

Senate Council  
June 10, 2015

The Senate Council met in special session for its annual retreat at 9 am on Wednesday, June 10, 2015 at 3555 Rice Road, Thoroughbred Club of America, Lexington KY. 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) retreat to order at 9:01 am.

1. Welcome and Introduction for the Day, Minutes from May 11, 2015 and Announcements

The Chair welcomed attendees and thanked them for coming. He said he expected the day's discussions to be different from regular Monday SC meetings, with time to ponder questions about the meaning of shared governance and what role the University Senate (Senate) should play. Although there would be some time constraints, SC members should feel free to pose questions and offer comments.

There were no changes to the minutes from May 11, 2015, so the minutes were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**. The Chair then introduced the SC's newest member, Mr. Austin Mullen, who is the Student Government Association president as well as the student representative to the Board of Trustees. Those present introduced themselves. The Chair commented that student viewpoints were extremely important; he encouraged Mullen to help identify students to serve on Senate committees.

2. Update from Provost Tim Tracy (Senate's Role in Implementation of the New Strategic Plan, Title Series Alignments, University Budget)

Provost Tim Tracy thanked the SC for inviting him to attend the SC's retreat and he noted the positive partnership he had with the Chair. The Provost related some statistics that demonstrated how rapidly things are changing; for example, UK is educating students for jobs that do not yet exist. Provost Tracy said that this information would lead into discussions about UK's strategic plan, which sets UK's course for the next five years. The Provost explained how campus input was solicited and how the strategic plan's five components of undergraduate student success, diversity and inclusivity, community engagement and impact, graduate education, and research are both woven together as well as stand-alone pieces. Provost Tracy explained that the plan would go to the Board of Trustees (Board) in June for approval, but really only the first part is done. Currently, the plan offers a high-level road map; the plan will soon need to be operationalized with a street-level plan of action. That will allow UK to focus on more detailed considerations for various initiatives, such as what exactly the initiative will look like, who needs to be involved, what resources are necessary, and if there are any time constraints. Essentially, the strategic plan will need implementation plans with associated priorities.

Provost Tracy said that as UK determines what resources are needed and where they should come from, UK will have to make some hard decisions about future resource allocations. Merely having done something in the past will be insufficient justification for continuing to do it in the future. Those types of hard decisions, though, are best made with input from a broad community, in accordance with UK's shared governance structure. The Provost said he envisioned five implementation groups (one for each area) that are relatively small but still diverse, comprised of about six members plus a chair. A responsible administrator will likely be named to ensure the implementation plans are carried out. Provost Tracy said that he needed help with identifying people to serve on the core implementation group; the group will need a sufficiently broad base to know who else should be engaged. It will be important to also partner *with* communities, as opposed to doing research *on* communities.

The Provost explained that the Board wanted implementation plans to review at its October meeting, so there is a short time frame in which to prepare implementation plans. Tracy said that he believed it could be done, but if it relied on one person, it would fail; with the help of SC and the Senate, the right faculty can be matched up with the right core groups. The Provost said he wanted to hear comments from SC members, so the Chair opened the floor for discussion.

Christ suggested aligning implementation committees and Senate committees; she said in cases where there was a shared charge/issue between an implementation committee and a Senate committee, it would be logical to have a member of that Senate committee also serve on the implementation committee. Provost Tracy said he was open to that idea and said he would count on SC to let him know who should serve, and where. The Provost commented on the student success element: there is a significant opportunity to make a real impact on student success, particularly for those students in the middle of the academic performance spectrum. Provost Tracy said that he wanted people on campus to move away from thinking about, for example, whether we need another classroom for 200 students, to thinking about what UK should look like, what the value of a residential university should be, and what UK needs to do to ensure its viability into the future.

