

Senate Council
May 14, 2007

The Senate Council met at 3 pm on Monday, May 14, 2007 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Kaveh A. Tagavi called the meeting to order at 3:03 pm.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair referred Senate Council (SC) members to the various minutes requiring approval. The SC minutes from April 2 were approved as distributed. There were a few editorial changes to the April 16 minutes; therefore the minutes from April 16 were approved as amended. The minutes from April 23 were approved as distributed.

The Chair explained that because the minutes for April 30 were not submitted to SC members for review until that morning, he would be willing to delay approval of them until a future meeting if anyone needed more time to review them. There being no concern by SC members, the SC minutes from April 30 were then approved as distributed.

The chair announced that Grabau and Dembo had informed the Office of the Senate Council that they would be absent; Randall would be late. The Chair reminded SC members of the upcoming annual evaluation of President Todd. He said that he had received over 20 evaluations so far, mostly from senators. There being no objection, he said that the evaluation would proceed similarly to how it played out last year.

With no objection from SC members, the agenda was rearranged to accommodate a guest.

3. UK Candidates for Degrees for Summer 2007 (Dietetics and Education)

The Chair invited Associate Registrar Jacquie Hager to offer [an explanation](#). Guest Hager said during the past summer, after graduation check-out occurred, the candidates for degrees did not go to the University Senate (Senate) for approval until September since the Senate did not meet over the summer. Therefore, the August degrees were essentially held until one month after completion of the summer term. Graduating students in the College of Education encountered certification and promotion problems due to the late approval and the Dietetics program was cited by their accrediting agency for the degrees having been held. Hager explained that by approving the candidates for summer 2007 degrees in May, the degree list could then go to the Board of Trustees (BoT) at its June meeting. Once the August degree candidates were ensured to have completed their requirements for graduation, their degrees could be conferred immediately.

In response to Finkel, the Chair said that the SC routinely approved summer degrees on behalf of the elected University Faculty senators. The Chair confirmed for Michael that five elected faculty SC members constituted a quorum for matters such as approval of the degree list.

Lesnaw **moved** to approve the list of candidates for summer 2007 degrees (MA in Education; BS in Dietetics; and BA in Education) on behalf of the elected University Faculty senators. Harley **seconded**. In response to Aken, Hager said that students could be walked on to the list later on if it was determined that they had completed the requirements for a degree. Wood joined the meeting during this discussion.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to approve the list of candidates for summer 2007 degrees (MA in Education; BS in Dietetics; and BA in Education) on behalf of the elected University Faculty senators. The motion **passed** unanimously.

1. Announcements

The Chair said he would again return to announcements, beginning with his recent appointment by President Todd to the Employee Benefits Committee, for a three-year term beginning September 1, 2007. Randall and Dembo arrived.

Due to a recent request by the Office of the President, additional nominees for the following area committees were discussed: the Medical Center Clinical Sciences Area Advisory Committee; the Social Sciences Area Advisory Committee; and the Librarians Area Advisory Committee.

SC members directed the Office of the Senate Council to submit the names decided upon to the President.

The Chair explained that the Office of the Provost had contacted him to obtain three to four names for two separate faculty merit review committees (College of Agriculture and College of Business and Economics), both in the social sciences academic area. There was a lengthy discussion about which names should be put forward.

Subsequently, Lesnaw **moved** to send the list of faculty members as amended by the SC to the Office of the Provost for membership on either of the two merit review committees. Piascik **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

The Chair said that in deference to Guest Bob Grossman, he wished to discuss something that had not been placed on the agenda. SC members agreed.

The Chair explained that there had been an existing benefit (Employee Education Program, or EEP) for employees in which six credit hours of classes

could be taken at no cost to the employee every semester. The benefit had recently been expanded to dependents and spouses/domestic partners (Family Education Program, or FEP). The proposal sent to the Employee Benefits Committee (EBC) did not include tuition waivers, however, for professional schools. After asking Human Resources Director Joey Payne, the Chair said he was told that professional school courses had subsequently been included in the FEP proposal. The proposal sent to the BoT, however, specifically excluded professional schools and graduate courses. In conversation with Executive Vice President for Financial Affairs Frank Butler, the Chair said that Butler expressed surprise that the proposal no longer included professional schools. The Chair shared that Butler said he would look into and respond to the Chair's concerns.

