

Senate Council
May 11, 2017

The Senate Council met in special session at its annual retreat on Thursday, April 10, 2017 in Stuckert Career Center room 202. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Katherine M. McCormick called the Senate Council (SC) retreat to order at 9:04 am.

1. Arrivals/Breakfast (8:30 – 9 am)
2. Minutes from April 24, 2017 and Announcements (9:00 – 9:05 am)

The Chair welcomed those present and suggested that everyone introduce themselves.

There were no corrections to the minutes from April 24. There being **no objections**, the minutes from April 24 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair said that Provost Tim Tracy was away from the office and would likely appoint the new academic ombud upon returning from vacation.

One of the co-chairs of the SREC, Davy Jones, asked the Senate Council office to look into improving the search functionality on the Senate's website. Ms. Brothers explained that the prior website platform allowed searches of document content, file names, and HTML content, but the current platform only searched file names and HTML content. The Chair said that the office would include that on their summer "to do" list. Schroeder said that the College of Education had similar problems in Drupal, but switched to WordPress and the problem did not recur.

The Chair shared that she had spent the prior day with a group of faculty looking into a University requirement for graduation that would increase students' understanding of difference. The idea had originally begun as a part of the Citizenship requirement in UK Core, but it was found that the majority of courses in that area dealt with politics and government, not difference and diversity. Eric Sanday (AS/Philosophy), who chairs the UK Core Education Committee (UKCEC) has been working hard to bring this general idea to fruition. The Chair explained that one of the issues brought to President Eli Capilouto's attention by students from underrepresented minorities who expressed the opinion that UK students do not know much about people different from themselves. Those working on the requirement have broadened it somewhat beyond issues of race and ethnicity to a conversation about difference. The Chair said that a number of individuals were involved in the effort and were keenly aware of the need to ensure that no additional credit hours would be required – Kentucky's Council on Postsecondary Education wanted undergraduate degree programs to stay around 120 credit hours, with a few notable exceptions in the STEM fields. The idea has morphed into an approach whereby students can meet the requirement through either a UK Core course or through a course already required by their degree program.

SC members discussed the proposed new requirement, still under development, and were receptive to the general idea.

SC members discussed the date for the first August SC meeting – the Chair indicated it would be either August 14 or August 21. SC members hesitated to meet the day before nine-month contract faculty return, but five SC members said they would be absent on August 21. After discussion about ensuring quorum at the first SC meeting of the year, the group determined that August 14 would be the first SC meeting of the year.

3. Digitized Workflow for Distribution of Effort (DOE) Forms – Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement G. T. Lineberry, Project Manager Diane Gagel, and Assistant Financial Controller Jennifer Miles (9:05 – 10:00 am)

The Chair welcomed the guests for the presentation on digitized distribution of effort (DOE) forms: GT Lineberry (associate provost for faculty advancement), Diane Gagel (IT project manager), and Jennifer Miles (assistant financial controller). Lineberry, Miles, and Gagel presented information to SC members; there was lengthy discussion (about an hour) regarding the changes. SC members offered a variety of comments and questions.

SC members suggested that references to “research activity” should be renamed to something like “scholarly activity” to better include faculty whose DOE does not include traditional research. The terminology used by Vice President for Research Lisa Cassis regarding creative expression would be a good substitute. Mazur expressed repeated concerns that it was very difficult for a faculty member to verify that the data on the digitized DOE from SAP and Human Resources regarding payroll distributions for grants is correct.

Schroeder asked Lineberry about his perspective on the DOE and what it was intended to do. Lineberry responded that he saw it as a planning tool. When a faculty member and chair meet in March or April, the DOE is a starting point to establish the department chair’s expectations. If the DOE is reviewed again in the fall (September through November) and information on funded activities is included, the DOE can demonstrate how much effort is committed to various DOE areas. He said the purpose was to know what UK has asked faculty members to do and what they have agreed to do. These comments led to many statements by SC members that their experiences with DOEs were quite different, that they were seen as a contract of what effort would be exerted where, not a starting point for discussions. McGillis stated that in the College of Medicine the DOE was used at part of performance evaluations. McGillis also expressed concern that external funding dollars on DOEs were used as part of performance evaluations. Lineberry and others stated that some college faculty had chosen to include external funding dollars as a metric or submetric for performance evaluations. The Chair commented that she was aware that Provost Tim Tracy is interested in various ways to demonstrate scholarship. The Chair used Mazur as an example. Mazur has a grant to work with schools in a certain Kentucky county – she has built a cohort of students and will offer tremendous service to the community with those grant dollars, but the total impact of Mazur’s scholarship must also include the transformational impact felt by the community, not just the exact grant dollars.