Kraemer brought up for discussion ways of determining where offerings should be housed: in colleges or in other areas, like centers. For example, while the “Honors Program” is campuswide and centralized, individual colleges also offer departmental and college honors and this makes it difficult for students to navigate the University landscape. The Provost said he had thought about that too, and while he did not have all the solutions, he resurrected the Provost’s Council on Metrics to restart discussions on what types of metrics should be unique to certain areas (scholarship would be very different in Medicine versus in Fine Arts) and which metrics should be adopted campuswide (every area should have a focus on retention). The Provost said he believed that for the issue of retention, every college ought to be measured against both itself and against the entire University. The purpose of such comparisons is to start thinking about UK as a whole and judging individual areas based on their own progress, but also on the University’s overall progress towards a goal.

McCormick asked if there would be opportunities to periodically review metrics from the strategic plan, perhaps in collaboration with appropriate Senate committees. Provost Tracy replied that he would be more than happy to review the scorecard with the Senate on an annual basis. McCormick said that one current problem was that such information was held and used only when a grant submission requested such information – she spoke in favor of reviewing the data on an ongoing basis.

The Chair asked about faculty who decline service-related appointments because of the lack of any reward associated with such service. He asked how the Provost intended to reward or value University service. The Provost said that there were direct and indirect ways of rewarding or valuing service. He said he makes sure to inform a dean when a faculty member does a great job on a committee and he mentions that person at every possible opportunity to tell others how great they were. He continued that depending on the person or the service, he will either go to that person’s office to invite them to participate, but he sometimes invites them to his office to subtly underscore the value and level of importance he places on their service contribution; or if the service is time-consuming, he could buy-out a faculty member’s time so all their time would be spent on a specific initiative.

Christ said she had colleagues who had served on a committee but felt they had made little or no impact and consequently turned down future requests for committee service. Christ asked if there was a way to remedy that problem. The Provost answered that while UK does not always hit homeruns, it is

important to hold committees accountable and ensure all voices are heard, even if a minority opinion does not make it into a final report; at the very least, those espousing the minority opinion must be respected and considered. Christ clarified that it was not a problem of discourtesy so much as it was a balance of true debate with a perceived preformulated outcome. Some faculty do not feel comfortable reopening certain issues. Provost Tracy said that an open and honest debate and discussion were critical and it will be his responsibility to determine if a committee chair is upholding that value. He did note that reopening foundational aspects of a large issue (such as the strategic plan) was not necessarily helpful, but all options would need to be discussed. Wilson commented that UK has a longstanding reputation for soliciting approval for something that was already decided, as opposed to truly seeking input. He said it was a built-up perception that would take time for culture change to percolate down from the top. Tracy said he was doing his best to at least hear all comments and suggestions; there have been a few adjustments to the strategic plan recently to accommodate suggestions.

Watt brought up one of his longstanding frustrations with UK's past strategic plans. Past leadership has often embraced both important and unimportant considerations in a strategic plan, but would pursue the relatively unimportant aspects with the same gusto as the important ones. Invariably, UK ends up making headway on the relatively unimportant aspects because the important ones are difficult and more challenging. Further, Watt suggested that the never-ending emphasis on metrics minutiae and the time spent by faculty recording this type of data is silly. Provost Tracy recognized this as the "peanut butter approach," where a little bit of attention is spread equally over everything. The Provost said that if the strategic plan should have no more than 20 metrics for the five areas. He noted that the plan is eight pages, including the introduction. He agreed with Watt's overall sentiment of investing in signature programs/areas and making hard decisions about where resources should be allocated.

McCormick commented that in her college (Education), the programs best aligned with Education's mission and priorities are selectively rewarded, which causes a lot of discussion. She noted that perhaps not all funded areas were equally foundational. Provost Tracy said that this area was one where SC and Senate could really play a role. Where to spend money is relatively easy to decide, but he said he was probably going to ask for help when making tough decisions through hearing the faculty perspective on pros and cons. Tracy said that he would take responsibility for the tough decisions, but he wanted the shared governance process to help him through solicited advice for thorny issues.

