

Senate Council
February 28, 2011

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, February 28, 2011 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 3:03 pm. She reminded SC members that Provost Subbaswamy would be arriving around 4:30 pm, as per the SC's invitation that he attend one meeting a month, to discuss current issues.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair offered a few announcements.

- Regarding an ad hoc Senate assessment committee, the Chair recalled discussions the previous week. She noted that the Interim General Education Oversight Committee (IGEOC) was tasked with assessment issues, but the Gen Ed course workload is taking precedence. The Chair talked with Assistant Provost for General Education Bill Rayens and suggested that at the next IGEOC, those members offer possible names for an ad hoc committee. IGEOC can then morph eventually into a committee that deals with assessment policy issues and the larger assessment picture. Although it will be primarily focused on undergraduate education for now, it should eventually include representation from professional schools, etc., if and when it becomes a standing committee. The Chair also suggested that the committee made up jointly of administrative and faculty employees. There were no objections.
- The Chair reported she would be absent from the March 7 meeting, and that Randall would preside.
- SC members discussed the Chair's questions about whether and how other departments, programs, centers, etc. utilized outside reviewers during the six-year program review. After some time, it seemed as though the Chair's concern about the routine lack of recent outside reviewers was unique to her department.

The Chair asked Vice Chair Anderson to report on her recent trip to Berea with the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). The Vice Chair explained that Berea College, Eastern Kentucky University, and UK were represented at the meeting, where the topic was, generally, the tough economic times and what it does to education. She explained that there was an inactive AAUP chapter at UK, and also an inactive state conference, although only three active chapters were required for activation of the state conference. She said that the AAUP offers a "red book" which contains best practices for faculty on campuses around the country. The Vice Chair then offered an extensive recap for SC members, which initiated a few brief discussions.

Steiner asked for the Vice Chair's notes on the issues, and agreed that an abbreviated version of the report would be good for the University Senate (Senate) to hear.

The Chair talked to SC members about the "State of Faculty Affairs" address in April. She wondered about invited two Herald-Leader reporters and a few representatives of UK's Public Relations department. Grossman commented that the goal should be to present faculty as an independent voice

of the University. Steiner commented that it would be helpful to make sure that point be made. SC members mentioned three reporters by name, and Peek suggested the KY Kernel be notified, as well.

2. Old Business

a. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 1.3.3.A* ("Senate Council Chair")

The Chair commented that when the SC last left the discussion, Steiner was supporting the proposed change in chair elections to include the entire Senate body in voting. Steiner agreed, saying he had agreed with Grossman, but that the SC did not have time to get to any comments against the proposal.

SC members offered the following general comments:

- There are some perceived, potential drawbacks to the proposed changes (to allow the entire Senate to vote in the election of the SC chair and extend the term to two years, with an allowance for a second term), but they are outweighed by the need to help enfranchise senators, as well as allow the chair sufficient time to learn the job (one year) and have another year to feel comfortable in the position.
- A mechanism should be developed to deal with the situation in which there is only one candidate for the position, but SC members recognized that putting in such an accommodation seemed to minimize the position.
- One option available in the event no SC member is able to run is to open up the pool of eligible candidates to the entire Senate.
- Serving on the SC very much helps a potential SC member learn a lot about what the chair does.
- More time is necessary to discuss the proposed changes.
- Additional changes can be made to open the process up even further, but those steps should be taken in a slow, incremental fashion.

SC members agreed that comments should be solicited from the Senate **[AI]**.

b. Resolution on Space Policy

Blonder suggested that a resolution be offered, based upon the information offered to the SC by the College of Medicine's Senior Associate Dean for Research Alan Daugherty and Dean Emery Wilson. After some discussion, it was determined that Blonder would draft some language to send to those gentlemen regarding some thoughts and recommendations from the SC about the research space allocation policy in the College of Medicine.

c. Nominees for Area Committees and Others, Part II

SC members discussed vacancies for various committees, and offered a handful of names for consideration.

3. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee - Dwight Denison, Chair

i. Proposed Name Change for Department of Family Studies

The Chair offered a brief explanation of the proposal to change the name of the Department of Family Studies to the Department of Family Science.

Grossman **moved** that the SC send the proposed change to the name of the Department of Family Studies to the Senate with a positive recommendation, effective upon approval by the Board of Trustees. Anderson **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with one opposed.

2. Old Business

c. Discussion on Proposed *Governing Regulation X.B.2.d.vii* ("Entrepreneurial Leaves of Absence")

SC members discussed the proposed changes to *Governing Regulation X.B.2.d.vii*. Provost's Liaison Greissman commented that a change in the language to allow an exception was added, allaying the concerns of the faculty member who contacted the SC. Wasilkowski affirmed Greissman's statement.

SC members then discussed the proposed language, particularly the recently added wording, and offered some suggestions. Greissman said that he would remove the second sentence in the last bullet of the application ("Normally "continuous service" is interrupted by a sabbatical leave.")

Grossman **moved** to endorse the proposed changes to *Governing Regulation X.B.2.d.vii*, including the day's edit. Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. SACS Mandate To Use CIP Codes Based On Graduate Degrees To Assess Faculty Qualifications To Teach Courses

The Chair invited Grossman to present his concerns. Grossman explained that the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools is requiring that UK to assign Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) codes to every class that is taught. CIP codes will also be assigned to faculty based upon their graduate degree, and SACS intends to match up the faculty CIP codes with the class CIP codes to determine if faculty members are qualified to teach specific courses.

All SC members who commented were opposed to such a use of CIP codes. It was suggested that Vice President for Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness Connie Ray be invited to help explain the situation **[AI]**.

4. Provost Subbaswamy

SC members asked Provost Subbaswamy questions about a variety of issues, including a requested expansion of the Family Education Program (to allow the transfer of benefit to be used for graduate courses), salary increases, the Athletics Association, research space allocation, and the incentivized faculty tenure buyout-retirement plan, among a few other issues.

The meeting was adjourned shortly after 5 pm. [The Action Items are a part of the minutes, but fall at the end.]

Respectfully submitted by Hollie I. Swanson,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Kyle, Anderson, Grossman, Lee, Kelly, Nokes, Peek, Wasilkowski, Thelin, Swanson, Steiner.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Friday, March 4, 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	
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	
24.		Review Senate meeting attendance policies. (8/30/10)	SC	
26.		Query VP IRPE Connie Ray about number of administrators at UK vs. benchmark institutions. (9/20/10)	Mrs. Brothers	
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)	Greissman/SC	
36.		Send solicitation for Commencement Cmte Co-Chair to college associate deans. (10/18/10)	Mrs. Brothers	
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	
48.		Create a charge for a committee to review DL courses. (12/6/10)	Chair, SC	
50.	√	Ask Provost on 2/28/11 if there is a metric of square feet/funding used to determine how research space is allocated. (1/10/2011)	SC	02/2011
53.		Investigate "Quality Matters" WRT distance learning courses. (1/10/11)	SC	
56.	√	Ask Provost how the funding from the bought-out tenure will be used on February 28. (1/24/11)	SC	02/2011
57.		Look into creating a Senate committee on assessment. (1/31/11)	SC	
59.		Invite Board of Trustees members and chair to April "State of Faculty Affairs" address. (1/31/11)	Mrs. Brothers / Chair	
60.		Deliberate during summer retreat(s) on what the SC's strategic vision is for academic facilities. (1/31/11)	SC	

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	
63.	√	Email "substantive change" information to SC and Senate. (2/21/11)	Chair	
64.	√	Post "faculty title series" information. (2/21/11)	Mrs. Brothers	
65.		Invite Associate Provost for Undergrad Ed to offer "State of Undergraduate Education" address to Senate. (2/21/11)		
66.		Invite Associate Provost for Academic Affairs about distance learning courses. (2/21/2011)	Mrs. Brothers	
65.		Query Connie Ray to explain use of CIP codes for courses and faculty. (2/28/11)	SC	