

2-9-04.txt

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE

\* \* \* \* \*

Regular Session

February 9, 2004

3:00 p.m.

W. T. Young Library

First Floor Auditorium  
Page 1

2-9-04.txt

Lexington, Kentucky

Dr. Jeffrey Dembo, Chair

An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.

179 East Maxwell Street

Lexington, Kentucky 40515

(859) 254-0568

Page 2

2-9-04.txt  
University of Kentucky Senate

February 9, 2004

\* \* \* \* \*

2-9-04.txt

JEFFREY DEMBO, CHAIR

GIFFORD BLYTON, PARLIAMENTARIAN

REBECCA SCOTT, SECRETARY TO SENATE COUNCIL

MARLA FRYE, COURT REPORTER

\* \* \* \* \*

The chair called the meeting to order at  
3:03 p.m.

CHAIR DEMBO: Good afternoon. Welcome to the February Senate Council meeting. Today's game plan is, as you received, there's been two changes to it. One is that Dr. Nash's presentation on IRIS, the Integrated Resource Information Systems, will be postponed to the next meeting of the Senate. But she did want me to alert you to the fact that the Website is up and running for IRIS, and one of the most important aspects of this is the software - the vendor demonstration will be on campus. And the two vendors that will be demonstrating are SAP and PeopleSoft at the dates listed. On the Website for IRIS is a detailed calendar of events as to what these vendors will be doing each of those days. So, keep this in mind and as a - there's actually two committees. There's a smaller, I guess, executive committee for IRIS and a larger oversight committee that's following the process along. It's going to be a complicated process, but one that will no doubt help the - the University.

2-9-04.txt

The other change that we'll have will take the - will be by way of announcements regarding current events related to Lexington Community College, but we're going to progress with the action items at present, and the first will be the presentation of honorary degree candidates. I'd like to ask Dean Blackwell to come on up.

BLACKWELL: Thank you. The nominating committee for the honorary degrees - the committee on honorary degrees is listed here, and I'd like to thank the committee for their service: Tom Robinson as chair of this committee, Judy Lesnaw, Sue Roberts, Bob Shay, Denise Jones, Mary Ann Simms, the trustee member, and ex officio members, the usual suspects, Lee Todd, Mike Nietzel, Wendy Baldwin, Terry Mobley and me. And many of the ex officios actually participated in the nomination process actively this year, and so we have some interesting candidates to put forward. These candidates include: Dr. John D. Baxter who is professor of Medicine in Biochemistry and Biophysics at the University of California, San Francisco. He is a Lexington, Kentucky, native, has a BA in chemistry from 1962 here at the University of Kentucky, and some highlights from his career: An MD

2-9-04.txt  
from Yale Medical School. He has been active in endocrine studies and a whole range of genetic studies. Including, in 1979, cloning the gene for the human growth hormone. He is a member of UK's Hall of Distinguished Alumni, that, in 1980. He is the founder and editor in chief of the Journal DNA. He has been elected into both the National Academy of Science and the Institute of Medicine. And he was president of the International Endocrine Society from 2001 to 2003. He is also the director of the Metabolic Research Unit at UC, San Francisco, and was - served a long term as the Chief of the Division of Endocrinology there. He's won many - many national awards for his research. And for his contribution to science, industry, and public health, Dr. Baxter is recommended for an Honorary Degree of Science -- Honorary Doctor of Science Degree.

Our second proposed nominee is James W. Stuckert whom many of you may know. He is the chairman and chief executive officer of Hilliard Lyons and is a 19 - a Louisville, Kentucky, native. Mr. Stuckert graduated from UK in 1960 with a BS in Mechanical Engineering and went on to earn his MBA from UK in 1961. At that time, he went into - went to work with Lyons -

2-9-04.txt

W. L. Lyons & Company and has served the University of Kentucky in many, many capacities. He is a past president of the UK Alumni Association, the past chair of the UK Development Council, UK Alumni Association's Distinguished Service Award is one of the many awards that he counts as his own, and he, too, is a member of the UK Hall of Distinguished Alumni. He's in the Alumni Hall of Fame of both business and economics and engineering and something for which we can be very grateful sitting in this room right now, he chaired the Corporate and Foundation Committee for the campaign for the W.T. Young Library. And he is currently the chair of UK's capital campaign.

The third nominee is George W. Wright - George C. Wright, excuse me. George Carlton Wright is currently the president of Prairie View A&M University. And this is the apex of a long and distinguished career as a professor and college administrator. He is a Lexington, Kentucky, native. He received his BA in history here at the University of Kentucky, his MA in history, and he served here as an assistant professor of history from 1977 to 1980. But after 1980, he continued on in his award-winning research in Post Civil War



2-9-04.txt

Black History, particularly black history in Kentucky. He codirected two documentaries, "Don't Let the Sun Go Down" and "Upon This Rock, The Black Church in Kentucky." He served as professor and director of African-American Studies at both Duke University and at the University of Texas, Austin. He was a vice provost at Duke University, was voted into the Best Professor Hall of Fame at the University of Texas, Austin, and served as executive vice president and provost at the University of Texas at Arlington, and has also served here as part of the College of Arts and Sciences, UK Arts and Sciences Advisory Board. So, the nominations approved by Graduate Faculty for your consideration are Dr. John D. Baxter, the Honorary Doctor of Science; James W. Stuckert, Honorary Doctor of Letters; and Dr. George C. Wright, Honorary Doctor of Letters. Thank you.

CHAIR DEMBO: Thank you, Jeannie. Stay up here in case any questions.

BLACKWELL: Okay.

CHAIR DEMBO: The item is on the agenda because the Senate Council voted to send it forward without a recommendation either way. State law prevents us from closing the meeting. So I'd like to impose on your good honor to not divulge

2-9-04.txt

the names of any of these candidates because it's not official until the Board of Trustees formally approves them. Are there any questions about any of the candidates? Professor Tagavi.

TAGAVI: Could you mention why we did not give a recommendation?

CHAIR DEMBO: I'm sorry?

TAGAVI: Could you mention why the Senate Council did not give a recommendation either way?

CHAIR DEMBO: The Senate Council did not give a recommendation because the names were not available to the Senate Council.

TAGAVI: Thank you. (AUDIENCE LAUGHS)

BLACKWELL: This is very hush-hush.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Jones.

JONES: Just a question. Dr. Stuckert is currently the chair of the Capital Campaign, the UK Capital Campaign; is that - is - is that a reason to be - to give him this honorary degree? Is that one of the listings of merit?

BLACKWELL: It was just one of the highlights that I pulled out of, you know, more than 25 years of service to the University of Kentucky, also in the Jefferson County Alumni Association past president and so forth. So, it wasn't one that particularly singled him out.

CHAIR DEMBO: Any other questions for Dean

2-9-04.txt  
Blackwell? Okay, yes.

KERN: It seems obvious but why - why  
are there no women nominated this year?

SCOTT: I'm sorry, name, please.

KERN: Oh, Kathy Kern, Arts and  
Sciences.

SCOTT: Thank you.

BLACKWELL: We actually approached several  
candidates who either did not respond or  
were not available on commencement day,  
because now under the rules, they have to  
be present at commencement, and that very  
often is their own commencement day, and  
so it makes for a conflict of times in  
many cases.

CHAIR DEMBO: Other questions? Okay. So all  
in favor of these three nominees, please  
signify by saying aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR DEMBO: Any opposed? Any abstentions?  
Thank you. The - the next agenda item  
also relates to the graduate school.  
This is a proposal to change the Senate  
Rule that relates to the graduate record  
examination. This is the current Senate  
Rule as it - as it reads. The GRE is  
required. The rule may be waived in  
individual cases upon the recommendation  
of the DGS. However, the GRE scores must  
be submitted before the end of the first  
semester in case they are waived. Dean  
Kalika, during his time at the graduate

2-9-04.txt

school, had put together a subcommittee of the Graduate Council to look at recommending a change to this Senate Rule. The proposal was approved by the Graduate Council in March of '03. There was an open forum held of the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kentucky, followed by a Web balloting, and this was the - the result of that vote. In December, this was approved by the Senate's Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards, and on January 26th, approved by the Senate Council with some modifications that I'll point out to you. So, it's on the floor now as an agenda item for discussion. The - the writing that's in pink are the words that were added by the Senate Council, and the one word in yellow was the one that was recommended for deletion by the Senate Council. So, before we - we go any further, Jeannine, are there any other comments from the graduate school regarding this proposed change?

BLACKWELL: None.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. And Professor Ferrier, from your committee that also reviewed this, any comments?

FERRIER: No.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Any comments from the Senate Council, then?

2-9-04.txt

SPEAKER: I'm speechless.

CHAIR DEMBO: How about questions from attendees?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Chemistry. I

was

on the original Graduate Council Committee that came up with this. I was just curious why the Senate Council decided to remove the dean's level of approval of a program before it goes to the Graduate Council. Because by this wording, the dean of the college in which the program resides may approve or disapprove, but either way, just sends the proposal on up.

CHAIR DEMBO: So, any Senate Council members who would like to respond? Professor Jones.

JONES: Yeah. This - this is a matter of educational policy not management. It's the faculty bodies that approve this. The dean is the chair of the group, and they're - they're transmitting interface to the next higher level in this context.

GROSSMAN: Okay. Good enough.

CHAIR DEMBO: So, then it must go to the dean because the dean is chair of the Graduate Council but it's in that capacity that it's transmitted to the dean. Other questions or comments about this proposed change to the Senate Rule? Yes.

2-9-04.txt

DEEM: Jody Deem, College of Health Sciences. I'm just presuming that the - the period after the first sentence: The graduate program faculty may petition for another exam, MCAT, LSAT or so forth. That - then the period. The next sentence means then: A graduate program faculty may also petition the Graduate Council to exempt its applicants from the GRE. It also then means from every other standardized test; is that correct?

BLACKWELL: Yes.

CHAIR DEMBO: Dean Blackwell.

BLACKWELL: Yes, that's what that means.

A

program - this - we're calling this the Opt Out or Opt Out Mode, and that is a graduate program faculty can petition. And the way that we envision this happening is that it comes as a petition to Graduate Council that that program will either not require any standardized test whatsoever, or require a replacement test, or an option of tests. For example, a program could say: Our program will accept the GRE and the MCAT, for example. Or they can say: We will require the MCAT, period. Or they can have no standardized test requirement. But that has to be a program decision. It's not a case-by-case student decision. It goes into the bulletin, and it's your

2-9-04.txt  
official admission's policy. We'll  
enforce it, the graduate school.

CHAIR DEMBO: Jody, did that help?

DEEM: Yes. Thank you very much.

CHAIR DEMBO: Other questions. Okay. So, if  
this were to result in a positive - yes.  
Oh, I'm sorry.

ALBISETTI: Could you give - Jim  
Albiseti, Arts and Sciences. Could you  
give us a little background as to what  
programs were interested in doing this?  
I - I have no reason to vote for it  
because I - my program certainly wants  
GREs and will keep them.

