

Senate Council  
April 2, 2012

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, April 2, 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 Hollie I. Swanson called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:05 pm.

1. Minutes from March 26, 2012 and Announcements

The Chair offered announcements to SC members.

Tim Tracy, chair of the University Budget Review Committee, will meet with SC members on April 5, between 3 – 5 pm. The Chair will email the presentation to SC members afterwards.

Subsequent to a discussion on the SC listserv, the Chair and Chair-Elect Lee Blonder met with President Eli Capilouto regarding an interim provost. They carried the comments from the SC, that essentially the person would not rock the boat and would keep things steady. After discussion with the President, the Chair said the last thing she wanted was to have the reports written lately to lie around until a permanent provost is identified. She wondered aloud if a conservative interim provost was such a good idea. Grossman opined that the most critical issue was not having the interim candidate be a candidate for the permanent positions. In response to McCormick, the Chair said that there will be a national search, but that an interim provost would serve until a permanent provost was chosen. Grossman said that the search requirements could be designed in such a way as to ensure an individual who has a wide variety of experiences from different institutions.

The Chair said that the President will talk with a large number (30 – 50) individuals from different constituencies and intends to follow the guidelines set out in the *Governing Regulations*.

Grossman **moved** that at the next University Senate meeting, the Senate thank Provost Kumble Subbaswamy for his University service and formally wishes him well. If he returns to Kentucky, he should not go to Louisville. Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Brion **moved** to approve the SC minutes from March 26, 2012 as distributed and Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstaining.

The Chair asked Wilson to offer SC members an update on the March 2012 Board of Trustees meeting. He spoke about the changes to the *Governing Regulations* and the change to a 360° evaluation of the President's evaluation. SC members discussed metrics for the evaluation.

After additional discussion, SC members said they would like to invite the University Registrar to a future SC meeting to learn more about the implementation of the Senate's admissions processes.

Upon receipt of a final version of the SC's suggestions for the evaluation of the president, the Chair will forward it to Wilson to share with appropriate individuals at the level of the Board of Trustees.

Those present introduced themselves.

### 3. Committee Reports

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

##### i. Proposal to Move Appalachian Center from Vice President for Research to College of Arts and Sciences

Guest Farrell, chair of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) said that the motion from the SAOSC was to recommend acceptance of the proposal to move the Appalachian Center from the Vice President for Research to the College of Arts & Sciences. Farrell explained the proposal. He and Guest Ann Kingsolver answered a variety of questions about the proposal, which were answered satisfactorily.

In response to a question from Brion, Kingsolver explained that the center does not have any faculty lines and does not offer any courses or programs. She said the unit was described as a multidisciplinary research institute during its 1988 unit review. The Appalachian Center will reside within the College of Arts and Sciences and will have an advisory board comprised of deans from colleges across the University.

Grossman **moved** to amend the motion to add “multidisciplinary research center” to the motion to describe the Appalachian Center and Davis **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

McCormick asked about mechanisms to ensure that the Appalachian Center continues with an interdisciplinary, campuswide mission. Provost’s Liaison Greissman suggested that the program review process would display that information.

Grossman **moved** to recommend acceptance of the proposal to move the Appalachian Center, a multidisciplinary research center, from the Vice President for Research to the College of Arts & Sciences. Davis **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the **motion** passed with none opposed.

##### ii. Proposal to Change the Name of the College of Communications and Information Studies

Farrell said that the **motion** from the SAOSC was to recommend acceptance of the proposal to change the name of the College of Communications and Information Studies as submitted. Guest and College of Communications and Information Studies Dean Dan O’Hair answered questions about the proposed college name change. He confirmed that the change was only to the name; there is no change in infrastructure, degree name, etc.

After a suggestion from Davy Jones, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, Farrell changed the wording of the **motion** from the SAOSC to recommend acceptance of the proposal to change the name of the College of Communications and Information Studies as submitted. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with two abstaining.

