

Senate Council
June 11, 2014

The Senate Council met in special session for its annual retreat at 9 am on Wednesday, June 11, 2014 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 9:02 am.

1. Welcome and Retreat Overview

The Chair said he saw the retreat as an opportunity for SC to have time to pause and think about how the SC operates. He offered additional comments about his hopes for the day's retreat and asked SC members to consider two main questions throughout the retreat.

1. What is the Senate Council for?
2. Can the SC be better at what it does?

The Chair suggested that a good way to get started was for all those present to introduce themselves for the benefit of Jake Ingram, the newest member of the SC, who is the new president of the Student Government Association. SC members did so.

2. Relations between Senate Council and Fellow Faculty

The Chair asked SC members to consider a few questions, listed below, to get the discussion started.

- How can SC make relations between the SC and fellow faculty less antagonistic, assuming it is antagonistic, and can there be more transparency in the review process?
- What is the SC's tone and should it be changed?
- Does SC feel safe expressing opinions about proposals and can SC do a better job of anticipating potential problems and dealing with them prior to the meeting?

Debski asked for clarification about the first question and the inherent assumption. The Chair replied that as a former guest of the SC due to having had a proposed new program on a SC agenda, he could speak both from experience and from comments expressed to him by recent SC guests. Some feel that attending a SC meeting is something akin to an interrogation and that SC does not necessarily want a proposal to be approved. Debski replied that many proposals have significant deficiencies when they are presented to SC, so she wanted proposals to be better reviewed prior to coming to SC. She said that many problems should have been caught earlier on in the review process and that during the limited time frame of meetings, it was necessary to be direct. Debski disagreed with the characterization of SC meetings as antagonistic. Watt agreed with Debski, but Wilson stated his agreement with the negative characterization of SC. Wilson said that he spoke with three recent SC meeting attendees who were present to answer questions for a proposal; he said each thought their interaction with SC was more akin to an Internal Revenue Service audit than to a collegial review.

There was a lengthy discussion about the root of the problem. SC members largely agreed with the premise that if reviews of proposals by prior committees and councils were more thorough, there would be no need for SC to have to perform such granular reviews of proposals. This, in turn, would do much

to change the tone of SC meetings. SC members offered anecdotal evidence of various problems with past proposals, as well as anecdotes of frustrations by proposal contact persons who were routinely asked to make multiple revisions for different reviewing bodies and who felt that the review process was overly long and difficult. During the course of discussion, SC members offered a variety of comments and suggestions on how to improve the process for proposing new programs as well as changes to both academic organization and structure, and changes to admissions and academic standards).

- If a proposal is not fully and appropriately vetted at prior levels (department, college, and University Senate academic councils) the prior vetting bodies should be held accountable.
- SC could measure the approval process outcomes and satisfaction of faculty colleagues “clients.” Faculty involved in a new program proposal can feel as if the goal posts keep moving as the proposal moves through the approval process and every reviewing body asks for different and additional information.
- Some faculty have a skewed perception of the University Senate (Senate) review process – many times it takes months of collaboration to get a proposal to the point of leaving the college. Proposal development is a necessary part of the process, not an unnecessary Senate delay. Once a proposal enters the Senate apparatus, the Senate has an obligation to review it from a University perspective, which naturally takes time.
- Evaluating performance and improving efficiency is a good goal, but measuring client satisfaction would be a terrible aim – no one ever wants to revise a proposal, no matter how well or poorly written it may be.
- Some proposals come to SC with very basic mistakes and problems that should have prevented the proposal from ever leaving the college. If proposals come to SC with a lot of problems, what is the value added from reviews by departmental and college committees and by the Senate’s academic councils (Graduate Council (GC), Health Care Colleges Council (HCCC), and Undergraduate Council (UC))? The whole curricular review process should be redesigned.
- Proposers do not know what the SC expects to see in a program proposal unless the proposer happens to have served on the SC or Senate. That is why expectations are not met – faculty do not know what SC and Senate want to see.
- There is a more fundamental problem with the review process in that there should be some evaluation as to whether a proposal should go forward or not. Sometimes there are bad proposals that simply should not move forward under any circumstances. How, or can, the Senate say “no”? Proposals almost always get approved.
- If there was better assistance offered to proposers at the beginning, issues could be resolved before a proposal is many pages long and requests for revisions are met with resentment.
- If SC could ensure that proposals are prepared more carefully and in accordance with Senate requirements, the process would be smoother for everyone involved. Perhaps the Chair could

hold workshops with college curriculum committee chairs, as well as with the chairs of the GC, HCCC, and UC.