Guest Grossman said that when he spoke with Work-Life Director Laura Koppes after the BoT approval, she said that when the proposal went to the President's Cabinet, it was determined that the benefit as proposed was too expensive. It was then returned to committee, which decided that the FEP would only apply to undergraduate work.

Lesnaw requested that the recent changes to UK's benefit structure be made the topic of a future SC agenda. She expressed deep concern that the recent expansion of various benefits was beneficial only to single, unmarried employees.

Finkel opined that the issue of summer salaries was a more relevant and applicable topic for discussion than the new FEP. The Chair invited Grossman share his thoughts before closing discussion on the matter.

Grossman said that although the EEP benefit was a good benefit, the vast majority of faculty members could not take advantage of it since most (if not all) faculty already held a bachelor's degree. After the recent fanfare about extending the benefit to dependents and spouses/domestic partners, Grossman said he was expecting a usable benefit. Instead, the benefit had been designed in such a way that it was only relevant for some employees. He said that he was not overly concerned about professional school courses not being included, since graduates from those programs normally entered the work force with a high salary. Graduate-level courses, however, could lead to a high learning potential. Grossman said that many faculty members' spouses/domestic partners likely already held a bachelor's degree. Therefore, the benefit would be largely useless for faculty unless they had children. Grossman said that he was also upset about how the change came about – omitting graduate school coursework was never part of the public discussion on the proposed new benefit.

Wood expressed agreement with Grossman's thoughts. She asked that the new benefit formally be placed on the agenda for the SC's summer retreat. The Chair thanked Grossman for attending.

2. Clinical Title Series Wrap-Up

The Chair explained to SC members that although the Senate offered its input on the proposed changes to the Clinical Title Series (CTS) *Administrative Regulations*, the SC had yet to formally weigh in. He asked for suggestions.

There was a lengthy discussion about how to reflect the sentiment of the SC. Ultimately, Yanarella **moved** that the Senate Council go on record as supporting the May 7 endorsement by the Senate of the revised *Administrative Regulations* dealing with the Clinical Title Series. Lesnaw **seconded**. Discussion continued about possible rewording.

When there were no further comments to be made, a **vote** was taken on the motion that the Senate Council go on record as supporting the May 7 endorsement by the Senate of the revised *Administrative Regulations* dealing with the Clinical Title Series. The motion **passed** with seven in favor and one against.

4. Rule Waiver Request - RWA Submitted to Dean Beyond "Two-Year Window" (BC-53)

Upon moving to the next agenda item, Finkel **moved** to approve that the Senate Council waive *Senate Rules 5.1.8.5.A.2* ("two-year window") for student BC-53, so long that his case was heard by the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee by July 16. Lesnaw **seconded**.

Finkel **called the question**. A **vote** was taken on the motion to call the question. The motion **passed** with six in favor and one against.

A **vote** was then taken on the main motion that the Senate Council waive *Senate Rules 5.1.8.5.A.2* ("two-year window") for student BC-53, so long that his case was heard by the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee by July 16. The motion **passed** unanimously.

5. Summer School Pay

The Chair thanked SC members for the good discussions had on the SC listserv regarding the summer school pay issue. He said that the email included in the handout had been reviewed by Provost Subbaswamy, who did not object to it being distributed. Tagavi shared the following language from the email with SC members:

Here is my understanding of some points expressed by the Provost:

1. The Provost regrets that the faculties of some colleges have been given short notices regarding these changes. He said that the budgetary changes were put in place early last fall, but their

consequences would have been apparent to the deans only during registration.

2. Unfortunately, the question of compensation for summer courses never came up during the planning process. Had it come up, the Provost would have made clear that a reduced or negotiated fee paid to the faculty member is not appropriate. The Provost believes that regular faculty members who teach summer courses should be paid the customary and prevailing rate. However, cancelling an “expensive” course which could just as easily be offered during the academic year is a part of sound fiscal management. There might also be circumstances (e.g., outreach mission) where a course might need to be offered regardless of financial considerations.

3. The Provosts and the deans will be revisiting this funding model at the end of the summer to examine the negative and positive implications.

While a senator had asked for a discussion on the matter at the May 7 special Senate meeting, the Chair said the agenda for that meeting had been so full that it would have been impossible to hold a robust discussion on summer school pay.

