

Senate Council
September 20, 2010

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, September 20, 2010, 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. She introduced Lee Blonder (ME/Behavioral Science), and explained that Jensen resigned her position on the SC, due to a variety of other responsibilities requiring her attention. The Chair welcomed Blonder, and those present introduced themselves.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair said that she was currently reading work by Margaret Wheatley regarding chaos management. The Chair explained that that particular style of management is intended to prepare an organization for change, and she thought it apropos. She asked each SC member to describe the University Senate (Senate) meeting the previous week from their own perspective, in turn. SC members offered the following comments:

- There was a disjointed “discussion” of issues that people felt very strongly about, although there was really no synthesis since people were unwilling to leave entrenched positions.
- The straw poll was notable, as was the assertion that if Athletics were charged for its land usage, so must the hospital and the College of Agriculture, etc. also be charged.
- There was an undercurrent of disharmony and anger at the current administration. The vast majority of faculty are discouraged by the President’s salary change, and that also fed the mood. Many administrators have tin ears, and the Board of Trustees (Board) continues not to listen. Employees have not had raises in the past three years, and the ratings of the University continue to decrease in important public polls. There is a lot of anger and disheartenment, and the source of the anger is a top-heavy institution that does not listen. The Board only hears certain things, little bursts of anger, yet the faculty seem to be very unhappy in general.
- Colleagues in the Senate were expressing frustration and/or concern about the level of engagement they feel they have in faculty governance at UK. The SC needs to pay attention and address those concerns.
- There was a clear discontent, as expressed through the straw poll. The specific, correct language to describe the increase to the President’s base salary increase was not used from the outset, and that information might have changed the vote. Faculty were left feeling that they do not have much power, with just three elected UK representatives on the Board to express sentiment. It was interesting to learn about the retirement package for vice presidents, and more people should know about it.
- The meeting demonstrated incredible strength of administrative culture at UK, and more explicitly a non-academic culture. A vice president who justifies a policy by explaining that “it’s how we’ve always done it” is unfortunate. The Senate discussion showed that trying to get

significant data from even readily available data is like pulling teeth. The tone of the meeting was rebellious.

The Chair said that the Parliamentarian, Catherine Seago, recognized afterward that straw polls are not permissible according to Robert's Rules of Order. The Chair opined that it was an important action, even if it was, technically, unproductive. Randall said that when he spoke with Vice President for Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness Connie Ray, he thought she said that UK was not out of line with regard to its number of administrative positions. SC members wanted more information about that question [AI].

SC members then discussed the SC's input into the presidential evaluation, and discussion turned to the spring evaluation of President Todd, led by the SC (and independent of the Board's evaluation timeline). Grossman suggested that the evaluation be sent to all Board members, not just the Board Chair [AI]. In addition, since the narrative evaluation information will be independent of the Board's request, it can be shared with others. Specific scores for the Board's evaluation of President Todd can be created and sent to the Board privately [AI]. After additional discussion, SC members asked about inviting the Board Chair to a SC meeting [AI].

The Chair recalled that she had sent out information regarding a proposed change within the College of Medicine so that 80% of faculty will be in the clinical title series. She said she would discuss it with Provost Subbaswamy in her upcoming meeting with him.

The College of Health Sciences is in the process of eliminating a division and reorganizing, and the Chair said that the process bore watching. She and the chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, Davy Jones, were involved in the process to ensure the appropriate channels and processes are followed.

The last announcement pertained to the presidential search committee – the Chair explained that the nominating round would involve only elected faculty senators, and run from this coming Friday through Wednesday. The voting round, involving the entire campus, will run from October 4 – 8. The committee will be formally composed early the following week.

2. Academic Readiness Program – Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mike Mullen

The Chair asked Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mike Mullen to offer information about the Academic Readiness Program, which he did. Afterwards, Guest Mullen answered questions from SC members.

3. Graduation Writing Requirement

Mullen shared information about the Graduation Writing Requirement (GWR). He said that groups have been talking about the specific GWR requirements for courses, to see about better adapting writing intensive courses into majors. He explained that the current requirements prohibited certain types of disciplinary writing styles.

4. Old Business

a. Action Items: Kelly reported on discussions he and Grossman had with individuals across campus, regarding action item number four ("Establish ad hoc committee to identify a faculty member with legal expertise who can advise the SC on various matters. (7/14/10)"). The feedback received was that from the perspective of the Legal Office, it was not a good idea. There is a regulation that says there should

not be any faculty taking legal positions that are contrary to the broader legal position of the University. Grossman agreed with Kelly's summation, and added that part of the problem might have been a misguided perception that the SC was interested in engaging in litigation. There were also issues pertaining to officially providing legal guidance, as well as Distribution of Effort (DOE) percentages. It was determined that the issue had been properly dealt with, and was completed **[AI]**.

b. Discussion on Vetting Process for Proposed Changes to *Governing Regulations VII*:

Provost's Liaison Greissman explained the reasoning behind the proposed timeline for vetting the proposed changes to *Governing Regulations VII* ("University Organization"). There was extensive discussion, including comments about a possible first and second reading for the University Senate (Senate); the ramifications of that possibility on the timing of presentation during Board meetings; how the Senate will be responsible for approving some aspects of the proposed changes, and only offering input on other aspects; and the duration of the timeline. It was accepted that the SC would review the changes far in advance of making a decision about sending the proposed changes to the Senate for formal action in February.