- The SC could best improve the process by putting a human face on it. The décor and room arrangement for 103 Main Building [the regular location of SC meetings] is intimidating. The SC should not be a rubber stamp, but it could do a better job of recognizing things under its control that could improve some part of the approval process.
- Provost Christine Riordan should provide financial support for a position that would help advocate for and shepherd proposals through the approval process.
- Filling out forms is not the first step in the program review process – the first step should be having a pre-proposal that a new committee could review and determine when and for how long which review bodies and outside units should be involved in the review process.
- Any new position involved in program review should be in the SC office. That position could also liaise with the Senate’s academic councils and be an overall facilitator. The person could be a staff employee or a faculty member with sufficient distribution of effort (DOE) time identified. It would be important for the person to have broad knowledge of existing courses and programs and units across campus.
- If a Senate academic council identifies a problem with a proposal, it should include some reference to the revision so that later reviewing bodies can see what previous bodies have noted or requested.
- The creation of a new committee will in no way speed up the review process. Having an individual to serve as a facilitator and contact person for the overall review process is a good idea.
- Proposals that are truly awful should receive some comments on how it could be improved and then no further review until the proposal is substantially revised. Proposals that are clear and well written should be moved along as quickly as possible by people who are experts in the particular disciplinary area of the proposal.
- Faculty members of reviewing bodies do not feel comfortable objecting to proposals that do not seem to deserve further consideration because of deficiencies in the overall premise or the organization of the proposal’s contents.
- The revised “new undergraduate program” form will solve some of the problems by explicitly requiring specific things that SC wants to see but are not currently in the form. Creation of a committee to triage proposals sounds like a good idea but it would be highly impractical given the number of entities that currently must be involved in the review process. A facilitator is a good idea.
- While a committee may be less nimble, it would contain more knowledge than a single person would have. Many issues are raised by sheer luck, depending on whether the right faculty

member is in the room during the right meeting. A committee would offer more than one set of eyes.

- A facilitator would not replace the Senate structure, but the position could ensure that proposals were submitted in line with Senate requirements. Although the SC office gets more and more proposals every year, no additional financial support for more personnel has been forthcoming.
- Issues about the ability of a proposed new program to offer a quality educational opportunity should be asked at the level of college curriculum committees and the Senate's academic councils. SC's role should be less about determining a quality educational experience and more about providing unique, University-level oversight.
- Even small steps could alleviate the perception of the Senate as a bureaucratic environment.
- There should be a better way to mentor and educate people involved in the proposal review process so they know what type of review is expected of them. There should also be a person available to mentor and help ensure the proposal moves forward as appropriate.
- Roughly 60 – 70% of new program proposals that the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) receives for review have significant problems that, if unfixed, would prevent SC from approving them. The SAPC feels that many of the problems are of such magnitude that they should have been fixed further back in the review process.
- If one person is responsible for tracking a proposal throughout the approval process, it will be much simpler to track the time of a proposal's progress from one vetting entity to another, as well as track any delays in responding to a request for additional information. Such tracking will make it easier to identify problems inherent in the review process, too.
- A simple way to improve many proposals would be to include a judicious review of the benefits and costs and true collaboration with others. Having a series of "please send me an email that says 'yes'" attachments dated from late in the vetting process does not define true collaboration with other departments and schools.
- The SAPC could be asked to fulfill the role of facilitator, by being involved at the beginning of the process, instead of at the end.
- When one body in the approval process identifies deficiencies in a proposal, the proposal could be returned back to the previous vetting body. This could also help track common problems.
- If a Senate committee identifies problems with a proposal, Senate committee chairs could be instructed to also inform the academic council chair from which the proposal came. That could help improve review processes at all levels.
- Cross-college issues should be discussed very early on in the process, not at the level of SAPC review. Faculty should have a process that facilitates formal collaboration long before forms are filled out.

