

Senate Council
May 27, 2010

The Senate Council met in special session for a retreat at 8:30 am on Thursday, May 27, 2010 in the Lexmark Public Room, 209 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Dave Randall called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 8:47 am. SC members and invited guests had already begun a working breakfast. Those present introduced themselves.

1. Minutes and Announcements

There were no minutes ready for approval.

2. Honorary Degrees

The Chair announced that he would offer Provost's Liaison Greissman a few minutes. Greissman explained the rationale behind a suggestion that the University Senate (Senate) approve the awarding of off-cycle honorary degrees, as well as the possibility of increasing the number of honorary degrees allowed so that some portion could be bestowed during the December 2011 commencement. There were a few questions, after which Greissman departed.

3. Gen Ed Approval Process for Fall 2011

The Chair noted that the SC would need to keep its pulse on the forward movement of the Gen Ed initiative. Although it would be simple to let the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education take the lead since he would do a good job, it was important to ensure the Senate was in command.

The Chair then turned responsibility for the meeting over to Vice Chair Hollie Swanson.

4. Comments from "Improve the Senate" – the Senate Council Responds

The Vice Chair explained that SC members had a list of all the comments offered by senators. After some very brief comments, SC members decided to turn to agenda item number nine.

9. Identify Senate Council's Goals/Key Issues for 2010 – 2011

SC members spent some time discussing the transfer credit legislation passed by Frankfort, and the extent to which the SC was or was not involved in meaningful discussions and deliberations. Referring to the Supreme Court decision in *Sweezy v. New Hampshire* (1957), Thelin commented that the ruling was that the university is the only body that can determine who is admitted, what is studied, who teaches and who receives degrees. He wondered why UK did not utilize that argument with the state legislature.

SC members generally agreed that the mission of the Senate should be to advance and protect the academic mission at UK, including academic integrity, performance and criteria. After a few additional comments, it was determined that agenda item number seven should be addressed prior to further deliberation on goals and/or key issues.

7. Reinvigorate Standing Senate Committees

The Vice Chair referred SC members to the list of standing committees. Grossman commented that after having served on a variety of committees, it was his opinion that the committees that function the most effectively are those that have a specific issue brought to them. He went on to suggest that there be individuals identified from the administration to serve as ex officio non-voting committee members, in

order to help committees identify and get in front of issues, instead of merely react. Steiner disagreed with that idea, saying that it was not helpful for an administrator to offer information on what an administrator thinks is important. Having a faculty perspective is crucial to directing committee activities.

There was general discussion regarding the usefulness of charging Senate committees with specific duties, as well as comments about the attempt a few years ago to require UK to define parameters for completer degrees. This turned into a discussion about how the Senate is able to respond to situations that occur outside the University, and if the Senate had some type of legal representation. Although there is Legal Counsel, that office is biased toward representing the administration's perspective. There was general support for the idea of identifying a faculty member from either the College of Law or the College of Education to serve as a legal liaison, akin to the Provost's liaison.

Joe Peek (incoming faculty trustee) opined that communication and communication failures were a large part of the issues discussed up to that point. He noted that having access to and understanding the budgeting process was critical in order to make sensible decisions.

SC members discussed various situations from the past and how changes in communication could have resulted in different outcomes. There was a suggestion to form a Committee on Committees, made up of Senate committee chairs, to make recommendations on the possible merger or dissolution of various Senate committees.

After additional discussion, Grossman **moved** that the SC identify a faculty member with legal expertise who is willing to serve as the Senate's legal advisor, and then pursue appointment of that person with appropriate recognition, approximately 20%, in their Distribution of Effort form. McCorvey **seconded**.

Yanarella stated that the legal advisor position should also serve as the SC liaison to UK's Legal Counsel, so that person can go to Legal Counsel and get appropriate documents that may bear on a particular issue, as well as offer feedback to the SC and Senate. Grossman opined that the person would be a frequent attendee of SC meetings, either voting or non-voting. There were additional comments made.