BLACKWELL: I think several in - in the  
Advanced Sciences and Engineering - is  
that right? Yeah. - were interested in  
mechanical engineering, for example, for  
those programs.

GROSSMAN: Oh, I - I can also address  
that a little bit. There - there  
were - most programs felt that the GRE,  
while not a be all and end all of  
admissions, was a useful measure. But  
there were some programs they felt very  
strongly that the GRE was - was not  
useful for their program. For example,  
there was an architecture program, I  
believe, that felt that many of its  
applicants were professionals who had  
been practicing many years already, and  
it was sort of insulting to ask them to

2-9-04.txt

take the GRE before they enrolled in a program. And another example was, there was one program that had a lot of people from overseas, and - and it was both a financial burden on their applicants to take it, and they tended to do worse than - than their later performance would indicate they should have done because they weren't used to these typical tests. So, it just wasn't a good predictor of their performance in graduate school. And these were the types of programs where we said, you know, they felt strongly that they had other measures that would predict the success of students, and the GRE wasn't useful for them. At the same time, we didn't want to just have a free-for-all where everyone could just get rid of - where everyone had the option to have the GRE or not. So, we decided to have this opt-out mechanism.

BLACKWELL: And so that means if your program does not formally petition Graduate Council, you still have a GRE requirement.

CHAIR DEMBO: Is there a question?

PEFFER: Sean Peffer, Business. Does that mean that if you're not using GRE right now, like some of the business programs are not using it, they're using



2-9-04.txt  
the GMAT, that they're going to have to go back and even though they're doing GMAT right now and not doing GRE, they're going to have to go back and petition before they can do what they've already been doing? I just don't know the rest of the wording of this.

BLACKWELL: We - to -- to confirm the status quo, we'll probably have, you know, a group blessing, if that's the will of those programs. We'll probably group them together at the first Graduate Council meeting should this measure pass and just fix it all at once for those programs that are just maintaining status quo.

CHAIR DEMBO: Any other questions? So, all in favor of this proposed edition to Senate Rule 4.2.5 signify by saying aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR DEMBO: Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay. This will be sent to the Rules Committee for codification and inclusion in the Senate Rules.

The next action item on the Agenda is an addition to the Senate Rules. That will be a new section 4.2.2.14. It follows a number of other subsections of similar nature where the individual colleges outline what their admission requirements are. Let me skip

2-9-04.txt

ahead here for a second. In April, the University Senate came up with this recommendation that the Senate Rules should be amended to state that all proposals to create or change admission requirements must provide a detailed rationale for each criterion, and we should not limit enrollments solely by the grade point average. So, that sets the stage of -- in - in the light - the light in which you should consider this proposal. The rule is to create some new admission requirements at the Arts Administration Program: students at UK, 45-semester hours, 2.8 minimum cum, premajor core requirements. And the program's rationale was that - hang on - the Arts Administration Program began in '88 with 30 students. It's now tripled. They have two faculty, one full time and tenured and one full-time adjunct and several part-time faculty. And with this increasing number of majors, it challenges their ability to provide the quality of instruction. And the average ratio of students in a major to faculty at UK is 20 to 1. And in Arts Administration, they say it's over double that number, and they also have other activities that require supervision by faculty. So, the Senate Council has

2-9-04.txt  
recommended approval of this. It's on the floor for discussion. First, are there any members from Fine Arts Administration that are here or would like to talk to this?

BRAUN: No, I think it speaks for itself.

SCOTT: State your name, please.

BRAUN: Michael Braun.

CHAIR DEMBO: This was also reviewed by Professor Ferrier and the Academic - the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee. Wally, what do you got to say about it?

NOONAN: Could you put the proposal back on?

CHAIR DEMBO: There are two pages to this. This page (INDICATING) and then this below.

FERRIER: We were aware of the contentiousness of this in past endeavors by college communications and other units, and initially tabled this until we digested more fully what -- that Bill Fortune's Task Force actually has recommended before finalizing this. But we - we were unanimously in favor of it.

CHAIR DEMBO: Open for discussion. Dean Hoch.

HOCH: I've got a number of questions. First, how many do you anticipate accepting into the program and - because

2-9-04.txt

you said it grew from 30 to 90, but it's unclear sort of what the target enrollment is. But I'm also very concerned as to, let's say hypothetically, they plan to take in 45 students. Where are the other 45 students supposed to go and how are they going to be managed? I mean, I'm always concerned just out of narrow self interest from our college that anytime a college slaps on an enrollment cap, although it may not necessarily be in this case, that the students wind up in Arts and Sciences, and therefore it's just an unfunded mandate. Now, if they want to reduce their enrollment in the program from 90 to 45, and we do a study and suspect that, well, 30 of these will wind up in Communications and 15 wind up in Arts and Sciences, that's fine, but the resources need to flow with that because somebody has to educate these students that they've just put the cap on. Now, it may be they all stay in this college. I don't know. But I think we need to look at that before we approve it because this does have substantial financial cost and financial implications.

CHAIR DEMBO: It has a broad response.

BRAUN: Well, in looking at the number

2-9-04.txt

of students, it probably would reduce it by about 15 to 20 students out of the 90. And let me say this: I'm all for the resources flowing into the programs, but I mean, I have less money in this program in terms of resources, you know, to run it than I did when I got here nine years ago. So, you know, some of it has to - you know, the issue of it is a popular program. I've got a lot of students who want to get into it, and there is a quality issue at a certain point where how many students can you handle, and we just feel like we've reached it at this point.

CHAIR DEMBO: A response to that? Dean Hoch.

HOCH: I think everybody's in the same situation, and I sympathize with you, and I suspect in this case most aren't going to come to Arts and Sciences, but they will go somewhere. And I think in cases where we do put caps on college fund programs or on colleges, we need to do the best we can to try to figure out where they're going. I mean, I'm in a situation where, you know, Engineering has caps, B&E has caps. You've got a cap? He's got caps. We don't have any caps. We're the repository. I mean, every student we admit to this University, we have an obligation to educate them. If you don't want to

2-9-04.txt

educate them in your program, they wind up in somebody else's. And we need to figure out before we make - we recruit things like that, the best we can, where they're going to go because those costs go somewhere. Okay. All this motion does is reallocate resources within the University. That's all the motion does. It may improve the quality of your program, but also sends resources going other directions, in this case liabilities, students that are unfunded. And I'm not - I'm very uncomfortable with, you know, supporting something like this without knowing what the broader implications are. I know what the implications will be for your program. They'll be beneficial. But there are other programs out there that may suffer, and we have to try to understand that.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Grossman.

GROSSMAN: Well, I - I would double what Dean Hoch would say. I also want to know when this is going to end. I mean the college - we have -- B&E has admissions standards higher than the University as a whole. We have - Engineering does. Now, Communications does. I was far more concerned about Communications than this particular program because this is one program in a - in a larger college, and

2-9-04.txt

frankly, it's a fairly small college.

But nevertheless, where is this going to end? Is every college at this University going to have admission standards higher than the admission standards of the University as a whole? Should we force people to drop out if they don't meet a certain standard after they've been here one or two years? Maybe, that is an option, but what's going to happen is that the default colleges, A&S and Agriculture, are going to be burdened with all the students that the other colleges don't want. And this is - this is a problem that can't be solved by piecemeal limits on enrollment in different colleges. What it does, again, is it places - it means that the poorer students all get excluded from increasing more and more colleges, and end up in just a few - the few that haven't yet imposed extra admissions requirements.

CHAIR DEMBO: And as a partial answer to your question: Where will - will it all end? It possibly will end with this because from what I see in the rest of 4.2.2, just about every other college has their own admissions requirements.

GROSSMAN: Well A&S doesn't. Maybe, we should. I mean, we're facing the same problems that every other college is facing in terms of increasing enrollment

2-9-04.txt

and decreasing faculty.

CHAIR DEMBO: Any other comments? Professor Braun.

BRAUN: Well, I would want to point out that this proposal was submitted two years ago when the first time we went around and took a look - I -- I think it was when Communications had suspended there, and had to be tabled at that time because there was a Task Force that was put together, that it came up with recommendations in regards to selective admissions. Okay. And they came up with recommendations that said, well, we are going to allow selected admissions to continue. There were some caveats put on it saying it couldn't just be GPA and that sort of thing. And so, okay, I waited for that Task Force to be over. Now, it's over. I'm resubmitting the proposal. I share your concerns with the allocations of resources, but if we're going to take a look at that again, I would put forth: Look at this, this is the second time I put it forward. Let's move on with this, and then let's - let's move on to looking into the whole issue that - that other people have raised which I also have concerns about.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Gesund.

GESUND: It's Gesund, Engineering. I



2-9-04.txt

believe we have two different problems here. One is the allocation of resources, and I sympathize with you - with both of you, and I believe the allocation of resources has to be done by the provost and president among colleges. They're the only ones who can do this, and I assume they're doing the best they can with very limited resources. The other thing - the other question of admissions requirement speaks to the probability that a given student will successfully complete the degree. In Engineering, our admissions requirements are based on that requirement that we assure that the vast majority of students that we admit to Engineering standing at the end of the first three or four semesters in school, that those students will have a good chance of finishing and getting their degrees. We are not so concerned with limiting enrollment. We are concerned with the ability of the students to complete the courses of study, and that's why Engineering primarily has this requirement. So, I think we have two different models or modes here, and the ones where the problem is lack of resources, I believe that problem must be addressed at a higher level, and is really not a concern of the Senate. The problem of ability to

2-9-04.txt

graduate the students in a reasonable time with their degrees, that is our problem here in the Senate. That's an academic problem, and we must address it as best we can. And I think in this particular case, I have seen nothing that says that this is a quality control problem to make sure the students you accept will graduate. So, I - my own feeling is this problem is not one that we here can solve. That has to be solved at the provost level.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Albi setti .

ALBI SETTI : I was simply going to ask

where

the Dean of Fine Arts is in this in reallocating resources in his college if there's a major disgruntle, and why is this a matter for enrollment cap rather than faculty provision?

CHAIR DEMBO: I don't think Dean Shay is here to answer that. Provost Nietzel, is there any comment you wish to make.

NIETZEL: I can make two comments. We - we will be looking at a innovation in the tuition rate for students that would assess an upper-division fee on students, and that is designed to help address some of this bubble coming through - the enrollment growth bubble coming through to the majors, and would be available for a summary allocation to help address

2-9-04.txt

shortages in the major. The issue of these increasing enrollments ultimately is one that has to be looked at in terms of the selective admission requirements. I'll show you data later that'll indicate we're continuing to accept the same percentage of students who've applied to the University fairly steadily over the past few years. The vast majority of those students are admitted automatically because they meet the University's selective admissions requirements. There's not a choke-off at this point that we could apply to those except if the Senate wanted to consider a higher set of scores in terms of selective admissions.

CHAIR DEMBO: Other questions or comments about this proposed rule? Michael.

