

Senate Council
October 22, 2007

The Senate Council met at 3 pm on Monday, October 22, 2007 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Kaveh A. Tagavi called the meeting to order at 3:02 pm. He reported that Dembo would be absent.

1. Minutes from October 1 and Announcements

The Chair asked if there were any changes to the minutes. Mrs. Brothers reported that there were a handful of grammatical and editorial changes that were tracked in the handout, but the basic information was unchanged. There being no further revisions, the minutes from October 1 were approved as modified.

The Chair noted that there were some announcements to attend to. In addition, Lesnaw, Wood and Randall each expressed a desire to request the privilege of the floor after the agenda items were finished; the Chair agreed.

The gubernatorial inauguration in Frankfort will fall on the same day as the December Board of Trustees (BoT) meeting, which is also the date of the Annual Board and Senate's Holiday Reception. The Chair noted that the time of the BoT meeting had been changed from early afternoon to late morning on that day in order to accommodate BoT members and others' wishes to attend the inauguration. Therefore, the annual reception could not be held at the same time, and would likely not be held that day. The Chair asked if Senate Council (SC) members had any comments – there were a few. The Chair said that he would report back to the SC after discussions with the Staff Senate.

The Chair provided SC members with some names of nominees for service on the Humanities and Arts Area Advisory Committee and the Social Sciences Area Advisory Committee. After some discussion, SC members designated four individuals (two for each committee) to be submitted to the Office of the President.

The Chair explained that during the October 8 Senate meeting, a miscommunication occurred, resulting in a senator not making a motion she intended to make. The Chair said that he was inclined to allow the motion to be introduced at the November Senate meeting, followed by a very brief amount of time for very limited discussion.

SC members then engaged in a brief discussion about the last portion of the October Senate meeting in which no motions were made regarding Robinson Forest. A couple SC members reported that some senators expressed that they were mistakenly under the impression that motions were to be moved at a later time in the meeting. Yanarella noted that it would be beneficial to have a sense of the Senate to share with BoT members. Michael suggested SC members next deliberate on how to proceed. He opined that more than five minutes should be dedicated to the topic of a "sense of the

Senate” motion on Robinson Forest, but wondered if the planned timeline of a November discussion on the general education proposal required adherence to a strict timetable, so that no lengthy discussion on Robinson Forest could be had in November. He suggested that more time be allowed for discussion and that motions be submitted in advance to the SC. The SC could then review them ahead of time, prior to putting a motion on the Senate agenda. It would improve the focus of the discussion and aid in determining a good sense of the Senate.

The Chair noted that while he had the responsibility of setting SC agendas, the Senate agenda was most definitely in the SC’s purview. In response to Thelin’s concern that the Senate had no authority to approve or disapprove non-academic policy, such as the proposed experimental logging in Robinson Forest, the Chair replied he would work with senators to ensure motions were worded correctly, i.e. a motion could recommend on, support, or not support the issue, but not approve or disapprove the proposed logging.

Finkel **moved** that the SC solicit nominations over the course of the next two weeks from faculty senators via email and then at the November 5 SC meeting, SC members would determine which motion(s) and associated wording would be presented in advance to senators and how much discussion would be allowed for them during the November 12 Senate meeting. Wood **seconded**. A **vote** was taken on the motion and it **passed** unanimously.

2. [Proposal to Allow WKCTC Grades Factor into UK GPA \(Engineering\)](#)

The Chair reported that the contact for the proposal was unable to attend and wished to attend on November 5 to explain the proposal.

Wood **moved** to withdraw the agenda item. Lesnaw **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

3. [Charge for Senate Council’s Ad Hoc Committee on Senate Committee Structure](#)

The Chair asked SC members to turn to the proposed charge for the SC’s ad hoc Committee on Senate Committee Structure (CSCS) and offer comments and suggestions. He noted that he had approached both Wood and Finkel about possibly chairing the committee, but that they were not able to take on the added responsibility.

There was a brief discussion during which the proposed deadline for a report from the CSCS changed to March 2008. Lesnaw **moved** to approve the charge as outlined in the handout. Michael **seconded**. Michael suggested the CSCS chair also be identified. Wood nominated Tagavi to serve as chair of the CSCS. Lesnaw and Michael **accepted it as a friendly amendment**.