Lineberry stated that if a faculty member’s scholarship or research productivity had decreased, the department chair ought to work with the faculty member and direct their efforts elsewhere to narrow the gap – extra effort “here” could offset less-than-stellar efforts “there.” Bird-Pollan stated that it would be nice if deans and department chairs could be reminded of that at the beginning of the year and Lineberry said that was feasible. Blonder noted that her department chair was very good at motivating faculty and listening; she wondered what types of training are available for department chairs. Lineberry replied that he has had 54 chairs go through his training academy (24 currently involved). He said that the ideal department chair is someone who has conversations with faculty members, reviews past productivity, and initiates conversations about how to help the faculty member do the most they can to contribute to the unit’s mission. He said he was troubled to hear of department chairs who did not sound like they were supportive or helpful.

As discussion wound down, the Chair thanked Lineberry, Gagel, and Miles for attending, noting that they had certainly received the feedback Lineberry had sought. SC members thanked their guests for attending and offered them a round of applause as a token of their appreciation. SC members took a 10-minute break and resumed their meeting around 10:30 am.

4. Senate Committee Compositions (10:00 – 10:30 am)

The Chair explained that it was time to populate University Senate committees – thanks to the good works of many different individuals, SC was in a position to be able to compose committees in May, instead of waiting until the fall semester. Ms. Brothers explained the paperwork in front of them and the process she used to tentatively place senators on various committees. She emphasized that what was presented to them was preliminary work; SC retained the authority to change compositions as appropriate.

SC members reviewed the Senate committee compositions and made a handful of changes. Members discussed committee chairs and offered suggestions to the Chair as to possible committee chairs for various committees for 2017-18. The understanding was that the Chair would be responsible for all final decisions regarding committee chairs, with the SC offering advice during the discussion. The compositions for the Senate's Admissions Advisory Committee and Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee were not completed. SC members offered suggestions and it was determined that those particular compositions would come back to SC for review in the fall with changes to membership as discussed.

Grossman **moved** to approve the composition and changes as discussed (minus the compositions for Senate's Admissions Advisory Committee and Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee) and Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Standardizing Effective Dates for Changes to *Senate Rules* (10:45 – 11:00 am)

SC members discussed standardizing effective dates for changes to *Senate Rules*, using the supporting documentation posted with the agenda as a guide. After discussion, SC members present were in agreement. Cross **moved** to direct the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) to codify in the *Senate Rules* that: changes to the Senate Rules that are approved through the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) are effective for the following fall semester; and changes that include an effective date in the motion are effective for that particular date; and all other changes to *Senate Rules* are effective the first day of the next fall semester. Grossman **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. Senate Committee Productivity (11:00 – 11:45 pm)

The Chair led SC members in a discussion about how to facilitate productivity and efficiency in Senate committee activities. Below are suggestions offered by SC members, although no motion was made.

- Have a conversation with new committee chairs to reinforce the importance of timeliness.
- Post expectations for committee chairs on a web page, such as expectation to meet as necessary and not rely solely on email. Another expectation to share would be that committee proposals/issues should be vetted by the committee within 10 business days.

Senate Council
May 11, 2017

- Require all committees to report to the SC at least annually. This will give SC baseline information (over time) about the need to retain specific committees. Some committees do not need to meet regularly to be helpful.
- If the level of productivity of a committee is not acceptable and can be attributed to the committee's chair, the SC Chair could chat with the committee chair and indicate that another chair could be found if the current chair is unable to actively serve.
- Ask committee chairs to draft an SOP for their particular committee and post them online and refer new committee chairs to these procedures to ensure continuity and expectations.
- In lieu of an annual report that merely acknowledged not having met, committee chairs could be asked to complete a questionnaire to gauge the need for the committee to continue.

7. LUNCH (12 – 1 pm)

SC members adjourned for 45minutes for lunch.

