

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE

* * * * *

Regular Session

April 12, 2004

3:00 p.m.

W. T. Young Library

First Floor Auditorium

Lexington, Kentucky

Dr. Jeffrey Dembo, Chair

An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.

179 East Maxwell Street

Lexington, Kentucky 40515

(859) 254-0568

University of Kentucky Senate

April 12, 2004

* * * * *

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: The meeting is called to order.

One of the marks of my doing a good job
today is to be able to hand over this
gavel to Ernie Yanarella at the end of
the meeting. So that's what we need to
accomplish by 5:00 today. I don't know
what's going to happen if we don't,
Ernie. I'm just, boy, I don't know. So,
I'm trying to stick to a very tight time
schedule today with, I think, enough time

to intelligently and collegially discuss all the issues and to have the Senate make an informed vote. I also hope that there's an extra minute or two in there somewhere. If it does look like we'll complete our meeting, I have a few words I'd like to say in my role as presiding officer at the last meeting of the University Senate during my term.

The minutes from March 8th, we didn't receive, Rebecca, I don't think any recommended changes and, so, without any objections, the minutes will stand approved as written.

I have several announcements to make. The first is, you know, my role as - as presiding officer and Senate Council Chair, was supposed to announce to the Senate when there have been rules waived on behalf of the Senate. Some - a year or two ago, the Senate Council decided that we should form a separate ad hoc committee on student reinstatements. The Senate Rules state that if you've been suspended from UK a second time, you cannot be readmitted. However, there are select circumstances where the rule has been waived owing to very special

circumstances, and the college, in fact, comes forward and asks the Senate to waive the rule. So, the ad hoc committee has been made up of myself, Kaveh Tagavi and Braphus Kaalund, all members of the Senate Council. And there have been four of these reinstatements during the 2004 year. One, January 3, and March. So, I'm announcing that to you. And there's also been one grade change. The Senate Rules state that a grade cannot be changed for a second time. However, in this case, there was somebody whose I grade reverted to an E but, in fact, the work that was supposed to have been done, was done, so the college sent it forward recommending that the correct final grade be given which was an A for that student. And that's been taken care of.

Another announcement, faculty Trustee elections will begin this Wednesday, April 14. It's going to be an electronically-based election as we did last time. All the bugs have been worked out of the software. There's going to be information on the Web site for faculty who have difficulty logging on, using their U-connect ID. There's going to be a broadcast e-mail that should go out, I

guess, tonight or tomorrow --

SPEAKER: Tomorrow.

CHAIR DEMBO: -- tomorrow to go to all faculty. The slot that's going to be vacated is that of Davy Jones. As you may recall, Davy was filling in for a departed Trustee, Claire Pomeroy from the College of Medicine who went to the West Coast. And by the rules, Davy had to fill in Claire's remaining term. So, he didn't get to serve a full three years. However, I would like to make a public thank you to Davy for his very effective representation of the faculty. And on a personal note, I want to thank him for his knowledge of and passion for the role of faculty and shared governance of the University. I appreciate, Davy, how much you've taught me over these years. Thank you very much.

(AUDIENCE CLAPS)

CHAIR DEMBO: And the three candidates, we only had three nominees for this election, so there's only going to be one round of election. Roy Moore from Communication Information Studies, Carol Steltenkamp and Dean White. Roy has served as Chair of the Senate Council in

the past and as a Senator. Carol has just been elected Senator from the College of Medicine and has served on the Senate Committee on - John, what's the name of your committee again? Academic Program Planning and Priorities. Thank you. And Dean White, who's been a sitting Senator for a number of years from my college, the College of Dentistry. That's it for announcements, aside from the misspelling.

The next item on the Agenda is Phyllis Nash to report the progress of the IRIS. And once again, my humblest apologies on behalf of the Senate because twice we have canceled you because of other pressing matters. So, as things work out at the University, if you wait long enough, the whole agenda changes anyway, and now Phyllis can report on what happened as a result of the IRIS Committee.

NASH: Do you want me to give my presentation?

CHAIR DEMBO: Yeah.

