

Senate Council
March 2, 2015

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, March 2, 2015 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Andrew Hippisley called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:01 pm.

1. Minutes from February 23, 2015 and Announcements

The Chair said he did not receive any corrections to the minutes. There being **no objection**, the minutes from February 23 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair reported that he had received a communication from the Provost's office regarding the reappointment of Michael Healy (LA) as academic ombud for a second year. According to the *Senate Rules*, an ombud may be reappointed for a second term so long as the ombud, Provost, and SC agree. There were no objections from SC members.

An advising retreat was held recently and Kraemer, chair of the Senate's Academic Advising Committee, also participated. The Chair asked Kraemer for an update. Kraemer recalled that an initial retreat occurred in January. Kraemer said that the retreat was highly populated by a diverse crew of professional (staff) advisors, but that faculty advisors were not as well represented. Kraemer opined that part of the problem is that UK does not have a clear roster of faculty who advise students, hence the difficulty in directly inviting those faculty to participate in advising retreats and other activities. Kraemer said that the participation of his committee will ensure the Senate will be engaged in the advising initiative. Kraemer added that his committee plans to bring to SC in the late spring a report on what has transpired this semester with respect to advising, especially policy issues that are beyond any one particular college. One primary issue has been differential advising. Kraemer said that he felt good about where things are headed, but said more faculty needed to be engaged in advising discussions.

The Chair noted that he had an appointment to meet with Provost Tim Tracy the following day and asked SC members if they had any issues they would like him to bring up. Kraemer asked about targeted enrollment figures. Guest Ben Withers (Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education) said the targeted number for fall 2015 will be 5,250 freshmen, which is about 100 more students than UK welcomed in fall 2014. There were a few comments from SC members about how increasing numbers of students are creating some challenges, such as campus services and class sizes (specifically classes that students need but cannot get into). Another comment raised the issue of the tremendous amount of uncertainty about exactly when, how, and if the new budget model will be implemented.

2. Old Business

a. Teacher-Course Evaluation (TCE) Discussion

The Chair reminded SC members that during the last SC meeting, the SC discussed the University Senate's (Senate's) response to the teacher-course evaluation (TCE) report. The SC did not have any complaints about the TCE questions as distributed in the report from the ad hoc Committee on Teacher-Course Evaluations, chaired by Jonathan Golding. Further, the SC had said that Golding did a great job answering questions from senators about the questions, the Committee's deliberations, etc. While the spirit of the proposal from the Committee includes mandatory, core questions to be answered by everyone, there were queries about some aspects of implementation, such as how additional questions

for the TCE will be added and if there will be a cost associated with adding extra questions. There were also questions about how some clinical courses and independent study courses or courses with small enrollments may need exceptions to the proposed TCE questions. The most substantive question, however, was about mandating use of the core questions. After the SC's discussion on February 23, the SC came to a consensus that the SC would recommend to the Senate that users of the current campuswide TCE will have to switch to the new TCE questions, but areas that use other TCE instruments will not see any change to their practices. The Chair asked Guest Golding to offer his thoughts on the matter.

Golding said that not requiring campuswide use of the proposed TCE made no sense to him. Because questions can be added, there is no reason why an entity could object based on a claim that the questions do not suit their particular pedagogy. In addition, from the Committee's standpoint, their charge was to come up with questions that everyone could use. If that is not done, then all the hours the Committee poured into creating questions that could work for everyone would be wasted effort. Golding said that he was not quite clear what the problem was with the Committee's recommendations. If an entity is not currently using the most common campuswide instrument, there would still be no harm in changing to the common set, because as already mentioned, there is a mechanism for adding whatever questions a unit wants to add. Golding wondered if there were concerns that one college could be compared to another, but opined that making comparisons were the point, as evidenced by having common questions that everyone uses. Golding's final introductory comment was to note that the TCE are used more widely at other institutions to help students see past evaluations. Golding said that he could not find any posted TCE on UK's website but he thought it would be helpful for students to be able to access them easily.