- Any facilitator should be housed in the SC office and be more responsive to the needs of faculty than administration needs. A human face could greatly improve the entire process and offer advice on choke points in the process, which will provide for quality improvement along the way.
- Any request for funding for someone to facilitate the review process should include a suggested DOE percentage at least equivalent to the SC chair's DOE percentage (50%).
- The facilitator should be from one of the Senate's committees that regularly reviews curricular proposals; it would make sense to have a senator reporting to senators. The person could be additionally compensated for that work.
- The facilitator should not be a Senate committee member because that could introduce a conflict of interest. A facilitator independent of Senate committee allegiance would be better.
- The Senate Council office receives its funding from the President's office and the President is the Chair of the Senate, so the President could provide funding for a program facilitator.
- A facilitator would also assist faculty in pursuing entrepreneurial ideas and would make the process entirely more efficient.

The Chair said he thought there was a general consensus formed around instituting a facilitator position. There were no objections from SC members.

Commenting that the discussion thus far touched on everything but electronic (or "clicker") voting, the Chair suggested the discussion turn to that aspect of SC meetings. Hippisley explained that there is a software program, "Turning Point," which takes input from clickers and aggregates (or otherwise organizes) the information. If the Senate used such technology, it would quickly record exactly who voted and how, but would not necessarily make that identification immediately on screen. Ms. Brothers investigated the law regarding voting in open meetings and was told that there must be a record of who voted for and against a motion, but it is acceptable to keep that information in files and share it upon request. SC members discussed the pros and cons of using clickers in SC and Senate meetings. At the Chair's request, discussion focused on principles behind arguments for and against use of clickers, not implementation concerns.

Ingram and Day provided information on how the Student Government Association (SGA) uses clickers. SGA senators have individual clickers with their names on the back. The use of clickers began after it became evident that some student senators were uncomfortable voting against a funding proposal if they had a personal connection with the proposer. The SGA publishes voting records online after meetings to comply with open meetings laws so anyone can see voting records. Ingram summarized by saying that clickers sped up the process, worked well, and gave accurate vote counts. Discussion continued and there were a few suggestions for a couple of straw polls towards the end of the discussion to help determine next steps.

At 10:45 am, the Chair suggested a 15-minute break; the meeting was reconvened at 11:09 am.

SC members debated the issues below.

- Whether or not electronic voting would decrease public discussion, thereby making it more difficult for guests to intuit or “read” the sense of the SC prior to a vote.
- If the desire to make SC members and senators comfortable voting against a proposal necessarily conflicts with transparency.
- If the downsides of clicker use would be offset by quicker vote counts when the vote is close and assurance that only those with voting rights are voting.

The Chair asked if anyone opposed the use of clickers in Senate meetings. No SC member objected to the use of clickers in Senate meetings. Blonder, past chair, said that the President’s office agreed a few months ago to fund the purchase of clickers if they needed to be purchased. There was additional brief discussion.

Anderson **moved** to use clickers in the Senate, with preparations over the summer so that they can be piloted at the September Senate meeting. Pienkowski **seconded**. There was additional brief discussion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with one opposed.

The Chair asked if anyone wanted to pursue use of clickers in SC meetings. No SC members spoke up so the assumption was that there was no support for using clickers in SC meetings.

