

University Senate
October 14, 2013

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm in the Auditorium of W. T. Young Library on Monday, October 14, 2013. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Lee X. Blonder called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:03 pm.

The Chair reminded senators to:

- Sign in upon arrival;
- Give name and affiliation when speaking;
- Attend meetings;
- Respond to emails and web postings as appropriate;
- Acknowledge and respect others;
- Silence electronic devices; and
- Communicate with constituencies.

1. Minutes from September 9, 2013 and Announcements

The Chair said there were a few changes to the minutes, noted in track changes, and asked if there were any additional changes. There being no additional changes, the minutes from September 9, 2013 were **approved** as amended by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair reported a variety of announcements, below.

The SC approved a minor calendar change for 13 courses for the MA in Arts Administration. Classes will take place over the summer, beginning on the Wednesday following spring commencement and ending the Friday prior to the start of fall classes. The non-standard calendar applies to the following AAD courses: AAD 520, AAD 540, AAD 600, AAD 610, AAD 620, AAD 630, AAD 640, AAD 650, AAD 660, AAD 699, AAD 730, AAD 740, and AAD 750.

The SC approved waiver of *Senate Rules 5.2.4.8.1* ("Common Examinations") for Professor Bob Grossman (CHE 323); he needed to change room for final exam, but no room with necessary facilities was available during the scheduled time.

The SC approved waiver of *SR 5.2.4.8.1* ("Common Examinations") for BIO 155 to approve an exam time. The exam for this course was inadvertently left off the schedule.

The process for election of SC members begins in late November. The SC members rolling off are: Gail Brion (EN); David Pienkowski (EN); and Greg Wasilkowski (EN). The election of officers will take place during the SC meeting on December 16. More information on both of these elections will be presented during the November Senate meeting.

Jeff Suchanek (Libraries), Connie Wood (AS/Statistics) and David Pienkowski (EN/Biomedical Engineering) will serve on the Budget Model Faculty Advisory Committee. These faculty representatives are in addition to the other faculty nominees to be appointed by Provost Riordan.

Below is a list of new and reappointed Senate standing committee chairs for 2013-2014.

- Academic Programs: Andrew Hippisley
- Academic Organization and Structure: Greg Wasilkowski
- Academic Advising: Phil Kraemer
- Academic Planning and Priorities: Walter Ferrier
- Admissions and Academic Standards: Greg Graf
- Disability Accommodation and Compliance: Debra Anderson

President Eli Capilouto and the Provost Search Committee have invited employees to an open house reception for Provost Christine Riordan on October 24, from 4 - 6 pm at the Hilary J. Boone Center.

2. Provost Christine Riordan

The Chair introduced Provost Christine Riordan, who talked to senators about her vision for the Provost's office, as well as campus initiatives. [Provost Riordan's presentation is available at http://www.uky.edu/Faculty/Senate/files/Meetings/1_2013-2014/20131014/University%20Senate%2010%2014%2013_Provost.pdf.]

As the Provost talked about the new values-based financial model, Grossman asked for information about the mechanisms that will be used to prevent perverse incentives for each unit to maximize its own profits, even at the risk of duplication. Provost Riordan acknowledged that she was also concerned about that, but the formulas that have been developed will create incentives for collaboration. She said that due to UK's size, it may not be feasible for the Provost's office to see everything that every unit does, so the Senate, Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council can help with that. Faculty advisory committees and policies can strengthen collaboration among colleges and units across the University, while at the same time recognizing that some duplication may be necessary due to high demand from widely varying student groups.

Jones asked the Provost to explain her idea of what tenure means and what tenure means to UK. Riordan replied that tenure is not a right and a privilege, but rather is earned and is a promise of potential to the University. Tenured faculty are UK's potential and should be part of crafting UK's future, as role models for the rest of campus. Provost Riordan added that UK also must mentor and steward untenured faculty. Tenure is part of the University and something that is earned and valued.

Brion commented that with the new budget model and associated transparency, the costs of administration will become clear for the first time. In light of past comments from President Capilouto about a pledge to make the administration leaner and meaner, Brion asked the Provost to comment on the Provost's goals in that area, as well as what Provost Riordan will view as success. The Provost replied that the University was putting accountability metrics for support units into place, so there will be transparency as to how things are evaluated; support units will have expected outcomes. Instead of building something new, existing resources can be reallocated. Also, there will be a monitoring phase of the new budget model in which a budget monitoring committee, including Provost Riordan and Executive Vice President for Health Administration Michael Karpf, will review all expenses and talk with budget advisory committees. Finally, looking across the financial spectrum, the amounts allocated across 16 colleges vary from 17% to 41%; if a unit primarily provides needed services to students, that

unit will need more support from central campus. Other sources of income, such as philanthropy, will also be considered.