Kraemer encouraged Provost Tracy to think about what he has to begin with when implementation arrives, as even Google does not try to guess what will happen over the course of a year. The Provost said he would send to the Chair a link to an article about change and noted that the strategic plan would need to be a five-year plan that could be adjusted annually in response to changing times. Porter commented that scholarship does not seem to be something that UK cares about. Faculty are supposed to work with high school students and undergraduates but that effort is not part of a faculty member's evaluation. Porter said he would be interested to see how evaluation of scholarship is done after the new strategic plan is implemented. The Provost noted that impact is important but it can be challenging to measure it.

Wilson spoke in favor of creating a more nimble and innovative structure; UK must be able to respond quickly, not two years after a problem occurs. Wilson said that UK does not foster innovation; rather there are plenty of barriers to doing anything differently. He said he sees articles and notices about what wonderful, innovative things faculty do at their home institutions and it is unfortunate that nothing like that is feasible at UK. Wilson said many faculty no longer even try to innovate because they know the existing barriers. He offered an anecdotal example of an honors course instructor who wanted students

to do video projects. UK's media center, however, required that all cameras be used in the media center space – they could not leave the building. Wilson said that what worked eventually was faculty cobbling together some cameras for students to borrow so they could create their projects. Other institutions have figured out how to be innovative but UK still lags behind.

Watt said that UK's ability to innovate would depend on a variety of factors. He thought the Senate would resist any change, as is its natural inclination. Watt said he would like to see the abolishment of all title series – he said the hours spent in Senate on title series discussions, as well as all the hours spent deciding if a faculty member should be promoted, were utterly ridiculous. Provost Tracy said that he, personally, was comfortable with change and was happy to partner with the Senate. Tracy offered a mantra for innovation: start small, fail fast, and scale quickly. He commented that failure is not failure, but rather a lesson learned and that is what UK is all about.

Christ noted that UK had some very good, basic programs (such as math and history) that have excellent track records. She wondered if UK's established research priorities were appropriate, or if additional ones in the humanities could be added, noting that many unrecognized programs were unglamorous but were the bread and butter of a solid humanities education. Provost Tracy commented that a bachelor's degree in liberal studies was likely to make its way through the Senate in fall 2015 and would be housed in the College of Arts and Sciences. Christ commented that humanities studies occur in more than just one college. She also noted that customized degrees take intense faculty effort to be successful.

Provost Tracy then turned to the matter of tenure and title series. UK currently has seven titles series and within each one there are between three and four levels of promotion; on top of that there are lecturer and instructor positions. In addition to these, there are faculty in voluntary and adjunct series and both of those assignments have multiple levels. The Provost said that the system was extremely difficult to understand. The Provost said that there were no plans to do anything at the moment, but welcomed a discussion with SC and Senate on changing this to just two categories of faculty – tenure eligible and non-tenure eligible. Both series could also have the assistant, associate, and full professor rankings that faculty are familiar with. The Provost referred to the 1990 report by Ernest Boyer, "Scholarship Reconsidered – Priorities of the Professoriate" and that document's discussion of different areas of scholarship.

The Provost commented that the title series appointments he sees are not standardized from one college to the next and he spoke in favor of a system that had career ladders for both tenure and non-tenure eligible series. As non-tenure eligible faculty progressed through the system, they could be rewarded with progressively longer contracts (one-year, three-year, etc.). Watt said he was aware of a university that offers three-year contracts for assistant professors, six-year contracts for associate professors, and 12-year contracts for full professors. In this scenario, if a faculty member ceases contributing to academe, their contract might not be renewed, even if they were tenured. McCormick expressed doubt that the Senate would see any such change as positive. The Provost said he just wanted a partner in taking a good look at the issue of tenure and title series, specifically how it could be simplified and how faculty could be better rewarded for what they do. Bailey spoke in favor of just relying on the requirements on the Distribution of Effort form (DOE) and the job description given the tremendous redundancies and discrepancies among a faculty member's job description, title series description, and DOE.

Christ commented that there were problems with the DOE across campus – some areas use flexibility well but other colleges have a dean that arbitrarily sets a certain percentage for an aspect for every

faculty member. The Provost said that he has productivity reports for every college and after starting to compare them with DOEs, he has found that the two are not really correlated but they should be. Provost Tracy volunteered to buy a copy of Boyer's work for SC members. He said that although it was 20 years old, it could jumpstart major initiatives and it addresses the mission of a university very futuristically.