Yanarella suggested changes¹ to the language in the second bullet: “...and suggest a new structure that will maximize the effectiveness of the ~~fits the~~ University and University Senate’s need in a more ~~efficient~~ effective manner that is informed by the

¹ Strikethrough indicates deleted text and underlining denotes new text.

changing context of the university. The changes were accepted as friendly amendments by Lesnaw and Michael.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion to approve the charge for the Senate Council's ad hoc Committee on Senate Committee Structure, including the changed date and language changes. The motion **passed** unanimously.

4. Discussion on Summer School Pay

Thelin said that he had attended a presentation by an associate dean in the College of Education about summer school courses and pay structure. Thelin said it was helpful to have the guidelines come out around September/October. He said he was struck by the manner in which monies received for summer school tuition were divided – 40% went to the unit where the course was being offered and 60% went to the Office of the Provost. With respect to the large amount of money going to administrative, non-educational units, he asked SC members for their opinions.

The Chair interjected to say he had written to the Provost about the issue of summer school pay late in the preceding week, but had not yet heard back from him. In response to a question from the Chair, Provost's Liaison Greissman opined that the summer school pay memo had already been sent to college deans, but did not know if the 60/40 split language was in it.

Michael asked how regular semester tuition was divided up – the Chair opined that it was his understanding that it went to the general fund with no split. On a similar note, Yanarella recalled that with respect to the winter intersession, under then-Provost Michael Nietzel, the winter intersession was not intended to be a money-making enterprise – breaking even was acceptable.

The Chair noted that he had seen a memo from a college dean (although he could not recall the college) in which there was a variety of details, including language that prohibited different faculty members from being compensated at different rates for teaching summer school courses.

Greissman explained that the 40/60 split came out of an experiment in the College of Arts and Sciences a few years ago – after a successful test run and approval by the council of deans, it was implemented across campus with a few caveats.

Thelin said that minimum enrollment required during summer school was announced at 14 students on one day, but went up to 15 students the next day. He expressed concern that such a large portion of the summer school tuition was going to a non-educational entity. He believed that staff employees, who are essentially on a 12-month contract, would already be performing duties related to summer school as a part of the already-assigned duties. If that was the case, he wondered why such a large chunk of the tuition income went toward an administrative unit. Michael wondered why the income from summer school tuition did not go directly into the general fund like other tuition income.

Wood said that years ago, the College of Arts and Sciences was concerned about a lack of any incentive to offer summer school courses – internal resources, personnel, etc. were being used with no extra income to cover the extra resources. In addition to the severe caps on what faculty could earn teaching a summer school course, there were fewer and fewer summer school offerings. An experiment was undertaken in which some profit was returned to the department and college with the understanding that any over-budget issues would be the responsibility of the department and college. This was the beginning of the current summer school pay model.

Piasek said her recollection of the SC's summer school pay conversation in spring 2007 also involved graduate courses not being taught due to low enrollment, which created a hardship for some graduate students who could only take the course in the summer. Thelin suggested that could indeed still happen.

In response to a comment by Greissman, Thelin stated that the undergraduate enrollment level was at 20 – the “15” number related to the number of graduate students enrolled. Wood wondered why the SC did not have the opportunity to offer input into the summer school discussion prior to the memo to deans being sent by Provost Subbaswamy.

The Chair said that he would work with Greissman to provide additional materials, particularly the memo from the Provost to the deans, after which the topic would return to a future SC agenda.

The Chair then allowed Wood the opportunity to share a concern with SC colleagues regarding the new general education proposal.

