

Senate Council
October 24, 2011

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, October 24, 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 3:04 pm.

1. Minutes from October 17, 2011 and Announcements

The Chair offered a variety of announcements. There was some discussion among SC members for a few of the topics.

- The Chair congratulated Wimberly, who was crowned Homecoming Queen.
- An SC member is needed to serve on the Office of Institutional Diversity's Advisory Council. Coyne volunteered and there were no objections from SC members.
- The SC has been asked for a faculty representative to serve on a task force to review the Performance Evaluation system for staff employees. The only requirement is that the faculty member supervises at least one staff member. The SC identified three possible faculty members.
- The SC will review a presentation regarding the proposal for an employment ombud on the agenda for November University Senate (Senate) meeting, for Senate endorsement.
- The President's Chief of Staff will attend the Senate meeting, not to give a report but rather to attend in President Capilouto's place (who will be travelling) and to answer questions.
- The Chair will be meeting with President Capilouto during the week. She asked SC members if there was anything specific SC members would like for her to discuss with the President. Grossman mentioned that he was aware of conversations for a three-year pilot to expand the Family Education Program to allow a spouse or domestic partner to take graduate-level courses. He asked the Chair to mention to the President this long-standing request from the SC.

There was additional discussion regarding the format and order of Senate agendas. The Chair reminded SC members that the SC approves the tentative Senate agenda, so SC members can make comments about the length of presentations, change the order of agenda items, etc. prior to approving the agenda.

Grossman asked that the slides from the Quality Enhancement Plan presentation be posted with the Senate agenda, along with the other presentations. **[AI]**

Wasilkowski **moved** to approve the SC minutes from October 17, 2011 and Grossman **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

2. Old Business

b. Arrangement for SC ad hoc Committee on Best Practices for Distance Learning

After brief discussion, Grossman **moved** to approve the composition (including subcommittees and chair and co-chairs) and the individual subcommittee charges. McCormick **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

c. Nominees for SC ad hoc Committee on Faculty Productivity and Accountability

Provost's White Paper on Faculty Productivity and Accountability

Guidelines for Teaching Excellence

Nominees

Charge

The Chair led SC members in a discussion of the previously-discussed plan to identify a committee of (primarily) tenured faculty to review the Provost's white paper and offer recommendations. The Chair explained that a faculty-led group had created Guidelines for Teaching Excellence, to help establish a method to assess faculty teaching beyond the normal student course evaluation.

Wasilkowski expressed concern that the white paper on Faculty Productivity and Excellence framed the entire issue as one solely in Provost Subbaswamy's purview and that the proposed ad hoc Committee on Faculty Productivity and Accountability (CFPA) would have no role to play. Provost's Liaison Greissman acknowledged that the language was not as clear as it should have been – he rewrote some portions of the white paper, but neglected to revise that section. Greissman was very clear that the Provost had no intention of presenting the white paper at town hall meetings, etc. Greissman said that the last part of the memo was inaccurate. Wasilkowski requested a revised memo that only included current, relevant information.

Many SC members expressed concern that if the SC was being asked to look at faculty productivity and accountability, there should be a similar review of administration. There was discussion about running parallel committees, one to review faculty productivity and one to review administrative productivity. The Chair commented that she believed that Huron Consulting was going to be available to help the CFPA- she said she could ask if the consulting group could also assist with an evaluation of the number of administrators.

There was extensive discussion among SC members. A variety of comments were made, including:

- A sense that the SC was being asked to work with administration to develop regulations that would possibly punish peers.
- If personnel costs are roughly 70 – 90% of the University's expenditures, as stated by Provost Subbaswamy when he visited the SC on October 17, 2011, there should be data to back that up.
- It is reasonable for the Provost to request the SC look at areas where the post-tenure review could possibly be improved, which is a separate issue from the number of administrators.
- The issue is not one of individual positions, but rather that the overall accountability issues of faculty should also be applied to administrators.
- If the issue is actually about making the University more efficient, a review of both administrators and faculty is not two separate issues.
- Some faculty are already quite anxious to hear about this discussion – it is bad timing to discuss revisions to the post-tenure review when there concern about how a new president will cut costs.
- If a dual committee structure (review of faculty and administration) is created, there should be some communication between the two.
- Some pieces of information that seem almost obvious as important things to know are simply not available through UK's current recordkeeping.
- Actually figuring out what percentage of the UK budget is going to what particular activities would be what UK has needed for the past 30 years, particularly if President Capilouto is willing to support the activity.
 - Any such activity would need to be able to overcome the fiction of the DOE (Distribution of Effort) form, and show what percentage of a faculty administrator's salary is being charged to administrative duties, not just lists of percentages of salary that is paid from various accounts.

- The request to look into the post-tenure review process was either based on an underlying question of efficiency or accountability.

Greissman commented that the SC could consider not forming the CFPA until after the Provost attends a SC meeting to discuss the matter further. SC members continued the discussion. Wood commented that an increase in assessment, etc. may have also contributed to the increasing numbers of administrators.

It was ultimately decided that the SC will invite Provost Subbaswamy to attend the SC meeting on November. Grossman noted that much of the administration did not lie within the Provost's purview, but rather under the President's purview. The specific requests from the SC are below.

- That the Provost will support a thrust into accountability for faculty as well as administrators.
- Any review of post-tenure activities will be one part of an overall review of the University, which includes accountability and efficiency of administration, faculty and staff.
- The SC is interested in participating in a self-evaluation of faculty, but also wants to see the general conversation in a broader context.

The Chair said she would draft a formal letter to the Provost but first send it around to SC members for input.

3. Discussion on Transcriptionist and Personnel Hours

Grossman led SC members in a discussion about videotaping the Senate meetings and no longer using the services of a transcriptionist. He noted that SC members had had an opportunity to review the video recording of the October Senate meeting.

Grossman reported that, according to a UK oral historian, there is no software that will automatically transcribe audio into written text. One other drawback is that the audio on the video is not searchable, although there are markers that allow a viewer to skip around to various agenda items.

SC members offered the comments below.

- The videographer should have moved the camera to capture speakers in the audience.
- Even when senators identified themselves, it was difficult to hear that on the video and difficult to identify speakers.
- Additional microphones may be necessary to ensure that senators, not just speakers at the podium, are heard on the video.
- The costs associated with moving away from a written transcription may be larger than originally thought. The amount spent with such changes, though, is less than the cost of a monthly transcription.
- The transcript is primarily helpful for retaining the context of motions, etc. for action items. It is less important to record the exact wording of individuals giving informational presentations.
- The transcripts are accurate to the word including such things as “[laughter].”
- Transcripts are requested from the Office of the Senate Council very infrequently.
- At least one department on campus uses software that involves voice recognition that is 99% accurate.

- Perhaps just the announcements and action items can be transcribed.
- While the design of the Auditorium in W. T. Young Library does not lend itself well to video recording, there are other rooms on campus that do. Those rooms, however, are not centrally located.

Grossman said that it sounded like there were a few ideas that could make the situation more workable. The services of the transcriptionist will continue to be used until the SC and Senate are assured that a substitute process is workable.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:47 pm. [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: In attendance: Blonder, Coyne, Grossman, Kelly, McCormick, Peek, Pienkowski, Steiner, Swanson, Wasilkowski, Wimberly and Wood.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Friday, October 28, 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	
53.		Investigate "Quality Matters" WRT distance learning courses. (1/10/11)	SC	
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	
63.		Invite UofL employment ombud to SC meeting after joint ombud cmte visits the University of Cincinnati. (2/21/11)	Mrs. Brothers	

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 about distance learning courses. (2/21/2011)	Mrs. Brothers	
72.	Discuss status of department chairs and directors of interdisciplinary centers during the August Advance. (6/15/11)	SC	
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	
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	
92.	Post the slides from the October Senate meeting's QEP presentation, along with the other presentations. (10/24/11).	Mrs. Brothers	