When the meeting began again around 12:45 pm, SC members talked briefly about the Senate's "Committee on Committees," after Mazur explained that there was no specific charge for that committee. Bailey **moved** that the chairs of standing, ad hoc, and advisory committees meet as a group every fall and spring semester with the SC Chair serving as chair; in the fall semester include immediate-past committee chairs so they can share their experiences with new/current committee chairs, and in the spring semester, review committee activities for the past year and make a report to the SC prior to the end of the academic year, and that this group be referred to as the "Committee on Committees." Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with one abstention.

8. Department Chair and Dean Signatures: What Approvals are Needed and Under What Circumstances (1:15 – 1:45 pm)

The Chair explained that she had asked Ms. Brothers to put together a description of what approvals were currently required by the SC office. Ms. Brothers noted that if a memo from a department chair or school director included specific references to the date of a meeting and the content of discussion and votes, she did not also require meeting minutes; what was included was sufficient evidence that unit faculty were consulted.

SC members discussed the required approvals. While there was overall consensus that it would be nice to assume that unit faculty were appropriately consulted as needed, there was sufficient evidence that appropriate consultation did not always occur in every unit, hence the need to require information about approvals. Schroeder asked Ms. Brothers to post the supporting documentation as an FAQ on the Senate's forms page and that suggestion was met with wide support. SC members suggested that the file also be shared with associate deans, too.

Ms. Brothers commented that an all faculty email address could be created, through which the Chair could communicate Senate-related information to faculty. A regular email to all faculty, which could include information about required signatures on curricular proposals, could be sent out at the beginning of the fall semester. SC members were supportive of this idea.

9. University Senate Matters (1:45 – 2:15 pm)

The Chair asked SC members to consider the diversity of Senate membership and wondered if there were any obvious steps that could be taken to improve and increase diversity of members. Blonder commented that the University was overwhelmingly white and she was not sure if the Senate's ethnic and racial make-up mirrored that of the University as a whole, or if the Senate lagged behind. SC members discussed what was generally perceived as a University culture that lacked an emphasis on diversity, e.g. a series of white men on a podium at a recent building dedication and the lack of conversations in search committees about soliciting applicants from a diverse pool. There were a variety of comments and suggestions on how to increase the diversity in Senate membership.

- Diversity should be considered by colleges when nominating faculty to serve in the Senate. Dean's offices could communicate a message to their college faculty when the Senate's college elections are being conducted.
- UK has so few faculty of color that many faculty of color cannot take on additional service roles – most faculty of color are already serving the University in some way.
- In some colleges, faculty of color are quickly promoted into administrative positions, which removes that faculty member from the faculty ranks, thereby worsening diversity of the faculty.
- In search committee deliberations, it is often students who raise the issue of having diverse perspectives.
- One SC member learned he was half Native American, but once that information became more widely known, he was inundated with offers to serve on committees pertaining to minority affairs.
- Every college has a diversity officer and it seems likely that UK's Vice President for Institutional Diversity Sonja Feist-Price would meet with all of them, either individually or as a group.
- The letters that are sent to deans to initiate college elections could also include suggestions on how to encourage participation from a diverse group of faculty.
- The Char could reach out to Vice President for Institutional Diversity Feist-Price and ask that she (Feist-Price) contact diverse faculty, too, about college elections.
- It would be interesting to know if the salary "fighting fund" ever gets used to promote/secure diversity among current faculty members.
- Invite Vice President Feist-Price to attend a SC meeting to talk about diversity initiatives that Senate could undertake.

SC members then discussed the possibility of creating a new Senate committee, to be focused on increasing diverse membership. After discussion, Grossman **moved** that the SC recommend to Senate that it establish a permanent committee (that is not required to be chaired by a senator) on diversity and inclusion and that the charge of the new committee includes the following responsibilities: 1. to increase the diversity among senators, in particular representation of underrepresented minorities; 2. to work with admin to disseminate best practices for recruiting and retaining faculty of color; and 3.

address other issues around diversity and inclusion as they arise. Grossman noted that his intent was to give Senate an opportunity to think about it and discuss it at the September Senate meeting, but then vote on it in October. McGillis **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

SC members then discussed meeting productivity. The Chair began by saying that anyone who has led a group of people knows the tension that occurs when balancing the need to give senators enough time to discuss at their leisure and the need to be productive. She said she had received some feedback about the April Senate meeting in which at least one senator expressed frustration at what they perceived as insufficient time for discussion. The Chair asked SC members to offer their comments and perceptions about Senate meeting activity. SC members had a number of comments about the May Senate meeting in particular, as well as tactics the Chair could use. During discussion, the Chair noted that the new Senate parliamentarian in the fall semester would be Cross; the most recent parliamentarian had been a great help but had served for the past few years.