Wilson said he agreed with many of Golding's comments, but was particularly concerned with how the data would be used. Wilson's college, the College of Medicine (ME), uses its own forms and associated system, but even within ME, Wilson said he received course evaluations for courses that he had never taught. He said his concern was that once the data was gathered into a large source, there could be issues with validity. He said there may be solutions to that type of problem, but many faculty members were reluctant to put data into a system that may not use or report it properly. Wilson said he would like assurances about how the data would be handled at the Provost's level. Golding commented that it would likely fall under the auspices of Institutional Research, but that unit would probably need additional resources to be able to support mandatory, campuswide use of the proposed TCE.

Bailey commented on the issue of student compliance with regard to submitting TCEs. He wondered if the shorter form would encourage more submissions. Golding commented that he once offered a group incentive for the entire class if everyone filled out his TCE and it worked. Golding said he was not sure why it was hard to get students to fill out the TCE, but wondered if it was a cultural issue, unique to UK. Golding commented that many other institutions have the TCE online and have done it that way for some time; Golding opined that this was yet another example of UK not doing something that is commonly done by everyone else.

Mazur expressed concerns about a few aspects: the quantification of everything without assurances about how the data gathered will be used and about the validity of the data; the opinion that TCE was more a survey of student satisfaction in a course, not really a good evaluation of teaching performance; how student response rates could be improved; and implementation concerns. Golding commented that questions about implementation and use of the data would need to be posed to the Provost.

The Chair then asked SC to begin to concentrate on the specific recommendation the SC will make to the Senate. There were a variety of comments from SC members. Brown **moved** that the SC take a smaller step than proposed in the report from the ad hoc Committee on Teacher-Course Evaluations by proposing to substitute the new questions for the current questions. Porter **seconded**. There was lengthy discussion about this motion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **failed** with three in favor, three opposed and one abstaining.

Christ then **moved** that the SC recommend the Senate: accept the report by the ad hoc Committee on Teacher-Course Evaluations; mandate that these questions will be the common questions that all programs will use on their TCE with exceptions made for courses with certain characteristics; and that the implementation of the new questions be effective as soon as practically possible. Porter **seconded**. After additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with five in favor, two opposed, and one abstaining.

3. Nonstandard Calendar for MCL 510

The Chair invited Guest Francis Bailey (AS/Modern and Classical Languages, Literatures, and Cultures) to explain his request and Bailey did so. There were no questions from SC members.

Christ **moved** that the SC approved the one-time calendar change for MCL 510 and Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Late Additions to the Degree List (as per Senate Rules 5.4.1.1.D.1-2)

The Chair explained that the last revision to the *Senate Rules* laid out a process for units to request an addition to a degree list due to administrative error. The Chair invited Guests Ruth Beattie (AS/Biology, associate dean of advising) and Cleo Price (GS, assistant dean for graduate academic services) to explain the requests.

a. College of Arts and Sciences Student JD-04

Beattie explained that the student JD-04 was working on double degrees; the primary degree was Economics and the secondary degree was to be Spanish. The student completed the requirements for both degrees. The student's advisor suggested on a number of occasions that the student declare the second degree. The student subsequently said he submitted the appropriate form and the advisor promised that his second degree would be added to his record. Unfortunately, advisors cannot add or remove degrees from a student's record so adding the degree was not done by the advisor.

Mazur **moved** that the SC approve, on behalf of the Senate, the late addition of student JD-04 to the December 2014 degree list, specifically with a second degree in Spanish. Brown **seconded**. Beattie clarified that no rescission was needed, just the addition of the second degree. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. College of Arts and Sciences Student RA-44

Beattie explained that the student originally applied to graduate in May 2014, but did not complete the degree requirements in time. The student then switched his graduation date to December 2014. At some point, the degree application was inexplicably rejected and the student therefore was not on the December 2014 degree list. Beattie said that the student had completed all the requirements for the degree.

Christ **moved** that the SC approve, on behalf of the Senate, the late addition of student RA-44 to the December 2014 degree list. Brown **seconded**. After brief discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

c. Graduate School Student SL-17

Price explained that master's students who are not currently enrolled may not apply electronically for graduation – it must be done on paper. The staff employee responsible for taking care of this student's request to graduate is a reservist and was away for two weeks. While the department claimed that they sent over a form so the student could graduate in August 2014, the Graduate School does not have record of receiving it. Price said that the student met all the requirements and should not be penalized. Price added comments regarding his hope that the Senate would soon take up the proposal that would require master's students to be enrolled until they have finished all the degree requirements.