BRAUN: I'm just going to go, you know, send out one more, I guess, message in that this is legally in keeping with what Communications and Businesses have done in the past. And if we're going to start, you know, paring back, you know, these issues of selective admission, then fine, then let's start doing across the University. I followed all the rules, all of the procedures that are in place in terms of putting this proposal forward. And, I guess, I think the

2-9-04.txt

question I would have is just, I mean, I can frame this in terms of students being able to get through my program because they have real difficulty getting through the program if they don't have the kinds of resources that are necessary to oversee their movement through the program. And right now we're getting to the point where that just is not the case. And I think it's a fair way of dealing with the issue. You know, we're talking about, as I was saying, 15 to 20 students perhaps. It's a very small program. I guess, I would just request that if there are these broader issues that we're going to be taking a look at, that we frame them so that we go forward and look at them in a fair way, but this was put forward under the rules that are in place at that time, and then along the lines that many other programs and colleges within the University have - have done in the past.

CHAIR DEMBO:                   Okay. Comment. Professor Debski.

DEBSKI:                         I just - it's a question, I just - I think a lot of people would like to know whether specifically the people who have the grade point average under 2.8 are less likely to do well in - in this program than others who have above that grade point average.

2-9-04.txt

BRAUN: Well, certainly grade point average is an indicator as to whether they're going to do well in the program. But on the other hand, there are five introductory courses that they have to go through and get a 3.0. Those are a much better indicator because then we have, you know, at least in two of them, direct contact with the students, and we can measure their abilities at that time. So, it's a combination of overall 2.8 --

DEBSKI: I mean, do you actually have numbers associated with that - any of that quality of assessment?

BRAUN: Okay. In - in terms of which part?

DEBSKI: In - just in terms of how - how good a predictor this GPA is for the overall success in graduating in this major?

BRAUN: I can't - I would have to say it would be, you know, my experience in dealing with the students.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. So, another comment. Dean Hoch.

HOCH: Yes. Could you just go back to what the Senate Rules are? I mean, the arguments that I've heard here seem to suggest that we're doing this simply for budgetary purposes. We haven't heard an argument that the students who get a

2-9-04.txt

2.8, 2.9, are far less likely to succeed, that they're - that they're not obtaining their degree in a timely manner. It seems to me they're simply trying to limit it for resource purposes, and if we really want to go down that road, I mean, you know, and I'm sorry the fact that, you know, other programs have done it. Were I here at the time, I would not have been sympathetic to those either. But I think these are resources who I was very surprised to hear the comment that the Senate doesn't deal with issues of resource allocation since the person who spoke spoke so eloquently in times about the resource allocation involving changes in retirements and benefit. So, we do speak quite directly to resource issues here, all the time. This is a small one, but it's not an insignificant one when you keep adding them up time after time after time.

CHAIR DEMBO: Wally, as chair of the Senate Commission - Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards, was this one of the issues that you looked at whether their request was in compliance with the Senate's recommendation?

FERRIER: It was one of the things we looked very closely at, and academic integrity up there in the Senate Rule can mean a lot of different things. There's

2-9-04.txt

quite of bit of definitional conceptual wiggle room there. Enrollment ratios, resources are - are certainly all drivers of academic integrity and quality.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Without any other comments, we'll bring this to a vote. We'll do it by a hand vote, and this is a vote to implement the new Rule 4.2.2.14 from the College of Fine Arts. All in favor, please raise your hand. Okay. All opposed, please raise your hand. Ms. Sohner.

SOHNER: I have to count them again. I'm sorry.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay.

SOHNER: 12.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. All in favor again, please raise your hand so we can document it for the record.

SOHNER: 44.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. So, the vote was 44 to --

SOHNER: 12.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. So, the motion passes.

GROSSMAN: Jeff, I would like to propose new motion after that one passed. May I do so?

CHAIR DEMBO: Is it a new agenda item or new action item?

GROSSMAN: It's related - it's related

to

much of the discussion that we've just had. It's a proposal that the committee - that a committee revisit an issue. So, it's not something for us to vote on, but - but I - I would like the committee, Wally's committee, to revisit this issue of selected admissions for all the colleges and to look at - specifically at the effect that some - the restricting admission some colleges have on other colleges, so that we can look at this overall resource issue in relation to enrollment and, maybe, come up with some sort of formula that will address these issues as a whole to the satisfaction or lack of satisfaction of everyone, reduce the - the imbalances inherited, addressing these things in a piecemeal fashion.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. So, I think since the Senate Council was present to hear the discussion both pro and con, why don't we discuss it at our next Senate Council meeting to see what the specific charge might be to the committee. Is that acceptable, Bob?

GROSSMAN: Yes.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay.

TAGAVI: May I make a parliamentary inquiry?

CHAIR DEMBO: Yes.



TAGAVI : This is somewhat related to Professor Blyton last time saying if an action item is - if an item is not on the Agenda, we cannot vote. I'd just like to know according to what rule? Is it Robert's Rules of Order or Senate Rule? How was that ruling made by Professor Blyton? May I inquire?

CHAIR DEMBO: For this --

BLYTON: I would say Robert's.

TAGAVI : Robert's Rules of Order?

BLYTON: Yes.

TAGAVI : Okay.

GROSSMAN: It's not a motion. I would just like --

BLYTON: He hasn't made - he hasn't presented the motion.

CHAIR DEMBO: I think the Senate Council has heard the sense of -- of what you are asking about.

What I'd like to do at this point is to go to the section about announcements. I received an e-mail as chair of the Senate Council from Steve Reed, chair of the Board of Trustees who was specifically asking whether or not the Senate Council has weighed in on the matter regarding LCC. He writes that: Often the correct answer to a difficult question may be unclear, thus, we cannot guarantee we'll make the right choice

2-9-04.txt

here. However, it must not be said that we didn't follow their correct process in our efforts to reach that decision.

Along these lines, has the Senate Council voiced an opinion? If so, what is it?

If not, I'm concerned because in no way would I want to create the perception that your opinion does not matter because it does. Perhaps more important is that you have been given the opportunity to voice an opinion regardless of what it is.

Before we get into some discussion here, and again, this is not a formal agenda item, it's a discussion, accept my apologies for not sending out an advance e-mail to all members of the Senate. It went to select members of the Senate and not to everybody, and that's an oversight on my part. In response to Steve's inquiry, the Senate Council, in fact, considered the matter but didn't weigh in with a specific opinion. And if there are opposing viewpoints, I'm happy to entertain those. At the request of Provost Nietzel and Executive Vice President Dick Siemer, we met and discussed LCC. And out of that meeting came, among other things, a concern about a resolution that KCTCS had put forward that would, in essence, cause the transfer of - of everything from LCC and

2-9-04.txt

UK to KCTCS. And there was a lot of concern on the part of Senate Council members and of staff Senate members as well. And that resulted in a letter being drafted and sent from both the Staff Senate and the University Senate expressing concern about that KCTCS resolution. Another piece of background is that the way the timing was originally presented to us was that there would not be an adequate opportunity for the Senate to weigh in, and that's because the Task Force recommendations came out in December. The first meeting of the Senate was due to be February 9th. And from everything we have been told, it was likely that the Board of Trustees would consider making their final decision at a January meeting. At least that seemed to be the most likely alternative. Since that time, much has happened, I think. Probably the - the most immediately significant item is that the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board this morning voted on a resolution that would transfer LCC to KCTCS. There were a number of amendments that were made to that resolution, and I can call on our trustee Professor Kennedy in just a second. He's on the Academic Affairs Committee. Also, since that time, the

2-9-04.txt

Senate Council last week had an open meeting - all of our meetings are open -- regarding LCC. And in attendance were chair of the Academic Affairs Committee Alice Sparks, as well as Barbara Young, as well as Professor Kennedy and other trustee, Davy Jones. Where there were some - it was much discussion about all sides of the issue. That's just my perception. Some very passionate perspectives were presented, and so at this stage, I believe, that Chair Reed knows that the Senate, per se, has not weighed in on this issue. So, what I'd like to do is to open the floor to discussion. I'd like to limit this to no more than half an hour, because, again, likely there will be many different viewpoints brought up. But to get a sense of the Senate as to how we should respond to Chair Reed's statement and request. Professor Gesund.

GESUND: All right. I'll start the -- I'll start the discussion. My own feeling is that as a faculty member for many years is that the faculty of LCC should be the ones who decide their own fate. And I would say we should go along with whatever the faculty at LCC wants. And I think that is the correct way for a university or a college to be governed. And so I - I believe that the faculty of

2-9-04.txt

LCC should decide what is best for LCC for its students and faculty and staff, and then we should push very hard to have whatever they decide done.

CHAIR DEMBO: Michael Kennedy, can I call on you for a second just to report what amendments were added to the resolution at the Academic Affairs Committee this morning?

KENNEDY: Well, I hesitate to read - read all this. The primary amendment - well, there were three or four. There were a number of whereases added to the preamble of the resolution. And as I say, I sort of hesitate to read through all that.

CHAIR DEMBO: Would you give us a sense of the nature of them.

KENNEDY: We wanted to - we wanted to reassure LCC folk that the - that their ties with the University of Kentucky would be strongly maintained, and that even though they became a separate autonomous organization, institution, that once that happened, numerous contracts and - and - numerous contracts could be executed between LCC and UK to allow their students to use our dormitories, athletic facilities, the transfer of courses is already taken care of, and so on and so forth. There was an

2-9-04.txt

amendment that said that LCC adjuncts and part-time faculty would be paid at the same rate they had been paid. There was some concern because some community college adjuncts are paid at less than the rate in Lexington. There was an amendment about buildings guaranteeing that at a minimum LCC would retain use of the buildings for five years and also that until and unless another campus was developed and there was somewhere else for them to go, they would stay in their present quarters. Do you remember any other amendments?

SPEAKER: Those - those are the main thrusts.

KENNEDY: Well, for the next six years, was it, LCC students will - will get UK diplomas.

CHAIR DEMBO: Yes.

STATEN: Ruth Staten, College of Nursing. I had read probably in the newspaper, actually, some concern about what happened to LCC faculty that was different than what happened to other community college faculty when this transfer was made before. Has there been any resolution of those concerns?

KENNEDY: I'm not sure what the concerns are, but my understanding is that when the transfer was made in 1998, Community College faculty - UK - who were UK

2-9-04.txt

employees at that time, could stay under the UK personnel system or switch over to the KCTCS personnel system. And apparently, some still are under the UK system. A large number have migrated to the KCTCS system. In terms of people with tenure retaining their tenure, people on a 10-year track are to be evaluated in the same manner as when they were employed.

STATEN: So, they would have that option, LCC faculty will have that option?

KENNEDY: LCC faculty will have that option. Well, one thing to understand is that, where we are now is the Academic Affairs Committee has made a recommendation to the Board which meets tomorrow. The Board is actually making a recommendation to the legislature because this requires an amendment to House Bill 1 which established the move of the community colleges except for LCC. I think that just looking at the amendments is sort of not addressing the main issue, and I could - I could read you something about why I believe the Academic Affairs Committee voted this morning to move LCC to KCTCS, if you want me to. That would take about five minutes.