- Unless the President is addressing the Senate, the Chair should always be the one to lead discussion by calling on senators. Although a variety of individuals are invited to present to Senate, it is also unlikely that they are all well versed in parliamentary procedure.
- Ask Senate to move a motion to limit debate on an agenda item. It could be done at the beginning of the meeting as a housekeeping item or it could be a motion made during discussion.
- Continue trying to solicit senators' comments for and against an agenda item, as opposed to generally asking for discussion.
- There may be a need for more information to be given to senators to explain what an agenda item entails and exactly what senators are voting on.

The Chair expressed her appreciation for SC members' willingness to always come to SC and Senate meetings prepared, already having read the materials. She said that a lot of effort was made to get agendas out to SC members in the middle of the week, so that SC members are not always spending Sunday afternoons reviewing agendas. She also commented that it seemed like more senators were speaking during meetings, which was a good thing; in the past, it seemed that SC members were the most common speakers and movers of motions during Senate meetings. Students were also speaking up more frequently. Comments and suggestions continued.

- As necessary during discussions, remind senators how much time is remaining in the meeting and how much is left to be done.
- Include a timeline on an agenda as a guide for how much time has been allotted to spend on individual items, even if it is not enforceable.
- A committee chair that is presenting a series of items may notice that Senate is getting bogged down on one specific item. That committee chair (or anyone else, for that matter) could move to postpone discussion on that particular item until other items from that committee are reviewed, or even until after all remaining agenda items are reviewed.

The Chair thanked SC members for a fruitful discussion.

10. Update on UK Core – Eric Sanday, UK Core Education Committee Chair (2:30 – 3:15 pm)

The Chair welcomed Eric Sanday (AS/Philosophy, interim department chair) and explained that he is the UK Core Education Chair – he was in attendance to talk about UK Core and a new initiative currently titled, “Inclusive Excellence.” Guest Sanday explained that discussions about UK’s general education program began at least 10 years ago and started with Global Dynamics and US Citizenship, which had some language specifically referencing social justice, but also included more traditional political and citizenship issues. Fast forwarding to November 2015, some concerned students met with President Eli Capilouto and expressed a desire for increased curricular discussions about diversity & inclusion. That and other motivations resulted in a proposal for a diversity & inclusion graduation requirement, which could also be viewed as a social justice graduation requirement. Currently, the idea is not to require students to take a particular course, but rather that the requirement would be met through an existing (or new) course in one of the 10 areas of UK Core, or a course in a student’s own major, which included significant discussion about a topic related to diversity and inclusivity. The Chair and Sanday reiterated that the requirement was not a course requirement. There had been a discussion about rewriting the US Citizenship, but that would remove a traditional citizenship class. Another drawback was that some courses with large enrollments that currently serve many students as the US Citizenship course (such as the introductory Political Science class) would no longer be included in UK Core because they currently do not have a social justice-type component. A further problem is that there are not enough courses focused solely on diversity & inclusion to service the entire undergraduate population. The current plan (use existing courses offered in UK Core and through the student’s major) will let students “double dip” and use one course to fulfill more than one requirement. The priority is implementing the diversity & inclusion course in such a way as to ensure that no credit hours are added to any student’s requirements for graduation.

Sanday explained that the day before the retreat there had been a day-long retreat hosted by the Senate Council, UK Core Education Committee, and other stakeholders with about 15 – 20 faculty, administrators, and students – discussions included student learning outcomes and what a course would need to encompass to be included as part of an Inclusive Excellence (IE) requirement. The basic idea was that at the very least, a course would need to have a substantive focus on a social justice-related issue and include content on intersectionality or the ways in which different types of identity interact. There is a range of what a course could look like to be identified as meeting the IE requirements – at the most permissive end of the spectrum, there are many, many courses that a student could take, and it is quite likely that a student could have already taken one of those courses, even by mistake. On the other end of the spectrum would be courses that are more restrictive in terms of what would be required to identify a course as meeting the IE requirement – these courses were much fewer in number and harder to find currently in existence. Sanday explained that one current unknown was the amount of resources that upper administration was willing to contribute to the initiative, and when.