NASH: I'm actually expecting a fire drill about any minute. I notice that I have five minutes on the agenda. So, I'm going to go into high speed and talk as

quickly as possible. I do want to let you know the progress that we're making on the Integrated Resource Information Systems which is really a replacement of our major administrative applications here at the University. You might ask - you've probably heard about this thing called an ERP, the - the words make no sense whatsoever. But, basically, this is a preengineered set of applications that really help to do the business of the institution. You may - what does this have to do with faculty? Well, really, all of the administrative functions of the University such as registering students, getting their financial aid, their billing, their transcripts, you getting paid, your W2s, all of that, making sure that the accounts receivables and payables are taking care of and purchasing, all of these are managed by our applications. During this project, we will be replacing our student information system, our financial resources system, our human resources system, our supply chain management system. Eventually, we will get to document imaging, to grants and

contracts, to development enhancement.

Any - any way you look at it, we're going to touch every life and make everybody at the University miserable before it's over. One of the things that you may wonder is: Why should we do this? Given the budget situation, this is a very expensive project. You may say: Why would we not put this on hold?

Well, there are several reason, and - and several are very practical. First of all, the University just does not have the information at - at the time that we need it. Our current systems are not well integrated. The systems cannot talk to each other. You have to - when you generate a report, you have to go to various different places across the institution. The information is not real time. It's dated. And, so, in order to be responsible and responsive as we need to be in this changing environment, we need information. Secondly, the technology environment that we're using is incredibly obsolete. We're only one of five in the entire world that are using the three major program applications, FRS, HRS and SIS, and they're only 14 in the world that are

using one of those. These systems are all so customized that they are - that the vendors don't even support them. They are so unscalable so that during student registration, for example, we have to shut down other parts of the system in order to get registration accomplished. Every time that there's a payroll, I'm told, that the folks over in the IT center cross their fingers and just hope that it's going to run. So, our systems are really obsolete, and we really have no real choice but to get moved as quickly as we can off of those systems. Certainly, with an issue like financial aid where the federal regulations change on an every other month or so situation with GASBY that we had to be responsive to and the federal government, we really had to use a lot of our internal resources to go in and configure our current systems in order to be responsive to these requirements, these federal regulations. And because of that, certainly, the services that you get, the services that our students get, are not very efficient and not very effective. We have a lot of double-data

entry. We have a lot of shadow systems that are trying to accomplish the work of the University, and hopefully, we'll be able to respond to those and make them better. Also, many of our business processes are totally out of date and, so, we hope during this process to get more in the -in the future. So, why now? It's just the maintenance of our current system, the need for more efficiency, the growing need for access to information, and really to remain competitive with our peers. What I want to briefly say or tell you about today is the organizational structure for this project, where we are, a little bit about the staffing. Let me just quickly tell you that we are approaching this project in such a way as to make it not just a technology project. I mean, certainly, this project is going to rely heavily on technology, but every point in this project, we are paring the business owners with the technology folks so that when we come out on the other side of this project, we have technical staff that really understands the needs of the end users. And we have end users understanding what the technology can do

for you. So, we are very dedicated to making this an end-user technology partnership. We are going to have the leadership teams for the three major areas, HR, FR, and student, and then we will have some teams that run across the project. We'll have one team that's working on nothing but training because if we don't do a good job of training, we could put the best technology in the world, but if people don't know how to use it, it's going to be for naught.

We'll be trying to communicate with you on a regular basis, as regularly as we can get on your schedule, and coming to you in many ways to let you know what's happening. We are - we have dedicated space for this project. If you look at the space that says 630 on the green shutter there. That's actually on South Broadway. If you look in the - in the distance there, you see the Patterson Office Tower, so it's not far away. This is an old feeder - feed store which is not much to look at on the outside, but it's very nice on the inside. Right now, we occupy a third of the space. Another third of the space is occupied by a