Moving to the topic of the budget, the Provost said that he hoped he would be sharing what others would consider to be welcome news. UK's budget has traditionally been a hybrid model, not a true incremental model. Allowing colleges to retain their fund balances and the portion of facilities and administrative (F&A) costs being returned to a unit are examples of the hybrid nature. UK has now allocated \$5 million in new money for colleges, which will be awarded based on quality and quantity. The Provost said discussions with deans about how to measure quality and quantity were ongoing. Colleges will be compared to themselves when evaluating their performance on quality and quantity. If a college has good retention rates, then that college could focus on improving their graduation rates. The Provost said he wanted to have these types of discussions with SC, too. He commented that for every 1% increase in retention annually, UK sees a corresponding annual increase of \$1 million in revenues.

Christ asked Provost Tracy if he was aware of any plans to reward a college's efforts on behalf of a student who later changes majors and moves to another college for a different major. He said that each college will be measured on retention and graduation rates for their individual college as well as for the entire University. Tracy acknowledged that the balance may not yet be right, but would be adjusted as necessary. He noted that some universities have developed creative ways to improve retention and graduation rates, such as those that take a portion of a bonus pool and reward every employee if the university reaches its retention goals. The Chair commented that many of the incentives would work with deans, but that there is a danger that individual faculty would not be rewarded for their efforts; the Chair spoke in favor of incentivizing all the way down and not stopping at the dean's level. The Provost noted that he would need SC's help with transparency.

Provost Tracy offered closing remarks and thanked the SC for inviting him. He said he appreciated the conversation and the great ideas and thanked SC for being willing to have a discussion on title series. SC members thanked the Provost for attending.

The Chair suggested a 10-minute break. The meeting reconvened at 10:55 am.

3. Board of Trustees Chair O. Keith Gannon – Shared Governance and the Role of the University Senate  
The Chair welcomed Board of Trustees Chair O. Keith Gannon, noting that Board Chair Gannon immediately accepted his invitation to attend the SC retreat.

Board Chair Gannon said that he hoped to participate in a conversation about shared governance, among other things. He started with some introductory remarks to SC members about his background and personal philosophy. Gannon opined that shared governance is one of the most important things a university can be about, resulting in a melting pot of creativity, thought and intellectual leadership. He spoke in favor of tenure and that a large part of the greatness of academe is the freedom of faculty to speak their minds. He said he hoped UK would never move away from a tenure system. Board Chair Gannon explained that the job of trustees is to monitor the University and delegate to the President the responsibility of running the University on a daily basis. The Board must be willing to engage beyond UK's walls to sustain a transformation that will affect the Commonwealth of Kentucky for generations to

come. Board Chair Gannon said he wanted to help trustees become more engaged with shared governance and to facilitate that he attended a recent national conference put on by the Association of Governing Boards (AGB). He attended several workshops, including shared governance and having a consequential board. Gannon explained that university boards around the country were facing many of the same issues as UK, including how to effectively communicate while obeying restrictive sunshine laws.

Gannon explained that through hard work in the shared governance arena it was possible to get policies and actions that all constituent groups felt ownership for. To have healthy communication, there must be trust, transparency, and metrics by which to assess progress. He acknowledged the naturally occurring healthy tension that is found in effective shared governance. There is room for innovation but the tension helps hold all parties accountable... Board Chair Gannon noted that he had been involved in the Board's healthcare committee but wondered aloud how successful he would have been had he spent his time comparing technical capability with the highly trained medical faculty and staff – he said there was no way he, as a trained chemist rather than medical professional, he could or should try to match that kind of expertise. As a trustee he tries to help set aspirational goals and challenges and continually ask thoughtful questions. Shared governance allows everyone to do their part and simultaneously bring their expertise forward. Faculty must be champions of a healthy and progressive curriculum, but UK cannot focus disproportionately on what we did yesterday. UK must be committed to the state, which means commitment to addressing the state's needs and problems. UK is the intellectual nucleus of KY and we must remain accountable.

