

Senate Council
November 7, 2011

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, November 7, 2011 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 3:02 pm.

1. Minutes from October 31, 2011 and Announcements

The Chair introduced Janie Ellis, the new employee in the Office of the Senate Council. The SC members present introduced themselves. Ms. Ellis offered a little information about her history, as well as her current responsibilities.

The Chair asked Provost's Liaison Greissman for additional information about the recent issue in which the University Appeals Board (UAB) increased the penalty for a student who, after making a grade appeal to the UAB, had their penalty increased by the UAB. After discussion, it was determined that the Chair should meet with a handful of individuals to bring final resolution to the issue, whatever that may be. **[AI]**

The Chair showed SC members the sample charts drawn by Pienkowski that deal with salaries, budgets, and dollar amounts, and numbers of administrators, faculty by title series, etc. After asking Pienkowski's permission, she shared the information with President Capilouto. She said the data showed a clear increase in undergraduate enrollment, but flat growth for numbers of teaching faculty. The President thought the SC's comments about needing a review of administration had merit. As a result, he asked the Chair, Vice President for Human Resources Kim Wilson, Treasurer Angie Wilson and Director of Institutional Research Roger Sugarman to meet and look into the topic. The Chair said the group would likely begin with some numbers and basic assumptions.

SC members engaged in robust discussion regarding the possible different types of combinations of figures and what information it would glean. During discussion, the Chair said that she did share the SC's concerns about a focus on faculty but no similar focus on administration. The Chair reported that the President was looking at how UK's financial resources are focused on UK's priorities, so a similar question would be about whether UK's human capital is focused on UK's priorities.

It was clear that SC members wanted some basic data about the numbers of administrators, but having the information broken down by actual administrative activities, not administrative titles. Steiner said that he had data presented in 2003 to then-President Lee T. Todd about the uneven growth of freshman enrollment vs. the stagnating or declining numbers of faculty and what that would mean for the future. At the Chair's request, he said he would send her the report.

Grossman **moved** to approve the minutes from October 31, 2011 as distributed and Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no discussion a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Marketing UK Core as a University Senate Product - Assistant Provost Bill Rayens

The Chair invited Assistant Provost Bill Rayens to talk to SC members about current issues involving the interim General Education Oversight Committee. Guest Rayens, chair of the interim General Education Oversight Committee (GEOC), explained that it would be helpful for the SC and Senate to reinforce and

remind faculty and administrators about the faculty-led effort that resulted in UK Core, the new general education program that replaced the University Studies Program.

The observations and opinions below, among others, were offered.

- Looking forward to GEOC report to the University Senate (Senate) on GEOC activities.
- Rubrics are how GEOC determines if learning outcomes are met – student artifacts [projects] are evaluated against the rubrics, allowing for a general review of a UK Core Area of Inquiry, not reviews of individual courses.
- UK Core is a creation of UK's faculty, through various Senate-led committees, etc.
- Some individuals are not overly concerned with the creation and integrity of UK Core, but rather with as fast a review process as possible.
- A survey of faculty involved with UK Core could be helpful in identifying possible issues with the interim UK Core approval process, which can be valuable insights into how to improve the process.
- Senators should receive a brief history of UK Core.
- There is a need for courses in Inquiry in the Humanities and Social Sciences, particularly in the 300- and 400-level courses.

The Chair clarified for McCormick that a mid-year report from GEOC will be on the agenda for December.

The Chair thanked the guests for attending and for their work with UK Core.

2. Action Items

b. Action Item Number 76 ("Develop metrics for faculty input into president's performance during August Advance. (6/15/11))"

Coyne and Wasilkowski offered a brief presentation on how the faculty evaluation of President Capilouto can be more effectively integrated into the overall performance evaluation. SC members were very interested and offered a few suggestions, which would be incorporated.

It was ultimately agreed that SC members will send in their comments and suggestions to Coyne and Wasilkowski, who will offer a brief presentation to senators during the November Senate meeting. Coyne and Wasilkowski liked the idea of invited senators to participate in their activities.

5. UK's December 2011 Degree List

Grossman **moved** that the elected faculty senators approve UK's December 2011 list of candidates for credentials, for submission to the Senate and then through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure (SACPT) – Jim Geddes, Chair

i. SACPT 2010 – 2011 Final Report

The Chair invited guest Geddes to offer the SACPT's year-end report for 2010 – 2011, which he did. Geddes offered a de-identified synopsis of each case reviewed, as well as six specific recommendations based on observations. It was understood that there was a **motion** on the floor from the SACPT for the report to be received by the Senate Council.