3. Getting the Best Senators

The Chair explained that most faculty did not understand what the Senate does, unless the faculty member had been a senator in the past. When the Chair began in the Senate, he asked a seasoned senator for some advice and was told “nod wisely.” The Chair said that because the Senate is charged with an enormous educational mission, the Senate should be seen in a better light than it is. The Senate needs excellent faculty to be senators and needs those faculty to perform University-level service on behalf of the faculty, instead of those faculty being tapped to perform departmental- or college-level service. When attending a meeting of the Provost’s deans council, both Hippisley (current Chair) and Blonder (then-current Chair) explained that senators are useful members of a college and can help sort out issues prior to them being on the Senate floor. The Chair said that it was his impression that the Provost did not believe in compensating faculty for service because her view was that providing service was something that a “good citizen” faculty member ought to do. The Chair commented that there was little to no uniformity regarding how service effort was documented on distribution of effort forms (DOEs) across colleges. In some colleges, faculty have to argue with their chair that service at the University level should indeed count towards “service” in the same way that as department- and college-level service counts.

SC members offered a variety of ideas and opinions about possible ways to improve the problem of University-level (i.e. Senate) service not being respected or valued by college administrators, as well as how to make the Senate more relevant to faculty. Day suggested that it was an issue of branding and that when she became a member of SC, there was no mission statement to describe the body’s purpose. She said many students want to be involved in the SGA, but it took a lot of work to brand SGA into an entity that has meaning on campus. Students want to be involved in something if there is a purpose, but students also see participation in the SGA as a résumé builder. She said a rebranding could help people

understand not just what the Senate does, but also why the Senate is important. Rebranding could facilitate a greater collaborative spirit that should include deans and chairs.

There was no consensus among SC members as to whether or not service should be additionally compensated – some believed it was necessary to encourage participation by the best faculty and some believed that the definition of service precluded financial remuneration. SC members offered some suggestions and thoughts about the issue of University-level service and documentation of such on the DOE.

- It could help if the Provost sets a standard with deans, which should flow further down to chairs, that respected service and valued it as much as grants when promotion and tenure discussions take place. The Provost should tax colleges that do not perform their fair share of service activities.
- No matter what type or how much service a faculty member provides, DOEs typically only ever reflect 5% for service activities.
- If the Senate were more involved in new faculty orientation, it could help reinforce early the requirements for promotion and tenure. When deans, chairs and other administrators involve the Senate in informational activities, it will also reinforce the importance and functions of the Senate and its value to an entire college, not just to the senator and a few colleagues.
- When service is not valued, it perpetuates a self-fulfilling prophecy that service is not valued. A happy faculty member is able to participate in a number of interesting things at one time and can be valued for the complexity of their job description. This can begin by being mindful of the need to showcase senators in meaningful ways.
- The new budget model could include calculations that equate a certain percentage of service effort to faculty teaching, which would mean colleges would receive increased funding for increased faculty participation in service activities. Financial multipliers are already given for Honors courses and other specific activities so something similar could be done for service.
- If everyone argues that everything they do deserves a percentage, it will be difficult to run the University. Will something like writing letters of recommendation receive its own minuscule (or large) percentage on the DOE?
- The College of Medicine already has granular DOE requirements that force artificial percentages, such as granting (under “Teaching”) 0.4% effort per each student taught.
- Current DOE guidelines are not respected across campus. If the suggestion to equate service effort with a percentage of teaching effort was implemented, there would be incentives for administrators to stop artificially holding down service percentages. The DOE is a contractual device for assignment and reward of effort and if a faculty member is doing assigned activities, the faculty member should not be told that one part is only worth 5%.
- If the new budget model allows a charge for use of library resources and for space, then it could also include a charge to colleges that do not perform a sufficient amount of service.

- The Senate may or may not have a role to play in encouraging chairs to push younger faculty to develop the habit of giving reasonable service. Sometimes faculty are promoted based on research alone with no consideration given for service and that gets people out of the habit of seeing service as part of the career trajectory. Service on campus should be something that faculty aspire to after a few years of employment. The importance and value of service can be stated in a variety of ways that do not involve financial compensation.