Mazur **moved** that the SC approve, on behalf of the Senate, the late addition of student SL-17 to the August 2014 degree list. Porter **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) - Ernie Bailey, Chair

i. Proposed Name Change of the School of Library and Information Science to the School of Information Science

The Chair invited Guest Jeff Huber (CI/Library and Information Science, school director) to come to the table. The Chair asked Bailey, chair of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC), to explain the proposal, which he did. The Chair noted that the recommendation that the Senate **move** to endorse the proposed name change of the School of Library and Information Science to the School of Information Science came from committee, so no **second** was needed. There were a variety of questions from SC members.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) - Connie Wood, Chair

i. Proposed Revisions to Senate Rules 1.2.2.1.A ("Elected Faculty Membership," "Apportionment")

The Chair invited Guest Connie Wood (AS/Statistics), chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), to explain the proposal, which she did. The **motion** from the SREC was to approve the proposed change to SR 1.2.2.1.A. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. Wood accepted as a **friendly amendment** Mazur's suggestion that the wording of the proposed new sentence be changed from "all eligible faculty have the opportunity" to "all faculty eligible to serve have the opportunity."

The Chair asked about the process to ensure college deans are aware of the new, explicit statement that all eligible faculty have the right to participate. He asked if it would be appropriate for him to share the information with a few deans and Wood said that would be a good idea. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed Revisions to Senate Rules Section 6.3 and 6.4 ("Academic Offenses and Procedures" and "Disposition of Cases of Academic Offenses")

Wood explained the background for the handful of changes. The **motion** from the SREC was to approve the proposed changes to Section 6 of the SR. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was

required. There were no questions from SC members. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. Report from Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Disciplinary Action

The Chair asked Watt, chair of the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Disciplinary Action, to lead the discussion. Watt offered some background information but began by thanking the members of the committee, Liz Debski, David Pienkowski, Connie Wood, John Wilson, and Marcy Deaton from Legal Counsel, for all their critical thinking and hard work. He noted that the Committee was not unanimously in favor of the language presented to SC in the proposed new *Governing Regulation (GR)*, but the Committee was of the belief that it would be more productive to bring the issue to the SC. The President wrote to SC in September with concerns that there were only two possible extremes for disciplining faculty. Watt opined that while a slap on the wrist and revocation of tenure are two options for disciplinary action, there are other possible actions outlined in other rules and regulations, particularly in cases of research misconduct.

Watt explained that the memo from President Capilouto did not offer any specific indication as to precisely what the President wanted. Subsequent Committee discussions and conversation with General Counsel William Thro and the President made it clear that the President was really looking for something as a result of concerns expressed by the Board of Trustees (Board); the final product, according to Watt, would take the form of an *Administrative Regulation (AR)*. The Committee expressed concerns that ARs are promulgated by the President and as such, could be changed by the President at any time. There were concerns on the part of the President and Legal Counsel about putting the language in the *Senate Rules (SR)* because it could be easily changed by the University Senate, so a decision was made to create a new *GR*, which must be approved by the Board and cannot be changed without faculty input and Board approval.

Watt commented that he had hoped to address a handful of other concerns, such as the lack of guidance on how to handle faculty who have mental health issues. In addition, the language in UK's Human Resources Policies and Procedures (HRP&P) for drug abuse refers to "University employees," but the language in the HRP&P on alcohol abuse specifically refers to "staff employees," implying that it does not apply to faculty. Watt said it was made clear to him that those issues, as well as issues about post-tenure review, research misconduct (beyond fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism), academic rights of clinical title series faculty, and inconsistencies among policies (*GRs*, *ARs*, *SRs*, *HRP&P*, and Business Procedures) should not be part of the Committee's deliberations.

Watt said that the report from the Committee tried to capture the regulatory complexity of the University yet maintain fairness for faculty. Watt said that he would not lead SC members line-by-line through the report, but reiterated that the President had said that such a policy would apply to all faculty, regardless of rank, title series, or administrative appointment. Watt asked that SC discuss the report and noted that the Committee offered two recommendations: 1. that the SC consider and send the Committee's report, or an amended document, to the Senate for their consideration and approval; and 2. that Section 7 of the *SR* ("Code of Faculty Responsibilities") be reviewed in light of the fact that nothing in the *GRs* or *ARs* delegates responsibilities for some punishment and sanctions to the Senate.