There being no further questions for the moment, Provost Riordan finished her presentation. Christ said that some of the initiatives lined up fairly well with the charges to Senate committees. She asked if the Provost had thought about meeting with Senate committees, in conjunction with Provost Riordan's priorities. The Provost said that was a great suggestion, adding that she and SC Chair Blonder have committed to meet together monthly, as well as with the SC monthly. Initiatives and Senate committees could be better aligned. In addition, the SC, Provost and deans will plan to meet once a semester.

Jones referred to Provost Riordan's mention of harnessing faculty energy on committees and added that there are unit administrators who view that type of activity as something that does not bring in grant or clinical income, and do not express to faculty that that type of activity is important. He asked how Provost Riordan was encouraging deans in that area. The Provost replied that every college is a little different, with amounts on Distribution of Effort forms (DOEs) ranging from 10% to 15%, with a few higher. She said she is asking deans for nominations for committee work out of her office and that prior to consolidating the committees, she will talk to deans about faculty having sufficient time to participate. Service participation varies across disciplines and colleges and that is normal; stage of career also affects participation. Faculty should not feel burdened, but there is a tendency to go to the same people for committee participation. Hopefully, UK can identify additional thought leadership with the new committees.

3. Officer and Other Reports

a. Chair (five minutes)

The Chair explained that the SC had a lunch meeting with deans and Provost Riordan on October 8. The topics discussed included:

- Senate course and program approval process;
- Budget model implementation at the college level;
- Living-learning communities;
- New initiatives; and
- Commitment to increased communication.

The Provost will arrange a follow-up meeting in the spring.

4. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) - Greg Wasilkowski, Chair

i. Proposed Transfer of MS in Radiological Medical Physics from the Dept. of Clinical Sciences in the College of Health Sciences, to the Dept. of Radiation Medicine in the College of Medicine

Roger Brown, a member of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC), presented the proposal for the Senate's review. He closed with saying the SAOSC sent a strong recommendation to the SC for approval.

The Chair reported that the **motion** from the SC, which did not need a **second**, was that the University Senate endorse the transfer of the MS in Radiological Medical Physics from the Department of Clinical Sciences in the College of Health Sciences, to the Department of Radiation Medicine in the College of Medicine.

There was brief discussion about whether or not the faculty votes about the transfer were secret votes. In some cases, ballots were not secret but still passed easily.

The Chair reminded senators that the motion was still on the floor. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed Name Change of the Department of Health Services Management (in the College of Public Health) to the Department of Health Management and Policy

Wasilkowski explained the proposed changes to the name of the Department of Health Services Management. He said the SAOSC strongly recommended approval.

The Chair reported that the **motion** from SC, which did not need a **second**, was that the University Senate approve the proposed name change of the Department of Health Services Management (in the College of Public Health) to the Department of Health Management and Policy.

Butler identified himself as being from the Graduate School and part of the Martin School of Public Policy and Administration. He said he would speak in opposition to the motion. The Martin School (MSPPA) faculty was not consulted about the change, nor did the faculty see any version of the proposal. The director of MSPPA had a brief discussion in March, in passing, learning that something like this would happen, but the director never saw a proposal. MSPPA faculty and graduate students deal with policy and its application; as such, the MSPPA faculty would like an opportunity to review the proposal; health management and policy has been the subject of lengthy consideration, so coordination of a name change is very important. Butler **moved** to return the proposal to committee for consultation with the MSPPA to discuss its concerns. Grossman **seconded**.

College of Health Sciences Dean Steve Wyatt said that he had spoken with the director of the MSPPA, Merl Hackbart, and followed up with an email. Wyatt then read the email he sent.

There was a brief discussion about parliamentary procedure. Jones commented, on an editorial note, that the motion should be to endorse, not approve.

Kaplan asked if there was an explanation for MSPPA faculty not being aware of what was going on. Butler said no MSPPA faculty member was informed of the content of the proposal; he could not speak to communications between its director and Dean Wyatt, but the proposal was not seen by the faculty in advance.