SC members engaged in lengthy discussion about a variety of aspects of the report. Grossman **moved** that the suggestion to change the *Senate Rules* to state that "an initiated appeal to the SACPT shall be completely submitted within 75 days after the faculty member being notified by the dean regarding disapproval of promotion and/or tenure." McCormick **seconded**. There being brief discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. **[AI]**

7. Discussion with Provost Subbaswamy

Provost Subbaswamy attended the SC meeting to discuss the recent SC response to the Provost's request that the SC begin the process of establishing guidelines for recommendations regarding post-tenure reviews of faculty for productivity and accountability. The SC suggested that an additional committee look into issues pertaining to administrative activities at UK, concurrently with the faculty productivity and accountability committee.

There was extensive discussion regarding administrative functions. SC members were concerned with reports from colleagues about their concerns about administrative bloat. To make matters worse, none of UK's computer systems are readily able to report on the amounts of time employees actually spend on administrative duties, as opposed to employees with administrative titles.

6. Tentative Senate Agenda for November 14, 2011

SC members affirmed that the Senate should receive a presentation on the Executive Review Committee's report. Additionally, senators should hear about Coyne and Wasilkowski's efforts to create metrics by which the faculty should evaluate the president.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10. [The Action Items are a part of the minutes but fall at the end.]

Respectfully submitted by Hollie I. Swanson,
Senate Council Chair

SC members in attendance: Blonder, Coyne, Kelly, McCormick, Peek, Steiner, Swanson, Wasilkowski, Wimberly and Wood.

Invited guests present: J. S. Butler, Bill Rayens, Jim Geddes, Janie Ellis, Roxanne Mountford, Ben Withers and Lynda Brown Wright.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Friday, November 17, 2011.

| # | √ | Item | Responsibility | Completed |
|------------|---|---|--------------------------|-----------|
| 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 | |
| 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) | Document Handling System | |
| 40. | | Draft changes to <i>Senate Rule</i> language on Senate meeting attendance policies for review by SC. (8/30/10 & 11/15/10) | Chair, Steiner | |
| 42. | | Discuss with the Provost the method of allocating resources from distance learning courses. (11/15/10) | Chair | |
| 44. | | 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; 12/6/10) | Chair, SC | |
| 46. | | Discuss election of officers, specifically who is eligible to cast votes. (12/6/10); Solicit opinions from the Senate. (2/28/11) | SC | 9/2011 & |
| 57. | | Look into creating a Senate committee on assessment. (1/31/11) | SC | |
| 62. | | Determine how to address the issue of the proportionate representation of appointed Board of Trustees members. (2/7/11) | SC | |
| 66. | | Invite Associate Provost for Undergrad Ed to offer "State of Undergraduate Education" address to Senate. (2/21/11) | Chair | |
| 67. | | Invite Associate Provost for Academic Affairs to share information and talk about distance learning courses. (2/21/2011) | Mrs. Brothers | |
| 73. | | Ask each college dean's office to submit information about their faculty council, as part of the SACS reaccreditation effort. (6/15/11) | Chair | |
| 76. | | Develop metrics for faculty input into president's performance during August Advance. (6/15/11) | SC | |
| 77. | | Draft a report on the perceptions of the faculty reps on the Presidential Search Committee on the process, and include relevant info from similar universities' recent presidential searches. (6/15/11) | Chair & Steiner | |
| 81. | | Meet with each college's faculty council in the fall, and also reinforce the importance of identifying a senator to communicate with college faculty. (6/15/11) | Chair | |
| 82. | | Request that the chair of the Senate's Academic Facilities Cmte be invited to attend meetings of the Capital Planning Advisory Group. (6/15/11) | Chair | |
| 85. | | Find out if the Senate has an approving or endorsing vote on proposed changes to post-tenure review policies. | Chair | |
| 86. | | Determine by late August the message(s) the Chair should relay when she visits college faculty councils. | SC | |
| 89. | | Ask the President to hire an outside agency to review the Office of the Senate Council, specifically procedures and staffing levels. (8/5/11) | Chair | |

| | | | | |
|-----|---|--|-----------------------|---------|
| 89. | √ | Invite Libraries Dean Terry Birdwhistell to discuss open access at SC meeting. (8/22/11) | Mrs. Brothers | 09/2011 |
| 90. | | Post Senate cmte final reports on their websites. (8/22/11) | Mrs. Brothers | |
| 91. | | Ask the President to nominate a faculty representative to the SEC/NCAA from a list of names forwarded to the President from the Chair of the Senate Council. | Chair | |
| 94. | | ask the Provost examine the possibility of consolidating all registrar positions into the University Registrar's office, and report his decision and rational to the SC. (9/26/11) | Chair | |
| 95. | | Post the slides from the October Senate meeting's QEP presentation, along with the other presentations. (10/24/11). | Mrs. Brothers | |
| 96. | | Seek final resolution on UAB jurisdiction questions through a meeting with Legal Counsel and the Provost's Office. (11/7/11) | Chair & Mrs. Brothers | |
| 97. | | Ask SREC to deliberate on changing SR so that an appeal to the SACPT must be completely submitted within 75 days. (11/7/11) | Mrs. Brothers & SREC | |