Watt explained that the Committee identified a handful of key issues. The first was that of complexity – allegations of misbehavior, etc., arise from reports from local law enforcement, routine internal investigations, complaints through "hot lines," and complaints through academic channels. The Committee hoped that the multiple avenues available for reporting would not lead to endless trivial

allegations. For example, inadvertently bringing home a UK pen is far different from regularly not showing up to teach class.

Fairness was another key concern. The proposed *GR* has a section on mediation and notifications and lists sanctions that are available for faculty who are acting outside of professional norms. While 99.9% of faculty will never need to reference this proposed *GR*, there are situations that occur from time to time that require disciplinary action. With regard to a peer review, the *GR* includes something akin to a grand jury, an inquiry panel, which will look at evidence and determine how serious the allegation is, but not conduct an investigation. If the panel finds cause for a sanction, the inquiry panel will bind over the case to the faculty hearing panel. There are a number of appeal mechanisms, as well. Towards the end of the document there are a series of options for faculty members to appeal what transpires at various stages along the way. At the end of the process if the faculty hearing panel finds a faculty member guilty, the faculty member can appeal guilt or innocence directly to the President. Watt commented that there was a lot of legalese in the proposed *GR*; he said that something far simpler would be more easily understood.

Regarding the inquiry panel, it would include one faculty member chosen at random by a computer program, with the faculty member being chosen by the President from a pool of faculty nominated by the SC. One of the three members of the inquiry panel will be a representative from Human Resources (HR), because there have been complaints from staff members that staff are penalized for breaking rules for which faculty are not penalized. The HR representative will be there to ensure faculty members are not held to a lower standard than staff. The third member of the inquiry panel will be a representative from the Provost's office, to ensure there are no inequities among colleges. This inquiry panel will make a recommendation to send the issue to the faculty hearing panel or to dismiss the charges. If the inquiry panel votes for dismissal, the process ends. If the inquiry panel believes the charges have merit, it will send the issue to the faculty hearing panel. The faculty hearing panel will be made up of five faculty members. The Committee discussed the faculty hearing panel more than the inquiry panel. The faculty hearing panel will be able to make a recommendation to stop the inquiry or send the matter on to the Provost for sanctions; the faculty hearing panel will make non-binding recommendations for sanctions.

Watt noted that there was an accommodation in the proposed *GR* that would prevent a situation in which an inquiry panel or faculty hearing panel conspires to find a faculty member innocent regardless of the circumstances. The accommodation was that there is an option for a dean to appeal the decision of innocence of a faculty member directly to the President. Watt said he would like to hear the thoughts and comments of SC members. The Chair invited members of the Committee to the table to participate in discussion.

The Chair opened up the floor for discussion among SC members. There was a lengthy and lively discussion. Below are the comments and questions from SC members and from Committee members; Watt responded to many of the comments and questions by explaining the rationale behind certain passages of the proposed *GR*. Throughout the discussion SC members thanked Watt and the Committee for all their work.

- Will the proposed *GR* take away discretion from a department chair to report or not report an issue? Response from Watt: At the very least an issue would need to go to the dean of a college who will make a decision on whether or not the department chair can work on the matter alone, or if Legal Counsel (or another entity) should be involved. Watt went on to say that when he served as an administrator, he thought it unfortunate when an issue fermented for months at

the departmental level, but then exploded in another direction at some point due to not being taken care of. He said he regretted that the department chair had not talked to anyone higher up on the reporting chain so as to address the problem sooner rather than later. While the department chair has a role to play in the proposed *GR*, it will be up to the dean as to whether the issue will be handled solely internally or if other entities (such as the Provost or Legal Counsel) will need to be involved.