Bailey said that departmental name changes were usually a matter of providing an accurate description of what a department does, not changing the substance of a program. He asked if the proposed change was a substantive change. Butler replied that MSPPA faculty had substantive comments they wanted to make about the proposal, particularly the question of health policy. It was hard to have such a discussion on the Senate floor, but the MSPPA is involved with a lot of health policy. Ferrier wondered if this was an instance of a legitimate concern about duplication, or if the sandbox was big enough that health policy could be viewed by different angles. Butler repeated that MSPPA faculty would like to have a discussion about it with the proposers.

Grossman said that while he seconded the motion to get discussion on the floor, he would vote against it. He opined that a name change was not a major change and that there was already overlap between the Department of Health Services Management (HSM) and the MSPPA. Changing the name would not

add or detract to either unit. He agreed that there were things that the department should discuss, but would like to see that at the program level, not about a department name.

Guest Ty Borders, chair of the Department of Health Services Management, said that many faculty do policy research, including HSM faculty, who have \$1.5 million in research funding on health policy issues. HSM does its policy work differently from MSPPA. HSM is one of the only units of its type in the United States that does not include “policy” in its name.

Hulse said that the proposal was for a name change, and wondered about the consequence of delaying review and getting input from the MSPPA. Borders said that he was not sure about any consequence, but also that he was not sure HSM would change its proposal, as it had already been approved by council. The Chair asked if there was any urgency to changing the name. Borders replied that the name change process had begun almost a year ago (November 2012) and it affected educational and research initiatives, as well as HSM’s identity on campus and nationally. Kennedy said he did not think it was a big deal, but also that he would vote to table the proposal, partly to encourage people to communicate to the maximum.

Kaplan asked if the SAOSC was aware of the MSPPA’s concerns during deliberations. Wasilkowski said the SAOSC did not; it saw the proposal as reasonable due to the focus of education and research in the department. Also, the proposed new name, Department of Health Management and Policy, was typical of names across the nation. There were no program changes, just a simple name change.

Watkins said that recruiting season was in full swing for incoming professional masters and doctorate students, particularly those being recruited; therefore, it was an issue of timing. Dean Wyatt added that one reason he proactively reached out to the MSPPA was so that issues could be raised prior to Senate review; he was a little disappointed that issue was not raised until now. Valentin said it did not sound like everyone knew about the change, but he would vote in favor of the change. Hertog said that if the discussion centered on promoting a department based on whether or not it is a policy-oriented department, then there was a reason for the Senate to be concerned with whether or not it is duplicating what is going on in the MSPPA. If recruiting graduate students hinges on the name change, as well as the idea that it is a policy department, the proposal should be clear about what the differences are. It concerned Hertog that both units lay claim to the same policy areas.

Christ said she hated to punish a department that tried to follow all the rules and communicate, but if the MSPPA director did not communicate the proposed change to MSPPA faculty, the process was not complete and she would vote to return it.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion to return the proposal to committee for consultation with the Martin School of Public Policy and Administration to discuss its concerns. The motion **failed**, with 30 in favor and at least 39 opposed.

The Senate returned to discussion on the original motion, that the University Senate approve the proposed name change of the Department of Health Services Management (in the College of Public Health) to the Department of Health Management and Policy. Brion commented that the Senate should vote to endorse, not approve.

A **vote** was taken on the motion that the University Senate endorse the proposed name change of the Department of Health Services Management (in the College of Public Health) to the Department of Health Management and Policy. The motion **passed** with a majority in favor and 14 opposed.

5. Ombud's Report for 2012-2013 – Ombud Sonja Feist-Price

Ombud Sonja Feist-Price (ED/Early Childhood, Special Education, and Rehabilitation Counseling) offered senators a precise statistical report, prepared by Laura Anshel, which will be included in the Senate minutes. [The complete report is at the end of these minutes.]

Brion asked if the increase in cases was due to the new regulations on plagiarism, or if students did not understand the rules, or some other rationale. Feist-Price said that one thing happening was that more students were submitting assignments via Blackboard – it was not just used by distance learning students anymore. With Safe Assign, the numbers are increasing; most cases are tied to Blackboard and Safe Assign.

Debski also commented on the increase in cases. Feist-Price responded that the number of cases has increased over the past five years. More is being done to ensure students know more about plagiarism; for example, an email is sent out at the opening of the term to all students, offering the services of the Ombud and explaining what plagiarism is and how to prevent it. In response to Ferrier, Feist-Price said that some cases involved graduate students, but that by and large the students who are involved are undergraduates.