Bailey asked how the Board receives information from the faculty. Although the regs require the President to communicate the faculty's opinion, he wondered if the faculty's opinion comes through well at the Board level. Gannon said that he continues to rely heavily on the two faculty trustees for faculty input. He commented that different perspectives are important and that Board deliberations were a thoughtful and sometimes circuitous process, rather than linear. Board Chair Gannon said he hoped to hold a special meeting at the end of August for trustees whereby outside experts and speakers would provide the Board an opportunity to hear about shared governance, among other critical topics, from a national perspective. While trustees must rely on the President for information, they must also challenge the administration in a healthy manner. Gannon spoke in favor of continuing various dialogues and building trust. He said he is involved and informed on a number of issues, but stays at the 30,000 foot level, noting that a Board chair who becomes too involved in more specific details would likely cause unnecessary problems.

The Chair asked if a mechanism was present to give heavier weight to the opinion of faculty trustees when something like a research building is discussed. Board Chair Gannon suggested that faculty underestimate the weight of the faculty trustees' voice. He spoke of one specific instance in which faculty input played a huge role in terms of decision making, and that trustees do listen. He commented that although faculty may not know how their voices work their way through the system or the message was ultimately communicated, messages are heard.

McCormick asked if Board Chair Gannon had any suggestions on how faculty can help the Board advocate at the state level for increased funding. Gannon replied that the AGB conference taught him that many states are in precarious financial positions and that Kentucky had to deal at this time with unfunded pension plans and the anticipated costs associated with expanded Medicaid when federal support winds down and states must pick up part of the tab in a few years. He said that the Medicaid issue will directly affect UK healthcare. At the healthcare retreat in a week, he said there would be

much discussion about revising UK Healthcare's strategic plan with that in mind. Although trustees are very comfortable with the path UK Healthcare is on, now, trustees are continuing to ask hard questions.

Kraemer asked if the Board has a perspective or opinion on the rate of change in the future and large-scale changes to the higher education landscape. Board Chair Gannon explained that he hoped it would and that the Board's October retreat will focus carefully on the metrics of the strategic plan that is nearing completion. It will be important for trustees to discuss matters of consequence and not get sidetracked by tangential issues. Gannon said that he wants to help put more emphasis on the Board being even more of a consequential board in the 21<sup>st</sup> century – UK is at a critical transitional point. Although President Capilouto has been here for 48 months, in many ways UK has only just planted the seeds necessary to be a national leading university far into the future. The Board is thinking hard about where it wants UK to be in three, five, 10 years and beyond but without the benefit of full clarity as to what the world of higher education will look like then. Governing boards of today are expected to true fiduciaries of all aspects of the universities they serve.

The Chair referred to the article on shared governance that was posted with the agenda. Board Chair Gannon said that he would never question the President publicly, but he assured SC members that the communication between him and the President is very healthy and of much substance. For example, the President's performance evaluation is almost complete and all important topics have been addressed properly and with appropriate depth but with proper consideration for ensuring the President isn't inadvertently undermined. Gannon said he has huge respect for President Capilouto and that UK is on a great course; President Capilouto has done a wonderful job. It was important to utilize a recent closed session for the most recent Executive Committee meeting so that those members could have a clear, unfettered discussion with the President about his performance evaluation. Although there were points during the discussion in closed session that were not completely comfortable, they were necessary, healthy discussions. The Board values the ability to agree in public, but disagree in private. While the Board does not seek unanimity on everything, efforts are made to resolve issues in advance to avoid creating unnecessary conflict.

