

Senate Council
November 22, 2010

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, November 22, 2010 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 meeting to order when quorum was achieved at 3:09 pm. Due to the number of invited guests present, all those present introduced themselves.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair commented that she had hosted a symposium the previous Friday, and that another one might be in the works. She mentioned that the minutes from November 15 were not ready – Mrs. Brothers had been concentrating on processing curricular proposals. She then referred SC members to an email from Davy Jones, about the exploration of restructuring the College of Medicine (COM).

The Chair explained that the interim dean in COM announced that he wanted to look into a reorganization, which has struck fear into some faculty members, particularly those in the basic sciences. Rumors are that basic scientists will be moved into clinical departments, since basic science research is not as fiscally rich as clinical research. One department chair went so far as to suggest faculty members begin to investigate other employment. Aside from all the rumors, the Chair said that Dean Wilson told her earlier that day that he wants to look into reorganization and see if there are better ways of reviewing research productivity.

The Chair said that she was on the reorganization committee, as are many members of COM's faculty council. The Chair said that it was her personal opinion that if she is on the reorganization committee, she is there as a representative of the SC and Senate, and not just as an individual faculty member. She asked if other SC members felt the same. SC members discussed the issue, but no one was opposed to the Chair participating as representative, not just an individual. There was additional discussion, and Anderson ultimately noted that there were some concerns that there would not be appropriate SC and Senate oversight.

Provost's Liaison Greissman said that he could not speak to what the proposed reorganization was, but could offer information regarding what it was not. Greissman said that, to reiterate what Jones has repeated, there is no way a tenured faculty member can be dismissed as a result of reorganization. A dismissal can only happen under circumstances laid out in Kentucky Revised Statutes, such as incompetence, moral turpitude, or financial exigency as defined by the American Association of University Professors. He said that he also wanted to be clear that while discussions are happening, it is true that no decision will be made at the college level before a new dean is thoroughly acquainted with the COM. No decision will be finalized until after a campus decision with appropriate review by the Senate. The process will be deliberative and public.

Grossman said that he did not see any evidence that there was any predetermined outcome. Kelly said that it made sense to welcome discussion about it. SC members then discussed sending out an email, perhaps jointly with Provost Subbaswamy, to explain what SC members have been told, to allay concerns among faculty **[AI]**.

Discussion then turned toward the recent lack of discussion regarding the proposed changes to *Governing Regulations VII (GR VII)*. SC members noted the important issues that had been brought to light, and the need to address them. Greissman commented that his concern was that as knowledgeable and deliberative as the SC is, the SC has pretty much been at its wit's end about how to and frame the discussion for such a dramatic change. He wondered about the benefits of sending such an issue to faculty that have not received the benefit of SC's informed discussions. Grossman stated that there were several issues that needed to be addressed, but that at least two of them are: the question of when does a unit cross the boundary from an administrative unit to an educational unit; and the question of what constitutes the core faculty of an educational unit. Blonder noted that there were a lot of associated, as well.

Grossman opined that there needed to be some decision on ideas about what constitutes an administrative and an educational unit, and if there is a continuum or a sharp difference. Any conversation would need to include the Office of the Vice President for Research (VPR), which should know the most about all the various units and centers. He further suggested a joint committee with the VPR, faculty, and the Office of the Provost come up with suggestions for the SC to discuss **[AI]**. He said that when it was understood what units have an educational component, it can then be determined how to define the core faculty of educational units. He commented that there seemed to be several models, even for those that are considered to be mostly educational units.

Moving to other matters, the Chair reminded SC members of its goal from the summer retreat to make sure faculty get input early into the decision-making process. Recently, the Chair was carbon-copied on an email from the Provost to John Rawls, chair of the Senate's Academic Facilities Committee (SAFC), in which the Provost includes input from the SAFC as part of his timeline for NAME OF DOCUMENT.

The Chair noted that elections for officers would occur soon, and said she was willing to serve another term if so desired by the body. Anderson said that she was not going to stand for the position of vice chair again, citing her opinion that the chair and vice chair should not both be from the health care colleges. Mrs. Brothers offered some general information about how the SC had conducted elections for officers in the past.

The Chair said that she attended a recent meeting where the proposed changes to honorary degrees were discussed. Greissman offered additional description of the changes.

Grossman asked that discussion return to officer elections. It was agreed that the Chair would depart prior to discussions regarding officer elections, at the end of the meeting.

The Chair invited Kelly, as chair of the Senate's Research Committee (SRC), to offer information about the matter of indirects. Kelly did so, saying that Vice President for Research Jim Tracy had been very active in their meetings, and offered quite a bit of useful information. The SRC moved to inform the SC of Tracy's willingness to share information, and that it encouraged the SRC to think about how that information can best be shared with the broader faculty.

After brief discussion, it was decided to invite Tracy to attend the February 2011 Senate meeting. Kelly explained that Tracy offered information regarding degrees of freedom, regulations, etc. He said that many faculty members know bits and pieces of research, but not many know all the aspects.

3. Feedback on Gen Ed

At the invitation of the Chair, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mike Mullen offered some information about what the presentation to the Senate in December, regarding the implementation of the Gen Ed curriculum, should include. SC members offered a wide variety of comments, and the Chair also transmitted a concern from an absent member.

After discussion, Grossman **moved** that the SC communicate to the Senate that the SC recommends that the Senate vote affirmatively on the motion on the table [that the Senate approve the implementation of the Gen Ed curriculum effective fall 2011 for all incoming undergraduates]. Nokes **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Overview of Commencement – Q & A with Associate Provost for Academic Administration Jeannine Blackwell

The Chair invited Associate Provost for Academic Administration Jeannine Blackwell to offer information about the commencement activities for December and May. Blackwell offered detailed information about the two ceremonies, and answered a wide variety of questions from SC members. She confirmed that the SC Chair will participate by handing diplomas to the President, who will hand the diploma to the student. Various SC members expressed their appreciation for the thought put into the new and changed aspects of December and May commencements.