6. Proposed Change to *Governing Regulations II* (Executive Committee Composition)

The Chair invited Associate General Counsel Marcy Deaton to explain the proposed changes to *Governing Regulations II*, which Guest Deaton did. The Chair said that the **motion** from the SC was that the Senate endorse the proposed changes to *Governing Regulations II*. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

7. Presentation on Dean Reviews - Mia Alexander-Snow, Director of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness

The Chair introduced Director of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Mia Alexander-Snow. Guest Alexander-Snow explained the review of chief academic officers to senators.

Royse recalled that when such processes were undertaken in years past, confidentiality of responses was at the heart of the review. There was no way for a dean to know if feedback came from college faculty, other deans or the community at large. Knowing who gives the feedback is methodologically important. Alexander-Snow said her involvement began about two and a half years ago; she said that she agreed with Royse's concern and that survey respondents can self-identify their relationship to the dean and that responses are aggregated by respondent categories.

Alexander-Snow confirmed for Kaplan that some information about the outcome of the survey goes back to the faculty of the college. Jones noted that the discussion had primarily dealt with deans. He thought former provost Kumble Subbaswamy had a formative and summative review as a direct report to the president, but could not recall the a formative or summative review of Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration Eric Monday. Alexander-Snow replied that the summative review is designed for the academic side, so the administrative leadership in healthcare only has a formative review, nothing that is designed to be similar to the review of a dean.

The Chair said that some faculty, like her, in the College of Medicine, completed a survey on Dean Frederick de Beer but the submission was not recorded. The Chair said she called and got a new link to use for the survey and was told that programming work was being done on the submission issue. She said she was concerned about the response rate, if faculty spend a lot of time on a survey but get timed out. Alexander-Snow said her office will not know about problems unless they are reported to them. She asked those affected to send her an email and she would get in touch with the third-party survey provider. If information has not been submitted, then a faculty member will have another opportunity to do so.

Schoenberg asked for more information about what steps are taken to mediate or improve a dean's performance after results are received. Alexander-Snow said that it would be a conversation between a dean and Provost. Provost Riordan commented that although she had not experienced any of them yet, she thought a conversation would include discussion about strengths and weaknesses in a sit-down manner. Jones asked for assurances that faculty input has real meaning in the evaluation process of deans. Provost Riordan replied that faculty input does make a difference and said that she hoped deans also take the information seriously. She will sit down and discuss the results of the survey with a dean, which is particularly good in formative reviews. Deans should know where their strengths and weaknesses are and how to sustain or improve performance. Grossman asked the Provost for assurances that she will hold a dean's feet to the fire if there is an area of significant deficiency that is identified and that there would be consequences for a dean who does not follow up. Provost Riordan said that she would hold someone responsible for areas of deficiency that are identified; there will be consequences if a dean does not follow up on issues.

Webb asked for information about the dean search in the College of Agriculture. Provost Riordan replied that one candidate withdrew for health reasons, but the goal remained focused on academic excellence in the college. If a strong leader emerges from the two remaining candidates, then the search will still be a success. If there is not a strong candidate, the process will start over again.

8. Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee (SRWAC) - Tom Nieman, Chair (Annual Reports for 2011 - 2012 and 2012 - 2013)

Guest Tom Nieman, chair of the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee (SRWAC), offered a report for the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 academic years. Nieman went over a variety of statistics regarding the retroactive withdrawal process. He recalled hearing a comment that SRWAC hears a lot of cases, but when the 76 cases from 2012-2013 is compared to an enrollment of 29,000 students, he thought the number of cases was actually very small. He closed by saying that SRWAC does not give blanket approval to all requests for retroactive withdrawals, but rather is careful in what they approve and do not approve; their main concern is students and academic integrity. There were no questions from senators.

There being no further business to conduct, the meeting was adjourned at 4:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Connie Wood,
University Senate Secretary

Invited guests present: Mia Alexander-Snow, Ty Borders, Marcy Deaton and Janelle Molloy.

Absences: Adams, Andrade, Atwood, Bailey, Ballard, Bathon, Blackwell, D., Brennen, Bugg, Capilouto, Conners, de Beer, Deep, Dickson, Dietz, Eckman, Evans, Feist-Price, Fox*, Galloway, Hazard*, Jackson, Kilgore, Kirschling, Kornbluh, Kraemer, Lewis, Martin, McCormick, Mehra*, Mock, Murthy, O'Hair, D., O'Hair, MJ., Richey, Riordan, Schroeder*, Sekulic*, Smith*, Spradlin, Steiner, Sutphen, Tracy, T., Tracy, J., Turner, Van Wie, Vasconez, Voro, Walz, Wilson, Wiseman, withers, Witt, Yelowitz, and Yost.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, October 30, 2013.

* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.