Porter asked what tangible things the SC could do to help promote shared governance. Board Chair Gannon passed out a shared governance grid that asks the user to identify what type of role (e.g. recommends, approves, consults) should be played by which constituency (e.g. board, president, faculty senate, staff senate) regarding which issues (e.g. hiring president, employee benefits, curriculum changes, faculty handbook). Gannon asked SC members to fill out the grid, which came from an AGB publication ("Shared Governance in Times of Change: A Practical Guide for Universities and College," April 2014). He referred to the second page, which included a figure of the components of shared governance as a system and commented that he rarely heard anyone talk about shared governance as being part of a system. Board Chair Gannon opined that the figure appeared to illustrate a fair framework for shared governance.

Bailey commented that many shared governance issues take place at the department or college level; faculty administrators have more turnover in their positions and, hence, bring their own rules or simply do not care to know what UK's rules are. This gives rise to conflicts of understanding and is where shared governance breaks down. Board Chair Gannon acknowledged that the perspectives of 18,000 employees can be difficult to navigate. Due to the complexities of UK's system, however, he should not reach too far into the system or risk creating complications. Bailey noted that the SC and Senate routinely slow down proposals to ensure that the faculty involved are appropriately consulted, as opposed to merely having a dean saying s/he speaks for the entire faculty without caring what the

faculty actually want. Christ said that administrators have no incentive to reward administrators who properly employ shared governance or who stop things that are going wrong. Bailey added that there was a perception that the SC and Senate are an impediment to efficiency. Board Chair Gannon acknowledged that having that reputation may not feel entirely comfortable, but the process ensures that faculty consultation has been sought and is an important responsibility, although delays for the sake of delay must be avoided.

Board Chair Gannon said that, philosophically, while he may not always get what he considers to be complete answers, UK is a complex system to navigate. In his personal business, which is relatively small, he can direct communication and organizational conversations. However, as with any system that grows and matures things become more complex and there are new obstacles to work around. Gannon reiterated that his intent as chair was to trust the process and keep checking to ensure it is the right process. He reiterated that shared governance is one of the most important things that happen at a university and it, like our state and national democratic processes, was probably not meant to be nice, neat, and clean. The basis of the tenure concept is that it ensures that faculty as the intellectual leaders of society can speak freely. Watt asked if his opinion would be different if some of his company's employees disappeared daily for an hour or two at a time to do something unrelated to their employment. Board Chair Gannon replied that he left the corporate world to start his own business so that he would not be constrained by a corporate bureaucracy; Watt's scenario simply does not exist in Gannon's company and is not meant to exist in private business. Gannon added that UK has a fundamentally different set of rules that have to be dealt with. It is unacceptable for a faculty member to be idle, but the problem cannot be fixed in one day and the system cannot be sacrificed to address individual issues and situations. UK has been around for 150 years and taking a year or two or more to address problems will certainly not matter as much in the long run as dismissing or dismantling a fundamental building block. Watt continued that as a faculty member who had held a lot of administrative roles at UK, he had seen a great deal of faculty productivity issues across colleges. Regarding the Board's fiduciary responsibilities, Watt said that some believe there is a fiduciary responsibility to ensure funds given by the state and others are spent prudently to assist UK's mission.

Kraemer commented that one sticking point was the distinction between governance and management; which can be confusing for faculty. Shared governance is an implicit delegation of some level of authority. He wondered if trustees understood the difference. Board Chair Gannon opined that smart and driven people typically have strong belief in their ideas and concepts and as such want their way, but he believes the best way forward should always involve the consideration and perspectives of others. He expressed amazement at the energy some put into creating a clear path to a silo as opposed to trying to be collaborative. Gannon said that from conversations with President Capilouto it is clear to him that the President is making headway with the faculty and also highly values the faculty perspective. Further, the evaluations of the President by the faculty are improving, but all sentiments will not be changed overnight; positive improvement is a good and healthy trend.