- The proposed *GR* is not consistent regarding the role of the department chair; sometimes the chair is notified and sometimes not. In the latter parts of the process the Chair is largely written out. Clarifying the role of the chair throughout would be helpful, although it could be an editorial change made after the philosophical issue of chair input is determined.
- There are a number of time frames mentioned in the proposed *GR*. If one thinks about it backwards from the end to the beginning, a faculty member could theoretically be in limbo for many days or months, even if the allegation turns out to be false. It could be damaging to a researcher to lose access to a research lab or paperwork while the disciplinary process unfolds. Response from Watt: The President shares the concern about ensuring a timely resolution. There is currently a federal law requiring accusations of sexual harassment to be taken care of within 90 days of the report, hence the President's desire for the proposed *GR* to outline a process that will be started and completed within a 90-day timeframe.
- There is no mechanism for a faculty member to appeal in the initial stages, which could come to treading on academic freedom if the faculty member is prohibited from utilizing or accessing research-related resources. If there is any infringement of academic rights the case should be sent to the Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure (SACPT). There are no checks and balances.
- It is inappropriate to have a mechanism for the President to overrule the decision of the faculty hearing panel. If the faculty member is not found guilty, then it is akin to being tried twice for the same crime if the President or Dean ignores the recommendations of the faculty hearing panel. Such an allowance seems to be based on a premise that administrators do not trust the integrity of a faculty process to decide on cases.
- There is precedent for an administrator to overrule a faculty decision, specifically the processes under which the SACPT functions. After receiving a recommendation(s) from the SACPT, the President is free to disagree with the SACPT's findings and ignore their input.
- The SACPT is only an advisory body, but there is a reference in one of UK's regulations that says if the President or Provost ignores the recommendations of an advisory committee, the President must report to the Senate on why he did so. Further the proposed *GR* allows the President to consider a case de novo, which negates the spirit of the proposed *GR*. At the very least the President should have to report to the SC, SC Chair, or to the Senate as to why he disagreed with the advice.
- Because there are policies that state faculty and staff may appeal to the Board any decisions regarding conditions of employment, the proposed *GR* must also include that language so that if the President disagrees with the faculty hearing panel, the accused may appeal to the Board.

- The proposed *GR* gives the administration many options, but does not offer the same to faculty. It is very troubling that the proposed *GR* allows a unanimous decision by the faculty hearing panel to be overruled by an administrator, but without any options for the faculty member.
- If an appeals policy is added to the proposed *GR*, it will add to the process's duration. Even if a faculty member is suspended with pay, there has to be clarity about an appeals process for faculty. Response from Watt: Watt understood that the President opposed limiting the grounds upon which a dean could appeal or overrule a decision of the faculty hearing panel. Clearly, if a dean appeals a decision on frivolous grounds, just to get rid of a faculty member, Watt opined that the President would not at all be pleased. That, however, requires a level of trust on the part of faculty regarding how frivolous appeals and decisions will be handled by the President. That being said, the Committee was still concerned about it. Watt said that because the Committee was handing the matter back to SC, it would be in the SC's purview to make any further edits.
- The SC should not trust the administration to do the right thing. The proposed *GR* should be edited according to what best protects faculty; SC and Senate can deal with the consequences later.
- At some point, it is reasonable to assume that someone will have to make a final decision, after which no appeals are permitted.
- A proper check and balance regarding the President's authority would be to prohibit the President from overturning a recommendation from the faculty hearing panel and to allow appeals of final decisions to the Board.
- If the offending faculty member is a chair or dean, it is highly unlikely that the inquiry panel will recommend further action because the HR representative and Provost's office representative are beholden to the University. There should be a different process for faculty who also serve in administrative positions because they will be protected by their faculty administrator colleagues from any sanctions or findings of guilt.
- The proposed *GR* does not address confidentiality for the accused – if information about an allegation is made public, it will be hard for the faculty member to receive an impartial hearing.
- The issue of indefinite suspension without pay is troubling because it really amounts to termination of employment.
- If there is a faculty member accused of something that is relatively minor, but who is also an unpopular faculty member, the process outlined in the proposed *GR* could allow that person to be terminated for the minor infraction.
- An employee ombudsperson would be helpful to have at UK.
- A faculty member from the College of Law who is knowledgeable about dispute resolution practices should be consulted on the proposed *GR*.

- A lot of the legalese in the proposed *GR* could be removed if the following simple practice were instituted: if a faculty member's behavior is out of line, the way the case could be heard could still involve just three individuals. The two disputing parties would each identify an advocate for their position, and then the two advocates would agree on a third person to hear the situation.

At this point, given that it was 5:10 pm, Watt suggested that SC begin to focus its comments on the appropriate next steps for the proposed *GR*. The Chair reminded SC members that the timeline agreed upon with President Capilouto involved a first reading at the March Senate meeting, followed by a second reading in April, so the President could have a final version on his desk by May 1. Below are comments representative of the various suggestions and responses.