CHAIR DEMBO: Well, why don't we hang on a

2-9-04.txt

second so we can see what the Senate feels it may need to get the sense of the Senate. I have a question to ask: There's been some discussion as to whether or not we truly understood what SACS was expecting us to do and in what time frame. Most recently, there was a telephone conversation between President Todd, President Kerley, Provost Nietzel and Michael Kennedy, as a member of the Academic Affairs Committee with SACS. And there have been other ongoing discussions that have occurred. And at today's Academic Affairs Committee, Jim, I thought I heard the fact that SACS will effect - will effect - accept either of those options. It will accept any option as long as we're not doing what we're doing now; is that correct?

KERLEY: That is correct. They are - well, they - SACS doesn't really care which way we go. They - they say stay with UK, separate accredited or go to KCTCS. So, there's not a preference on SACS. They have - we are put on probation for one year, and the key issue is the autonomy with the University of Kentucky. So, we must solve that dilemma and be able to answer back to SACS with that. They - we - we have been led to believe from SACS that - that there really was a very strict time line.



2-9-04.txt

There is a time line we need to report back to them. I'm in contact with them on a daily, weekly basis almost, telling them, updating them. But in our last conversation with them which was last Friday with Dr. Todd and Nietzel and myself and - and Michael, the SACS people said they would give us time to work it out if we stayed with UK. So, we're not - we're not totally boxed in. We felt like we were boxed in with that, but I - I do believe that is - and I respect Dr. Todd that it's his wish for LCC to - to not have that full autonomy that's necessary that's required by SACS. So, that is - that is an issue, and we, you know, we have - we - we appreciate the concessions that were made this morning by the Academic Affairs Committee, but I still have concern on the five-year guarantee. That, to me, is not sufficient, that what happens after five years with 8,700 students? Could be 10-12,000 students in a couple of years. Those buildings were built for LCC specifically by the legislature, so those are a couple of comments I would share with you.

CHAIR DEMBO: Let me talk - Peggy, could I call on you for a second? The University Senate had two representatives on the

2-9-04.txt

Task Force that was to look at this issue and, Peggy, you were our Senate Council member and a senator. When the Task Force came up with this recommendation, the wording was something along the lines of that while the majority would have preferred Option One, that is LCC staying with UK but being autonomous, that Option Three was chosen. Can you go into some more detail about what the Task Force sentiment was?

SAUNIER: Peggy Saunier from LCC. I think it says in the Task Force that we looked at the deadline that we thought that the changes had to be made by the middle of February in order to prepare for a March visit. We looked at the complexity of the kinds of changes that would have to be made for us to be autonomous, and these would be a number of changes. It's not one or two things to change. It's a lot of things to change. And also, we looked at the risk of not being accredited. If - we've been working on this since November of 2000, and since our visit, we have submitted reports, and they've said, no, that's not enough. And then we submitted another report. They said, no, that's not enough. And there was the question of, if we do something but not enough, then we submit another one, and they say,

2-9-04.txt

no, that's not enough and we're not accredited. So, part of it was dealing with the idea that our strong preference was we need to maintain separate accreditation. To maintain our position as a community college, we need separate accreditation. So...

SPEAKER: Can I --

CHIEF DEMBO: Becky.

WOMACK: Becky Womack, LCC, UK Senator, Undergraduate Council, member of the SWAT team that generated the information which then fed into the Task Force process, and I was also a member of the Task Force. So, I've got - I also am not a person who normally stands up to speak. I prefer write it. I did co-write the report that went to Dr. Todd and the Provost and to the Council on Postsecondary Education two years ago which detailed all of the benefits of our wonderful symbiotic relationship in working together. So, I have several perspectives from which I speak, but I just wanted to support Peggy in what she's saying that at the time the Task Force was appointed, and I want to say this with all due respect in the best possible way, and I'm not likely to do that, but at the time that Task Force was appointed, in a sense it seemed that

2-9-04.txt

because the Task Force was appointed to gradually deliberate a decision on three options, one of which was very time dependent, we thought, it seemed almost that the appointing of a long - you know, a longer process to deliver a decision on December 31st narrowed the options which could legitimately be considered. Is that fairly clear? So, we heard the clock ticking in the Task Force process. We - we - and you know, I -- I sort of heard one of the options, the one of remaining separately accredited and affiliated with UK, kind of gasping for breath because that one required the greatest amount of work. From our understanding that SACS wanted a report in February for their consideration by the - an April visit to our campus. That seemed to be the - the option that was losing its life, and yet that was the preferred option. So, I - I can't speak for everyone on the Task Force. I wouldn't presume to do that, but I know that I heard a clock ticking on one of those options. And because separate accreditation is absolutely necessary for a community college to fulfill its mission, I think, you know, that influenced my thinking process as a member of that Task Force. And any other member of the Task Force from LCC

2-9-04.txt

could - could comment individually on that. Thank you.

CHAIR DEMBO: Other questions regarding that point?

KENNEDY: I think --

CHAIR DEMBO: Michael.

KENNEDY: - the comment was made that SACS doesn't care what we do, and I think that that's not correct. SACS cares very much what we do. They've cared for three years. We wouldn't be in this position if SACS didn't care. SACS has some very, very specific requirements for LCC to stay a part of UK but be autonomous. And I've come to the conclusion, and as I've say, I've got three or four paragraphs that I can read which would tell you why I came to the conclusion that the option that we've chosen, namely to recommend LCC become part of KCTSC, and then forge other alliances with UK, is the only viable one. It's not just the timing thing. It's a - it's a matter of trying to do two things which do not seem to be doable at the same time: be autonomous and not be autonomous. So, I would be glad to - to go through this logic if you want. But so SACS does very much care if - if we choose one course of action going to KCTCS, they send one kind of committee

2-9-04.txt  
called a substantive change committee.  
If we attempt - continue to attempt to  
satisfy them that LCC is autonomous but  
part of UK, they send another kind of  
committee called a special committee, and  
that committee decides whether or not  
LCC's accreditation ends on June 30th.  
So, there -- there's something good -  
there's a big risk here.

CHAIR DEMBO: Provost Nietzel.

NIETZEL: I just wanted to add one thing  
about the timing. I think what I heard  
in the SACS' phone call was that we would  
have - they would give us extra time to  
work through whatever decision we made,  
but they were not interested in giving us  
more time in making a decision and  
expected that to be forthcoming. So,  
there's - there's really a difference  
here in terms of either one of those  
options will take, as it did with KCTCS,  
years to implement. It's not a matter of  
one or two, I think, it's actually more  
than that. But what I did hear very  
clearly in that phone call was that they  
did need a decision from us about which  
direction we were going, and that that,  
in fact, was probably past time. They  
asked for it six weeks prior to their  
visit in the spring.

CHAIR DEMBO: First of all, is there anybody  
else we haven't hear from who has

2-9-04.txt

questions about what is presented up to now?

YATES: I guess I'm still confused. Steve Yates, Chemistry. I'm still confused about the real issues involved here because I realize there's great unrest at LCC, particularly among the faculty, and I certainly agree we need to make sure that the faculty are treated well, whatever the changes. But the things that Mike Kennedy keeps referring to, I'd like to hear those arguments because at the time LCC was not made a part of KCTCS, there was a lot of suspicion as to why that was true. Some thought it was an olive branch to a former president, a payoff, or whatever you might call it. And many people wondered why that wasn't the situation. It made sense at the time that all of the community colleges might be grouped together. I'd like to hear the reasons that Mike keeps talking about because I feel like we're trying to discuss something without knowing what's really the full story.

CHAIR DEMBO: And that - that may be one of the critical points, Steve, because it would take, honestly speaking, at least a two-hour Senate meeting to present everything the Task Force had available

2-9-04.txt

to it in terms of appendixes, pros, and cons of each of the options, the nuances of each. I -- I don't know if we have the time at this Senate meeting as a discussion to do that. But I hear what you're saying that that would be something important you'd need to know.

minutes

GROSSMAN: But we do have the five

it would take for Mike to read - Michael to read that?

CHAIR DEMBO: Would that be helpful then?

KENNEDY: This is an e-mail that I sent to the Senate Council and the Academic Affairs Committee meeting, and I'll excerpt it and make this as short as possible. I - it's sort of like trying to start off and explain chemistry, you know, I mean, you really have no background for this, and so I hope this will - this will enlighten you somewhat. This related to - I was reporting on the phone call. The most - the most important specific thing I learned was that if the decision was to move LCC to KCTCS, that would be a, quote, "major change," quote, and LCC would be visited by a substantive change committee, call it Committee X. Issues related to autonomy would go away, as would the 30 June expiration of LCC accreditation. That would be a new ball game. However,



2-9-04.txt

if we make changes - if we make changes to UK's administrative structure to make LCC autonomous but still part of UK but still separately accredited -- you see the problem -- then we would be visited by the special committee, call it Committee Y, and that was detailed in a letter, 3 July 2003, from SACS that would recommend to the 77-member SACS Commission on Colleges whether sufficient autonomy would have been gained to prevent ending LCC accreditation. The commission would vote. There is a risk there. The - the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees is quite disinclined to take that risk. I did ask the question: Suppose the LCC president and the UK president both reported to the current Board of Trustees? The answer was in that case, assuming all the other SACS' requirements, which means separate this, separate that, separate the other, separate legal offices, separate purchasing offices, and so on and so forth, that that would constitute autonomy. But then, of course, LCC wouldn't be part of UK. It would be - it would be competing with UK for attention from the same Board of Trustees. It would fall to the Board of Trustees to make decisions about

2-9-04.txt

buildings, revenue allocations, fund raising, and so on. A long story short, no matter how much we try to finagle, if UK and LCC are part of the same institution in any significant sense SACS will not be satisfied enough to accredit with institutions separately. And if we try and - decides - LCC loses its accreditation. So, I came away from the phone call convinced A, that SACs was somewhat shortsighted and bound by higher - I think the current situation works quite well and ought to be allowed. And B, that the only reasonable course of action was to recommend that LCC be administratively managed by KCTCS but with strong ties to UK where it mattered. Physical proximity, dorms, transferability of courses, dual enrollments, access to facilities, and so on. I plan to propose amendments to the February 10, AACR 1 that will emphasize this. And you have a copy of that. I really do think the issue has been looked at in detail. It wasn't just a timeline manner. Alice Sparks, Chair of ACC, has twice come before the Senate Council to get input and answer questions. If her views and that of the administration seem biased, I think it's because they have done a fairly close examination of the

2-9-04.txt

situation and come to the same conclusion that I have. That any other course of action is not - is not just not feasible for reasons of time but not feasible, period. The Senate Council did weigh in on this matter. I think they did a good job in enunciating concerns about the transfer of KCTCS. Its language was incorporated into AACR 1. I want to include additional language to recommend that the UK administration to coordinate and cooperate with LCC. Actions that may well result in even closer ties between the two institutions in important areas than now exist. So, that is basically my thinking on the matter. Yes.

