possible that we're outflanked; that -- I don't know what the view of, let's say, the Provost or the president was on it, but I think our powers are limited and I think we're often -- we have to be reactive, but I don't think we're necessarily asleep at the wheel all the time, except when we're on cell phones.

JONES:

Just pretty much a historic anecdote. Up until the late 1970s, you know, I'd have to go back and check the Senate minutes, it was routine that much of the April or May meetings of the year were end-of-the-year reports where the committee chair stands up for five minutes and reviews what that committee has done.

If we could get a clearer charge and orientation to the committees at the beginning of the year, and a report by the end of the year. On all of our committees we -- we -- we ought to be aware of what they're doing. I mean, the -- the course work -- the -- the new degree programs and what-not, those all come through here from Senate committees. A Senate committee has seen and worked on those, but we -- these other areas, you know, policy making, new policy, priorities, I think that's -- that's our soft spot right now, charging those committees and then getting a report from them as to what they've done with the charge.

ANDERSON:

Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.
I'm just curious if I could ask Davey a question about the committees in the past.

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt

were those committees aligned with an administrative person or committee or... You know what I'm saying? Because it seems to me that if a Senate committee is aligned with a committee that is maybe administratively run, that it -- it increases that communication and makes the transparency -- well, it makes it more transparent.

SWANSON: I think the question I have is whether or not it's effective to have separate committees looking at the same issues or integration of the committees.

JONES: well, a number of our committees do have administrators on them. I mean, we specifically solicit that. We have administrators who are in this body right now and then they're on Senate committees.

You know, the Rules Committee, for example, has the registrar, the Admissions Committee also has an administrator on it. So there are various committees that are tapping the expertise of the administration, but, again, we're not privy to the Dean's meeting.

SWANSON: Right, but we're still not hearing back from those committees, so that is --

JONES: Yeah, and we're not hearing back and we're not -- we're not charging them the way we should be able to charge them, but I -- I don't think that we're starving ourselves of the expertise and the communications. We have the (unintelligible).

SWANSON: Additional comments?

CHAPPELL: I'll make one more observation, example observation that -- that is troubling to me, and I'll use today's agenda.

We approved a scholar's Master's program in merchandising, something, and there -- as far as I know I'm the only dissenting vote in the Senate for that.

And the reason why is because this is exactly what our charge is. We are the quality control gate for our degree programs. And where was the scholarship that was illustrated to you in that -- in that process that said this should be a very special degree; a scholar's Master's degree program.

I -- I'm still -- I'm in trouble already because my dean's here and it's my college. So, I'm speaking very openly and candidly about this but the issue is still the same. We did not -- we -- we are not fulfilling what I think is our -- our role as the gatekeepers and quality control keepers for our institution because I don't think anybody in here could really articulate for me how this special Master's opportunity is -- is excelling those students beyond other than just being able to complete a Master's in five degrees rather than -- than six degrees. It -- it -- they're able to take whatever their 12-credit hours early, but it

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt
hasn't addressed the -- the scholarship of
it.

And so I don't -- I -- and I think
we should have a committee that deals with
this, that should have reported to us. We
have councils, the graduate council, they
probably reviewed it, undergraduate council.
But -- but in -- in reality, I don't think we
had a serious discussion about this -- this
matter, and we just voted it in.

VIELE: I'd like to say on that point --
BROTHERS: Name, please?
VIELE:

Kert Viele, Arts & Sciences.
Having been one person who has put
through proposals, I had to go through
University Council, I had to go through
University -- or Undergraduate Council,
Graduate Council. I had to fill out 70 pages
of paperwork for various other things, so the
last thing that I want is the Senate having
to go through this process again.

I've got to say, my worst
experience at this University was dealing
with Senate Council on an issue like this
where I'm from statistics and having an
individual from another department explain to
me, basically, I didn't know how to do
statistics, and they did.

You know, that -- considering how
many different committees -- now, I fully
agree it would be nice for a quick report on
how things were vetted, whether there were
issues and I don't know how you relate it to
the particular -- I view the Senate's purpose
here as does a change in one program affect
other programs negatively, as opposed to a
complete audit of whether each individual
unit is capable of instruction within its own
department. So that's not where I
(unintelligible).

