

Senate Council  
October 19, 2009

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, October 19, 2009 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a voice vote unless indicated otherwise.

Chair David Randall called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order around 3 pm.

1. Minutes from October 5 and Announcements

The Chair reported that Kirk and Swanson would be absent. He then reminded SC members about the UK Stakes Reception, on October 27, from 2 – 4 pm.

2. SACS/QEP Presentation – Kaveh Tagavi and Deanna Sellnow

The Chair invited Professors Kaveh Tagavi (Engineering) and Deanna Sellnow (Communications and Information Studies) to share information with SC members. Guests Sellnow and Tagavi offered a presentation to SC members regarding activities that should occur at UK in anticipation of the reaccreditation visit by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. As part of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) re-accreditation process, a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) must be a designed and focused university-wide initiative to improve student learning. In general, there will be an increased focus on learning outcomes and student learning, in which faculty and students must be highly involved. Regarding best practices, Tagavi and Sellnow said that a pre-planning team would need to be developed to outline best practices, and that the QEP topic ID must have broad-based input and demonstrate evidence. There will be a QEP development team and a QEP implementation team.

Thus far, representative faculty and administrators have attended a SACS workshop related to QEP and are in the process of sharing the information with other faculty and administrative groups, including the University Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities (UCAPP), Senate Council, and the Dean's Council. A plan must be developed by December 2012/January 2013, followed by a five year period for implementation..

The SC engaged in a discussion of assessment in general and different types of assessment, along with the purpose for developing the QEP program. It was made clear that the coming assessment procedures would be just one piece of the assessment process, and would not replace department and college assessments. The SC determined that Anderson, Jensen and the Chair would begin the process of identifying possible names of faculty members to serve on the SACS/QEP pre-planning team. A minority of SC members were not convinced that the proposed activities would amount to much, but were willing to move forward.

3. Vetting Team Compositions

SC members reviewed the voting results from the University Senate (Senate) election of faculty for the Gen Ed vetting teams. They spent a long time reviewing the names, affiliations and vetting team member compositions. SC members: acknowledged all the individuals accepted by Senate vote; opted to include Librarians as ex officio members of the vetting teams for which no Librarians were elected or named by the SC; and identified faculty for the remaining vacancies on the vetting teams from the list of runners up in the Senate election and from the faculty at large. The SC also identified possible chairs, the names of whom came from both the Senate ballot and the faculty at large.

It was determined that after nominees from the faculty at large were contacted to ascertain willingness and ability to serve, the revised vetting team compositions would be returned to the SC for an additional review.

Due to the time, the Chair initiated a discussion on which agenda items to discuss in the remaining time. It was decided by SC members that agenda item number eight should be dealt with first.

#### 8. [Cliff Vesting](#)

The Chair asked Yanarella (SC member and faculty trustee) to initiate the discussion, and Yanarella did so. He talked about the erosion of faculty benefits and how there were other sources of revenue, namely the annual contribution from the Athletics Association to UK, that could be used to shore up the University's financial situation, instead of chipping away at various employee benefits. Discussion ensued among SC members regarding UK's actual budget versus expenditures, and how to determine a reasonable amount for the Athletics Association to pay to UK, versus what would be an embellished amount.

Yanarella **moved** that the SC invite Mitch Barnhart to the SC to talk about the Athletics Association (AA) budget and discuss the following issues: the number of student athletes; the AA's responsibility to UK; the average stipend offered to student athletes; the number of coaches by sport; the average coach's salary by sport; the value of UK to the sports program; and AA's opinion on the suggestion that there could be a percentage increase paid by the AA to UK's general fund relative to the increase in the AA's income. SC members also suggested that Professor John Thelin be invited for that discussion. Rohr **seconded**.

There was a good deal of discussion regarding both the suggestion that AA increase its contribution to UK's general fund, as well as the motion itself. After some time, Chappell **moved** to table Yanarella's motion and Ford **seconded**. A **vote** was taken; there were three opposed and three in favor. The Chair cast a vote in favor of tabling, therefore the motion to table **passed**.

The meeting was adjourned after 5 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Dave Randall,  
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Chappell, Ford, Jensen, Randall, Rohr, Wood and Yanarella.

Invited guests present: Deanna Sellnow and Kaveh Tagavi.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on October 30, 2009.