CHAIR DEMBO: Mike.

CIBULL: Will LCC be autonomous from KCTCS? Will they have - I mean --

KENNEDY: Okay, right, again, it's Physics 101. What SACS wants to see in an autonomous institution is that it's either a freestanding institution or it's part of a system. KCTCS is a system. It has a board of trustees. It has a president.

CIBULL: We're not a system?

KENNEDY: What?

CIBULL: This isn't a system?

KENNEDY: UK is not a system. It's - it's an institution, and it has in it LCC, and that's the problem. We - the

2-9-04.txt

possibility - there would be the possibility of making a UK system which would be composed of the major, what we now think of as, UK except for LCC, the research institution, and LCC, each of which would have a president or a chancellor, and they would report to a president, and that president would report to the Board of Trustees. That's a possibility, but that puts a very large institution and a - and a fairly small institution together as a single system, and it adds another level of hierarchy. SACS would go for that.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Durant.

DURANT: David Durant. President Kerley, could you speak to - to - much of the discussion has been about the timeline and - and professions. Could you speak to the issue in terms of what when we refer -- now that the timeline seems relaxed, what - what your sense is that LCC prefers.

KERLEY: Very clearly, our faculty, staff, students - we have an Advisory Board at the college, all of them have passed resolutions to strongly emphasize to stay with UK, simply put. It's a very strong, strong preference across the board. We've done polls. I think 86, 87 percent of all of the faculty staff that

2-9-04.txt

responded to the poll, and about 75 percent responded, strongly preferred the number one option, stay with UK, simply put. So again, I - I echo that a lot because I have to speak for our faculty, staff, and students, and I will continue doing that. Clarification if I could, Jeff, it was mentioned that SACS doesn't care. They really - I'm - I'm talking to them on a regular basis, they don't care which option, but Mike and Mike are both right that they -- they want specifics, and it has to be - we have to give them some kind of answer. They -- this is a quote from SACS: They must have a convincing course of action. We must give them a convincing course of action, meaning, specific time lines what we want to do, what - when we want to accomplish it. Things have changed a little bit since the Task Force. I think Dr. Todd mentioned that today at the Academic Affairs Committee meeting, and it has changed a little bit that SACS is willing to give us a - they didn't say that before. Now, they're saying they are willing to give us a little more time if we give them a convincing argument that we want to stay with the University of Kentucky, simply put. So, Dr. Todd did mention that. I have mentioned that. There are things that have changed a

2-9-04.txt

little bit since the Task Force made their recommendation.

KENNEDY: So, Cibull, it would be fair to say that LCC is - is not in support of the action that was by the committee today?

KERLEY: No. As a whole, we are not across the board. All of our different groups at the college, again, that I've just mentioned are - are fully against it. Our students -- have 3,500 students right now that they've signed against that resolution. We are opposed to the idea of just having five years as far as the use of land. Again, those buildings were designed for Lexington Community College, and I take issue with that. But I think the Academic Affairs Committee has done a great job trying to - honestly trying to dissect the information, to understand it. They've also made concessions to give our students more options, you know, when we - if we were going to leave UK. So, I do thank them for that. It's not an easy decision, Mike. And this is a difficult decision and should not be easily made, in my opinion.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Grossman.

GROSSMAN: I have one question and one comment. The -- the question is about

2-9-04.txt

the KCTCS resolution in terms of moving and if LCC decides to become part of KCTCS, everything and immediately is under their system. Has there been any change in their position as this discussion has proceeded?

KERLEY: I think other people have talked to that.

SIEMER: Do you want to answer, Mike, or do you want to?

KENNEDY: Well, go ahead and then I'll see --

(AUDIENCE LAUGHS)

SIEMER: We've had - we've had lengthy conversations with Michael Cole, Ken Walker, the people over there. If you read the resolution, it says that's their preference, not their requirement, and - and they've agreed to - to actually make the transfer exactly as it was made before with no difference, and - and -- we don't see that as an impediment at all.

GROSSMAN: The - the comment I had was that it seems like deja vu all over again, in that a lot of what you say is exactly what was said several years ago when - when the community colleges were separated from UK, when the 14 out of the 15 community colleges were separated from UK and made part of KCTCS. It's fear of a change, fear of the unknown. It

2-9-04.txt

doesn't mean it's going to be worse. In most of the community colleges, I think, today are quite happy being part of KCTCS, even though at the time, a lot of them were very hesitant to be separated from UK. So, I wonder if - I - I know that you've said they prefer the status quo, but how much of that do you, in your opinion, maybe, you're not just unwilling to say or don't have much of a sense, but how much of that is looking at KCTCS and deciding: no, we don't want to be part of them, or just saying, well, we like it the way we are?

KERLEY: You know -- if I can answer that, I don't think there's a fear with our faculty staff. They're pretty outspoken, very independent individuals. They're not - they're not afraid of anything, in my opinion. I would not hesitate to go to battle or whatever with them. They're - they're not afraid. They feel like, and they - and I agree with them that there's high academics since 1997. The fall of '97, we had 5,500 students. Now, we have 8,700 students. We have - we've gone from minority faculty up, upward. Our - our students, African-American students have gone from 300-and-some-odd students to about 1,000 students distance learning



2-9-04.txt

from almost 0 to over 1,000. I could go on and tell you all the - all the - the reasons we should stay with UK. Funding has not done as well. That's a negative sign. We have not gotten a building, although we are in the Governor's budget now. We're excited about that. So, there are a lot of things that haven't gone as well, but I don't see any fear on our part. I think we could develop a creative model with UK and LCC. Again, there's no certain model anywhere in the country. There are a lot of different models and a lot of different shapes and colleges, and no one says it has to be with a university or a community college system or independent. All those work successfully in other states across the country.

CHAIR DEMBO: Gesund, and then I'll say something.

GESUND: I want to call for a motion that I hope will gain the acceptance that we back the faculty, students, and staff of KTC in whatever they want - LCC. Sorry. LCC, in whatever they have decided they want, their course of action. They are the ones who are going to have to live with it. And I - I think we ought to be backing them.

CHAIR DEMBO: The best we can do since it's not an action item on the Agenda, is to

2-9-04.txt

get a sense of the Senate. We could take a straw poll. The Senate may come up with other recommendations. One of the governing regulations says that the Board of Trustees relies on the President as well as the University Senate for recommendations regarding changes in - in academic organizational structure, and that's what this represents. So, getting back to Chair Reed's question: How would the Senate like to weigh in on this?

SPEAKER: We just heard - we just heard a proposal.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Steve.

YATES: I guess what you're saying is we should back the preference of the faculty and students at LCC. The other side of the coin is to back the Board of Trustees and the President and the faculty. That's the choice that's being asked to make by your resolution.

CHAIR DEMBO: Yes.

SPEAKER: Well, there is no resolution.

CHAIR DEMBO: You can - we can take a straw poll. You can instruct me.

BERGER: I have a question.

CHAIR DEMBO: Uh-huh (AFFIRMATIVE).

BERGER: From Mike Kennedy. I'm trying to get a better understanding of the problem, and maybe I'm a bit slow today. Rolando Berger, Medicine. But you said

2-9-04.txt

it is not feasible, it is not doable, and I keep hearing it through all the postings and e-mails that it cannot be done to keep at UK. Can you summarize in three sentences what is the unfeasible obstacle? I can't - there are part. What -- what is the thing that cannot be done that makes it impossible to keep LCC at UK but autonomous? I mean, there may be an obstacle, but I'm just not seeing it. What is -- what is unfeasible?

KENNEDY: What is not feasible is to keep LCC as part of UK as things are now. LCC would have to change - LCC would have to change so much, and UK would have to change so much to accommodate this --

BERGER: But Mike --

KENNEDY: -- that it's not feasible.

BERGER: -- what things need to be changed?

KENNEDY: I could give you - so...

CHAIR DEMBO: Jim, I wonder --

KERLEY: I'm sorry.

CHAIR DEMBO: -- to make it fair since we talked about - are there any LCC senators who would like to respond to Professor Berger's question.

HARDWICK: Don Hardwick from LCC. Talk about how hard all this is, we have two models. President Kerley has talked about both college in Arkansas and LSU, if I'm not mistaken. And would you

2-9-04.txt

tell - would you mind, Dr. Kerley, explaining the model that we try to follow, that it doesn't seem to be so hard from - of course, I'm sitting here saying that, but it's possible.

CHAIR DEMBO: Rolando, would that answer your question?

BERGER: I don't know. I haven't heard the answer.

(AUDIENCE LAUGHS)

NOONAN: Let him tell about that.

CHAIR DEMBO: Go ahead.

KERLEY: I - I can give you an example.

The University of Arkansas and Hope, I've talked to them several times. James Taylor, not the famous James Taylor, but he's the Chancellor of the Hope Community College. And I said, James, tell me - tell me how it's going at your college and what is your relationship with the University President? He said very open, very supportive, the President's very supportive to the community college mission. He lets me go to the Legislature to lobby for buildings. He - we have our own Faculty Senate. That's the difference. We have our own private foundation to raise money. We - we are able to do our own contracts. Sometimes with the University, sometimes outside of the University. Those are a

2-9-04.txt  
couple of key things. Our budget is -  
we - we answer to the Board of Trustees.  
The - the head of the community college  
is on the Cabinet of the University  
President. They answer to the Board of  
Trustees on all curriculum items and any  
agenda items in front of the Board of  
Trustees. It's the head of the community  
college answering, but the relationship  
with the head of the community college  
and the Chancellor is very open, very  
supportive. New buildings would not be  
in competition with University buildings.  
It's - it's presented separately to the  
Arkansas Legislature. So, the answers -  
the answer is it can be done. It is  
complicated, but it can be done. SACS is  
willing to work with us on that. There  
are some risks, as other individuals have  
mentioned. There are some risks with  
that. They might not accept the whole  
thing, but - but I think if we had,  
again, a firm commitment from the Board  
and the Administration, I think it can be  
done. That's the answer. And that's  
recent information, even since the Task  
Force that has sort of changed a little  
bit - even my opinion somewhat. Does  
that help?

BERGER: Yeah. You told me it can be  
done. Could I hear from somebody who  
says it can't be done?

2-9-04.txt

KERLEY: I - I personally don't like the word "can't." I mean, can't is not the - I think - I think it can be done if there's a will - if there's a will for it to be done.

BERGER: Well, I know you think it can be done.

KERLEY: Yes.

BERGER: Anybody who thinks it cannot be done, we would be nice to hear why they think it cannot be done.

KENNEDY: Well, that is not just a community college and a major university. There is a state system in Arkansas that is comprised of seven or eight institutions, one of which is community college, and they all report to a president of that system, who reports to the board, as I understand it.