Regarding some technicalities, Sanday explained that House Bill (HB) 160 requires UK to give general education certification to every student that transfers in with general education credits. If the intent is to have a campus conversation about diversity and inclusion and there is a desire to not allow a class taken at another institution to meet the IE requirement, then it must be a “graduation requirement.” If it is a part of UK Core, then many students will not take a course to fulfill the IE requirement here, but rather will fulfill the requirement elsewhere. Sanday said that in the fall, he would like to share information with senators and ask senators for their ideas about what they would want and what they would like to see. The intent is to have a vote in Senate by mid-winter at the latest (before February)

and have the initiative be in place for the 2018-19 academic year. Sanday suggested that the intent is to start slowly and be very permissive for transfer students in the beginning; hopefully within a couple of years, UK will be able to develop relationships with the universities that send the most transfer students to UK to discuss how to ensure transfer students can meet the requirement.

The Chair asked about existing courses and Sanday indicated that in consultation with department chairs, the College of Arts and Sciences Deans' office put together a list of about 200 courses that deal with social justice in a broad sense, including environment, gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, and identity. Sanday said that some courses that do not have a heavy emphasis on race/ethnicity but maybe the courses could be modified somewhat. He said there needed to be a balance – the higher you set the criteria, the fewer the classes that can count towards an IE requirement. If the bar is set too high, it may be too hard for a faculty member to find a way to incorporate it into the classroom. Furthermore, some faculty will need training to help hold these types of conversations in the classroom and help them avoid situations where the conversation goes sideways and the faculty member is not prepared for it.

SC members engaged Sanday in a lengthy and lively conversation about the IE graduation requirement. He noted that the intent was for a focus on things that are pertinent to Lexington and the Commonwealth. The Chair explained that the intent is to prepare a draft version of changes to the *Senate Rules* to codify the new graduation requirement, so that senators can see how it would look in the *SRs*. It would not be subject to a vote the first time it was discussed in Senate, but rather senators would offer feedback and that would inform the proposal that will be brought to Senate for a vote later in the year. Sanday welcomed Childress' comment that he [Childress] planned to solicit input from the Student Government Association.

When discussion wound down, Sanday introduced another UK Core-related topic – UK Core courses taught within the major. He explained that there are a couple of programs that want to add a prerequisite for their UK Core class to restrict it to students within the major. He said that while there are a few ways to make that work and still remain in compliance with SACS' requirements that students can receive specialized training in UK Core classes and that UK Core include courses that are open to the broad student population, he was still concerned about it. He was anxious that over time it would result in Balkanization and separation of students into major-specific course, which would defeat the purpose of a "general" education requirement. SC members discussed the matter from a variety of perspectives, but there was a distinct sense during the discussion that all UK Core courses should remain open to all students, with the exception that some courses necessarily required a student to have taken other courses before enrolling. SC members did not object to the idea that Sanday and the UK Core Education Committee could allow an experimental trial of alternative restrictions, which would not set a precedent that UK Core would be required to follow in perpetuity.

Sanday also informed SC members that the UK Core Education Committee had submitted a recommendation to restrict the number of prefixes within a student's major that could be used to satisfy UK Core. The proposal had not yet been reviewed by the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), but he hoped it would be presented to Senate in the fall. Sanday commented that it was his impression that many units on campus believed that participating in UK Core by offering a course hurts the unit and its own programs. If the source of this belief was a result of how tuition monies flowed, the Chair said it would be useful to talk about it with Provost Tim Tracy.

SC members thanked Sanday more than once for attending and for the information he shared and he departed.

Senate Council
May 11, 2017

11. Closing Remarks (3:15 – 3:30)

Mazur brought up the matter of a program in her college that offers half-priced graduate tuition. The Chair said she could check with the Provost about it to find out more information. There were a few additional comments from SC members.

Cross **moved** to adjourn and Mazur **seconded** and the meeting was adjourned at 3:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine M. McCormick,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bailey, Bird-Pollan, Blonder, Cross, Grossman, Mazur, McCormick, McGillis, and Schroeder.

Invited guests present: Ben Childress, Diane Gagel, GT Lineberry, Jennifer Miles, and Eric Sanday.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, May 25, 2017.