As discussion wound down, Board Chair Gannon said that he thinks UK is on a great and historic path and that the 2015-2020 strategic plan will be one of the most important documents in UK's history, due in part to where UK is in this history. While UK has made approximately \$2 billion in infrastructural investments in the past four years, UK's momentum is also extremely valuable and may not be duplicated again in this lifetime. Public-private partnerships may be the key to advancing the University and the state, but it will be important to continue convincing key leaders across the state that such partnerships are worthwhile and will benefit the university and the state for generations. If UK fails to develop a clear plan to make the investment work effectively, we will lose not only dollars but the entire



state will lose the compounding effect that could bring greatness for decades to come. Gannon said that when he talked to other trustees and board chairs at the AGB conference, all were astounded at what UK has accomplished – this type of progress is simply not happening across the country at this time. Gannon also explained that President Capilouto was four years into a seven-year contract; no one knows for sure how long the President will stay, and everyone is hopeful it will be a long time, however, it is somewhat unlikely that President Capilouto will be at UK as long as 10 years. That means there is a reality in terms of leadership that the Board must also consider in the coming years. Gannon recapped some of the President’s accomplishments and said the President has always been very open to discussing obstacles and how to deal with them. Gannon said that President Capilouto respects both UK’s land-grant and flagship missions and understands clearly that UK must continue to honor the balance between the two. UK must set proper metrics to track its progress. We cannot put the strategic plan on a shelf and forget about it. Dynamic measurements and metrics will be the key to ensuring we make progress. That being said, UK will make good progress if we concentrate intently on the guide laid out in the strategic plan, even though the needle may not shift significantly in some areas for a few years. Although the vacancy in the provost’s office delayed the development of the strategic plan by a year, maybe that will work to UK’s advantage, given what we have learned about UK in the interim.

The Chair thanked Board Chair Gannon for attending and said that it was unprecedented to hear such direct, plain speaking from the Board chair. The Chair said he hoped such conversations would become routine. Board Chair Gannon admitted that political correctness was not his strong suit but he takes his role as chair very seriously.

At 12:06 pm, the Chair suggested a break for lunch. The meeting reconvened at 1:30 pm.

#### 4. Reflections on 2014-15 (Summary of June 11, 2014 SC Retreat and Summary of Senate's 2014-15 Activities)

The Chair recapped the activities of the SC and Senate, in the context of what the SC discussed during its retreat in June 2014. One big issue was the perceived sentiment among many that the SC alienated contact persons for proposals during SC reviews of said proposals. Some of the solutions that were implemented were: having a senator on the Undergraduate Council (UC), Graduate Council (GC), or Health Care Colleges Council (HCCC); contacting proposal contact persons with questions prior to the SC meeting; and revising undergraduate degree and certificate forms to better capture answers to the types of questions reviewers want answered.

SC members then discussed the issue of “faculty support” in various proposals and whether it was sufficient to get approval by a department chair (on behalf of the departmental faculty) or if a copy of meeting minutes when the item was discussed was necessary. SC members expressed a variety of opinions on the topic, with members split between wanting meeting minutes and others accepting a memo from a department chair on behalf of departmental faculty.

The Chair and SC members continued discussion of “Results” from the summary of the SC’s activities during its June 2014 retreat. The Chair noted that he had brought up the idea of getting University-level service onto Distribution of Effort forms (DOE) with the former provost, who did not do anything with it. The Chair noted that he had attended new faculty orientation to explain the University Senate to new faculty. The Chair also attended one of the former provost’s council of deans meeting in which he explained the importance of University service. There were some comments about percentages on the DOE being essentially meaningless due to some areas’ inclination to designate a specific percentage to service regardless of how much effort is given.

Regarding getting the best senators, Kraemer asked if it was possible to revisit the relatively recent prohibition on department chairs serving in the Senate. If faculty are serious about the value of rich perspectives offered by shared governance, then there should be concerns that the entire department chair demographic is going untapped. The Chair noted that within the past year a fantastic SC member became a center director, which meant that the person had to immediately resign their SC and Senate positions. The Chair clarified that the prohibition is in the *Senate Rules* and as such the language could be rewritten to allow department chairs to serve. He also reported hearing concerns that department chairs were specifically excluded from the Senate, even though deans had formal participatory roles. There was a lot of discussion regarding the inclusion of department chairs and those offering an opinion were all supportive. SC members thought that department chair membership in the Senate could be set up like deans (automatic but with voting rights only every other year) or department chairs could simply be allowed to run for a seat like any other faculty member.