The Chair recapped some of the primary ideas that came out during discussion. He said that one issue pertained to how DOEs should reflect University-level service in a very explicit way so that deans and chairs know that SC and Senate service count as much as departmental and college service on the DOE. Second, the Chair can make sure that appropriate Senate committee chairs are invited to relevant orientation sessions, which will help rebrand the Senate and help illustrate how the Senate is meaningful and something for new faculty to aspire to. Third, there needs to be a renewed attention to levels of service in the tenure and promotion process, particularly from the level of associate professor to professor. McCormick suggested that senators be reminded annually that they should request 5% service effort on their DOEs for Senate service. The Chair added that he could attend a meeting of the council of chairs to explain how it is in their best interest to have their best faculty be members of the Senate.

There was a brief discussion about how current University regulations restrict department chairs and center directors from serving in the Senate and SC. Those SC members commenting were of the opinion that such a restriction limits some of the best faculty from participating in the SC and Senate and should be changed.

The Chair suggested breaking for lunch. The meeting was temporarily suspended at 12:05 and reconvened at 1:15 pm.

4. Senate Committee Structure

The Chair led SC members in a discussion about the committee structure in the University Senate (Senate). He wondered if all the committees were necessary or if some could be disbanded, noting that some committees had not reported to the Senate in years. With respect to encouraging Senate committee-administration committee collaboration, he said the real danger was in a potential vicious cycle in which a low-workload Senate committee feels like it does not accomplish anything, so it stops meeting, after which the administration may believe there is no point in partnering with the Senate committee. Furthermore, there are some relatively new members of President Capilouto's leadership team who may not know there is a wide range of Senate committees with which the administration can collaborate. There were a variety of comments from SC members about the topic.

- The administration does not really want to partner with faculty, regardless of how well or how poorly a Senate committee functions.
- Committee members may not be responsive to queries from the committee chair.
- The administration might be willing to use faculty input (and Senate committees) but it does not know how to do so effectively. Perhaps more joint administration-Senate ad hoc committees about specific topics could be created.

- It is unreasonable to suggest that every Senate committee should meet on a regular basis. It is okay if some meet infrequently and that an infrequent meeting schedule does not mean that the committee should be disbanded. It takes time to create, compose, and charge ad hoc committees so they should not replace Senate committees. Senators should be better assigned to committees with an eye towards composition of individuals that will do the necessary work of a committee. Disbanding a committee should be predicated on whether or not the charge of a committee is still relevant.
- The Senate would like to be more proactive, but the administration generally consults with the Senate towards the end of any given initiative, so the Senate is forced into a reactive mode.
- SC deliberations were well informed and bettered by the presence and participation of Provost's Liaison Richard Greissman. If given the opportunity, SC would quickly agree to reactivate that type of collaboration between Provost Christine Riordan's office and SC, as there has been no liaison activity and only limited interaction with the Provost ever since the Provost removed Greissman from the role of liaison.
- Some committee charges are very broad, which can lead to confusion about what exactly a committee should work on.
- Sometimes when SC sends forward nominees for a University-wide committee, the nominee chosen is not told that the nominee has been appointed to represent the Senate, which leads to a disconnect between faculty representatives and the Senate.
- It is okay for the Senate to be reactive, as many of its committees are charged to react to proposals of one kind or another. If the Senate is to be more proactive, the Senate needs to change how administrators perceive it.
- Being proactive, as compared to being reactive, takes a lot more time.
- Perhaps senators could rotate among committees instead of being assigned for three years, to ensure senators spend time on both high- and low-workload committees.
- The Senate could survey faculty to find out what faculty think the Senate should be working on.
- Having non-functioning committees promotes a perception that the Senate is ineffective or obstructionist. Committee charges should be reevaluated and made more specific to improve committee functioning. It is okay to be reactionary – senates tend to react to the pleas of the people they represent. Faculty should be encouraged to go to their faculty senator with concerns.
- The root of the problem is that once administration receives a nomination for a committee from the SC, the administration believes it has sufficiently "involved" the Senate in an issue. Some Senate committees are non-working because the administration has supplanted Senate committees with administrative committees.