massage school, and the back part - and
the back part of the building is now -
is occupied by a boxing team. So, we
figure that if we get in trouble, people
can't agree, we'll send them to the
boxing ring to work it out, and if we
need to relax, we'll go to the massage
school. Actually, both of those entities
are moving out, and we'll take over the
whole building. We'll have about 50
people working full time on this project,
people from across campus, both technical
folks and people from the various areas,
the end users who will help configure
this system in such a way that it will
meet your needs. Let me just tell you
that I've already talked about the fact
that this is a partnership, and I would
want you to know that with the exception
of about three people, the staff for this
project has, actually, be selected by the
units. So that, for example, somebody
who really knows payroll was sent to work
on the project so that - and to lead
that team so that we can make sure that
we have the expertise that we need.
The - we -- we will be using
consultants. You just don't implement
one of these major systems without

consultants, but the philosophy is that we are the prime instalator, and we will use the implementor or the consultants, actually, as coaches so that when we finish this project, we will have a staff that's fully able to maintain and to continue to grow this system. We have completed our software selection. We used a contract negotiator out of Chicago. We had multi-track negotiations, so we had - we, actually, had two contracts that were very, very comparable from our -- the two vendors that we had narrowed the selection to, PeopleSoft and SAP. We did site visits on the four major vendors that we had narrowed the search to including Oracle and SCT. You - many of you-all attended the onsite or on-campus presentations by PeopleSoft and SAP. The contract negotiations went very, very well. Actually, we negotiated for about 22 hours in one stretch, and we, actually, wouldn't let me leave the room until we had a contract. So that we were able to come to the valuation team and say: We have two contracts that are really, really comparable. There's not much

difference between them and, so, we can make our decision on the software based on the user's needs. I will tell - will tell you that the financial folks and the HR folks really believe that either system could work for them, but the student - the people on the student side felt very strongly that SAP met the needs of the students much better. And our clinical folks felt that the SAP was a lot more complex and, therefore, would meet their needs better. So, it was really -- the decision was really based on the needs of the student area. And, so, I want you - I want it on record that at least one time in the - in the very not so distant past that academics is really what dictated the - the decision and, so, we did choose SAP. We have been working on a chart of accounts project. One of the very first things you have to do as you configure these systems is understand what your chart of accounts looks like, and we've had groups from - Matthew's led a group from all over campus to do about 75 percent of this work. The remaining 25 percent, we couldn't do until we had a software vendor. We are also trying to take a

really hard look at all of the policies and procedures that we can. There's no reason to wait until we're into this project and so, oh, gee whiz, we have to decide how we're going to do X, Y, or Z. We're trying to identify as many of those issues up front, get groups from across campus together, make a decision about those issues and move forward. For example, one of the things, we want to take this as an opportunity to look at is the faculty effort system and the way we certify faculty effort. We're one of only five that do it the way we do it in the whole country. So, this is the opportunity to take a look at the way we certify faculty effort and say: Do we do it the way it ought to be done, or should we change? If we decide to do it the way we're currently doing it, that's fine, but at least we will have had a systematic look at that. And we have several other projects the same way. We will be moving away from the Social Security Number as the major identifier for both employees and students and, so, we're having a group take a look at that and make sure all our feeder systems know

about that and can be responsive to that.

They tell me then in projects like this that decision making is the real key to keeping these projects moving. And, so, we're in the process of trying to develop a decision-making model that everyone can agree to up front so that we can, actually, keep the project on time. We are right now selecting an implementation partner or partners. As I said, we will need consultants to help us do this work, and we have an RFP out. We hope a decision will be made or we - no, a decision will be made by the end of May on that. We have a Web site. It's really, really easy, UKY.edu/IRIS, think of the flower. And we - we will keep information there. I will be happy to come back just as often as possible. I think as we move forward, we're going to want to look, particularly, in the student areas at some of the Senate Rules to see if - if they make sense in light of configuring a new system. And, so, I've been talking with Jeff about the need to work with you very closely as - when we begin to understand what some of those decision points are. So, I'm happy to take questions, although I'm sure I'm

out of time. I will - you can reach me
by phone or - or by e-mail. I'll be
happy to answer any questions now or at
any point in time. Yes.

HOLMES: On your organizational
chart, I didn't see anything about
faculty input for SIS. Is there any
provision?

NASH: Absolutely. We don't have any
faculty that are full time on the project
other than myself at this point, but
every one of the teams will have lots and
lots and lots of faculty end users.
Again, if we don't - if we do not manage
this system in a way that it meets
faculty needs, it meets student needs, it
meets the end user, we will have failed.
So there will be lots of opportunity for
faculty involvement.

