

Summary  
Senate Council Retreat  
July 2, 2003

The Senate Council gathered on July 2, 2003 in the conference room of the Bingham-Davis House of the Gaines Center for the Humanities. The following is a brief synopsis of what occurred.

The members of the Senate Council who were present included Chair Jeff Dembo, Vice-Chair Lee Edgerton, Ernie Yanarella, Kaveh Tagavi, Mike Cibull, Peggy Saunier, SGA President Rachel Watts, Student Senator Brافus Kaalund, Ernie Bailey, Davy Jones, and Liz Debski. Rebecca Scott, Administrative Coordinator for the Senate Council, was also present.

The Chair welcomed the group and briefly presented the items up for discussion and outlined how he hoped the retreat might proceed.

Davy Jones presented his PowerPoint presentation on the history of shared governance and, more specifically, faculty governance at the University of Kentucky. There were a few questions and comments and a brief discussion regarding the need for continued attention on the part of the Senate and Senate Council to maintaining and improving the faculty's role in educational policy development.

Jones and Jeff Dembo conversed back and forth for a few minutes regarding an e-mail received by Jones from Steve Reed regarding the problem of faculty salaries. Jones reported that a committee of the Board will be created to examine the faculty salary issue, and invited the Senate Council's input and possible participation on that committee.

The Chair presented a chart of the usage of time and attention paid by the Senate Council during its meetings to a variety of issues to determine where the most stream-lining was needed. Mike Cibull commented that too much time was being allotted to discussion of the minutes. He suggested that an electronic circulation of the minutes would help solve the problem. Ernie Bailey commented that he thought some small amount of time, even five minutes, would be nice for discussion of the minutes during the Senate Council meetings, but agreed that the amount of time being spent was superfluous. Dembo asked the Administrative Coordinator to present her ideas regarding the minutes to the group. Rebecca Scott reported that she would like to see a two-day turn around time on minutes and would like to circulate the minutes electronically for approval. Liz Debski brought up the point that this has all already been discussed before and she was under the impression that the minutes were supposed to be reviewed and edited by the Chair before being circulated to the Senate Council for approval. Some other members of the Senate Council agreed with Debski. Cibull suggested that the minutes be prepared by the

Administrative Coordinator, reviewed and edited by the Chair, be circulated electronically by the Chair prior to the Senate Council meeting, and that no more than five minutes be allotted to the discussion of the minutes during the Senate Council meetings. There seemed to be a consensus of agreement, so a trial run of this plan will commence with the circulation of this summary of the retreat. The Administrative Coordinator should include in her e-mail the use of the function in Outlook that will request that the receiver of the e-mail notify her of receipt upon opening the message. If the receipt notification has not been received from a particular member by the Friday prior to the Senate Council meeting, the party who has not been heard from will be contacted by phone by the Administrative Coordinator to confirm receipt.

Debski requested that items that are reviewed by Senate Council not be altered in any way between the time that the Senate Council finishes with an item and the time that it is presented on the Senate floor.

The Chair also noted that the method by which Reinstatements were being heard is going well. The Senate Council agreed to continue the use of the Reinstatement Committee in this capacity. Jeff Dembo asked the Senate Council if the current method for the posting and approval of proposals was satisfactory. The Senate Council seemed to agree that it was not satisfactory and presented numerous suggestions for how the proposals could be better circulated. All were in agreement that the postings to the Senate site could continue as it has in the past, but suggested that some guidelines be developed to sort between those items that should be brought to the attention of the Senate Council versus those items that are standard and normal enough that they can continue to be posted to the Senate Council web site for the current ten-day review process. Jeff Dembo suggested that he and Ms. Scott sit down and develop a list of all of the types of changes that come to the Senate Council Office and try to determine some distinguishing characteristics between those changes. This list and possible suggestions will be presented to the Senate Council at the next meeting.

The Chair asked the Administrative Coordinator to present her plans for the next few months regarding the operation of the Senate Council Office. Ms. Scott reported that a number of things need addressing, some of which are already underway. These items include the overhaul of the web sites, development of a tracking database, becoming current with archiving, updating the on-line minutes, keeping better track of agendas, the development of a procedures manual, and a variety of other items.

The Chair asked what other items might need to be addressed. Debski and Saunier expressed concern over an item that had been presented to the Senate Council as having been approved by the Undergraduate Council which was later contradicted by Phil Kraemer on the floor of the Senate. Debski was concerned that this sort of thing might happen again and asked what sorts of measures

were in place to ensure that they would not. Ms. Scott responded that the new tracking system would help, and suggested that if each item was approved by all entities involved before being submitted to the Senate Council Office, there would be fewer opportunities for error and confusion. Saunier noted that such a change in procedure was recommended by the Streamlining Committee. The Senate Council seemed to be in favor of such a change in procedure. The Chair indicated that the Senate Council Office would determine exactly where the problem had occurred before and will report to the Senate Council their findings.

Cibull and Ernie Yanarella suggested the implementation of time limits for announcements and action items during Senate Council meetings. Rachel Watts indicated that time limits are currently utilized in the Student Government Association meetings and are of great assistance. The Council members seemed to think that time limits are a good idea.

Kaveh Tagavi suggested that guest speakers who are brought in to Senate Council meetings as consultants in certain areas not be given time to make presentations, but rather that they serve in a question-answering capacity only. He indicated that by the time the expert is consulted, the issues at hand are already well-known and that there is no need to rehash what has already been said.

Yanarella brought up the issue of free tuition for the dependents of faculty, and possibly staff, as being an incentive to keeping senior faculty on campus. The obvious problem that exists with faculty salaries is causing poor morale and extensive turn-over among faculty. Yanarella brought the attention of the Senate Council back to the e-mail from Steve Reed that was received by Jones regarding the creation of a Board committee to evaluate the poor state of faculty salaries. Dembo asked if the Senate Council would like to create a committee to examine the issue. Jones asked if the Senate Council would like to have a person present on the Board committee to act either on behalf of the Senate Council or as the representative of a Committee of the Council, should the Senate Council choose to form such a committee. More discussion followed, and will continue at the next Senate Council meeting.

The Chair asked if there were any other suggestions for agenda items for the upcoming year. Some possible items include the honor code, the Graduate Student bill of rights, graduation contracts, faculty involvement in policy making and regulation, AR's and GR's under the Provost model, specific AR's and GR's related to LCC, distance learning rules clarification and revision, as well as the other items contained within this document.

The Chair thanked the Senate Council for their time and participation.

The retreat concluded at 11:15 am.

