

Senate Council
June 17, 2016

The Senate Council met in special session for its annual retreat at 9 am on Friday, June 17, 2016 in Room 330 of the Gatton College of Carol Martin Gatton Business and Economics Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

1. Arrivals/Breakfast (8:30 - 9 am)

SC members ate breakfast with Guest Gatton College of Business and Economics Dean David Blackwell.

2. Welcome from Gatton College of Business and Education Dean David Blackwell (9 - 9:15 am)

Senate Council Chair Katherine M. McCormick called the Senate Council (SC) retreat to order at 8:58 am. Guest David Blackwell, dean of the Gatton College of Business and Economics, welcomed SC members to the newly renovated Carol Martin Gatton Business and Economics Building. He invited SC to hold meetings in the building and shared some interesting details about the renovations and recent events. He also talked briefly about the proposal that Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) will review in the fall for the proposed new John. H. Schnatter Institute for the Study of Free Enterprise. Dean Blackwell chatted with SC members for approximately 20 – 25 minutes.

3. Minutes from May 9, 2016 and Announcements (9:15 - 9:20 am)

The Chair said that no corrections were received for the minutes. The Chair solicited a motion and Grossman **moved** to approve the minutes from May 9; Bailey **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The Chair had a few announcements but deferred them until after the update from faculty trustees.

4. Update from Faculty Trustees (9:20 - 9:30 am)

Faculty trustee Grossman briefed SC members on the Board of Trustees expected action on the proposed new *Administrative Regulations 4:10* ("Student Code of Conduct (Approved by the Board of Trustees)"). Grossman also initiated a discussion about UK's requirements for vetting new and changed regulations and contrasted that with the actual vetting process for *Administrative Regulations 6:2* ("Policy and Procedures for Addressing and Resolving Allegations of Sexual Assault, Stalking, Dating Violence, and Domestic Violence"), which affects both employees and students. Grossman asserted that *AR 6:2* was not vetted in accordance with UK's regulations, but after a meeting with General Counsel Bill Thro, General Counsel Thro had agreed to consider SC-proffered advice on that particular regulation. Faculty trustee Wilson opined that senior leadership seemed to regularly come up with reasons why rational shared governance rules are evaded. He and Grossman agreed that faculty would need to remain vigilant to ensure appropriate faculty input is given particularly when that input is not solicited by senior leadership.

SC members all participated in a lengthy discussion about senior leadership's unwillingness to engage faculty in decision-making processes and in their lack of adherence to rules regarding consultation with appropriate stakeholders when regulations are proposed and changed. Discussion included both specific instances (e.g. *AR 3:2* ("Phased Retirement Policy and Program") and *AR 6:2*) and general sentiments, as well as possible strategies and steps the SC and University Senate (Senate) could take. SC members thought it prudent to ensure that senators were aware of their concerns prior to taking any formal action. SC members also discussed possible motions to address the situation.

Wood **moved** that the SC form an ad hoc committee to consider shared governance aspects of the University and Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Grossman **moved** that the SC form a joint committee with the Staff Senate and Student Government Association to review the appendix to *Administrative Regulations 6:2* ("Policy and Procedures for Addressing and Resolving Allegations of Sexual Assault, Stalking, Dating Violence, and Domestic Violence") and offer suggestions and advice regarding possible modifications to each body's respective executive body. Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Action Items (9:30 - 9:45 am)

The Chair commented that she sent forward some nominees to serve on a search committee for a replacement for a new chief information officer (senior leader in information technology) – she did not realize that the nominees should have first been vetted with SC. She offered the names to SC members for their information and apologized for the oversight.

a. University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees

The Chair explained that she had been asked if it was okay for someone other than a Graduate School dean to serve as the chair of the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees (UJCHD); Provost Tim Tracy had not yet identified anyone to serve as the interim dean of the Graduate School. SC members discussed the matter and ultimately decided that it was preferable to wait until an interim dean of the Graduate School was named so that person could serve as chair of the UJCHD, rather than identify someone else to fill that position.

b. Late Addition to the Degree List (per Senate Rules 5.4.1.1.D.1-2)

i. College of Communication and Information Student DH-71

ii. College of Communication and Information Student SH-54

After brief discussion, the SC opted to postpone discussion until additional information about the requests was received.