SCOTT: I'm sorry, your name please.

HOLMES: Jim Holmes, School of
Accountancy.

CHAIR DEMBO: If I could jump in just for a
second. There have been two areas, even
at this early stage, that the IRIS group
has already identified they needed
faculty input. One is to give the
faculty the opportunity to switch to a

different payroll system if they want to,
and the other is with distribution of
effort. So, I think, that there have
been - they've been very aware of the
need for input from all constituents of
the University and as the various pieces
come - come out, that's when we're going
to be asked for input, I think.

NASH: And I should have mentioned, we
have a major steering committee with 30
people from across campus, and Jeff is
serving on that as - as one of the
faculty representatives as well. Thank
you.

CHAIR DEMBO: Thanks, Phyllis. While I'm
getting this set, a small announcement
that this afternoon Provost Nietzel's
mother passed away. We were scheduled to
have a Senate Council breakfast with the
provost tomorrow, so that's been canceled
for all council members. And Provost
Nietzel and his family are in our
thoughts.

 Next on agenda - thank you,
Phyllis. A very quick thank you to
Phyllis Nash. I worked with her for many
years, and it was truly a pleasure to see
you, first, get into the - as the Chief
of Staff in the President's office, and

in - in a short time, you did incredible work there. And now in your role as the IRIS director and coordinator, it's been an incredibly wonderful transition. I don't think there's any - sort of like dentistry, there's nothing easy or painless about it, but you're making it as much as possible. We really appreciate it, Phyllis. Thanks.

The next agenda item, in your role as the University Senate, both the governing regulations and the Senate Rules state that one of the functions of the Senate is to recommend to the President all candidates for degrees. Over the years, things went by the wayside, and the voluminous list that used to be sent out by mail to every faculty member when the University only had a handful of faculty, naturally, went by the wayside. Now that we've explored the full range of electronic communications, there's no reason we can't continue this, and we do this in the fall. There was a link posted at the University Web site, and it's a link containing the UK and LCC degree candidates. The Registrar gave it to us.

Cleo Price in the Registrar's office has been working very cooperatively with us, and I'm sure that it will get even - done even - in an even more timely fashion. So with that in place, it's not quite a consent item, but I will take a motion from the floor to approve the list as submitted by the Registrar.

BLANDFORD: So moved.

SCOTT: Your name, please?

BLANDFORD: Blandford, Engineering.

SCOTT: Thank you.

CHAIR DEMBO: Is there a second?

YANARELLA: Second.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Yanarella, okay.

YANARELLA: I seconded it.

CHAIR DEMBO: Thank you. Okay, any discussion?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR DEMBO: All in favor, say aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR DEMBO: All opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much. Okay. Item number 5, is the proposal for the College of Public Health. What I'd like to do here is to review with you the routing sheet which I'm proud to say that the Senate Council has helped out a great deal along with various committees

including Kay Chard's committee to try to develop a form whereby everybody can see that the bases have been covered and to what degree each constituent group of the University has agreed with or has - has not - has disagreed with the various proposals. This is where this College of Public Health proposal has gone: Among other folks, the faculty and College of Health Sciences, the Academic Programs Committee - I'll comment on that in just a second - the various councils of the Senate, three out of the four councils, the Senate committee on Academic Organization and Structure, Academic Council of the Medical Center, and finally, the Senate Council. The reason why the Academic Programs Committee says not applicable is because Bob Grossman, chair of that committee, said that it wasn't appropriate for his committee to comment on it since it did not represent a new program, per se. But Bob and his colleagues did have some comments about that related to how many units would be left in a college once other units moved away from it, and we may get to that question in a couple of

minutes. This was the Senate Council's recommendation to forward the proposal to the Senate with a positive recommendation, contingent upon administrative implementors taking into account the items in the letter from the College of Medicine faculty and the Faculty Council. And Kay Chard moved, Kennedy seconded, Jones amended. It passed without dissent at the level of the Senate Council. What I want to do is track it backwards one step to what the faculty in the College of Medicine said, and then to have Tom Samuel be available to give you a one-minute thumbnail sketch of this college and why it's coming forward, and then an opportunity to ask questions before it comes for a vote. So, because the Senate Council has forwarded it with a positive recommendation, it will be on the floor for discussion, and there's no second needed. Tom Kelly are you here? In just a second, Tom, let me see if I accurately portray what you wrote in your very elegant letter on the part of the Faculty Council in the College of Medicine. Your colleagues supported this proposal because accreditation of this now school