Thelin opined that if there was a policy that governed the process of assigning funds to support summer school courses, that policy needed to be readily available to anyone who wanted to read it. Wood said that it was her understanding that the policy was more or less just the language included in an email that Provost Subbaswamy sent to deans. She said that while it was only hearsay, she was told that the Provost was keeping 60% of the tuition payments and leaving the remaining 40% for a college to manage summer school courses. Both Thelin and the Chair believed that to be a factual statement. Wood said that just from discussions on the listserv, there was a lot of misinformation floating around – having a written policy that was distributed to faculty would be the best way to show transparency and educate faculty on the official policy.

Finkel said he believed that there had once been a base amount of money given to colleges, which was theirs to use for summer school, along with 40% of tuition revenues. A change was made recently, though, so that the baseline funding was removed so colleges only received the 40%. Finkel said that a college with a mix of cheap courses (a large class taught by a graduate student) and expensive courses (a small class taught by a full professor) can manage to succeed – the mix of courses allows subsidies. A college that only offered cheap courses would succeed financially and make money, but a college that offered only expensive courses would not be able to offer such courses in the summer. Finkel said that there was a very real educational ramification as a result of the current summer

school funding model. The fact that colleges were cancelling summer courses due to an inability to break even was definitely an academic issue.

Provost's Liaison Greissman said that the removal of baseline funding occurred shortly before then-Provost Mike Nietzel left UK. Wood said that there was a baseline that was in place, back to 2001, in which a college only received profit for income that was over and above the baseline. She noted that the current model negatively affected graduate education in the summer. Currently, a TA or RA that taught a course in the summer received full tuition reimbursement. This meant that 100% of the student's tuition payment came from the 40% that the college had to work with; coupled with the faculty member's salary and fringe benefits, some graduate courses were not offered in the summer session due to cost.

Finkel said that insofar as there was an academic component to the issue, the SC had the right to make a statement about the matter. If there were students who depended upon summer courses that suddenly were not offered, there was a real disservice to students.

Randall noted that the Provost had said the issue would be reevaluated at the end of the summer. Randall **moved** to send a letter to Provost Subbaswamy requesting that he keep the Senate Council informed about the reevaluation of summer school pay so that at an appropriate time, the Senate Council could offer its advice. Piascik **seconded**. At Yanarella's suggestion, Randall **revised the motion** to frame the motion as an issue with significant academic implications. Piascik also **accepted**.

The Chair said that in conversations with Provost Subbaswamy, the Provost was also opposed to the practice of allowing faculty to negotiate the fee paid for teaching a summer course. The Chair added that both he and the Provost agreed that every faculty member should be paid at the standard rate for teaching a summer course.

After additional discussion, Dembo asked if there were going to be faculty who received less than the customary and prevailing rate of financial remuneration. If so, the proposed motion would do nothing to address the issue of faculty being shorted in terms of pay for the summer 2007 sessions.

Wood subsequently offered a **friendly amendment** that the motion be amended to include, "The Senate Council has discussed recent changes in the summer school policy and has identified several areas of academic concern, including the issue of graduate courses in summer; continuing education and non-uniformity in faculty reimbursement. For that reason...." Randall and Piascik **accepted**.

A **vote** was taken on the motion that because the Senate Council has discussed recent changes in the summer school policy and has identified several areas of

academic concern, including the issue of graduate courses in summer; continuing education and non-uniformity in faculty reimbursement, a letter should be sent to Provost Subbaswamy requesting that he keep the Senate Council informed about the re-evaluation of summer school pay so that at an appropriate time, the Senate Council can offer its advice. The motion **passed** unanimously.

The Chair asked SC members about possible dates for the summer SC retreat. Various SC members shared dates of their travel plans. The Chair said he would continue the discussion regarding the date for the retreat over the listserv.

There being no further business to attend to, the meeting was adjourned at 5:04 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh Tagavi,
Senate Council Chair

Senate Council members present: Aken, Dembo, Finkel Harley, Lesnaw, Michael, Piascik, Randall, Tagavi, Thelin, Wood and Yanarella.

Provost's Liaison present: Richard Greissman.

Non-SC members present: Bob Grossman and Jacquie Hager.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, May 15, 2007.