

Senate Council
August 5, 2011

The Senate Council met in special session for its second summer Advance on Friday, August 5, 2011 at 9:00 am in the Keeneland Room of W. T. Young Library. 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 9:08 am. Those present introduced themselves, including Mark Coyne. [The Chair, in consultation with the SC, chose a senator to replace Sue Nokes, who resigned, since there were no other runners up from the most recent SC election.]

1. Minutes from June 15, 2011 and Announcements

The Chair had a variety of announcements, some of which became topics for discussion.

The retreat for the Board of Trustees (Board) has moved to October 1 and 2.

The Chair is leading a review committee to generate data and take a look at where UK is as an institution. She has met twice so far with the consultants [Huron Consulting Group], who are meeting with each review committee member individually. A final report is due to President Eli Capilouto prior to October 1. The Chair said that she was, so far, enjoying working with the consultants. She said she would offer more information to SC members as it becomes available. She explained further that the review committee intends to figure out UK's strengths and weaknesses, and offer suggestions on what UK should look like as an institution. She said the report will be presented to the Board in preparation for development of a strategic plan.

In response to Blonder, the Chair explained that the consultants asked to be treated as the committee's staff. The committee included herself, Michael Adams (Chair, Staff Senate), a handful of administrators and a variety of faculty members: Kim Anderson (EN/Chemical and Materials Engineering); Charlie Carlson (AS/Psychology); Nancy Cox (AG/Associate Dean for Research); Marcus Randall (ME/Radiation Medicine); Eugenia Toma (GS/Martin School of Public Policy and Administration); and Frank X. Walker (AS/English). The President appointed the faculty portion of membership based partly on her recommendations, after he had asked the Chair to provide him with suggestions for a broad representation of faculty.

The Graduate School asked for and received approval from the Chair for a change in their calendar. [September 20 is now the last day to submit application for degree cards to receive a December (fall) 2011 degree & the last day to submit notification of intent to receive a fall 2011 degree, and October 6 is no longer the last day for doctoral candidates for a December degree to submit a notification of intent to schedule a final exam.]

SC members opted to decide on the date of their first regular meeting towards the end of the Advance.

The Chair asked for SC members' opinions on live streaming University Senate (Senate) meetings. SC members offered a variety of opinions about how to manage such an undertaking. After brief discussion, SC members seemed mostly comfortable with the idea of recording meetings and posting the video (with time markers for important discussions), but the Chair suggested it be discussed again and everyone agreed **[AI]**.

The Chair updated SC members on her attendance at the recent Provost's retreat. She said that she thought the issue that will be discussed the most during the year will be that of changing the *Administrative Regulations (ARs)* regarding a post-tenure review of faculty productivity. The Chair shared that Provost Subbaswamy opined that part of the issue was UK not having articulated reasonable expectations. He was inclined to address the issue internally at UK, instead of having an external entity impose its own standards. In response to Grossman's question about the Senate having an approving vs. an endorsing vote on the changes, the Chair replied that the matter seemed to be squarely in the faculty's purview, but that it needed to be clarified. **[AI]** SC members had a brief discussion, and the Chair added that she did like the steps for development, as opposed to punitive actions, in the proposed changes.

SC members discussed the basic sciences and the critical need to include them in future planning. There was also a brief discussion on the loss of staff positions in some areas, in favor of centralized services.

There was a brief discussion on college faculty councils and the lack thereof in some colleges, along with Wermeling's comments regarding the need to create college rules for Pharmacy. Peek commented that when he was faced with the same situation, he started with the rules from Agriculture and made edits as necessary. The Chair commented that college faculty do not need their dean's approval for faculty efforts.

The presidential investiture will occur on October 18 at 4 pm in the Singletary Center. The Chair said that President Capilouto insisted that faculty be involved and that she would play a role in the ceremony.

The Chair commented that the Offices of the President and Provost had finally approved the request for a salary increase for the Administrative Coordinator, and there was a brief round of applause from SC members.

