

Senate Council
February 29, 2016

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, February 29, 2016 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Andrew Hippisley called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:02 pm.

1. Minutes from February 22 and Announcements

The Chair reported that no changes to the minutes from February 22 were received. Hearing **no objections**, the minutes from February 22, 2016 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair had a handful of announcements.

- The Chair met with new College of Design Dean Mitzi Vernon; he commented that she had served as a senate chair at a prior institution and that she was fascinated by the amount of shared governance embedded in the University Senate (Senate).
- Ms. Brothers slightly reorganized the proposal for the proposed new Lewis Honors College; she added a table of contents and added the executive summary that the advisory committee recommended. Both documents are now available on the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) site and the Senate's web page with general information about the proposed new Lewis Honors College. The Chair and SC members discussed the possibility of a town hall forum to discuss the proposal prior to the SC meeting on March 7. Those present eventually settled on Monday, March 7 as the opportunity for all faculty to ask questions, make comments, or offer suggestions. Chair was asked to send an invitation to all faculty and reference the proposal materials.

2. Old Business

a. Standard of Evidence in Academic Offenses - Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 6.4* ("Academic Offenses and Procedures")

Guest Scott Yost, chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), reminded SC members about the proposal; he noted that the last time SC met, the vote was postponed only because there were no students present to formally weigh in.

SC members discussed the proposal again. Wilson said that he understood that both President Eli Capilouto and Provost Tim Tracy supported having the same standards for faculty and for students in terms of disciplinary action. Wilson stated that while he was happy with the use of "preponderance of evidence," he wanted SC members to understand that they were implicitly approving standards that would eventually go forward for faculty and staff disciplinary actions. The Chair invited comments from Guest Rowan Reid, deputy chief of staff for the Student Government Association (SGA). Reid said that the proposal was brought before student senators and the SGA's executive committee and neither group identified any problems. She noted that having the benchmark information had proven helpful during the students' discussion. Yost confirmed for Reid that the burden of proof still fell on the faculty member. Gower confirmed that "preponderance of evidence" was acceptable.

Blonder opined that the change should include the legal definition of "preponderance of evidence" and that the change should go to the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC). Grossman explained that the SREC codifies Senate-approved changes and ensures new language does not conflict with existing language, but does not create policy. There was extensive discussion with some SC members

supporting the inclusion of the definition of “preponderance of evidence” while others, including Reid, thought that anyone who wanted to know what the word meant could just look it up in a dictionary. When discussion paused, the Chair suggested SC members vote on the **motion** from SAASC recommending approval of the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 6.4*. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. Blonder asked if the phrase “preponderance of evidence” was going to be defined and the Chair suggested she move a motion.

Blonder **moved** to amend the proposal to include the definition of “preponderance of evidence.” The Chair asked Yost if he would accept that on behalf of the SAASC as a friendly amendment. Yost replied that the SAASC discussed the matter at length and did not believe a definition was necessary. The Chair then asked for a second to Blonder’s motion. Blonder’s motion **died** due to **lack of a second**.

The SC voted on the motion from SAASC and the motion **passed** with six in favor, two opposed, and one abstaining.

b. Title IX Language - Addition to Syllabus Template/Guidelines

Guest Pearl James (AS/English) explained the revisions she made to the language since SC last saw it. Schroeder **moved** that the Title IX language be added to the syllabus template and syllabus guidelines and Brown **seconded**. Those SC members expressing an opinion were supportive of the addition, although there were comments that the information should be communicated to students in additional formats, such as during K Week activities.

When there was no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with one opposed.

c. Senate Meeting Roundtable

The Chair invited SC members to offer comments on the February 8 Senate meeting. Below are representative comments.

- The safety presentation by UK’s Chief of Police was very good.
- It is important to encourage discussion of motions on the floor, but there should also be some limits to it.
- The Chair should not call on any senator for a second time until every other senator who wishes to speak has had a chance to speak, first.
- SC members could consider calling the question if discussion is not breaking new ground.

3. Preliminary Discussion about Title Series

[Provost Tim Tracy arrived while SC was finishing up its discussion on the most recent Senate meeting. Therefore, SC did not hold its preliminary discussion.]