Senator Tony English (Health Sciences/Rehabilitation Science) commented that the activities as described by Blackwell did sound great. He said that during the Senate meeting when the proposal for a pilot December commencement was discussed, there was no mention of changing the spring festivities, specifically recent information that the individual college recognition ceremonies would no longer be held. After some discussion, the Chair asked Mrs. Brothers about how the matter was presented to the Senate during discussion. After consulting the meeting's notes, Mrs. Brothers reported that there was no mention that the individual college recognition ceremonies would not be allowed. The Chair added that the motion approved by the Senate was for a December commencement pilot, and that was all.

Greissman suggested that holding receptions instead of recognition ceremonies would satisfy the intent of the recognition ceremonies. He commented that having college recognition ceremonies would essentially negate the larger ceremonies planned for December and May, in which students would all be recognized by name. English commented that colleges would have to hold receptions, which are more expensive (including refreshments, music, etc.), between the morning and afternoon ceremonies, resulting in some faculty having to remain at Rupp Arena for ten hours or more.

Greissman said that he did not want to diminish the time commitment made regarding the proposed changes, and recognizing students for individual achievement in a reception is just fine. The issues cannot be resolved presently, however, and the major point was the approval of a December graduation as a pilot and establishing a founder's day. The changes also offer a less complicated spring ceremony (with some students graduating in December). He asked that it be left that the SC has raised issues about the recognition ceremonies, and that there need to be some discussions about what will occur during spring commencement **[AI]**.

Blackwell offered some closing comments, and agreed that she and Greissman would take the meeting's comments back to the Provost for discussion. The Chair thanked her for attending, and for all the effort put forth into the changes to commencement.

Grossman then **moved** to adjourn, and Nokes **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:20 pm.

[The Action Items that follow are an official part of the minutes.]

Respectfully submitted by Hollie I. Swanson,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Blonder, Grossman, Kelly, Nokes and Swanson.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, December 2, 2010.

#	√	Item	Responsibility	Completed
5.		SC subset to examine and revise the description of the administrative coordinator's job duties with a view towards increasing compensation. (7/14/10)	Grossman, Chair	
6.		Develop charge for Senate's Committee on Committees. Include in the charge that it explore need/establishment of committee for "grievances," as well as " graduate student/post doc education and related issues. " (7/14/10; 8/30/10)	SC	
12.	√	Discuss expansion of EEP with Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs to allow transfer to be used for graduate coursework. (7/14/10)	Chair	8/2010
	√	Discuss expansion of EEP with Provost Subbaswamy (6 credits per semester). (8/16/10)	Chair	9/2010
		Clarify with Provost Subbaswamy the term "cost-neutral" WRT a pilot for graduate credit EEP transfer to partner/spouse/dependent.	Chair	
17.		Create web-based mechanism for faculty to offer input into the President's annual evaluation; evaluation process will occur during April. (8/16/10)	SC Anderson	
20.		Charge Senate's Academic Programs Committee with creating processes for substantive change issues (teach-out, contractual/consortium process, off-campus sites, how to reopen a suspended program). 8/23/10	SC	
24.		Review Senate meeting attendance policies. (8/30/10)	SC	
26.		Query VP IRPE Connie Ray about number of administrators at UK vs. benchmark institutions. (9/20/10)	Mrs. Brothers	
27.		Send SC's spring evaluation of President Todd to all Board of Trustees members. Share SC's spring evaluation of President Todd with faculty members. Create numerical ratings for the Board's evaluation in early fall and submit those privately. (9/20/10)	SC	
28.		Invite the Board of Trustees' chair to a SC meeting. (9/27/10)	Chair	
31.		Ask the Provost to submit a statement of financial and administrative feasibility for proposals prior to the proposals being sent to cmte. (10/4/10)	Greissman/SC	

32.	Solicit input from department chairs regarding changes to <i>GR VII</i> . (10/4/10; 10/18/10)	Steiner	
34.	Invite Dean Blackwell to discuss changes to commencement ceremonies. (Invite Tony English.) (10/4/10)	Chair	
35.	Inquire about openness in the president search process. (10/18/10)	Chair	
36.	Send solicitation for Commencement Cmte Co-Chair to college associate deans. (10/18/10)	Mrs. Brothers	
38.	Identify committee to review "graduate student/post-doc education and related issues." (11/15/10)	SC	
39.	Draft changes to <i>Senate Rule</i> language on Senate meeting attendance policies for review by SC. (11/15/10)	Chair, Steiner	
40.	Discuss with Provost the possibility of an automatic leave of absence in the event there is a finding of procedural error in a promotion/tenure decision. (11/15/10)	Chair	
41.	Discuss with the Provost the method of allocating resources from distance learning courses. (11/15/10)	Chair	
42.	Send email to faculty, perhaps jointly with Provost, to explain the only circumstances under which a tenured faculty member can be dismissed as a result of reorganization (under KRS statutes, and in accordance with AAUP guidelines). (11/22/10)	Chair	
43.	Create ad hoc committee (perhaps with VPR and Provost) to look at what constitutes an administrative or an educational unit, and if there is a continuum or a sharp difference. (11/22/10)	Chair, SC	
44.	Discuss the issues raised during the November 22 meeting regarding spring commencement ceremonies and whether college recognition ceremonies will continue. (11/22/10)	SC	