##### iii. Proposed Restructuring of the School of Management in the Gatton College of Business and Economics

Farrell said that the SAOSC moved two motions at their meeting earlier in the day. He explained that the SAOSC **moved** to disapprove the proposed restructuring of the School of Management, within the Gatton College of Business and Economics, based on its academic merits. The SAOSC then **moved** to not endorse the proposed restructuring of the School of Management, within the Gatton College of Business and Economics, based on its non-academic merits, including but not limited to the method in which

faculty were polled throughout the restructuring process and the inability of faculty to choose a home academic unit.

Farrell said he intended to first give an explanation of the SAOSC's review process and timeline. He read from the minutes of the SAOSC's open hearing on Friday, March 30.

- The proposal was first sent to the SAOSC on December 5.
- Farrell, Hollie Swanson (SC chair), Lee Blonder (SC chair-elect), interim Senior Associate Dean Ken Troske (BE) and former interim Dean Merl Hackbart (BE) on January 30.
- Troske and Hackbart attended a meeting of the SAOSC on February 6 when a variety of questions were asked.
- SAOSC members asked additional follow-up questions that were forwarded to Troske and Hackbart on February 9. Troske responded with answers on February 21.
- Farrell and the SAOSC met with Swanson and Blonder on March, regarding how to proceed.
- At the suggestions of Blonder and Swanson, Farrell and the SAOSC invited faculty from the Gatton College to speak with the SAOSC on March 10.
- SAOSC members had additional questions, which were emailed on March 10 and 15, and answered on March 22.
- The need for an open hearing became apparent and appropriate plans were made to hold the hearing.

Farrell then explained that, with respect to reviewing the proposal to restructure the School of Management (SOM) within the Gatton College of Business and Economics (Gatton College), the SAOSC looked at the issues outlined in *Senate Rules 3.3.2.1.B.a-i*, pertaining to the procedures governing consolidation, transfer, discontinuation, or significant reduction of an academic program or educational unit.

- a. The centrality of each program or course of study to the mission of this institution or to the mission of the college, school, or department within which it is located;

The SAOSC did not deem this issue (a) to be relevant to the restructuring.

- b. The academic strength, productivity and quality of the academic program or unit, and of its faculty;

The SAOSC deemed this issue (b) to be relevant to the restructuring.

- c. The importance of the program or unit to the state or region in terms of its cultural, historic, political, economic, or other social resources;

The SAOSC did not deem this issue (c) to be relevant to the restructuring.

- d. The importance of the program or unit to the state or region in terms of its geologic, geographic, environmental, or other natural resources;

The SAOSC did not deem this issue (d) to be relevant to the restructuring.

- e. The relationship of the academic program or unit and the work done therein to some essential program or function performed at this institution;

The SAOSC did not deem this issue (e) to be relevant to the restructuring.

Other considerations may include:

- f. The current student demand and projected enrollment in the subject matter taught in the program or unit;

The SAOSC reviewed material pertaining to this issue (f) and found it to be relevant.

- g. The current and predicted comparative cost analysis/effectiveness of the program or unit;

The SAOSC reviewed what little information was available regarding this issue (g), which was believed to be relevant to the restructuring.

- h. The duplication of work performed in the academic program or unit by work done in other programs or departments at other public institutions of higher education elsewhere within the Commonwealth of Kentucky;

The SAOSC did not deem this issue (h) to be relevant to the restructuring.

- i. Such other factors as the committee deems pertinent.

The SAOSC did find a couple of areas under this issue (a) to be relevant to the restructuring. The SAOSC was concerned about the governance involved in the approval process and what information was available to faculty and when. In addition, the SAOSC thought that using the report by the Pappas Consulting Group, Inc., was not sufficient justification for doing away with the Decision Science and Information Systems area although the other areas in the SOM became departments; the Pappas report suggested raising all areas to the level of department, even though it was noted that the Gatton College had no plans to change the School of Accountancy to a department.