- Some administrators may simply not know that Senate committees exist and are available for consultation. When SC is asked for nominations for a particular University committee, if appropriate, the SC could respond by pointing to the Senate committee that is already charged to have the issue in their purview.
- Faculty non-senators who are SC nominees are not told that they are representing the Senate, so that needs to be made explicitly clear.
- Faculty could be contacted and informed that they can communicate concerns about issue X to a specific Senate committee, which may help improve the responsiveness of Senate committees.
- SC-approved nominees could be asked to present their opinions of their involvement in University committees to the Senate. Currently, such faculty nominees are not held accountable for their Senate representation.
- The Chair could bring an appropriate committee chair to a meeting with the Provost or President if an issue on the radar would likely involve that particular committee.
- In cases when the administration appears to not want faculty input, the SC and Senate may have to be more pointed in pressing Senate interests and involvement.
- Sometimes administrators make a show of “listening” to SC concerns or the SC chair, only because it is easier than engaging in an active discussion about pros and cons.

The Chair recapped the discussion for SC members: SC members believe that administration does not really want faculty input, but tolerates it. The Chair can provide the list of Senate committees to the Provost and explain that instead of offering SC-approved nominees for certain administrative committees dealing with a particular issue, the Chair will offer an entire Senate committee to assist. In order for that to work, though, the SC must ensure that Senate committees are led by excellent committee chairs. SC members offered some additional suggestions: orient committees and their chairs early on in the year, so they can hit the ground running when an issue comes up; ask outgoing committee chairs for suggestions on who could be an effective chair; identify a way in which committee chairs can somehow be compensated for their time (e.g. a small stipend or additional percentage on distribution of effort forms); and put committee chairs on a 12-month contract.

The Chair said that his primary feel of the discussion was that SC did not support disbanding any committees, but rather supported increased Senate committee involvement in campus activities, as appropriate. There were no objections.

6. Provost Office News

The Chair presented SC members with an update from the Provost. He commented that the initiative to integrate career services and advising could have involved the Senate’s Academic Advising Committee. SC members discussed the update, paying particular attention to how existing Senate committees could provide practical help to Provost Riordan in achieving some of her specific academic goals.

7. Strategic Plan (Emphasis on Academic Policy - Goal 1, Goal 2 & Goal 3): Wally Ferrier, Chair of Senate's Academic Planning and Priorities Committee

The Chair suggested that Guest Walter Ferrier give SC members an update on the activities of the Integration Committee for the 2014-2020 Strategic Plan.

Ferrier began by saying that until a few weeks ago, he assumed that the SC was aware of what the Integration Committee was doing. He did not realize that from the outset, the SC and Senate had not been formally involved in the strategic planning process. He said he had thought he was appointed to the Integration Committee based on his self-nomination and his professional expertise in strategic planning; he was unaware of any expectation that he would represent the Senate. Although he chairs the Senate's Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (SAPPC), he was unaware that the SC also saw his participation in the strategic planning process as an extension of that position. Ferrier explained that the strategic planning process was at the point of generalities – the University now knows the general location, size, arrangement, and quality indicators of the 2014-2020 Strategic Plan, but the specific details are still not determined. The implementation phase will be when specific entities on campus flesh out the details. Beyond that, the proposed 2014-2020 Strategic Plan has a positive symbolic value. Ferrier opined that the process, decision making, and planning had gone about as well as it could have possibly gone, particularly with something this big and ambitious.

There was a brief discussion about the preliminary summary drafts created by the Integration Committee, which were based on narrative reports from each Goal's work group. A few SC members reported they had heard from work group members that the final iterations from the Integration Committee were dissimilar to what work groups turned in. In at least one case a work group member said the Integration Committee's summary included something not discussed in any of the work group's meetings. Ferrier offered some comments about the Integration Committee's activities. He said that the Integration Committee looked for redundancies and overlap in the documents from the various work groups. There were some fragmented ideas that became more specific over time and gained traction in subsequent revisions. He did not find it surprising that, for example, a work group submitted 10 pages of text, but received back a shortened version that contained only 60% of the original material, condensed into five pages. Some material was shifted to another work group's domain and some document sections were prioritized higher than others. Ferrier said he did not feel uncomfortable that subsequent iterations of a work group's writings were not word-for-word what the work group submitted. Ferrier recalled that he sat in on a few robust discussions with work groups where ideas and frustrations were hammered out and reconciled. He suggested that work group members who wondered where a certain paragraph went needed to understand that sometimes the removal of fluid, disconnected thoughts and ideas made the draft plan more coherent in subsequent rounds.