The new student induction ceremony will take place on Saturday, August 20 from 4 – 5 pm in Memorial Coliseum.

The Chair asked Peek for an update on the joint faculty/staff employment ombud committee. Peek said that the staff members of the committee had done a lot of work on the proposal and did a lot of the heavy lifting. The committee met with employment ombuds at the University of Louisville and the University of Cincinnati. The final report is being circulated now and the committee is meeting with various administrators, all of whom have offered largely positive feedback. The Provost suggested a three-year pilot.

2. Old Business

a. Action Items

The Chair suggested that Action Items be discussed after other business, and there were no objections.

b. Document Handling

The Chair asked Mrs. Brothers to give an update on the status of the document handling system. Mrs. Brothers did so, noting that it would be completely online and linked to SAP, and that course proposals would be piloted in a few colleges during the fall semester.

Grossman commented that the dean of the Graduate School, Jeannine Blackwell, suggested that she post a spreadsheet of courses online for people to refer to in the meantime. The Chair added that the Provost has given his financial support to the document handling system, and Chief Information Officer Vince Kellen said that he would see the project through to completion.

The Chair asked SC members to look over a syllabus template drafted by the Undergraduate Council. The intent is for there to be a way for a faculty member, if so inclined, to pick and choose a few different phrasing options for some standard syllabus text.

SC members took a 10 minute break.

2. Old Business

c. SC Goals from 2010-2011

Grossman mentioned goal number 2.b (“Improve communication between Senators and home departments/colleges: b. Encourage Senators to establish a mechanism to communicate with their college constituencies.”) and said that some colleges communicate well and some still do not. SC members agreed that the SC should ask each college’s senators to designate a chief communicator to the college who be responsible for summarizing Senate meetings and sending it to college faculty. Steiner suggested that senators from different colleges could work together share summaries.

Wermeling suggested that the Chair attend faculty council meetings for each college annually. The Chair suggested that the SC determine by late August the message(s) she would carry to the faculty councils **[AI]**.

The Chair referred to the Senate’s Research Committee and the Senate’s Programs Committee as successes for the year, adding that the Provost had acknowledged the success of the Senate’s Facilities Committee and knew it would be meeting again in 2011-2012. She thought that the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee was also very good. She suggested that those committee chairs report on their prior year’s activities to the Senate during the coming year.

Wermeling said that when he began service on the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), he could get no answers from anyone about the basis on which the SAPC should evaluate proposals. Under his direction this past year, the SAPC now has a brief statement about the basis of new program evaluations and works with proposers to create a properly detailed proposal. The Chair suggested he mention that during his report to the Senate.

Steiner commented that some Senate committees, such as the SAPC, have clearly defined roles and responsibilities. Other committees, however, have no details and depend upon someone’s unique knowledge of current events. There were additional comments.

2. Old Business

e. Ad Hoc Committee on Best Practices for Distance Learning - Proposed Membership

The Chair and Coyne offered suggestions for the charge of the Ad Hoc Committee on Best Practices for Distance Learning (CBPDL). She directed SC members to the list of potential members in the handout. She explained that she intended to compose the CBPDL of five to seven faculty employees, with two staff employees involved in distance learning (DL) as ex officio members.

SC members settled on a list of names and agreed that the CBPDL should be charged with serving as an advisory body on the following issues: best practices for distance learning issues, such as how to secure exams in DL courses; the answer to “what is a credit hour?” with respect to a distance learning course; and the issues that arise when collaborating with multiple institutions on DL projects where there are different criteria for the definition of a credit hour from one institution to another. It was further agreed that the CBPDL should offer “next steps” based on their suggestions, whether that take the form of rules, guidelines, policies, etc.