Another area of concern for the SAOSC was the characterization of a key vote in April 2011 by some faculty on the issue of restructuring from four areas within the SOM to some other structure. The end result was that of 42 eligible voters, 27 faculty voted. Of those 27, 13 were in favor of restructuring into three departments, seven voting to reorganize into four departments, and five voting to keep the existing structure that would retain four areas in the SOM and leave the DSIS area intact. The SAOSC concluded that the 13 votes in favor of restructuring into two departments was not a majority, but rather a plurality.

The SAOSC asked for information about why the dissenters voted the way they did and was told that information was not available and the vote did not include any discussion. The SAOSC subsequently received a document from the former head of the DSIS area who had chronicled the vote and indicated the opinions for and against the different proposal. This discrepancy was problematic for the SAOSC.

Guest and Dean of the Gatton College David Blackwell added that the Gatton College had and continues to offer two doctoral programs – a PhD in Business Administration and a PhD in Economics. McCormick asked if there was a doctoral concentration in DSIS and Dean Blackwell confirmed that. Debski commented that the Gatton College’s website indicates the specific concentration of DSIS.

Farrell continued. He said there were discussions with DSIS faculty about where they would be transferred. After looking through substantial documentation, the SAOSC felt that the DSIS faculty wanted to move together to the Department of Management or to another new department, as a whole. The new appointments were announced via email on August 18. Multiple DSIS faculty have expressed dissatisfaction with their new placements and movement away from their academic interests. The SAOSC heard that the low voter turnout in October had to do with some faculty feeling the restructuring was a fait accompli or “done deal.” There was a unanimous vote by the Gatton College faculty in October, which does show that the will of the majority had spoken. The SAOSC was concerned, however, with characterizations that the vote and restructuring was widely agreed upon, when they were not; and that information about dissent was not made known to the SAOSC when the SAOSC asked for it.

Farrell explained that the SAOSC looked at the impact of the change on the DSIS faculty members. The SAOSC generally felt that some restructuring that took the SOM’s four areas to some number of departments was not problematic – a review of similar units’ structure at UK’s benchmarks show a wide variety of different structures. However, very few, if any of those benchmarks, do not have a DSIS unit.

The SAOSC was not sure if the proposal to restructure took into consideration the achievements of the DSIS faculty – the Gatton College’s website lists a substantial series of publications and achievements by the DSIS faculty.

Farrell said that he had no further comments to offer, but was happy to answer questions. He asked Debski, a member of the SAOSC, to weigh in with her recollections. Debski commented that Farrell had done an excellent job throughout the review process and gave an excellent summary. Debski said she wanted to reiterate the SAOSC’s concern over the discrepancies observed during the review process, including the characterization that the vote on structure was “overwhelmingly” supported by SOM faculty when it was not; that faculty were given a choice as to where to go, although only some faculty members’ choices were not respected; that faculty may or may not have known what exactly they were voting for and the consequences of the vote; and the statement that the justification for going from four areas to three departments was in the Pappas report, when the Pappas report suggested departments for each of the four areas.

Provost’s Liaison Greissman commented that the proposal to restructure had three parts: 1. The proposed restructuring 2. The transfer of four undergraduate degree programs to the new departmental structure; and 3. The suspension of admissions into the BBA in Analytics (formerly DSIS). The Chair noted the suspension had already received SC approval earlier, and the program transfers were not being considered, yet.

Greissman respectfully asserted that the first motion from the SAOSC, to “not approve” the proposed restructuring of the SOM was not legitimate and that the Senate only had endorsement authority on the administrative restructuring. The Chair replied that she respectfully disagreed – she believed there was quite a bit of academic relevance to the restructuring. Farrell concurred with the Chair, saying that the SAOSC followed the *Senate Rules (SR)* with regard to their review of the structural changes, including the academic impact and impact on faculty, as well as used the statement in the *SR* that the committee should review other factors it deems relevant. The SAOSC “divided” the restructuring proposal into academic and non-academic considerations, and included a review the governance involved with the restructuring. Farrell said he disagreed with the characterization that the proposal was not before the SAOSC for approval (as opposed to endorsement).