and soon-to-be college will increase educational professional opportunities. It will enhance the environment and the reputation of its faculty. It will enable competition for federal funds. It will help serve the Commonwealth more effectively than it is as a school right now contained within a college. And, finally, that the faculty and students of the School of Public Health and the Department of Preventive Medicine and Environmental Health do support the proposal. So that's one aspect of the Faculty Council from the College of Medicine. They also had some concerns they passed along. One is that, the faculty remain unconvinced that no additional resources will be required and will result in yet another unit that is achieving marginal success due to limited resources, end quote. Another concern, the status of this department was not specified, and the salary support for those faculty in that department should require careful attention. The third was more of a global concern. The potential impact of a new college at a time when there's decreasing resources, increasing

tuition, and diminishing morale among student, staff and faculty. And, finally, the college Council felt that the support may not have been well documented despite the assurance by representatives who put the proposal forward.

Tom, other comments you'd like to make about the College of Medicine or the Faculty Council's comments on this proposal?

KELLY: No. Thank you, Jeff. That was well done.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. So, at this time, Tom Samuel has been the primary spokesperson for this proposal. Tom, do you have any comments? A one-minute overview as to why and - why this is coming forward?

SAMUEL: I think we all know the status of health in Kentucky. We rank right down there. We, obviously, need to find a way to work with the state. We're lucky to have a Governor right now who's a physician willing to move forward with some activities in terms of public health. There's a Council of Post-secondary education plan going forward on public health that will move public health, I think, to a priority in

terms of funding at the state level, whatever that might be. We feel for the University of Kentucky to take full advantage of that, it is essential that we go to college status. Now college status, the reason for that, is that we need to have an organizational structure at the University of Kentucky that permits the dean or the chief academic officer of that particular organization to be equivalent to other deans at the University of Kentucky so we can go forward with accreditation.

Accreditation is important in that it's important for our students in terms of practicum placement. It's important to the college in that we are eligible for certain funding that is only specified for accredited colleges of public health.

We feel this is the time to do it in terms of the events after 9/11 and all the federal funding, the kinds of emphasis that's on public health, and, particularly, the status of public health in Kentucky, that it is - it is the time to move forward. And we have adequately laid out the 31 different groups have, in fact, endorsed our move to go to a

college, and we bring it to you and hope
you will favorably consider the college
status of the School of Public Health.

CHAIR DEMBO: So before I open the floor to
discussion, I want to know, first, are
there any questions about the details of
this proposal that somebody needs some
more information on?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Is there anybody who
wants the floor to speak either in favor
or against the proposal?

GOVINDARAJULU: I would like to --

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Govindarajulu.

GOVINDARAJULU: I would like to have - express
some concerns. Sorry. Sorry. Sorry, I
have a soft voice, but I would like to
express some concerns I have about the
creation of this college and one is
several rationale has been given, and
some of them are on shaky grounds. For
example, the health of the State of
Kentucky will go up if the -- College of
this Health Science plan is created.
Number two, UK will go up 31st in the
nation as the college is created. Number
three is faculty, the morale of the -
the quality of the faculty, the quality
of the students who come up will go up as

soon as the college is created. Faculty and the students go when there is program. They go - they are program oriented. They go with the quality of program rather than college ability. And somebody mentioned about accreditation which I don't understand. That might be compelling reason. I - I - you know, I don't mind hearing some arguments from Dr. Samuel on that. The main concern is it is taught as cost effective. Cost - sorry. Cost neutral. Whenever there's - a college is created and there's a new dean, there's a new - two associate deans on the physical assistant and supporting staff and some lines have been transferred and so on, they are cost - they do cost. So I was just wondering at this time of the year, at this time at UK when you are counting paperclips and pencils at the rest of the campus, is it wise to put this college through? What kind of a message we are sending to Frankfort, I'm not sure.