SC members and Ferrier engaged in a lively discussion about the preliminary draft documents for the three goals that Provost Riordan allowed the SC to review. [These were: "Goal #1: Create a Vibrant Undergraduate Learning Community"; "Goal #2: Stabilize and Strengthen our Portfolio of Graduate and Professional Programs"; and "Goal #3: Cultivate a Robust Research and Creative Environment."] The discussion raised a number of concerns for SC members, most of which are listed below.

- There was a distinct lack of collaboration between the Provost's office and the SC regarding the content of the narrative drafts for Goals 1 – 3. Even though SC and Senate are responsible for academics and the curriculum, SC was only very recently allowed to see draft versions of Goals 1 – 3, and only after a pointed request from the Chair to the Provost.

- The draft document for Goal 2 (and perhaps others) contains a number of easily-identifiable, factual errors. One example was that quantitative and verbal Graduate Record Exam (GRE) scores were averaged together, but statistically speaking that is like mixing apples and oranges.
- The Integration Committee only contained one faculty member [Ferrier], who was not informed he was appointed in part to represent overall faculty interests, as well as to bring his professional expertise.
- There is no underlying or available rationale to help understand why, for example, UK has a goal to increase the total number of credit hours taken online. Do students receive a better education when it is delivered online, or is it more efficient to teach students online, or is there another reason? Who was responsible for setting the targets on the scorecard?
- The use of three sets of benchmark institutions (benchmarks that are peer institutions, benchmarks that are institutions at high levels to which UK aspires to reach, and benchmarks comprised of the Southeastern Conference universities) seems to allow UK to compare itself to whichever set of benchmark institutions puts UK in the best light.
- Who is responsible for filling out the “TBD” fields for each Goal’s scorecard and when will that occur? Why are there so many metrics by which Goals are measured?
- The draft reports for Goals 1, 2 and 3 are about 10 pages, each. Once all the work groups’ writings are incorporated, the document will be about 80 pages long, which is far too long for any type of strategic plan.
- SC did not formally comment on draft versions of the 2014-2020 Strategic Plan that were shared with campus because SC members assumed the SC would have a dedicated opportunity to offer input as a body. The lack of a request for official SC input makes it awkward now for SC to relay its concerns, after campuswide vetting has occurred. Further, SC is not sure what, if anything, the work groups saw of the preliminary work group drafts that have already been sent to President Capilouto to review.
- The preliminary documents available to the SC focus on outputs and do not discuss inputs or difficult issues, such as identifying funding to support faculty in the STEM fields (science, technology, engineering, and math) who cannot find funding. That type of practical concern is very important to address.
- There are a number of Senate committees already with expertise in the various work group goals (e.g., research and graduate education, academic facilities, distance learning), but not a single Senate committee was asked to offer input.

Intertwined in the discussion was the issue of how, when, and to whom the SC should communicate its concerns. Also discussed was whether SC would only communicate concerns about factual errors, or if SC would also comment on substantive concerns, such as the document’s emphasis on bean counting to support a slew of extremely detailed metrics. Eventually, SC members reached a consensus that the appropriate next step was to ask Provost Riordan for access to the drafts for each Goal and review them; if issues are identified, those issues can be communicated to Provost Riordan, but SC has neither the

resources nor the personnel available to provide a detailed edit of all the preliminary drafts for each Goal as well as identify all the individual problems. If the Provost is willing to allow Senate committee chairs to quickly review the preliminary drafts in the fall, that would make a lot of sense, but that will be up to the Provost to decide.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 pm

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Hippisley,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Blonder, Brown, Christ, Day, Debski, Ingram, Harling, Hippisley, McCormick, Pienkowski, Watt, Wilson, and Wood.

Invited guest present: Walter Ferrier.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, June 19, 2014.