4. Provost Tim Tracy - Discussion about Title Series

The Chair welcomed Provost Tracy and the Provost thanked the Chair and SC members for inviting him and for all their hard work. The Provost said that he wanted to begin a conversation with the Senate Council on streamlining and simplifying UK’s faculty title series. The Provost said that UK has, depending on how one counts, at least seven different title series. That being said, faculty easily fall into one of two categories – tenurable and non-tenurable. The Provost mentioned that when he reviews promotion and

tenure (P&T) dossiers, it is particularly difficult to evaluate special title series (STS) dossiers because that title series is interpreted so differently from college to college. The standards for P&T for STS vary widely and with variable expectations of scholarship. He further commented that statements of evidence were not always easy to understand and could be difficult to interpret. The Provost mentioned Ernest Boyer's 1990's publication, "Scholarship Reconsidered" and Boyer's different forms of scholarship. The Provost asked SC if members were willing to have dialogues and discussions about moving to just two title series – tenure-eligible and non-tenure eligible, with each series having ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and full professor. Faculty could be focused around a handful of scholarship types, such as scholarship of research, scholarship of service, and scholarship of pedagogy. There would be clear criteria for each type of scholarship, which would be how faculty advance through the ranks. Provost Tracy said that he was concerned with faculty who remain at the assistant (non-tenure) or associate level for ten years or more; he wondered what UK could have done differently to help them advance.

Those SC members expressing opinions were supportive of having the sort of campuswide discussion suggested by the Provost. The Provost and SC members engaged in a lively discussion about the possibility of moving to two title series; below are a sampling of comments.

- It is the job of unit faculty to write statements of evidence, so even under a new system those statements could be just as confusing and varied.
- Having two tracks will make the entire system more idiosyncratic – there will need to be a job description and expectations that are unique for every faculty member.
- The Distribution of Effort form (DOE) is an important part of determining what a faculty member spends time on, so the DOE should be part of any discussion on streamlining title series.
- While Boyer's suggestions make a lot of sense, practically speaking it is not clear that a variety of individual expectations will be any clearer for faculty or the Provost to understand.
- The Senate has two committees (Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure; and Senate's Advisory Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure) which are charged with reviewing promotion and tenure regulations. These committees should be charged with reviewing the Provost's suggestions.
- Some units have abused the original distinctions among different title series; having two title series could make the lack of distinctions more problematic.
- It will be important for any change to accommodate protections for all faculty, as well as establish equitable baselines.
- Faculty job descriptions sometimes do not match the duties assigned to the person hired into that particular job.
- Some units do not have statements of evidence for advancement from lecturer to senior lecturer.

Senate Council
February 29, 2016

- If a faculty member is not familiar with the particulars of a given faculty member's duties, it will be hard to evaluate progress towards P&T.
- Simplifying the title series is a great idea. Two components need to be discussed at length: how will UK differentiate between different types of faculty; and protections will need to be established to prevent the scenario that has occurred in at least one college, where leadership there has asserted that while the faculty member is tenured, their salary is not tenured so the college can reduce salary to any amount.
- Some colleges distinguish between funded research and unfunded research, stating that only funded research "counts."
- It will be important that one group is not benefiting over the other group (tenure eligible and non-tenure eligible).
- Any review of UK's title series system should include a review of practices by benchmark institutions, as well as the University of North Carolina, which recently changed its title series system.
- If UK moves to two titles series, there needs to be time for new faculty to learn to be experts in the field they are assigned to. For example, a new faculty member who is expected to be an expert in pedagogy must have years of experience to let them grow into being an expert.
- The DOE is not uniform among colleges, let alone uniform within colleges.
- There are very little opportunities for assistant professors to engage in professional development activities.

The Provost noted that he was aware of universities that prohibited new faculty from serving on any committee for three years, after which the faculty member could only serve on college committees for the next two years. SC members were amused by the prospect of new faculty not being assigned to committees immediately upon arrival on campus, but did think it would be a healthy change.

- Most faculty, including SC members, do not get credit for all the service activities they perform.

SC members discussed the possibility of including DOEs in the discussion on title series. The Provost commented that he had the support of deans to look at title series changes, but had not brought up the issues of DOEs. As discussion progressed, it appeared that SC supported the idea of having a discussion on title series that would be given to the Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure (SACPT) and Senate's Advisory Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (SACAPT). In response to Wood, the Provost agreed to provide staff support if the SACPT and SACAPT needed it. McCormick suggested that both committees meet jointly.

As discussion wound down, the Chair thanked the Provost for attending and SC members echoed that sentiment.

Senate Council
February 29, 2016

Wood **moved** to adjourn and Schroeder **seconded**. SC members voted with their feet. The meeting was adjourned at 5:01 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Hippisley,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bailey, Biery, Blonder, Brown, Grossman, Hippisley, Kraemer, McCormick, Porter, Schroeder, Wilson, and Wood.

Invited guests present: Pearl James, Rowan Reid, Tim Tracy, Scott Yost.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, March 1, 2016.