Number two is, the duplication. Has it been mentioned in the document there's a duplication, the Martin School of Public Administration, there's already a

program? There is a program in Eastern Kentucky. There's a program in Western Kentucky. And the University of Louisville is also talking about this, and the cost had secondary education. Which a little bit of concern about this duplication has, you know, thought has been given to what duplication. First of all, duplication, then put up new proposals. Don't create a college first, and then turn to look at the duplication. It's too late. The major concern is about the creation of Department of Biostatistics. And we have a statistics department for the last 37 years at the University of Kentucky, and we are functioned very well. We have served the state very well. And the University of Louisville has been resisting creating other department there duplication of -- So we have served the state as -- UK very well, and there is also a Department of Biostatistics at University of Louisville currently for the last two years it has been in existence. And they do at UL, I was told, a Petry Program (PHONETICALLY). So we have been functioning very well. We have a Biostatistics option for students who want to go in Biostatistics.

So at this - we - we have already a Division of Biostatistics now. Why do you want to create a Department of Biostatistics, and this aspect has never been discussed adequately or, period, not discussed at all in our department. And it has a devastating effect on the Department of Statistics. And number three is, in the original document, there are four lines. We are being transferred -- is being transferred as soon as the college is created from Stat department. So this -- constitutes 40 percent of whole department, in fact. So if this ranks go, we have to adequately fund it to replace this. In the first place, we've created this Biostatistics because of the base of need to take care of the immediate needs and people retired or died - they can -- Biostatistics. So if these people go, we need adequate funding to replace those links. Even this aspect we have not discussed in our department. So, my main concern is creation - concerns of the creation of the Biostatistics Department. Thank you for your attention.

SAMUEL: I'll let Davy talk to the

budget -- well, let me talk about biostatistics first of all. First, we have talked with the Dean and we've talked with the Chair of Statistics. Those positions currently are 50 percent funded by the College - or the School of Public Health, and 50 percent by the Department of Statistics. They will remain exactly that, 50/50. However, their primary appointment is being moved from the College of Arts and Sciences into the College of Public Health because that is essential for us in order to achieve accreditation. Those assignments were made exactly the same after they are transferred as what they were before. Dick Kryscio will remain the chairman of the department. We intend to work very closely with the Department of Statistics in all that we do. In fact, when we started the process, it was that we were not going to go into competition with the Department of Statistics. We were going to work with them, and we worked with Connie throughout. We've worked with the Dean throughout in order to make sure that's the case. If either of them are here, they can speak to that. But, I mean, we have gone out of our way in

those letters of appointment to those four faculty members that will be transferred, their primary appointment, but they'll still be 50/50, but their primary appointment will be in the School of Public Health. That's the appointment letter they signed when they came. In other words, they - it said that once we become a college, they - if that happened, they would be transferred to the college as their primary appointment. So I don't think there's any change in terms of their status. I will say that Steve Wyatt on our faculty and somebody who's on - that happens to be on the advisory board at the University of Birmingham, Alabama, pointed out that in - just in the Cancer Center along, there are 15 biostatisticians. We have 5 at the University of Kentucky in terms of the University Medical Center. If we're going to go forward, if we're going to move to try to achieve anything like top-20 status, it's going to take a lot more biostatisticians, and I think the Dean - at least he made the statement to me, and I assume that I can make it again, has stated that the only way

that's going to happen is through the kind of process we're talking about of having a primary appointment in a College of Public Health and a full development of a Department of Biostatistics within the College of Public Health. However, it will be with the intention of total cooperation and integration with statistics. We do not intend to do something. We've been working with your Chair, trying to find a way to fund a bioinformatics position that would allow us to work more closely with the Department of Statistics. So, I think, it's the reverse. I, actually, think that staff will be better off if there's a college and the formation of a department in the College of Public Health.

CHAIR DEMBO: Thank you, Tom.

KRYSCIO: Dick, you're here. Do you want to speak to that at all? I see Dick Kryscio back there.