The Chair suggested that someone move such a motion. Grossman **moved** thusly. Wermeling **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion that the Ad Hoc Committee on Best Practices for Distance Learning be charged with serving as an advisory body to the SC and offer “next steps” based on suggestions, whether that take the form of rules, guidelines, policies, etc., on the following issues: best practices for distance learning issues, such as how to secure exams in DL courses; the answer to “what is a credit hour?” with respect to DL courses; and the issues that arise when collaborating with multiple institutions on DL projects where there are different criteria for the definition of a credit hour from one institution to another. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

1. Minutes from June 15, 2011 and Announcements

Steiner **moved** to approve the minutes from June 15, 2011 and Wermeling **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Program Assessment Overview - Dr. Mia Alexander-Snow, Director of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness

The Chair welcomed Mia Alexander-Snow, Director of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness. Guest Alexander-Snow shared her educational and professional experience with SC members and invited SC members to help her understand how she can best do her job. Alexander-Snow explained that she wanted to initiate conversations and raise questions for SC members about how the Senate can be more purposeful in looking at assessment. She then began her presentation.

SC members enjoyed Alexander-Snow’s presentation and asked that she offer the same presentation to the Senate. **[AI]** SC members and Alexander-Snow then engaged in a lengthy discussion about a variety of aspects of assessment, as well as the Senate’s current and possible future involvement in the program assessment process. Those present also touched on the issue of the lack of coordination between a program’s review by an external accrediting body, as well as UK’s requirement for a separate external program review. SC members requested they be emailed a copy of Alexander-Snow’s presentation. **[AI]**

Wermeling was strongly in favor doing a program review of the Office of the Senate Council. Alexander-Snow said she was happy to help, but that faculty would need to come up with criteria to assess and create the written document. SC members responded positively to the idea of using assessment metrics to help guide review of certain portions of new program proposals. Kelly commented that the Senate was also interested in being involved in decisions about whether to sunset some centers; as it is currently, there is not a time when faculty can see if the center is meeting the goals on which it was created.

Alexander-Snow suggested that the Senate think of a place to be involved and have a say prior to a center’s dissolution. She further suggested the Senate become more involved in the external review

process, so that the Senate's recommendations become part of an implementation and review plan. SC members requested Alexander-Snow return to the SC for additional presentations and conversations.

SC members broke for lunch with President Capilouto at noon and reconvened upon his departure at 1:40.

2. Old Business

c. Senate Council Goals from 2010-2011

The Chair suggested that SC members refresh their memories of the SC's 2010-2011 goals and drew their attention to the handout.

4. Senate Council Goals for 2011-2012

There was a brief discussion about the basic sciences, difficulties in identifying funding for research pilot studies, the Senate's charge to be responsible for UK's academic mission, and the need for faculty input into a general cost/benefit analysis of how UK spends its money.

5. Senate Committee Charges for 2011-2012

Senate's Research Committee (SRC)

The Chair asked Kelly to offer suggestions as to possible charges for the SRC. Kelly responded that the SRC would like to be recharged to look at two issues that it did not complete during 2010-2011. The first is to look into the issue of the indemnification of people doing research on campus. He said the SRC spent all year getting UK's attorneys to recognize that there is a real problem; the SRC would like to continue with that and help establish official University policy.

Kelly went on to explain that the indemnification of researchers was limited to those in the health care colleges doing research within the delivery of clinical care. The main campus believes indemnification covers everyone but it absolutely does not, and the question is how to deal with the broader issue. In response to Blonder, Kelly explained that a non-clinical care researcher can only depend on the goodwill of the administration.

The second issue for the SRC is looking into systems for faculty involvement in establishing policy related to research activities. Faculty are constantly told after the fact about what can and cannot be done with research dollars but there is no faculty involvement in those decisions. He said that Vice President for Research Jim Tracy was trying to put together a group of experienced faculty members to help him, but is concerned about members coming and going on a constant basis. Further, the time commitment has been so demanding that it has been challenging to get something meaningful in place.