5. University Senate Absence Policy

The Chair invited Davy Jones, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), to explain the Senate's absence policy, which he did. A brief yet lively discussion followed, with a variety of opinions and suggestions offered.

Grossman **moved** that the SC ask the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee to formulate a policy on what failure to attend Senate meetings should be, and then present that to the SC for further deliberation. Grossman clarified that the SREC could propose the current interpretation of the relevant rule(s), create an alternative, solicit the Senate for input, etc. Steiner **seconded**. There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. SafeAssign - Patsy Carruthers & Allison Soutl

Those present introduced themselves, including Patsy Carruthers (Academic Technology Group), Allison Soutl (Chemistry general lab manager), Ruth Beattie (past Instructional Computing Chair, who oversaw the TurnItIn pilot), and Brett McDaniel (UK Blackboard). Guest Carruthers explained that Blackboard, already currently in use, contained a component suitable for use as plagiarism prevention software, SafeAssign (SA). Carruthers offered a brief oral presentation to SC members.

Chappell asked for clarification regarding the purpose of the presentation – he asked if the SC was being asked to decide between SA and TurnItIn (TII). Randall said that the SC made a decision in spring 2010 and recommended purchase of a site license for TII, and suggested that the SC was being asked to reverse that decision. The Chair clarified that not purchasing a site license for TII would be a substantial cost savings.

SC members were concerned that with no pilot information to reference, it was difficult to compare SA and TII. Kelly **moved** that the SC request that the Academic Computing Committee evaluate TurnItIn and SafeAssign and offer the SC a specific recommendation, including a cost-benefit analysis. Nokes **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

7. Honorary Degree Policies - Timing and Number

Greissman referred to the Senate's spring 2010 approval of a three-year pilot (beginning in December 2010) for a winter commencement. Further, it was decided that there was not enough time to work through the practical and logistical issues involved with a December 2010 granting of honorary degrees. Greissman explained that the proposal before SC members involved allowing the granting of honorary degrees during the pilot winter commencement by suggesting a policy whereby the policy would change such that honorary degrees could be offered at various times throughout the academic year, with the number of honorees to be no more than five. He noted that SC members were given a sampling of representative institutions' policies.

Grossman **moved** that the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee take the number and timing of honorary degrees under consideration and determine if any changes should be made, and report back to the SC before the end of the fall 2010 semester. Chappell **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5 pm.

[Action Items are part of the minutes, but placed at the end to maximize use of space.]

Respectfully submitted by Hollie I. Swanson,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Blonder, Chappell, Grossman, Kelly, Kirk, Nokes, Peek, Randall, Steiner, Swanson and Thelin.

Invited guests present: Ruth Beattie, Patsy Carruthers, Davy Jones, Brett McDaniel, Mike Mullen, Allison Sault and Kaveh Tagavi.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, September 23, 2010.

#	✓	Item	Responsibility	Completed
4.	✓	Establish ad hoc committee to identify a faculty member with legal expertise who can advise the SC on various matters. (7/14/10)	Kelly & Grossman	09/2010
5.		SC subset to examine and revise the description of the administrative coordinator's job duties with a view towards increasing compensation. (7/14/10)	Grossman, Jensen, Chair	
6.		Develop charge for Senate's Committee on Committees. Include in the charge that it explore need/establishment of committee for "grievances," as well as "graduate student education and related issues." (7/14/10; 8/30/10)	SC	
9.		Send each senator a list of his/her college's senators and associated unit affiliation and email address. (7/14/10)	Mrs. Brothers	
12.	✓	Discuss expansion of EEP with Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs to allow transfer to be used for graduate coursework. (7/14/10) Discuss expansion of EEP with Provost Subbaswamy (6 credits per semester). (8/16/10)	Chair Chair	8/2010
13.		Add chair of Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee to COSFL listserv. (7/14/10)	Mrs. Brothers / Chair	
14.		Identify faculty representative for Coordinating Committee on Learning Management Systems/Academic Technologies by August 23. (8/16/10)	SC	
16.		Identify faculty representative for University Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities (UCAPP) by August 23. (8/16/10)	SC	
17.		Create web-based mechanism for faculty to offer input into the President's annual evaluation; evaluation process will occur during April. (8/16/10)	SC Anderson	
18.		Ask Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs to mention during new faculty orientation the requirement that final exam grades be submitted within 72 hour of administering the exam. (8/24/10)	Chair	
19.		Contact Administration to request that the Chair sit on the dais for future new student inductions.	Chair	
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	
24.		Review Senate meeting attendance policies. (8/30/10)	SC	
25.		Convene Senate committees, charge them, and facilitate identification and election of a chair.	Mrs. Brothers / Chair	
26.		Query VP IRPE Connie Ray about number of administrators at UK vs. benchmark institutions. (9/20/10)	Mrs. Brothers	
27.		Send SC's spring evaluation of President Todd to all Board of Trustees members. Share SC's spring evaluation of President Todd with faculty members. Create numerical ratings for the Board's evaluation in early fall and submit those privately. (9/20/10)	SC	
28.		Invite the Board of Trustees' chair to a SC meeting.	SC	