KERLEY: Well, we have the University of Arkansas system. They have an Arkansas State. There's several different ones. The University of Arkansas has the community college as well as some regional four-year colleges, but there - it's not just one system in Arkansas.

CHAIR DEMBO: Tagavi and then Ernie.

TAGAVI: Chancellor Kerley, I'm sorry, President Kerley, I - did I hear you correctly that the Chancellor of Hope reports to the President of whatever

2-9-04. txt  
uni versi ty?

KERLEY: Oh, the Uni versi ty of Arkansas,  
right.

TAGAVI : Is that acceptable to you or to  
LCC i f you --

KERLEY: Yes.

TAGAVI : - become autonomous but report  
to Presi dent Todd?

KERLEY: That could work according to  
SACS. They sai d we could - I could  
report di rectly to the Presi dent or I  
could report to the Board of Trustees.

TAGAVI : Okay. I di dn' t know that.  
Thank you.

CHAIR DEMBO: I think, Ernie, di d you have  
your hand up, or --

YANERALLA: I' m - I' m not clear on that,  
and, perhaps, what Mi ke' s about to say,  
maybe.

CHAIR DEMBO: Provost Ni etzel .

NI ETZEL: The Uni versi ty of Arkansas has  
a Presi dent over the system. And then  
each i nsti tuti on has a Chancell or that  
reports to that Presi dent. The  
Uni versi ty of Arkansas Research  
Uni versi ty is at Fayetteville. It has a  
Chancell or. That Chancell or has a  
relati onshi p to the Uni versi ty of  
Arkansas at Fayetteville, I i ke Lee Todd  
does to this campus. It' s called a  
Chancell or there rather than a Presi dent,  
because there' s a Presi dent over the

2-9-04.txt

system. And the system in the University of Arkansas consists of multiple institutions. It consists of a research university, several four-year colleges and several community colleges. So, it's really very different than what we're talking about here. I am not aware of anywhere in the United States in which you have a system composed of a research-intensive university and a community college. And what I heard, and again, Michael or - or Jim can comment on this, we were given two options in the phone call in terms of the governance. Both Presidents, Kerley and Todd, could report to the Board of Trustees. I suspect there's not a great deal of appetite for that kind of arrangement with the Board. Or you could have a system created in which you would have a President over it and two Chancellors, one of UK and the other LCC reporting to that President.

KERLEY: Mike, that isn't --

CHAIR DEMBO: Is there something factually incorrect here?

KERLEY: Some factual, basically, I think what SACS said is that you would not have to create a system. That - that you could do it within the University of Kentucky, Mike, that you



2-9-04.txt

would not have to create a University of Kentucky system. But it could be done under the current structure if you - if you committed to the autonomy that's needed for the institution.

NIETZEL: No, I didn't hear it that way, because what you would then have is the LCC reporting to the President of this institution, and that would not be autonomous. The only way you're going to have autonomy is to create a situation in which the heads of institutions report to the same level, and that level can be someone that is atop the system, as a president is, or to a board.

CHAIR DEMBO: Let's take a time out for a second. So, once - and getting back to the issue, thus far the Senate has not been given the opportunity to weigh in on the issue, and most of that was probably because of the perceived timing. It so happens now that the timing is tomorrow is the Board meeting at which our faculty and staff trustees, as well as the remainder of the Board, will be voting on this issue. And the Chair wants to know how the Senate would like to weigh in. Now, I interpret that very broadly. Whether the Senate wants to give an opinion one way or the other, or the Senate can say it does not have an opinion at this time, but I'd like to

2-9-04.txt

give the Chair something to take back to that meeting.

GESUND: Well, you have a suggested motion.

CIBULL: I'd like to speak against that. I don't - I think that it's sort of silly to say we'll - we'll go along with whatever they say. I mean, that's not - that's not what we've been asked to do. We've been asked to give our - our opinion. Now, if we can't give an opinion because we don't have satisfactory information, that's our opinion. I guess, I would really like to know which one of these two gentlemen is correct because if LCC - if LCC can report to the President of the University, Dr. Todd, then I would be all in favor of going full ahead with having LCC stay with the University because it could be worked out, I would think, if LCC would - could report to the - to Dr. Todd or the President of the University. If, however, Dr. Nietzel is correct, and it would require essentially equal standing between LCC and the University of Kentucky, I really don't see how that's going to work. So, I think it would be an important question to answer before we make a judgment.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Yanarella.

thi nki ng

YANARELLA:

2-9-04. txt

I've been - I've been

about this very hard over the last two months. It's really been an incredible education over the last week or so, at least since we had our last Senate Council meeting. An enormous amount of information has come to light in that - in that time. And I - Hans, I'm -- I'm not particularly supportive of your resolution because I think it - it misses the basic issue, and that is that this debate has come up a day late and a dollar short or some academic equivalent of this in the sense that - that all of a sudden in the last couple of weeks, we're getting an extraordinary amount of information that suggests there was - there seems to be a lot more maneuvering in the decision, but the whole process itself has been very heavily influenced by a perception that SACS has been the overriding problem, and that the timeline has been such that we - we didn't - we couldn't really consider those options. It was only last week that some of us asked Alice Sparks as chair of the Academic Affairs Committee to call SACS and find out where they stood in terms of the - of the -- the different options. It would seem to me that the original Task Force should have

2-9-04.txt  
been in continual consultation with  
the - with the key members of SACS  
asking for very clear information about  
their receptivity to one option - to the  
range of options that were being  
considered. I mean, I only learned in  
the last week or so that - that indeed  
the Task Force preferred Option One, but  
believing that indeed SACS was - was -  
it's position was a key obstacle, then  
turn to - to the other - the other  
option. I think if - I think we have to  
say - if we're going to say anything, I  
think we need to say something about the  
process, that the process in some way was  
an adequate or flawed or biased in such a  
way as to create a perception of a  
smaller range of options than others. As  
a member of the Senate Council, as a  
member of the Senate, I would have liked  
to have had the opportunity to - to  
examine the full range of options. I  
would have liked to have had the  
opportunity to look at the -- the pluses  
and the minuses of each one of them so  
that we could make our own autonomous  
decision. What we're being asked to do  
right now, the day before a - before a  
decision is probably going to be made by  
the Board of Trustees, on the very day  
that the Academic Affairs Committee  
working from a whole set of assumptions

2-9-04.txt

that we had been working from as well in trying to put together a humane resolution, we're being - we're being asked in this situation to become incredibly educated when in fact we - over the last - the last year or so, there has been a perception that has, I think, constrained our ability to secure the kind of information that we could - that we would need in order to make a - a reasonable decision.

SPEAKER: So, what do you propose?

YARNARELLA: What I would - what I would propose would be something akin to an alternate sense of the Senate that we believe that the - the process by which this - this resolution has come forth to the Board was - was unduly constrained by certain assumptions that operated, and that had we, and perhaps other constituencies, been - been aware of that - of that greater range of - of maneuver, we would have been able to provide a more independent decision. And don't ask me to repeat that.

(AUDIENCE LAUGHS)

CHAIR DEMBO: That's okay. Rebecca has it all taken down for you. Wally.

FERRIER: Wally Ferrier, B&E. In extending Professor Yarnarella's logic, is it possible that the sense of the

2-9-04.txt

Senate could be that the Board of Trustees kind of tables discussion and decision on this at tomorrow's meeting?

CHAIR DEMBO: The Board of Trustees relies on the advice of the Senate. So, the Senate can advise them in any way it sees - it sees fit. Jim.

ALBI SETTI: I would echo a couple of things said before Steve Yates comments about how unusual the situation created in 1998 was with one of the community colleges staying which is - seemed odd. That when this was first discussed last fall, the big concern was about the status of UK rules versus KCTCS rules for faculty primarily. It seems from what Dick Siemer says that it's been resolved from the amendments brought forward by Michael Kennedy. It seems that the resolution from the Academic Affairs Committee has added additional protections. The geographic proximity of the library, of the sports facilities, the culture will be there for LCC students even if they're part of KCTS. I think that the draft resolution is a proper response to the situation that will correct an anomaly left in 1998.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Abel.

ABEL: I'm Eileen Abel. I'm Chair of Community and Business Technology at LCC and I'm also a Senator. I think that that's a

2-9-04.txt

little bit of a misperception that the only issue for us was how we were going to fall under in terms of personnel. What we have in the resolution is language that we'd lose our buildings in five years. And who knows, given the state of the legislature now, granted we have been given a little bit of money, where do we put this 28.8 million dollar building? We can't put it on our campus because suddenly UK can say it belongs to them. And I think that the proximity can't be overvalued for a couple of reasons. I do think that one of the things that I have certainly seen since 1997 when we were put under the jurisdiction of UK, not jurisdiction, since we had a different relationship with UK than the other community colleges, is that we have a different level of programs than KCTCS, and I think that that's one of the things that we see being threatened right now is that our technical programs are different in terms of requirements than what KCTCS has. And I think that the faculty and the students perceive that as being a very real threat. So, I think that not just the programs and not just the loss of the buildings, but for students who come here, particularly first general college

2-9-04.txt

students who come to LCC, they go home, and they see themselves as UK students, and I think that loss of proximity and loss of UK name will affect our student body in ways that we can't or haven't even begun to think of. So, you know, for those of you who say, well, you know, it's just a change or it really just doesn't matter, I think that those fears are not that easily dismissible.

CHAIR DEMBO: We have no more than two minutes that we can spend on this because we have other agenda items.

KENNEDY: There's a misperception there about the buildings, though. The amendment to the AACR 1 was that LCC's building and grounds would be guaranteed for five years, that's Part A. Part B is that LCC would not - that UK would not ask for those buildings until LCC had another campus to move to, if ever.

ABEL: But in fact, that does damage our proximity. I mean, if we guarantee the students that, well, for six years you can have this, that or the other thing. I mean, they're still not going to have access to the library either way. I mean, they're not likely to drive over here and use the library. They're not likely to drive over here and use the writing center. I mean, that's -- in fact, that will change.



2-9-04.txt

KENNEDY: My guess is that there will always be LCC - a part of LCC on - in the area where you are now.

CHAIR DEMBO: Daryl.

JENNINGS: I'm just asking for an additional point of factual information. If - if the option to try and work out an arrangement staying within UK were tried, it's my understanding that one risk is that might not be acceptable to SACS, and then - and the accreditation could be lost. I'm assuming the fall-back position at that point would have to be to then to make LCC a college within the University in order to preserve accreditation at that point. Is that - is your sense is that an acceptable risk, or is that an acceptable fall-back position to - to that direction to the faculty and students at LCC?

KERLEY: If I could answer that, I would say that's not - that's not acceptable. We would not want to lose our separate accreditation, or to me that - we would be losing our face and jeopardize our mission of open access.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Can you help me out now with what I should be telling Chair Reed?

SPEAKER: Jeff.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Noonan.