A **vote** was taken on the **motion** that that the SC identify a faculty member with legal expertise who is willing to serve as the Senate's legal advisor, and then pursue appointment of that person with appropriate recognition in their Distribution of Effort form, and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

After the vote, SC members discussed how best to implement the motion. Grossman **moved** that an ad hoc committee be appointed to define the duties of the position and identify a person who would be suitable for the position, and report back to the SC in early fall. Steiner **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

There was additional discussion about various matters. SC members decided it was necessary to identify an annual, specific charge for various committees to address and make recommendations. The faculty and the University Senate must be mobilized, and there is a need to delegate information-gathering activities to the Senate's committees. There were comments about how to avoid losing institutional knowledge. Below are some of the comments and/or suggested goals for various committees. SC members agreed that all Senate committees should more actively interact with administrators, and request responses from appropriate administrative areas as necessary. Each committee's reports, recommendations and responses from administrators should be posted on the Senate website and

presented to the Senate on an annual basis. SC members also mentioned wanting more information about the budget of the Office of the Senate Council and its expenditures.

There was brief discussion regarding the salary for the SC's administrative coordinator. Grossman **moved** that the incoming SC Chair nominate a subset of the SC to examine and revise the description of the administrative coordinator's job duties with a view towards increasing compensation, and Jensen seconded. The motion was **seconded** and a **vote** was taken. The motion **passed** with none opposed. SC members determined that the subset would be comprised of Vice Chair Swanson, Steiner, Jensen and Yanarella.

SC members then moved into small groups to identify possible, specific charges for the Senate's committees for 2010-2011, and subsequently broke for lunch. Just after returning from lunch, Thelin **moved** that the Senate Council commend and thank Mike Mullen, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, for his sustained work and contribution to general education reform and his continued commitment to joint faculty-administration collaboration. Grossman **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Anderson **moved** that the Senate Council commend and thank Professor Susan Carvalho for her work and contribution to general education reform. After brief discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The suggestions below are a summary of the comments made both prior to and after lunch.

- Senate's Academic Facilities Committee: No new buildings for programs housed within the College of Arts and Sciences have been built in the past 35 years, and there is no information about how vacated buildings (e.g. Pharmacy Building) will be utilized. The committee should solicit input on physical plant needs from senators, faculty, Student Government Association and invite administrators to present their priorities and associated rationales. A list of Senate priorities and associated rationales should be developed and presented to the Senate for approval. This committee can also communicate the Senate's facility priorities/rationales to the administration and the Board of Trustees, through the faculty trustees.
- Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee: This committee should be charged to offer proactive response to pending legislation. It can review program criteria and standards, and admission, probation and suspension policies. How do such policies in one college affect other colleges? In addition, the committee should review the issue of transfer credit and how its impact can be measured. Finally, what courses have been approved in the past for transfer credit, and how are they reviewed for transfer credit?
- Senate's Institutional Finance and Resource Allocation Committee: This committee should be charged to review UK's budget and communicate with the Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration and the University Budget Office. It is important for this committee to be given access to detailed information in a proper and timely manner, particularly information pertaining to potential, tentative plans for financial enhancements or reductions. Finally, the committee should explore further administrative oversight of the budget for UK Athletics and the relation of the Athletics budget to UK's general fund. It will be important to have some sort of schedule of annual fiduciary deadlines/dates, as well as regular reports from pertinent financial areas.

- Senate’s Admissions Advisory Committee: A more appropriate name would be the “Enrollment Committee.” A written report as per the committee’s charge in the *Senate Rules* should be offered on the activities/changes that have taken place for the period of academic year 2001-2002 to the present. Grossman **moved** to change the name of the committee to the “Senate’s Enrollment Management Advisory Committee” and McCorvey **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The issue of transfer credit and how its impact can be measured should also be a part of this committee’s purview.
- Senate’s Academic Planning and Priorities Committee: A mechanism to communicate with faculty and staff and offer faculty offering the opportunity to weigh in needs to be developed. The committee must be proactive (not reactive) and should have regular meetings, including the SC Chair, with the President regarding growth and development, and with the Provost regarding academic issues. The committee can use these meetings to be informed of issues that are coming, and can set meeting agendas accordingly. There should be a liaison from the Senate’s Academic Planning and Priorities Committee to the Provost-run UCAPP (University Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities) and that liaison should offer an annual review. This committee could also take the responsibility for identifying funding for programmatic forums for faculty. Another possibility for this committee is a faculty award by the faculty, for the faculty. SC members wondered what other universities do with respect to academic planning and academic priorities. There was a suggestion that the SC utilize the SEC Affiliated Faculty Leaders group to find such information.
- Senate’s Research Committee: This committee should look into the Division of Laboratory Animal Resources (DLAR, dealing with ethics in animal management) as they relate to faculty research. In addition, the committee should examine the policies by which grant management is established and why the administrative response to faculty concerns is perceived as decreasing. The committee should review the overall indemnification process for all of campus, as the process for clinical research is only operational on the healthcare campus; there is no clear policy for indemnification on main campus. Finally, there should be a review of benefits in the graduate education process – graduate education expenses are increasingly being transferred to research funding awards, which may not necessarily be the best management of graduate education. There was discussion about the exceptionally detailed requirements of the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC), including, for example, directives on what types of sutures to use in animal surgery. It was asserted that the DLAR administrative processes were handcuffing the IACUC processes.