6. Preview of New Senate Website (9:45 - 10:00 am)

Ms. Brothers gave SC members a brief tour of the newly designed Senate website and noted various comments and suggestions for improvement. Ms. Brothers thanked SC members for their input.

Discussion returned to the proposed late additions to degree lists. Mazur **moved** to confirm the SC's support of the Chair making a decision for both requests on behalf of SC as long as the Chair was satisfied that the requests were in order. Brown **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

7. Curricular Aspects of Undergraduate Education (10:00 - 11:30 am)

- Centers (Chellgren, Gaines)
- Undergraduate Council
- Senate UK Core Education Committee
- Advisory Committee for Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement

SC members discussed the varied curricular responsibilities of Undergraduate Education. The Chair noted that the Undergraduate Council needed to have a chair but there was no one identified to fill that role as of yet. She said there would be a committee of faculty to review the educational activities in Undergraduate Education (UE). Kraemer, who is serving as the faculty liaison as part of the reorganization efforts in Undergraduate Education, offered historical information regarding what UE looked like in the past and offered opinions on how it came to include so many curricular components. Kraemer also commented on the aspects of UE that pertained to educational policy. He explained that Provost Tim Tracy intended to combine and consolidate Student Affairs and UE, after which he would

launch a national search for a director for that new unit. Kraemer thought that the Provost planned to restrict the search to faculty, which would mean the Chellgren Center for Undergraduate Excellence and the Gaines Center for the Humanities could report to the new director. He added that although there are Senate committees currently located in UE, there was no obligation for the Senate to identify chairs for those committees from anyone within the soon-to-be-reorganized units. The two undergraduate certificates currently homed in UE will need special consideration to ensure they continue to have an appropriate faculty of record; experiential courses in UE require similar considerations. Kraemer opined that there should be faculty leadership for anything that touches students, even if the University appears to be moving more towards employing staff to oversee student-related activities.

SC members' discussion included the topics below.

- The Provost's reorganization of UE, specifically as it pertained to the Senate's Undergraduate Council;
- Decentralization of activities previously overseen by UE;
- The (false) assumption that the former associate provost for undergraduate education officially held the title of "dean";
- The need for a place where University-level multidisciplinary programs can be situated;
- What to do with the undergraduate certificates in Global Studies and Universal Design, which are currently homed in UE;
- The lack of any solicitation for Senate involvement in the UE reorganization;
- What to do with the Chellgren Center for Undergraduate Excellence (not a multidisciplinary research center) and the Gaines Center for the Humanities (a multidisciplinary research center); and
- That there are only three faculty serving on the UE restructuring committee.

8. Provost Tim Tracy - Updates (11:30 - 12:30)

Provost Tim Tracy offered some general comments about the budget situation, the reduction in funds from the state, and the steps UK has taken and will take to minimize the impact of the cuts in state funding.

- Lewis Honors College

The Provost announced that the membership of the Honors College Transition Committee (HCTC) was now complete – the last person was confirmed a day ago. He said he would announce the HCTC's membership. He added that he identified someone to serve as interim dean of the Honors College but said he was not prepared to announce the identity of the interim dean at the moment; he said he thought SC members would find the person to be very high quality and that the person will not apply for the permanent dean position. SC members and Provost Tracy had a general conversation about a variety of matters pertaining to the new Lewis Honors College, including:

Senate Council
June 17, 2016

- The national search for a permanent dean for the Honors College and use of an outside consultant to assist in the search;
- Generalities and timeline for a new Honors College dean to be appointed;
- Work the HCTC will need to perform;
- New \$500 fee for students in the Honors College;

- Graduate School

SC members and the Provost discussed a variety of issues related to the Graduate School, including

- The optimal structure of the Graduate School;
- Funding for teaching assistants and related funding concerns; and
- Purpose and functions of the Graduate School;