Kelly summed up by saying he would like the SRC to be recharged with looking into the indemnification process and faculty involvement in establishing research policies, and with the charge from spring 2011, to work with other Senate committees on guidelines and evaluation of multi-disciplinary research centers (MDRC). The Chair commented that the SRC could also examine graduate student compensation (pay disparities, lack of summer tuition, etc.).

SC members discussed MDRCs and how best to move forward.

Senate's Facilities Committee (SFC)

The SC suggested the SFC look into the Physical Plant Division. Grossman **moved** that the Senate's Facilities Committee work closely with the Office of the President to develop procedures for

determining building priorities, with such procedures being transparent and involving faculty representation. Peek **seconded**. There was very brief discussion, and then a **vote** was taken. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

Senate's Institutional Finance and Resource Allocation Committee (SIFRAC)

Wood agreed to serve as chair of SIFRAC. The Chair suggested that SIFRAC examine the strengths and weaknesses of UK's current budget process and propose alternatives if appropriate. SC members then discussed possible membership.

Senate's Library Committee (SLC)

After brief discussion, Grossman **moved** that the SLC investigate what other universities are doing to address the increased costs of journals and other academic materials, and see if UK can align its efforts with other universities. Wood **seconded**. There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Noting the time and the remaining agenda items, the Chair suggested that discussion move to agenda item number six, with Senate committee goals to be continued at a later date. There were no objections.

6. Developing an Operational and Communication Plan for the Senate Office - Dan Wermeling

Wermeling spoke extensively about the need for documentation in the Office of the Senate Council regarding how various procedures outlined in the *Senate Rules* are to be conducted, the need to for office procedures to be documented, and ways in which to determine if the Office of the Senate Council is operating as effectively as it should.

The Chair opined that a faculty member in decision science or lean manufacturing could be asked to assist the SC. Grossman suggested that the Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness be asked to provide input into operations in the Office of the Senate Council. Wood opined that Wermeling was talking about two different but connected things – writing down current processes and then determining if current processes are the most effective.

SC members engaged in a lengthy discussion about the duties of the Administrative Coordinator, the lack of sufficient personnel in the Office of the Senate Council, what processes and procedures need to be documented and where, and how to begin.

Grossman suggested that Wermeling put together a list of the procedures that need to have “how to” guides, and the SC could start from that point. McCormick supported the idea of an FAQ for faculty, so that there is an easy reference point for faculty, but ultimately directs faculty to the pertinent regulation. McCormick also added that colleges could be solicited for ideas on what the list of procedures to be written out should include.

Peek **moved** that the SAPC be charged with establishing criteria for reviewing new academic programs and the appropriate procedures for such. Wermeling **seconded**. After brief discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair commented that even when Wermeling presents a list of procedures needing narrative descriptions, it will all come back to the same issue of who will have available time to write all those procedures.

Grossman suggested that there be an external review of the Office of the Senate Council and Mrs. Brothers immediately voiced her support.

Grossman **moved** that the Chair ask the President to hire an outside agency to review the Office of the Senate Council, specifically procedures and staffing levels. Wermeling **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Prior to adjournment, SC members deliberated on possible faculty to fill vacancies in the Health Care Clinical Sciences Area Advisory Committee, the Senate Advisory Committee on the Faculty Code and the Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

The meeting was adjourned shortly before 3:30 pm. [The Action Items are a part of the minutes, but fall at the end of the document.]

Respectfully submitted by Hollie I. Swanson,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Blonder, Coyne, Grossman, Kelly, McCormick, Peek, Steiner, Swanson, Wermeling and Wood.

Invited guest present: Mia Alexander-Snow.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Friday, August 19, 2011.