The SC then turned to discussion of Senate committee activities and evaluated how the committee functioned during the 2014-15 year. During discussion, the Chair clarified that the SC does not actually have the authority to approve any proposal, but rather the SC's role is to review a proposal and determine if it should be on a Senate agenda. Although the SC sends forward its recommendation with each proposal, that recommendation is not necessary. There was a brief discussion about whether a Senate committee could reject a proposal or if the committee chair only needed to share the committee's concerns while the proposal moved to the next step.

The Chair asked if there were concerns among SC members about the review process. Mazur said that the 3+3 UK BLUE (between the College of Law and College of Arts and Sciences) review was problematic – the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) report implied they felt rushed and under administrative pressure to approve it. Once the proposal made it to the SC, there were two deans in the room, both advocating approval. Mazur said she felt rushed and although conducting some business via email votes could be helpful, she was not sure if that sort of thing was actually allowed. Given that one of the colleges had already hired an advisor to work with the program, it was a *fait accompli*. Faculty become discouraged from participating in shared governance when they review something that is so clearly a “done deal.”

SC members then discussed the SAPC and its role in the approval process. There were some concerns expressed that the review process was layer upon layer of review, while some of the layers may not add value. Below are suggestions on the new program approval process, but no decisions were made.

- Send new programs straight from the college to the SC office for submission to SAPC.
- Have the UC or GC review the proposal in concurrence with the SAPC.
- Create a system whereby a subset of the SAPC is on the UC and helps ensure a thorough review at the earlier, academic council step.
- Change the structure of the SAPC so that it reports to the UC, not the SC and Senate.

SC members discussed the number of curricular items approved through the SC office. Ms. Brothers answered a variety of questions about the web transmittal process, such as the frequency of posting, the information posted with the actual form, and the number of objections received on an annual basis. A couple SC members suggested adding the course title to the web transmittal.

## 5. Senate Subcommittee Assignments

The Chair noted that this was the first time in years that so many colleges had completed their election for senator prior to the fall semester – only one college had yet to send in their results. The Chair explained the format of the Senate committee composition handout. The Chair noted that the chairs of at least two committees (SAPC and Senate's Rules and Elections Committee) commented on how helpful the student committee members were. The Chair said that he again planned to arrange a get together with student senators during the dinner hour and offer them opportunities to sign up for Senate committee membership.

SC members reviewed and discussed the proposed Senate committee assignments and made a few adjustments. There was extensive discussion about appropriate membership, diversity, and leadership on a variety of individual committees. In situations where the Senate term of the committee chair had ended, or insufficient work had been undertaken by the committee during the 2014-15 year, SC members recommended new or alternate chairs. There were a few committees that some SC members thought were archaic and would not be utilized by the administration, no matter how theoretically helpful they might be. The Chair said he would ask the Provost how faculty and the Senate could be more helpful and he would include Vice Chair McCormick, too. There was some concern that so many Senate committees were known by SC members to be dormant. Porter said that a lot of senators' first experience involves serving on a committee that does not meet, which results in a negative opinion of the Senate. SC members agreed to review the Senate committee structure in December, after committees have had sufficient time to begin meeting and working on their charges.

Watt **moved** to: approve the committee compositions as amended; direct the Chair to contact faculty about serving as chairs, as indicated during the day's discussion; assign College of Medicine senators to Senate committees upon receipt of their election results; and place student senators on Senate committees according to preference and need. Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 6. Planning Senate Activities for 2015-16

The Chair suggested adjourning and informally discussing Senate activities for 2015-16. Any formal recommendations could be moved and voted on during a subsequent, regular meeting.

There being no additional business to attend to, the meeting was adjourned at 3:38 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Hippisley,  
Senate Council Chair

Invited guests present: O. Keith Gannon, Austin Mullen, and Tim Tracy.

SC members present: Bailey, Brown, Christ, Hippisley, Kraemer, Mazur, McCormick, Porter, Wilson, and Watt.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, June 23, 2015.