

Senate Council
May 14, 2012

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, May 14, 2012 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Hollie I. Swanson called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:05 pm.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair asked SC members to offer their thoughts and opinions on the recent University Senate (Senate) meeting, which they did. SC members touched on a variety of areas. A common refrain was complimenting the Chair on doing a wonderful job in running a smooth meeting that was very long and could have been very contentious.

SC members then discussed the proposed budget for 2012-2013, particularly the administrative and academic cuts.

The Chair invited Guest Alice Christ, chair of the Senate's Academic Facilities Committee (SAFC), to offer a report on the activities of the SAFC during the year. Christ said that there were two specific charges given to the SAFC by the SC for the 2011-2012 year: 1. investigate the cost estimate procedures for repairs and maintenance for existing buildings; and 2. investigate current procedures for setting building priorities and recommend, if necessary, new procedures to increase transparency and faculty representation in setting those priorities.

Christ explained that the SAFC drafted and approved criteria for rating capital projects based on academic merit. She noted that there was a huge variation in proposals as to whether a proposal even mentioned academic merit. She said the SAFC would like the Senate to approve the checklist in fall 2012, so that it could perhaps be used by the Provost's office when units propose new building projects. A larger issue is getting faculty input into building priority decision-making, long before a proposed new building ends up on the project list. The SAFC was not sure when/where in the process is the appropriate time for faculty input.

In response to a question from Grossman, Christ explained that there was a long chain of committees that review building proposals. She opined that his suggestion of having a faculty representative on one of the final committees would not move the academic merit discussion forward all that much, since one faculty member would be just one voice out of a slew of administrators. She also mentioned that donors and the strategic plan also play a role in building priorities.

Christ then moved to the issue of the Physical Plant Division (PPD) and how renovations/repairs are priced. She explained that PPD is intended to operate on a cost-neutral basis and cannot make money off of a particular unit's project. She said that itemized bills are not presented to the paying department, although the information is available in SAP. There are also unique funding aspects to consider – once a department settles on a renovation of \$100,000 or more, the unit has to pre-fund the project via a separate plant fund account. If the money in that fund is not spent in its entirety for the project, the Provost has the authority to return all, some, or none of the remaining dollars to the originating department.

Christ explained further that PPD is not necessarily paying competitive salaries for skilled workers, so some employees are leaving, which means PPD is forced to hire an outside contractor to perform the work. She described the entire process as a "complicated mess." Christ opined that it was unlikely PPD was "padding" estimates, but rather that additional cost for a project came about due to state safety regulations or discovering something unexpected when tearing down old walls, etc.

Grossman **moved** to approve the report from the Senate's Academic Facilities Committee (SAFC) and defer any action on it until fall 2012. The motion was **seconded** and when a **vote** was taken, the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair thanked Christ and her SAFC members for all their hard work.

The Chair asked SC members to weigh in on the restructuring of the Provost's area, specifically that of the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs office. The thoughts below were expressed.

- Multidisciplinary centers should not report to the Vice President for Research – they should have remained in the Provost's reporting structure. Research should be under the purview of the chief academic officer.
- There are areas in Undergraduate Education that serve as the home academic unit for a few programs/courses. Therefore, if the area of Undergraduate Education is administratively modified, there are curricular concerns on which the University Senate may need to deliberate.
- Having the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs position continue with a strong voice is very valuable for faculty, particularly because it is external to the college structure. Faculty often need assistance from outside their local unit. The Office of the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs takes care of a wide range of faculty issues. It helps mediate issues and helps those involved come to a reasonable conclusion, preventing issues from moving to court. The office offers a voice for faculty who may feel uncomfortable speaking up, particularly junior faculty and those in the Clinical Title Series. The promotion and tenure workshops are critically important for retention.
- It is somewhat odd for an interim Provost to be charged with making long-term structural changes.
- The Assistant Provost for Program Support, Richard Greissman, is an important part of SC deliberations – it would be very, very helpful for him to continue in his position. He also has a vast knowledge of UK's regulations.

3. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Rules and Elections Committee - Davy Jones, Chair

i. Discussion on *Senate Rules 5.2.4.7* ("Final Examinations")

Grossman explained the issues. After discussion, Grossman **moved** that the SC endorse the interpretation of the SREC regarding the Dead Week rule (*Senate Rules 5.2.4.6*) and send that interpretation to various office around the University. Wood **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Wood **moved** that the SC establish a new policy effective immediately that the dates of final exams for accelerated/compressed courses must be published in the Registrar's schedule of courses. Grossman **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Document Handling System

a. Update

b. Naming

The Chair offered a brief update on the courses processed through the document handling system. SC members discussed possible names.

Wood **moved** that the document handling system be formally named the "electronic Curricular Approval Tracking System." Anderson **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Discussion on Potential SC Retreat Agenda Items

SC members discussed a number of items for possible discussion during a summer retreat, including those listed in the handout, as well as whether one retreat would be sufficient. All SC members present took part in the discussion. It was ultimately determined that one retreat would suffice (unless something unexpected comes up over the summer) and would include discussions on multidisciplinary research centers, charges for Senate committees and a handful of relatively related curricular matters.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:14 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Hollie I. Swanson,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Brion, Coyne, Grossman, McCormick, Swanson, Wilson and Wood.

Invited guests present: Lee Blonder.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Monday, June 25, 2012.