Wood stated that she had received a variety of emails from colleagues who were concerned about the general education (gen ed) proposal. She said that while those emails were troublesome, the issue that concerned her the most was her perception that the SC was not informed that when the gen ed proposal was sent to college councils and deans, those entities were expressly directed to not share the gen ed proposal with other faculty in the college. She said she was concerned that there was a perception that gen ed reform was moving too quickly without sufficient input from faculty, the very faculty who would be charged with actually delivering the program. Wood said that she had received comments from some faculty who were concerned that the Senate was reviewing the proposal in November, very soon after the release of the proposal to faculty, during which time it was very unlikely that faculty would have enough time to put together thorough, specific statements to address concerns about the gen ed proposal. Wood stated that placing an item on the Senate agenda was the responsibility of the SC, regardless of previously determined timelines, if faculty felt the proposal was not ready to be reviewed.

The Chair inserted that the proposed timeline involved a discussion among senators at the November Senate meeting, followed by another discussion and a vote in December. Wood replied that the schedule would not allow for substantive changes in the gen ed

proposal, but rather assumed that what was presented to senators in November would be what was voted on in December, with no opportunity for revisions, etc. She reiterated her concern that the SC was not told that college faculty councils were not allowed to share the gen ed proposal with faculty of the college.

Yanarella partially agreed, saying he had expressed his concern via an email to the Provost, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Heidi Anderson and the members of the USP Reform Steering Committee (USPRSC). His sense, however, was that the USPRSC was open to modest and to significant revisions. He thought an emphasis was placed on the revisions to the first year, with revisions for the second through fourth years being worked on over the summer. Yanarella said he was under the impression that the USPRSC was prepared to provide faculty with additional time for review. Furthermore, the working timeline was subject to the wishes of the SC and the Senate – the timeline was very much in the faculty domain.

After additional discussion along these lines, Randall asked Wood to explain what next steps she would prefer. Wood replied that a preliminary discussion was very suitable, but that the faculty with whom she had corresponded did not see the gen ed proposal in its current form as an actionable, finished document – it was lacking details and faculty were not substantially involved in its creation. It was unfair to faculty to assume a November Senate discussion followed by a December Senate vote.

Greissman opined that in retrospect, perhaps the proposed timeline had allowed misperceptions to develop. He said it seemed irrefutable and obvious that the Senate would do as it wished, independent of the USPRSC. Greissman added that the USPRSC had not been charged with developing a curriculum – its charge was to develop a framework, which necessarily would not have a lot of detail. He said that the USPRSC had worked within the boundaries of 10 years of national discussions and three years of university discussions. The USPRSC used feedback gleaned from the USP Internal Review Committee, which was made up primarily of faculty; used feedback gleaned from the USP External Review Committee, which was made up primarily of faculty; and used feedback from the General Education Reform and Assessment Committee, which was largely made up of faculty and organized forums for all undergraduate colleges so faculty could offer input. The gen ed proposal was not a final document – it did not go past the curricular framework charge. The gen ed proposal even included a reference on page 17 regarding the next steps to take.

Finkel **moved** that the Senate Council include a gen ed proposal discussion on the agenda for the November Senate meeting, but make no determination on a December Senate agenda until after reviewing the November Senate discussion. Michael **seconded**. The Chair summarized the motion by stating that the SC would not be on automatic pilot with regard to the proposed timeline.

After additional discussion, Wood **offered a friendly amendment** that senators needed to know this information as soon as possible. Finkel and Michael **accepted** the friendly amendment.

The Chair asked if that meant that an announcement would be made just prior to the discussion, during the November meeting. Finkel and Wood demurred, saying that the information needed to go out prior to the November Senate meeting, as soon as possible.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** that the Senate Council include a gen ed proposal discussion on the agenda for the November Senate meeting, but make no determination on a December Senate agenda until after reviewing the November Senate discussion, and that such information would be shared with senators as soon as possible. The motion **passed** unanimously.

The Chair then turned to Randall. Randall explained that a colleague had expressed concern that on the new UK home page, there was no click button for “faculty,” as there had been with the previous design. A discussion on the new UK web page took place, including suggestions that UK pursue the use of an intranet, but no action was taken.

Wood **moved** to adjourn. Aken **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion to adjourn **passed** unanimously at 5.01 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh A. Tagavi,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Aken , Finkel, Harley, Lesnaw, Michael, Piascik, Randall, Thelin, Wood and Yanarella.

Provost’s Liaison present: Greissman.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on October 26, 2007.