WERMELING: I served on the committee that
reviewed this. Okay, and so this is exactly
one that I thought about, and so I raised
this question with my chair because it was
finally my turn, it was my number to actually
be the lead reviewer of the proposal; okay?

But I asked the chair, I said,
well, what do you want to know? How are we
to look at this? What are the criteria, what
are the questions? And there wasn't
anything. I said, well, can you ask the
Senate Council about giving us instructions
about what it is that they would like to know
and then I'll -- can give you a report, but I
don't know what to report on.

So they do go through this system,
and unless there's something really egregious
in the documents that come through like
nobody's done it before or something and they
left something out, you'll -- there's not
much to do with that.

So, yes, you're exactly right.
These things just go right through us.

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt
SMITH: Scott Smith, Dean of Agriculture.
First of all, Professor Chappell
assumes that a University Scholarship --
Scholars Program has anything to do with
scholarship at all. I do not believe it
falls in the criteria. It is simply the
association of a Master's degree and a
Bachelor's.
If it makes you feel any better, I
was not aware of the proposal myself until I
read it in the agenda, and the fact is that
it was reviewed by a Faculty Committee in the
College Agriculture, it was pronounced fit.
It went forward to, I believe, Dean Blackwell
who has another Faculty Committee who
reviewed that proposal and apparently
pronounced it fit and now it reappears to my
vision as being highly reviewed and must be a
great proposal.

CHAPPELL: It got reviewed from College
Council. It's signed off by College Council,
Undergraduate Council, Graduate Council and
Dean Blackwell actually was part of the
presentation of it, I think, at -- to the
Senate Council.
So, yes, it received a lot of
endorsement, but -- but I -- it -- it --we
trivialized it in a sense, and I say that
reluctantly because we -- we didn't scrut --
it was just, let's have an undergraduate take
12 hours of a certain level of course work,
and then that's it, it's automatically
applied. It's double-dipping for the
undergraduate.

SMITH: Just if I may, I mostly just want
you to appreciate that all of us see it is
part of the animal and, in fact, deans are
not omniscient. They sometimes let these
things go, and I imagine that no matter what
we do in terms of the function of the Senate
there will always be pieces that you don't
see. That's representative governance.

SWANSON: I read a comment in the Times
yesterday that they know -- they know that we
are the horse state, but next time could we
send a senator from the other end of the
horse.

CHAPPELL: The programs -- the undergraduate
programs, academic programs are not
necessarily -- they're the responsibility of
the faculty, in my opinion, and whether a
dean knows exactly all the particulars or not
is less bothersome or worrisome to me as to
whether the faculty are really voting upon
the program and the value of the program to
the undergraduate populace. That's what's
important for me.

ZENTALL: Tom Zentall, Arts & Sciences.
I think the process -- we're
missing a point here. These programs have
been evaluated by multiple faculty
committees. When it comes before us, it
comes with a recommendation from the Faculty

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt

Senate -- from the Faculty Council -- Senate Council. And there's an opportunity for those who have thought about this to object and to state their opinion that -- to bring that up. If there aren't any objections, it's a matter of us seeking to what these other committees have already spoken for.

It's very much like approving of graduates that we do every year, that I always think it is inappropriate in the sense that we don't usually know but, in fact, we -- we find that there are names that should be on there that aren't, and we find that there are some people maybe who shouldn't be on there.

And so it is pro forma, but I think it's an important role that we play. And so most of the time we're just going to rubber stamp things because they've been vetted by all sorts of committees, Faculty Committees, and often these things have taken two years to get through all these committees.

So it's not as if we're trivializing it. There's an opportunity to speak up and if there is a reasonable argument against it, that should be said when we have open discussion about these issues.

SWANSON:

WASILKOWSKI: Greg.
Greg Wasilkowski, College of Engineering.

I just wanted to say that we have access to this information, and we are asked to check it. And, by the way, a few months ago I checked some other proposal and we asked the Council to stop because there was some troubles with it, and it has been stopped. So we have means to do it.