CRISEO: I just want to clarify, we have no intentions whatsoever to offer Ph.D. in Biostatistics. I think that -- decided to do that not developing a professional program which is, you know, precisely what we want. And as a full

professor in the Department of
Statistics, we worked very hard to put a
track in our Ph.D. program so that there
would be a Ph.D. degree in statistics
with a concentration in biostatistics
rather than, okay, like Louisville is
doing and certainly the school of public
health as, as far as I know, in all of
the years that I've worked with them that
has never discussed having a Ph.D. in
biostatistics. So, strictly a
professional program.

CHAIR DEMBO: Thanks, Professor Criseo.
Professor Tagavi.

TAGAVI: I heard you saying that four
lines are going to go from statistics,
the primarily appointment.

SAMUEL: Uh-huh (AFFIRMATIVE).

TAGAVI: You mentioned you consulted or
you formed a Chair of the Statistics
Department. Have you consulted - gone
out -- have you gone out of your way to
talk to the faculty of the Statistics?

SAMUEL: I believe - I -- I did
note - I mean, I - I will say that
Dick Criseo who is a member of the
faculty and has been part of all --

TAGAVI: Faculty of what?

SAMUEL: Of Stat.

TAGAVI: Of Statistics?

SAMUEL: Statistics.

TAGAVI: So, we established one person
has been consulted.

CHAIR DEMBO: If I could intervene for a
second --

TAGAVI: The faculty of the Statistics
being consulted.

SAMUEL: I didn't. I think that what
we've done is
talked with the Chair and with the Dean
and whatever their processes are, the
appointments to begin with were in the
Department of Statistics at 50 percent
and 50 percent of the School of Public
Health primarily in statistics, and now
that's been moved to primary and will be
moved to primary and biostatistics. In
terms of consultation, you're going to
have to ask the Dean. I did not feel
that was the responsibility of the School
of Public Health.

TAGAVI: It seems the faculty has not
been consulted.

SAMUEL: Well, I --

TAGAVI: I just want to make that --

CHAIR DEMBO: Point of clarification, one of
the tabs in the packet was a letter

signed by Connie Wood. And as Department Chair, one would assume that she would speak on behalf of the faculty. You can only go so far, I think, to - to try to query every single faculty, and you have to start trusting a little bit. If Dr. Wood does not represent the faculty's interest, that's an inter-departmental problem, I think.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Grossman.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Chemistry. I -

I do support this proposal and I agree with some of the concerns that previous speaker mentioned, but one thing that Dr. Samuel's alluded to which some people may not understand completely is the accrediting agencies have us over a barrel. I didn't understand this until the last year when this happened again and again. But without having a separate College of Public Health with its own Dean, the School of Public - the public health programs cannot be accredited. If they are not accredited, the graduates cannot get many kinds of jobs, and the faculty in the units cannot get large - do not have access to large pools of funding. So when he says that

financially this makes sense, part of what he's referring to is the opportunity to go out and find large pools of funding. As for your concerns about overlap and touching other areas in other colleges, I think this is the nature of research today that there is - no - no college is an island anymore. And there - and any college going to have programs that intercept the interests of departments in other colleges. For example, in chemistry we started up a program, an undergraduate option in biological chemistry, and our College in the Biochemistry Department in the Medical Center wanted to hear exactly what we were planning to do to make sure that there wasn't friction between the two departments over this new program. It's just the nature of interdisciplinary research, and it's always going to happen. There is a memorandum of understanding between the College of Public Health and the Martin School now that specifically address many of the concerns that were raised by the Martin School about the overlap between their programs in public policy and the public health schools' programs in public -

wasn't it public health administration;

is that right?

SAMUEL: Right. Right. Correct.