NOONAN: I'm still con - I think we'd

2-9-04.txt

all like to have things stay like they are, but we - we don't have that choice. And I'm still not sure - you mention the system in Arkansas which doesn't seem to fit with UK, and - and I haven't heard anybody come up with any kind of a plan that would make the other one work. Is there such a plan possible, Mike?

NIETZEL: To make what work?

NOONAN: To make it so that we can stay like we are, that they would be - that they would have autonomy within the UK system. It doesn't seem to me we've - anybody's come up of a way that we could really do this.

NIETZEL: Well, I think for two years we did try to satisfy through adjustments. Would that be a proper word, you think, Jim?

ALBI SETTI: Yeah. We've got to make some adjustments.

NIETZEL: To make adjustments to keep it the way it was where they would be separately accredited as part of the University of Kentucky. And the consultant actually that LCC brought in said we were - we were far away from what - what was required. As a matter of fact, having looked at the tape of that consultant's comments to the LCC faculty, the first thing that she said was, in fact, I look up here, and it says

2-9-04.txt

UK-LCC. That doesn't sound like an autonomous institution to me. So, many of the things actually that define how well this relationship has worked over the years can be found to be objectionable from the point of view of autonomy between the two institutions. And so, when we tried to work this initially when SACS came back, it was to say: But look how well we function together, and we tended to dig the hole deeper each time we did that.

NOONAN: I mean, I -- I think we have -  
if - if - if you go the other way,  
it's possible that LCC will be in a much  
worse shape than they are now because the  
way they're in such a good shape is  
because they're in noncompliance.

(AUDIENCE LAUGHS)

KERLEY: Going to be renegades.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. So, let me do another  
timeout here. Given what you've heard up  
to now and given that the Senate's input  
would be important, okay, how many of you  
have heard enough to know which opinion  
you would take about the route to go? In  
other words, how much - how many of you  
feel you've been given enough information  
to even make a decision? This is a straw  
poll. How many feel you have not been  
given the opportunity to get enough

information to make a decision? So, it's kind of half and half. Professor Tagavi.

TAGAVI: Yeah. I think you asked two or three times: Can I make this a straw resolution?

CHAIR DEMBO: A straw resolution.

(AUDIENCE LAUGHS)

TAGAVI: That -- that the Senate declines to make opinion beyond what they have already made in the past through Senate Council and beyond what we have said, that we just don't have enough information to make a strong opinion on one side or the other side. This is just too late to make an educated opinion.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Would anybody add to that or disagree?

DURANT: I --

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Durant.

DURANT: Dave Durant. This is a chance for the -- for the Senate to have some input on a fairly important matter. I think to say that we weren't given enough information -- is not appropriate. I think we need to ask the Board of Trustees to consider that the new timeline and see if there's a way to work out what the LCC wants. So, I - I would move - I think that - I think that it is an abdication of our responsibility to say, again, here we are at the point where we could have some input, but we

2-9-04.txt

don't want to.

TAGAVI: What would you say? What would you recommend?

DURANT: My comment is that if we were to wait long enough to take into account the factor of time.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Grossman.

GROSSMAN: My - my sense about this is that a lot of very smart people who know a lot about administrations and academic organization have thought about this a very long time, and have - and have come to a far better conclusion about this than we could sitting here talking about it for a half an hour. I mean, I - I believe that Mike and Mike and Jim and Davy and President Todd will come to some sort of consensus and present it to the Board as to what is the best course of action, and I'm - and they have - they're far more invested in this and know far more about it than I do. So, I guess, I guess, what I'm saying is I agree with Kaveh. I don't - I - I just think that this is not the appropriate place for these intricate issues to be hashed out.

CHAIR DEMBO: So, if - if we're to take a straw vote based on what Kaveh has recommended, that is to tell the Board - why don't you say it again, Kaveh?

2-9-04.txt

TAGAVI: We are not going to make any specific position beyond what we have said already through Senate Council or other committee or task force or whatever, and what we have said they can perhaps, I don't know - read what we said - is there a tape?

CHAIR DEMBO: There's a tape, and we have some expedited minutes we can send to them.

TAGAVI: That's - that's my verdict.

CHAIR DEMBO: So, if we were to take a straw poll on that resolution - a straw resolution right now, how many would be in favor of that? Could you take a straw vote? Just a general sense.

SPEAKER: Forty-one, I believe.

CHAIR DEMBO: How many would not support Professor Tagavi's resolution?

SPEAKER: Four.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Those who would oppose it, do you have anything else to put in its place?

KENNEDY: Did you ask for abstentions?

CHAIR DEMBO: Are there - are there abstentions? Okay. It's not a formal vote. Professor Yarnarella.

YARNARELLA: I agree with the - the general spirit of Kaveh's position, but I would - I would - I would be willing to vote for it if it included some of - illusion to the fact that - that the

2-9-04.txt

process as it was biased by a misperception of SACS' position had the effect of creating - of - of underlyingly constraining the range of discussion and the amount of information that would have allowed us to reach an independent - an independent recommendation.

TAGAVI: I can accept that if I know.  
That's no problem.

SPEAKER: We already voted on it.

CHAIR DEMBO: Chuck.

STABEN: Jeff - Chuck Staben, Biology.

So, this draft that's been presented is - is essentially the alternative to simply say that this draft does represent the reasonable opinion of the Senate, correct? I mean, wasn't this presented to us to say that is the alternative, not saying something or saying that LCC faculty should say something, or a number of the alternatives that have been discussed. You asked for what is the reasonable alternative, isn't this it?

CIBULL: You could make a motion to accept this, yes.

STABEN: We could make a motion to accept this as the recommendation?

CIBULL: To support it.

STABEN: To support this recommendation?

CHAIR DEMBO: Again, it will be a straw poll.

STABEN: A straw poll?

2-9-04.txt

CHAIR DEMBO: Yes.

STABEN: I guess, I would like to do that. It seems to me, and I'll just be very briefly, that this does make sense as an academic organization that the community colleges in Kentucky should belong to a community college system which is effectively what this does. And - and we do have a somewhat different mission, and no matter that, perhaps, the process hasn't involved as long a consideration of that as we might like, this is actually a very reasonable proposal to me.

CHAIR DEMBO: Any responses to that?

WYATT: Could I say something? Thank you.

CHAIR DEMBO: Introduce yourself, please.

WYATT: Yes. My name is Nelda Wyatt. I teach history at LCC. And I here just as an invited guest. There have been a lot of things, I don't know if I can try and point to each one of them. First of all, the things about LCC and the other community colleges, LCC geographically was never like the other community colleges. We were never created - it was always very different. That's very quickly why we were not separated from them in the first place. I think we -- also I want to make the point that as faculty, no, I would care less that UK is



2-9-04.txt

on my paycheck. That's not what this is about. It doesn't matter. What matters is the students. We do a great job with the students. The way this works now is excellent. It's not broken. It - there have been so many false frames in my opinion, so many smokescreens about what is going on here. And it's really not that difficult for LCC to be independently accredited under UK's Board of Trustees. The idea that it's somehow going to be easier for us to go to KCTCS is not the case. That's going to be even more complicated, in my opinion. And thank you, I have to go teach a class.

CHAIR DEMBO: Mike.

CIBULL: I'd like to speak against that resolution. I think LCC has a special relationship with the University of Kentucky. It prepares students who would not otherwise be able to graduate from the University to graduate from this University. It transfers a lot of students to the University of Kentucky and become successful. It is - it is an access to the University of Kentucky for students who would not otherwise have access. So, from that standpoint, I think it's different. I would also like to - to just reiterate that I don't think that I have a full set of

2-9-04.txt

information to make a decision on. I'm hearing contradictory statements about what SACS is saying or not saying. So, I would - I would not want to accept this - this document as right now. What I would like to do is recommend to the Board of Trustees recognize, and I think they do, that special relationship and try to resolve those still yet unresolvable - unresolved questions from SACS and then make a decision. It shouldn't take, you know, months to do that. It should - there are specific questions that we've asked that they should be able to go back to SACS and have answered very - in a very straightforward fashion and then make their decision. If the answers are all, you know: You can't do this without having LCC being absolutely independent of UK, then - then I think UK - then this - this body is going to have to accept that, that draft.

CHAIR DEMBO: Would it be a fair statement for me to say that there are some of you who feel strongly that there has not been enough information, and some of you who do? There's some of you who feel that of the choices given, that supporting the current choice of the Academic Affairs Committee would be a choice that they could support. Are there others of you

2-9-04.txt

who would not support that? When I -  
I - okay. Okay. Chuck. Chuck, your  
resolution, to be fair, because we've  
presented copies to support --

STABEN: We took a straw poll to see how  
many support --

CHAIR DEMBO: The Academic Affairs Committee  
recommendation that's going before the  
Board tomorrow. Okay. Again, a straw  
vote, how many would support it?

SOHNER: Fifteen.

CHAIR DEMBO: How many would speak against  
it?

SOHNER: Thirty-four.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Abstentions? Topsy.

STATEN: Ruth, College of Nursing.

We are really caught between a rock and  
a hard spot. That's why we can't  
deliberate on this or offer a solution  
because there's not one, I don't think,  
for us to offer. We believe that the  
people involved in the decision have  
taken a lot of time to consider it. We  
want to support our students and our  
faculty and our staff at LCC. I don't  
see how we can, today, come up with  
something meaningful other than to say  
those two things, and I think that's  
where people's rub is. We believe that a  
lot of thought has gone into this and  
probably really good thought, but we are

2-9-04.txt

very concerned about our colleagues, our students and our - our staff at LCC.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. We have time for two more comments, then we have to cut it short. Okay. You had your hand up for awhile.

FINNEY: I'm Greg Finney, faculty member and Senator at LCC. I would just say if - if that is the goal of - to support, first of all, students and then staff and faculty at Lexington Community College, you've heard that voiced. It's been polled. It's -- clearly as a faculty member, I think that the main thing that I want to protect, as the gentleman up front spoke about and Dr. Abel spoke about, is that this unique situation and what it offers our students. The faculty see it. The staff see it. The students recognize it. And that is that academically, not just from developmental courses, although those are very important, but academically, socially, and culturally, we do a service to the students at LCC and the State of Kentucky that will be lost if we are moved to KCTCS, which I respect that organization, but I -- what -- as I see happening, we'll have these buildings for five years. I'll be amazed if we move to KCTCS if we're able to maintain that. If we lose that, that unique situation is

2-9-04.txt

gone, and what we're able to offer those students, and I think if we look at the State of Kentucky is an incredible service that we can offer these students. And it's very clear as far as where those students, faculty and staff are.

CHAIR DEMBO: Since we haven't heard from any students yet.

KAALUND: I mean, I sit on the Senate Council, and I'm a student here and staff. At this point, Jeff, I think it's probably just best to forward to the Board of Trustees the expedited minutes because it's obvious from the various resolution, straw votes that we've taken, that the Senate is of an extremely divided opinion, and no consensus will come in the limited amount of time that we have left. And I don't know if there's really time for us to really get all of the information that we want. So, I think it's best at this point to simply say that there is no full opinion and just say, you know, here's what we've discussed. Here's the votes. Here's what we've done. And just let them do it as they please.