#	√	Item	Responsibility	Completed
5.	√	SC subset to examine and revise the description of the administrative coordinator's job duties with a view towards increasing compensation. (7/14/10)	Grossman, Chair	07/2011
20.		Charge Senate's Academic Programs Committee with creating processes for substantive change issues (teach-out, contractual/consortium process, off-campus sites, how to reopen a suspended program). (8/23/10)	SC	
31.		Ask the Provost to submit a statement of financial and administrative feasibility for proposals prior to the proposals being sent to cmte. (10/4/10)	Document Handling System	
40.		Draft changes to <i>Senate Rule</i> language on Senate meeting attendance policies for review by SC. (8/30/10 & 11/15/10)	Chair, Steiner	
42.		Discuss with the Provost the method of allocating resources from distance learning courses. (11/15/10)	Chair	
44.		Create ad hoc committee (perhaps with VPR and Provost) to look at what constitutes an administrative or an educational unit, and if there is a continuum or a sharp difference. (11/22/10; 12/6/10)	Chair, SC	

46.	√	Discuss election of officers, specifically who is eligible to cast votes. (12/6/10); Solicit opinions from the Senate. (2/28/11)	SC	1st reading 5/2011
53.		Investigate "Quality Matters" WRT distance learning courses. (1/10/11)	SC	
57.		Look into creating a Senate committee on assessment. (1/31/11)	SC	
60.	√	Deliberate during summer retreat(s) on what the SC's strategic vision is for academic facilities. (1/31/11)	SC	06/2011
62.		Determine how to address the issue of the proportionate representation of appointed Board of Trustees members. (2/7/11)	SC	
63.		Invite UofL employment ombud to SC meeting after joint ombud cmte visits the University of Cincinnati. (2/21/11)	Mrs. Brothers	
66.		Invite Associate Provost for Undergrad Ed to offer "State of Undergraduate Education" address to Senate. (2/21/11)		
67.		Invite Associate Provost for Academic Affairs about distance learning courses. (2/21/2011)	Mrs. Brothers	
71.		Invite Dean Kornbluh et al to present "A&S Wired" to the Senate in fall 2011. (5/2/11)	Mrs. Brothers	
72.		Discuss status of department chairs and directors of interdisciplinary centers during the August Advance. (6/15/11)	SC	
73.		Ask each college dean's office to submit information about their faculty council, as part of the SACS reaccreditation effort. (6/15/11)	Chair	
74.	√	Form an ad hoc committee charged with formulating a document describing best practices regarding distance learning practices, with membership of said cmte in the purview of the Chair. (6/15/11)	Chair	06/2011
76.		Develop metrics for faculty input into president's performance during August Advance. (6/15/11)	SC	
77.		Draft a report on the perceptions of the faculty reps on the Presidential Search Committee on the process, and include relevant info from similar universities' recent presidential searches. (6/15/11)	Chair & Steiner	
78.		Create checklist describing most common problems encountered during reviews of curricular proposals and disseminate to colleges. (6/15/11)	Mrs. Brothers	
79.		Contact deans and academic council chairs to let them know that incomplete/incorrect curricular approval forms will be returned (with detail on the problems) to the previous academic council for fixing. (6/15/11)	Chair	
81.		Meet with each college's faculty council in the fall, and also reinforce the importance of identifying a senator to communicate with college faculty. (6/15/11)	Chair	
82.		Request that the chair of the Senate's Academic Facilities Cmte be invited to attend meetings of the Capital Planning Advisory Group. (6/15/11)	Chair	
83.		Send list of existing senators and list of new senators to chairs of Senate's Academic Facilities Committee and Senate's Academic Planning and Priorities Committee. (6/15/11)	Mrs. Brothers	

84.		Deliberate on the idea of recording meetings and posting the video (with time markers of important discussions).	SC	
85.		Find out if the Senate has an approving or endorsing vote on proposed changes to post-tenure review policies.	Chair	
86.		Determine by late August the message(s) the Chair should relay when she visits college faculty councils.	SC	
87.		Invite Mia Alexander-Snow to give her presentation on assessment to the Senate.	Mrs. Brothers	
88.	√	Email Alexander-Snow's presentation to SC members.	Mrs. Brothers	08/2011