- The SC should send the report as-is to the Senate for the March meeting for comment, and reserve first and second readings for April and May, respectively.
- There is substantial disagreement within the Committee about the proposed *GR*, so the SC may want to consider a special meeting to discuss just the proposed *GR*.
- If a special SC meeting is called, a representative from Legal Counsel will need to be invited.
- It would be a mistake to try to edit the proposed *GR* on the Senate floor.
- SC should put compile a list of issues that it is willing and not willing to compromise on, and discuss those issues with Legal Counsel and the President.
- Given the level of importance of this document, the SC has not spent sufficient time to review it and it should not yet go to the Senate.
- The Committee members should also be involved in the SC's special meeting.
- Being on a timeline should not preclude SC's ability to be exceptionally thoughtful.
- The SC should edit the proposed *GR* as it sees fit and sent it to the Senate for review. It is not necessary for the President nor Legal Counsel to review that version prior to Senate review.
- It would be inappropriate to take to the Senate a version of the proposed *GR* that has not been reviewed by the President and Legal Counsel.
- The issue of greatly weakened trust came from the President's insistence that an administrator have the right to overturn a (perhaps) unanimous decision of the faculty hearing panel.
- Taking a revision to the Senate without first vetting with the President and Legal Counsel would not be the best course of action. The SC and Senate should make a good-faith effort to compromise on the issues it feels comfortable compromising on, but not compromise on aspects that are of critical importance to the faculty.

As discussion wound down, SC members began to concentrate on holding a special SC meeting very soon to deliberate further on the proposed *GR*. The Chair asked if the Committee desired an opportunity to revise the proposed *GR* based on the SC's discussion. The Committee members present concurred with the sentiment that the Committee's formal work was complete and it was the SC's responsibility to move forward. SC members had no objection to that, but made it clear that the continued input of Committee members was certainly desired.

The Chair recapped the next step – the SC will hold a special meeting on Friday, March 6, at 3 pm with the location to be announced. The SC will deliberate further on the document at that time.

7. 2014-15 Faculty Evaluation of President Capilouto

The Chair commented that he had invited Wood to also participate in discussion about the annual evaluation of President Eli Capilouto. He proposed that the evaluation and process mimic the evaluation and process from last year. Blonder commented that the President was unhappy that he was not given an opportunity to offer input into the evaluation questions. Wilson asked about consulting with the President and offering him an opportunity to comment on the evaluation questions, as well as offer additional questions. The Chair said that the President brought up the faculty evaluation of the President the last time they met. While President Capilouto was interested in offering additional questions, he acknowledged that using the same questions year after year offers an ability to measure trends. The Chair said that he would let President Capilouto know that the SC planned to utilize the same process and questions as was done the previous year.

Wood asked that a SC member be involved this year so that person would be able to do the survey in the future and Mazur volunteered to assist. Wood added that for the 2013-14 evaluation, narrative comments were solicited. Identifying information was removed and the comments in their entirety were given to the President. Wood commented that it was hard and time consuming to do a formal analysis of the narrative comments. The Chair asked SC that he be able to use his discretion in bringing up the matter of additional questions with the President and there were no objections.

Wood noted that the information was not cross-tabbed by demographics such as gender and race. Wood said that she cannot see an individual's responses but she can tell from the survey instrument if someone has completed the survey or not. She noted that requiring demographic information in the survey would decrease the response rate. In response to Kraemer about the response rates for the last two years, Wood said she thought the response rates were 31% and 28% respectively. Wood added that the numbers on percentage of respondents by college had been and still was available.

8. Tentative Senate Agenda for March 9, 2015

SC members discussed the tentative Senate agenda for March 9. All those present agreed that the only change needed was removal of the item on the faculty disciplinary policy – the remainder of the agenda was fine.

There being no further business to attend to, the SC meeting was adjourned at 5:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Hippisley,
Senate Council Chair

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

Invited guests present: Francis Bailey, Ruth Beattie, Liz Debski, Jonathan Golding, Jeff Huber, Cleo Price, Kate Seago, Ben Withers, and Connie Wood.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, March 10, 2015