CHAIR DEMBO: That's - I think that's exactly what I'll do, Braphus. And as fair-minded as - a manner as possible, I'll summarize the nature of what we

2-9-04.txt

discussed for bullet points as well as to have Rebecca's minutes sent to the Board for their consideration. There is - I appreciate it. I understand it's a very difficult position. And it's probably the - the most contentious and thorniest issue that the University has dealt with in - in a long period of time.

NOONAN: Can I just say one - I don't think there's any provision - I think we all actually want the same thing, we just don't know how to get there. We want it to be like it is now. And they tell us we can't keep it this way. And so, I mean, there isn't - everybody wants this. We'd like it to stay like it is, but we can't.

CHAIR DEMBO: Well, and on an optimistic note, when we were thrust together by the House - by House Bill 1 back in the late '90s, we made it work. So, I have no doubts that we can make it work no matter how it turns out.

We need to vote on this because the registrar will need to know whether or not to adopt a winter session because part of the Agenda today is to approve the academic calendars. The Provost, at a breakfast with us back in October, I believe, with us, the Senate Council, we hashed out the idea of the potential benefits of the winter intersession, that

2-9-04.txt

is to offer a brief but intense opportunity for students to take courses over what would ordinarily be the winter break. After that, the Senate Council and the Provost iterated several times what some of the concerns were. Posted on the Web site, you saw the Senate Council's letter to the Provost, and the Provost's detailed response. And initially, the Senate Council was - was not going to send us forward with a positive recommendation, but then we had further discussion, and the Provost came to the Senate Council in early January where we hashed out some of the concerns that we had. As a result of that discussion, the Senate Council now recommends - gives a positive recommendation to having a pilot winter intersession. Pilot meaning - actually, Mike, why don't you describe what your idea of a pilot is?

NIETZEL: Pilot would be -- I think we agreed on something around a dozen courses that would be offered essentially between the time of finals in the fall semester concluded and the first day of classes in the spring semester began. Those would be courses that would involve new experimental or innovative courses, study abroad. In some cases, they would

2-9-04.txt

be courses that would help students potentially who have fallen behind on time toward a degree to catch up. The idea was that the departments would work on courses that made the most sense for them to offer during this period of time, recognizing that some courses don't work as well in - in a compressed time frame as others. And we looked to a variety of other institutions that have winter intersessions to see the kinds of courses that were included there. Language instruction is a major one. Study abroad is a major one. Reading courses are significant in terms of the enrollment of students in them at - at a variety of institutions. So, the pilot basically, I think you've got the - yeah, there's the - is this the schedule, Jeff?

CHAIR DEMBO: Yes. Yes. This is from the registrar's office. So, basically, it would - it would go from one week before Christmas vacation and would go for one week after Christmas vacation. Classes in session four hours a day; is that right?

NIETZEL: Right. With assignments during the holiday break also possible. Of course, if it's an online course which some of these would be, the activity could continue during - certainly during that week. We would require that the syllabus for each of these courses be



2-9-04.txt

posted on the Web in advance so students know what the expectations are. We would limit students to one course enrollment during the intersession. There are a variety of other specific mechanisms that we agreed to try to give students sufficient notification about the demands and expectations of this course before they signed up for it since the drop period would obviously be quite short for them. It would really have to take place, I think, on the first day of class.

CHAIR DEMBO: And the other thing we discussed at the Senate Council was the idea that this is a pilot schedule, and if it - if it goes well, then one of the things we can look at is to look at the entire academic calendar to see if there was a way to start this intersession a little bit sooner, and, you know, there may be some flexibility that we can create. Steve.

YATES: I have two questions in mind. One of them is would the usual constraints on number of students required to offer a course hold, and do you anticipate that this is going to be revenue neutral? Is it going to make money? Is it - what - what finances are --

2-9-04.txt

NIETZEL: I think it will make money because I think that it will - the - the history at other institutions, Steve, has been for this intersession to really grow and for a number of courses to be added because students have voted with their feet with these intersessions. They really like - they really like this opportunity. So, unlike tax modernization, this is a policy that would not have to be revenue neutral, and I would think we would be enthusiastic about that. What was your first question?

YATES: The number of students required to offer --

NIETZEL: Well, we have to look at that to make sure it's not a revenue loser. And --

YATES: That's the constraint?

NIETZEL: Yes.

YATES: So, it has to --

NIETZEL: We - we need to come out at least neutral on it. Essentially, the Administration - the President's office has taken the position that this one's sort of on the Provost's back as far as the revenue issue. So, if we make some money on it, it goes back to the academic programs. I'm going to have to backstop it if we lose money on it. So, we will have to look at the enrollments closely.

2-9-04.txt

And if there's a course, for example, with three students in it, we're probably not going to be able to offer it because we would - unless that can be offset by a course in which they're very nice enrollments that would bring in the tuition for it, and over the course of those 12 courses, get us to at least a neutral point.

CHAIR DEMBO: Questions? Professor Arthur.

ARTHUR: Mary Arthur, College of Agriculture. This is, I guess, another question for Mike. Winter intersessions that I know about occur with three consecutive weeks not broken up by Christmas break. I'm wondering if in the universities that you looked out whether they also had this broke-up schedule?

NIETZEL: Jim, I'm going to ask Phil Greasley. There's all different kinds of schedules really, Mary. And Phil has more details than - than I on how other universities have done it. I am aware of some that bridge that week period. Can you answer with some more detail on that, Phil?

GREASLEY: Yes. We looked and we found

schools offering this schedule. That doesn't mean that's all of them. But we found 32 including several that are quite

2-9-04.txt

respected. Centre College, Cornell, MIT, Ohio University, Oklahoma State, Rhode Island School of Design, Universities of Arizona, Connecticut, Delaware, Hartford, Idaho, Iowa, Maryland College Park, Miami, Montana, and so on and so on and so on. There's many more, I'm just giving you the names you're most likely to relate to. Most of them are J terms, that's accurate, but not all of them. There are several that - that start in December break and then finish up in January. Some have a shorter time period than UK.

NIETZEL: One thing we wanted to avoid, Mary, was pushing the end of the spring semester back very far, although some institutions have done that. So, we've preferred to go with an arrangement where we bridged over that - that week, given that others that have done it have been pretty successful with it.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Grossman.

GROSSMAN: What are the implications for faculty DOE's? Are you going to count the course taught during this time as an overload, or are you going to provide extra compensation of faculty? I'm just wondering what the costs of this on the faculty side are in terms of faculty workload are.

2-9-04.txt

NIETZEL: My assumption is that the faculty who wanted to offer this course would not be doing it in load, that there would be a payment made to them for the course, Bob. Now, is it possible that in some departments a faculty member and a chair might negotiate this as an in-load assignment, that's possible, and that would be fine. But my presumption is most people would be doing this as a compensated overload.

CHAIR DEMBO: Any other questions about the nature? Doug.

MICHAEL: Doug Michael, College of Law. Is that quoted language there what you're asking the Senate to vote on today? I want to be clear what's on the floor in front of us.

CHAIR DEMBO: There's actually two parts to it. First, is for the Senate to endorse the concept - actually there's three parts. One, is to endorse the concept of a winter intersession. And along with that would go a modification in the University calendar for 2004-2005 to permit that. And then the third aspect is, that it would technically require us to waive Rule 5.2.1 for this isolated pilot. After which because of - of the wording in it --

MICHAEL: And I have some questions.

CHAIR DEMBO: Yes.

2-9-04.txt

MICHAEL: First, I -- I don't know that endorse concepts. I mean, you've asked for approval of the pilot program. I want to be clear that that's for one year, and that's why I'm asking for language. And secondly, modification to the University calendar, what I saw was correspondence between the Senate Council and the Provost with a number of suggestions. I mean, I'm concerned about the breadth of what's on the table. You suggested, well, maybe we can start earlier in the fall and zip away the fall break. Well, you're just making astonishing suggestions here, you know, that's sort of at the last minute in how those are really on the table. How much of that are we authorizing you-all to sort of do.

CHAIR DEMBO: No. We didn't mean to do that. The pilot that the Senate Council and the Provost talked about was specifically this calendar year for this one year that it would be offered as a pilot. Is that right, Mike.

NIETZEL: Yes.

MICHAEL: Okay. Well, that falls far short of endorsing a concept of a pilot. Of course, that's why I wanted to be clear what you wanted us to say. I mean, that falls far short from endorsing a

2-9-04.txt

concept. That endorses a pilot program. It says: Let's try this and see how it works. That's very different.

CHAIR DEMBO: Eliminate the word "concept". Endorsing a - a pilot program. Does that help? Any other questions about this?

TAGAVI: Can I just add that you kind of concerned me at the beginning and what hits you right immediately is the short duration of this. But then a couple of things I take into consideration. One, is the - this is the only course the student would have. Sometimes I would love to teach one course to a student whose only course is my course and see what happens. And on top of that, these are selected courses. I don't think Thermal Dynamics 1 is going to be one of these. English 101 might not be. I do not know, but these are going to be only selected courses, which is perfect for a - this type of winter course. And he said pilot course. It might have a big reward, so I think this is really - is justified to do it as a - as a pilot. I just want to mention that.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Any other comments or questions about it?

BLACKWELL: Something just occurred to me. Did we check with SACS about the thing about the concentration of hours.

2-9-04.txt

SPEAKER: Strangely enough, SACS did occur to us. Do you want to comment on what's required?

GREASLEY: SACS has - has no time limit on it, no minimum time.

BLACKWELL: Okay.

CHAIR DEMBO: There being one more question?

STABEN: How will the success of this pilot, or whatever we want to call it, be evaluated?

CHAIR DEMBO: The Senate Council was deliberating between having the Council assess the success of these or having faculty provide their own methods for evaluating it. We felt the latter was better, so that if somebody's going to be giving this course, they should provide some method by which they'll evaluate the success of giving a winter course. Did that answer that?

STABEN: Yes.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. There being no further questions, all in favor of - of approving this - not a concept, a pilot winter session for 2004-2005 which also would include waiving Senate Rule 5.2.1, signify by saying aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR DEMBO: Any opposed? Any abstentions?  
Now, there was one more action item on the Agenda, but if I talk very



2-9-04.txt  
slowly and people happen to walk out of  
the room, we might lose a quorum. So,  
it's - it concerned the definition of a  
family. Is that something you'd like to  
talk about now, or are people going to  
start walking out?

(AUDIENCE LAUGHS)

CHAIR DEMBO: Provost Nietzel, thank you for  
coming, and we're sorry to have to put  
your talk off until next time. We look  
forward to it.

\* \* \* \* \*

(MEETING CONCLUDED AT 5:00 P. M.)

\* \* \* \* \*



2-9-04. txt

---

MARLA FRYE, CSR, BCR  
NOTARY PUBLIC  
STATE-AT-LARGE  
K E N T U C K Y