- Undergraduate Education Reorganization

There was a lot of discussion regarding the ongoing reorganization of the Undergraduate Education (UE) unit. The Provost commented that he referred to it as “Academic Excellence reorganization.” He talked about UK’s Strategic Plan and the various aspects of it that touched on undergraduate student success, including graduation rates. Provost Tracy explained that there are four primary reasons why students struggle and gave SC members details on how the reasons were being addressed: 1. academic success; 2. financial stability; 3. belonging and engagement; and 4. wellness. SC members had a particular interest in the academic functions of UE and how or if those would continue, such as homing UK 101 courses and a couple of undergraduate certificates in UE. In this regard, the Provost commented that the homing of the two certificates in the Provost’s area needed to be revisited – the certificates could remain in the new unit of Student and Academic Life or they could possibly move to colleges. Wood commented that she was pleased to hear the Provost say the certificate programs may have to go back to the colleges. Those present also discussed how long a student should and/or could wait to declare a major, as well as issues regarding student advising, such as the appropriate levels of centralization and decentralization and exploratory advising for undeclared students.

The Chair called for an hour-long break for lunch and invited Provost Tracy to join SC members; he welcomed the invitation but noted he could not stay for the entire lunch due to a previous engagement.

9. LUNCH

10. Senate Committee Structure (1:30 - 2:00 pm)

The Chair explained the handout – SC members were given a list of universities to which UK compares itself: Southeastern Conference schools; universities identified by the 2011 University Review Committee as benchmark institutions; and the other seven universities in the United States that have all their colleges and a medical center on one contiguous campus. The Chair suggested that rather than review Senate committees during every retreat, the SC could use the opportunity to determine how to accurately evaluate committee functions and discuss which committees could remain as standing committees and which could become ad hoc committees. SC members discussed the Senate committee structure and offered various comments.

- Some committees have a lot of work to do and others are almost defunct. Committees with a heavy workload could benefit from dividing up into subcommittees.
- Having a wide variety of committees ensures that there is an appropriate Senate committee available if a situation arises that warrants committee work. Having committees that are somewhat dormant is easier to navigate than having to quickly create an ad hoc committee.
- There is a balancing act between assigning more people to a busy committee and giving that committee so many members that it is hard to get quorum.
- Some committee chairs have members that rarely, if ever, participate in meetings and deliberations.
- It is not a good first impression for a new senator to be placed on a committee that does not regularly meet.
- It would be helpful for the Student Government Association to know how important student committee members and how important it is for student committee members to participate.

The Chair said that she might develop a potential charge for the Senate's Committee on Committees, for the SC to review.

11. Structure and Processes Regarding Academic Organization and Curriculum (2:00 - 3:15 pm)

SC members offered ideas and discussed topics related to faculty oversight of the curriculum.

- There were concerns among many of those present about the perceived lack of an implementation plan to train faculty and help them understand and use the new curriculum management system, Curriculog.
 - SC members recommended the following: training on demand; multiple forms of training (web, in-person, PDF handout); a webpage with resources; and training of department chairs and faculty involved in courses and curriculum.
- Certificates (both undergraduate and graduate) appear to be proliferating across campus but it is difficult to know if a certificate helps a student find employment.
- It is hard to strike a balance between offering students a wide variety of degree program choices and ensuring that scarce resources are deployed to help the most students.
- It would be helpful to know if the Provost wants to submit a letter of support regarding administrative feasibility or if he would prefer that individual college deans provide such information.
- The concerns that academic councils have about course syllabi appear to slow down the course approval process. The University Senate is responsible for approving courses, not syllabi. The Senate Council office could provide a syllabus template that shows what is required to be in a

Senate Council
June 17, 2016

syllabus, what is recommended, and what is optional. Critical aspects of a syllabus could be part of the course proposal form instead of requiring the syllabus be attached.

- There should be a central repository for syllabi from past classes.

Given the time, the Chair said she would entertain a motion to adjourn. Wood **moved** to adjourn and Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 3:22 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine McCormick,
Senate Council Chair

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

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Monday, August 1, 2016.