

Senate Council  
October 3, 2011

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, October 3, 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 3:03 pm. The Chair introduced new SC member David Pienkowski (EN/CBME). Those around the table introduced themselves.

1. Quality Enhancement Plan Membership – Provost Subbaswamy, Deanna Sellnow and Diane Snow

Guests Deanna Sellnow and Diane Snow shared information about the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Topic Development Team with SC members. They talked about how the team was intended to function, and the various types of input that were solicited. They also explained the central administrative nature of the MCSC unit, and the cross-disciplinary steering team that will inform the director. What MCXC was and was not essentially, the QEP plan will be a mechanism by which faculty can opt, if they choose, to receive assistance in developing rubrics, projects, etc. for courses to emphasize the type of communication that a student in a particular program needs. They reminded SC members that the topic chosen and endorsed by the University Senate (Senate) was “Multimodal Communication Across the Curriculum” (MCXC). Faculty can receive guidance on incorporating aspects of the MCXC into existing courses.

Grossman **moved** that the SC endorse the proposed membership of the QEP Topic Development Team, with the inclusion of Vincent Cassone (AS/Biology). Kelly **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

2. Initial Discussion on Proposed New Policies on Faculty Productivity and Accountability

Provost Subbaswamy offered SC members some background information on the topic. He explained that he thought it would be best to proactively discuss how the University conducts post tenure reviews, and the faculty-created standards to which faculty are held to assess productivity and accountability. The Provost explained a few of his suggestions, which he said the SC could choose to use as a starting point. It was clear that while the Senate would need to vet and endorse a basic campuswide policy, it would involve a requirement that the each academic’s unit faculty will create departmental statements about expectations for satisfactory performance. The Provost suggested that if conversations get underway promptly, the language could be reviewed and approved by necessary entities by April 2012, and written statements also being in effect by July 1, or as soon as possible thereafter. There was some conversation about how long an informed discussion would take.

SC members discussed the best method to disseminate information in an effective way. After some time, it was agreed that the Chair would send the Provost’s document on possible methods to assess productivity to the appropriate committee [to be decided], while individual units will be responsible for creating written statements by which to assess post-tenure productivity and accountability. Provost’s Liaison Greissman mentioned the names of two faculty who could be added as ex officio committee members for the purposes of this discussion. Meanwhile, the Chair would alert faculty council chairs about the matter being reviewed and suggest that comments and input be submitted to the committee.

The Provost then talked to SC members about the need for the SC review, in the near future, proposed language for an *Administrative Regulation* to address the need for financial disclosure by all faculty and

staff employees. Federal requirements for such policies go into effect in August 2012. Although only faculty doing clinical research will be required to submit financial disclosure, it was thought it would be a good idea for all employees to be held to a certain standard of ethics. Essentially, UK would move from an honor system to an open disclosure system. Provost Subbaswamy said it would be a clean system to outline the outside activities that employees engage in, to prevent conflicts of interest. He offered a few examples of where the honor system was not as effective as intended. The Provost said that there was some draft *Administrative Regulations* language for the SC and other faculty groups to review.

The last item of discussion by the Provost pertained language in *Governing Regulations 7* regarding the definition of an educational unit. Specifically, he referred to the conditions under which the Senate wants multidisciplinary research centers and institutes (MDRC) to engage in instructional activity. Some current degree programs are located in departments that do not exactly fit, because the program cannot be housed in MDRC. When asked, he said that he was asking guidance from the SC and Senate on the conditions under which MDRC can engage in instructional activity. He acknowledged it was a complicated subject.

SC members offered comments during the Provost's discussion. The Chair thanked him for attending, and he departed.

#### 1. Minutes from September 26, 2011 and Announcements

The Chair offered a few remarks to SC members. Faculty Trustee Peek reported on the recent Board of Trustees retreat, and that he reported that the retreat was a positive step. The Board created a list of four topics on which President Capilouto should concentrate. Those expressing opinions said they liked the report of the Executive Review Committee, chaired by Chair Swanson. The Chair commented that she received feedback that the committee did not give due diligence to the quality of graduate education, so she will be meeting with a member of the graduate faculty for some further discussions.

#### 2. Old Business

##### b. Revisiting the Calendar Discussion

The Chair invited Guests Jacquie Hager (Associate Registrar) and Michelle Nordin (Associate Registrar for Education) to the table and said that she wanted them both to know what types of problems would be associated with a variety of newly created course calendar schedules outside those approved by the Senate.

Hager explained that after the last SC meeting, Mrs. Brothers emailed her about non-standard calendars. Hager said she replied that she did not know what to incorporate into the calendar – should she include the last day to withdraw, fee liabilities, the last day to add or drop, etc.? She said she attended to answer any questions SC members had about what happens with a calendar.

SC members engaged in a discussion with Hager about non-standard calendars. Although SC members seemed largely satisfied with the conceivable pedagogical merit of six-week courses, there was considerable concern about possible liability; students receiving a W for enrolling in a course that begins in the second part of the eight-week session and past the deadline to drop; and the need to manually enter students in non-standard courses .

After additional discussion, Wood **moved** that the issue of non-standard calendars be sent to an ad hoc calendar committee for a discussion of the academic merit of a six-week session and if so, to work with

the Registrar on administrative feasibility if so desired. McCormick **seconded**. Kelly asked about volunteers and the Chair said she could announce it during the Senate meeting and ask for volunteers.

Grossman **offered a friendly amendment** to permit courses to be offered at the beginning of the four-week session, or within two weeks of the beginning of the eight-week session. Wood **did not accept** the friendly amendment. Guest Butler, Senate Parliamentarian, stated that Grossman's suggestion would be an amendment, which did not need a second. A **vote** was taken on the amendment to permit courses to be offered at the beginning of the four-week session, or within two weeks of the beginning of the eight-week session and the motion **failed** with one in favor.

A **vote** was taken on the **motion** that the issue of non-standard calendars be sent to an ad hoc calendar committee for a discussion of the academic merit of a six-week session and if so, to work with the Registrar on administrative feasibility if so desired and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Grossman **moved** that the Senate permit six-week courses that begin at the beginning of the four-week session, and permit six-week courses that begin two weeks after the beginning of the eight-week session, for summer 2012 only. Steiner **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 5. Discussion on Transcriptionist vs. Personnel Hours

SC members discussed the feasibility of stopping the practice of using a court transcriptionist during Senate meetings, have the meetings recorded for future viewing, and the Senate having greatly shortened meeting minutes. Due to the time, SC members opted to discuss the issue again at the next meeting.

#### 6. Tentative Senate Agenda for October 10, 2011

SC members discussed the tentative Senate agenda for October 10, 2011. They agreed to add a preliminary discussion on proposed new policies on faculty productivity and accountability.

The meeting was adjourned about 5:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Hollie I. Swanson,  
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Blonder, Coyne, Grossman, Kelly, McCormick, Peek, Pienkowski, Steiner, Swanson, Wasilkowski and Wimberly.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guests present: J. S. Butler, Sonja Feist-Price, Jacquie Hager, Michelle Nordin, Deanna Sellnow, Diane Snow, Kumble Subbaswamy.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Friday, October 14, 2011.