Guest Davy Jones, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, said that the Senate has purview over the academic merit and academic content, but the Senate only plays an advisory role in issues that pertain to infrastructural resources and reporting. The academic merit component of reorganizations is not the same as the academic merit of degree programs. Jones said there was only one vote that should be taken, to endorse or not endorse. Farrell replied that the proposal to restructure appeared to have a direct effect on the BBA in Decision Science and Information Systems (DSIS), as well as the PhD in Business Administration with a DSIS emphasis, resulting in a significant reduction of those two academic programs. Therefore, the review included academic considerations.

Grossman asked if the Senate had approval authority over moving of one faculty line to another unit, or changes in ownership in degree programs. Jones replied that both were actions on which the Senate offered an advisory vote only. Grossman opined that the proposal to restructure could not be separated from the proposed ownership changes for the degree programs.

Grossman **moved** that, given the difficulties in the process outlined by Farrell, the motions from Farrell be tabled until the Gatton College can address some of the concerns that the SAOSC has raised, maybe through new votes or reconsideration of how many departments into which the School of Management will be divided. Wasilkowski **seconded**.

Guest and Gatton College Dean David Blackwell offered comments in support of the proposal to restructure. He said that the process undertaken for restructuring was extraordinarily open, inclusive and transparent. He said the Pappas report made the right recommendations restructuring. He said there were some other universities that had restructured DSIS faculty into other departments. He added that DSIS was not really a discipline and faculty in that general area could fall into any number of different disciplines. Dean Blackwell added that seven of nine faculty found their new department to be agreeable and that basically two faculty out of 85 were attempting to drive an administrative a decision.

In response to a question from the Chair, guest and Senior Associate Dean Merl Hackbart explained that students were not being admitted into the DSIS area of the PhD in Business Administration because there was only space for one student. He noted that the Marketing area also periodically restricted admissions into the Marketing area of the PhD in Business Administration.

Debski opined that the suspension of admissions into the BBA in DSIS and suspension of admission into the DSIS area of the PhD in Business Administration were part of the SAOSC's concern that the restructuring was clearly having an academic impact on DSIS faculty. Dean Blackwell said that those actions would have been taken anyway.

Seeing that the time was past 5 o'clock, Grossman **called the question**. Wasilkowski **seconded**. Farrell noted that the motion to table would delay final actions associated with the restructuring of the SOM; he said that he had been urged by the Chair to move as quickly as possible so the proposal could be reviewed by the Senate on April 9. The Chair commented that her request for speed was driven by other people's urging, not her own. Grossman commented that the Gatton College could take as little or as long as it wanted. Hackbart commented that with a vote of 13 in favor, asked if it was necessary to go through the whole process again. McCormick commented that 13 votes were only 33% of eligible voters; she wondered if that issue was something that Dean Blackwell would want to look at. Brion commented that the Pappas report stated that shared governance in Gatton College was not working well.

After the last of the discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** that, given the difficulties in the process outlined by Farrell, the motions from the SAOSC be tabled until the Gatton College can address some of the concerns that the SAOSC has raised, maybe through new votes or reconsideration of how many departments into which the School of Management will be divided. The motion **passed** with four in favor and three opposed.

The Chair commented that Margaret Bausch will return at another date to offer an update on the ad hoc Committee on Calendars.

#### 5. Tentative Senate Agenda for April 9, 2012

SC members agreed that the Gatton restructuring should be removed from the agenda. After additional discussion, Grossman **moved** to approve the tentative Senate agenda for April 9, minus the proposal to restructure the SOM in Gatton College. Brion **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The meeting was adjourned about 5:25 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Hollie I. Swanson,  
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Blonder, Brion, Coyne, Davis, Debski, Grossman, Swanson, Wilson, Wimberly and Wasilkowski.

Invited guests present: Paul Childs, Herman Farrell, David Blackwell, Davy Jones, Ann Kingsolver, Dan O'Hair, Margaret Schroeder and Steve Skinner.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, April 5, 2012.