As far as this particular item is concerned, I think it just -- program -- both programs, undergraduate and graduate, they have been in existence for a number of years. (Unintelligible) new program but -- (unintelligible) about just letting undergraduate students, those talented undergraduate students, take graduate courses, which are more difficult than undergraduate courses, so I really don't see much problem with that.

SWANSON:

JONES:

Davey.
I just -- a little more context to the process that is being -- on how something gets to us in the format that it is. And I want to thank Sheila here. She's -- she does a lot of work behind the scenes that people don't see. The -- and it -- it's toward getting us a quality product here.

The forms that have to be filled out for a new degree program or what not, those are something that have been -- been honed over the anvil for -- for a number years in which the -- the reason there are fewer problems now is because iteratively, by experience over -- over the several years, we

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt

have learned, well, what kind of information needs to be there that hasn't been there or that we got to send it back because it shouldn't be there. But the form is sort of what -- sort of the guideline and instruction on at least what have your predecessors considered to be important information. We used -- we used to not have forms. Okay? Nobody had any guidance, and so, again, we're getting better quality of product because the form itself has -- has been an iteratively improved guidance to the committees to make sure that all the information is there that everybody needs to see up the chain to our final oversight here.

We hope that we don't have to keep sending things back; that we can just...

SWANSON:

Shelly.

STEINER:

Joe, I think that you don't -- you don't like the program. You haven't -- there's been no concrete argument as to what's weak about -- but you don't like the whole idea of having double-dipping. Is that what you're saying?

CHAPPELL:

Right. I -- I just don't like the

idea that --

STEINER:

That's been vetted by lots of -- and this particular thing looked pretty good.

I didn't look at every course, I didn't look at -- but it looked like it was strong for that kind of program, you should move -- well, you have to move because you don't want those kind of programs. There's nothing weak about this program --

CHAPPELL:

But -- but I -- I think you heard Dan Wermeling articulate it very well. He gave the report to the graduate council on this one or the undergrad --

WERMELING:

--The committee -- ATC Committee.

CHAPPELL:

Yeah, so he didn't -- he didn't -- he didn't know what criteria to use in evaluating it. That's my -- my issue. It goes through a lot of councils and a lot of groups, but, you know, even those groups they just -- they're -- they're basically checking off, oh, there's four classes for this and four classes for that, and -- and that's -- that's too perfunctory for me.

STEINER:

Do you want individual courses to be evaluated?

CHAPPELL:

No, no. I want the spirit of the program.

MITCHELL:

Richard Mitchell, Dentistry.

When you have a group this large you want your committees to work well. Our role should be to make sure the committees work well. If we think the criteria in those forms are inadequate, we should work on the forms.

I would expect when a program comes to this committee that normally we -- we know we can approve it. We would trust our committee work. I think one thing we want in

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt

feedback to the Council is that we want our committees to work better --

SWANSON:

(Unintelligible).

MITCHELL:

I think we should also think about how much time we want to spend doing what.

I don't want to spend a lot of time doing things that committees should do well. I want to spend my time maybe asking some questions about how the University is financed, and -- and hoping my committees will do the things that need to be done by individuals and do it well.

NADEL:

Yeah, I want -- I want to agree with that, and reiterate that the committee I serve on tries not to bring anything to -- to the floor that isn't in the condition where it can make a good firm recommendation, and that's all well and good.

The real question is: If the committee system is working well, or where is it that you can improve; that creates a lot of time for this body to do other kinds of work.

The real question is: What should we be doing in this body that's not hearing reports or engaging in governance? When the committees are working well? What kind of ad hoc committees should we be setting up for? What sort of role should we have? How should we hold people accountable when administrators speak before us and lie to us? How should we hold them accountable?

SWANSON:

Any comments? Anybody who has not spoken, would you like to speak now? No. David, would you like to give a closing?

CHAIR:

Let me just reiterate, ideas occur to you, send them to Sheila with "improve Senate" in the title line and we will do our level best to make something fertile out of the discussion today.

ESTUS:

So is it going to be perhaps at the next meeting, we'll hear a committee -- a report on committees and which committees are meeting and not meeting and which committees we should have (unintelligible) --

SWANSON:

Well, what --

BROTHERS:

I'm sorry, your name, please?