There was also extensive discussion regarding faculty oversight of graduate education. There were suggestions that there be a review of policies for graduate students, teaching assistants, research assistants and post-doctoral scholars that pertain to remuneration, disability/maternity/medical leave, workload, background/immigration, and having summer salary taxed due to not being classified as a student. Thelin noted that in the 1990s, a graduate student brought the issue of not having access to health insurance to the SC. The SC moved the issue forward against the wishes of then-Provost Mike Nietzel, and health insurance for graduate students is now pervasive.

Grossman **moved** that the Chair establish an ad hoc committee to determine which existing Senate committee is most appropriately charged with reviewing issues pertaining to graduate education, including post-doctoral students, or if a new standing committee is warranted, and that a report be given by the next SC retreat. McCorvey **seconded**. There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

- Potential new committees:
 - Grievance Committee
 - Standing Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics: The rationale for this suggestion was that student athletes are students first, and there should be faculty oversight provided to those undergraduate student athletes. It was noted that UK is the only school in the Southeastern Conference whose faculty governance body does not have a seat on its athletics governing body. The faculty trustees confirmed that while there are faculty members on the Athletic Association Board of Directors, those faculty members are appointed by the President, not the University Senate. Grossman suggested that the SC ask if President Todd was amenable to making appointments to the Athletic Association Board of Directors from a slate of names offered by the SC. Grossman wondered about the benefit of researching SEC requirements for faculty representation on athletic boards. If faculty representation is required, then appointees by the President should not count as faculty representatives. Chair Randall volunteered to ask for information on intercollegiate athletics and faculty involvement from a University of South Carolina student doing her dissertation on that issue, who was involved with the group SEC Affiliated Faculty Leaders (SECAFL).

After discussion on specific committee charges wound down, there was generalized discussion about the Senate's committees. Jensen **moved** to establish an ad hoc committee on committees to be appointed by the Chair, to determine which Senate committees should continue, which should be merged, and which should be discontinued, and such a report given to the SC by early fall. Yanarella **seconded**.

As the retreat wound down, Chappell expressed some concerns that the actions of the SC during the day were more bureaucratic in nature than focused on faculty governance. He said that what was still truly missing was a greater involvement of faculty in taken ownership of faculty governance. Yanarella acknowledged that he was not a big supporter of small, incremental steps, but thought that in comparison to the past eight years and the corresponding stagnation of Senate committees, the day's actions were a huge leap forward. Jensen commented upon the need to communication between senators and faculty at large. Grossman suggested that the July retreat deal more with the issue of communication, particularly how to encourage senators to communicate more with constituents.

Vice Chair Swanson said that she would look into how other institutions tackle big issues and yet still conduct pro forma duties.

As a wrap up, there was general consensus among SC members that any of the following issues could be key goals for the 2010-2011 academic year: general education implementation; proactive review of budget cuts; engaging a greater number of faculty involvement; taking ownership of the faculty's responsibilities to the University; charging committees with relevant goals; establishing a bidirectional chain of communication; and clearly communicating the responsibilities of the Senate.

The meeting was adjourned about 2:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Dave Randall,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Chappell, Grossman, Jensen, Kelly, McCorvey, Nokes, Randall, Steiner, Thelin, and Yanarella.

Invited guests present: Joe Peek, Kate Seago.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on July 13, 2010.