ESTUS:

Oh, Steve Estus.

SWANSON:

I think what (unintelligible) said, and correct me if I'm wrong, I thought we wouldn't really get to it thoroughly until the summer and so what we thought we'd do now is gather information, take a really close look at our committees, see where the need is and then come back to you in the September meeting.

Is that consistent with what we thought at council?

ESTUS:

What you're asking is a report on just which committees --
(EVERYONE TALKING AT ONCE)

SWANSON:

You know, we can do that now. The University of Washington Senate site, they

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt

have a list of the committees and they have reports, and you just click through them. And so we could -- we could start working on right now because, you know, at the end of the year that's when everybody starts putting in their reports.

ESTUS: Actually, as a freshman of this, does this committee -- does this body meet through the summertime?

SWANSON: No, not generally.

ESTUS: Are people on nine month -- I don't even know, are people on the main campus on nine month appointments?___

SWANSON: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, they are.

NADEL: It's not 8 1/2 --

STEINER: The Senate Council has met during the summer when there's been --

SWANSON: Yeah.

STEINER: -- what's considered an emergency situation. And whether we're campus or not, most people show up for that.

SWANSON: Any other closing thoughts?

SMITH: Scott Smith, Agriculture, one more

time. I would just suggest that somebody look at the way the University Committees on academic policies and priorities also known as U-Camp Committees function, or I -- Jeannine, I don't even know if they're still functioning very actively, but as a result of widespread questioning of the business plan by -- by faculty, we -- we formed those committees and we're representative -- reasonably representative, had some, at least partial input of Senate nominations and administrative recommendations.

I wouldn't say they're running the University by any means, but they've at least had influence on strategic planning processes that at least exceeds the University -- the senate committees that I've been on.

I -- I don't know, Richard or Jeannine, whether those committees are still functional or not, but that was something that came out when I was Provost that worked well for a little while. It -- but, again, it involved sharing responsibilities. They're not Senate Committees, they're jointly appointed committees.

SWANSON: That's right. And so we should make good use of those.

SMITH: well, might just talk to the Provost about how -- how he sees those being used.

BLACKWELL: And I think another good example of where shared governance has worked has been in the process of adopting Gen Ed, by having joint committees, by having step-by-step approvals that -- you know, where there's been interaction at many stages to make sure that -- that there's faculty buy-in and there -- but also the administrative realities are

MarchUKSenateCouncil.txt

-- are very clear about what we can accomplish and what we can't accomplish.

SWANSON: I think another area we need to improve on is how we nominate, and I'm thinking about like the advisory area committees. And -- and I think we need to work on that so that we know who our go-to people are? Where their areas of expertise are?

Final comments?

JONES: I'd just like to ask one -- one rhetorical inquiry to our great Dean of Agriculture who's been here.

How -- how is it that you express to -- to your faculty that you value that they're here or on Senate committees instead or writing more grants or writing more papers?

SMITH: I don't think that I do.

JONES: There's an honest admission.

SMITH: Well, you present it as an either/or choice, Davey, and I -- I resist that dichotomy. I think that we have several faculty representatives to the Senate who are extraordinarily successful in grant writing -- and teaching and scholarship, that are committed members of the Senate and certainly when faculty are successful in their scholarship and they also serve the institution, those are -- those tend to be the top-rated faculty in my college.

SWANSON: All right. Thank you very much. I appreciate it and look forward to your -- your input.

* * * * *

THEREUPON, the Senate Council Meeting of March 2010 was concluded at 4:25 p.m.

* * * * *

STATE OF KENTUCKY)

COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

I, LISA E. HOINKE, the undersigned Notary Public in and for the State of Kentucky at large, certify that the facts stated in the caption hereto are true; that at the time and place stated in said caption a Senate meeting was held; that said Senate meeting was taken down in stenotype by me and later reduced to computer transcription under my direction, and the foregoing is a true record of the Senate meeting held on March 8, 2010.

My commission expires: January 26, 2010.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 16th day of June, 2010.

LISA E. HOINKE
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE-AT-LARGE
K E N T U C K Y