GROSSMAN: And - and that - that is

supposed to help address some of those

concerns. So --

SAMUEL: Let me just comment on the

Martin School which, of course, has

been - I've worked very hard on that, as

have Dave and -- and Gina and a number of

others. And I feel very good about where

we are. One of the concerns is that they

have a very strong public policy bent in

the Martin School, and that we not

somehow unjustly invade that through the

College of Public Health. And we have

gone to them. We have a course this fall

that will be Public Health Policy and

Politics. Before that course was

offered, before we put that on the books,

we went to the Martin School and said we

want to make sure that somehow we're not

competing or offering a course that's

going to cause a problem. And we were

told it was not a problem. And we have

pledged we will do that every time out of

the box. We are not here - public

health is interdisciplinary. Let me just

give you an example. We have a young professor we just recruited from UC-Davis, outstanding environmentalist in aerosol science, it turns out. That person has gone together with people in the College of Engineering. They've submitted a grant, an upscore grant which, I'm not sure whether it will get funded, but people in Engineering seem to feel very good about it. They could not have submitted that grant without his expertise, but the grant's going to be in Engineering not in the School of Public Health. It's going to be there because that's where most of the effort or most of the equipment, et cetera, is going to be located. It's a two million dollar proposal, and quite frankly, only about 150,000 is up in the School of Public Health. That's the net addition that I really believe will come from the College of Public Health. If we can be - if we can become that administrative unit that is accredited, that has access, then we can allow others to also have access to funds that we're currently - we don't have access to, and I really believe that's going to happen.

CHAIR DEMBO: We're 11 minutes behind

schedule. Anybody who's not spoken yet?

WASHINGTON: Currently, I'm a student --

CHAIR DEMBO: Please introduce yourself.

WASHINGTON: I am Regina Washington, one

of the DR PH Students currently in the

Public Health program. I probably would

not sleep well if I hadn't been able to

stand up and - stand and - for the

benefit of the program. I was attracted

to the program because of all the health

disparity. I've seen a great deal of

issues working in my community in West

Virginia. So, I was attracted to the

program back in 2001. I believe that

currently I've been involved in the

various subcommittees, the committees to

help move this program along because I

feel as though this is a very important

addition to this University because, one,

it's not duplicating, per se. I believe

it's more trans-disciplinary, trying to

bring things together. We do have

reactionary medicine, but we're looking

at prevention. We're looking at

intervention. We do have problems here

in Kentucky as well as in West Virginia.

I believe that this - there's - I

believe that you can't go wrong if you

support it. I mean, there's nothing that will threaten any other department, in my opinion. I don't know exactly what the concerns are, but I just - as a student, I wanted to let you know that we're 100 percent trying to support the endeavors and trying to move it from the school to the college. And we even had a student focus group to actually be right in the mix of trying to develop this particular School of Public Health into a College of Public Health. So, if you have any questions of the students, I'm not representing all the students, but as a student if you have any questions, please don't hesitate to ask.

CHAIR DEMBO: That's for coming and for your comments. We appreciate it. Any other discussion?

GOVINDARAJULU: Can I ask one clarification?

CHAIR DEMBO: Clarification.

GOVINDARAJULU: In my hand, I have a copy of a letter we took to you to a -. And it is signed by our Chair, Constance Wood, Thomas Samuel and David White. And this letter makes a correction that not all four of them will go to - in case there is a College of Public Health, only some.

CHAIR DEMBO: So not all four statistics

faculty?

GAVENDORAJALU: Yes.

SAMUEL: All four - all four that have been hired as joint appointments will be transferred to the College of Public Health.

CHAIR DEMBO: Raju, will this make a difference in the way you vote?

GOVINDARAJULU: This is - no, this is - if you want -- to you -- to you and signed by Dr. Samuel, Dr. White. If you want I could read this paragraph.

CHAIR DEMBO: Is the point one that will make a difference in the way you vote on the proposal?

GOVINDARAJULU: It says here that it was agreed - the agreed upon modified language, it was agreed that some of the faculty who have these funded positions will transport as primary ornaments in the College of Arts and Science to the College of Public Health at the time a tradition is sought for the College of Public Health.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Another question, a comment?

SHELTON: Brent Shelton, I'm in Internal Medicine, trained as an academic

biostatistician. There seems to be a great deal of concern here to me that what - what the faculty are about to do would hurt the Department of Statistics, in particular, and I would be sensitive to that concern, but I think there's a clear precedent for the fact that you can look across the country and what comes to mind are programs like the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and the University of Washington at Seattle, where in those particular institutes, there's wonderful coexistence of a - an independent stat department as well as an independent biostatistics department. And although those function independently, and that's critical to get this accreditation issue resolved, they coexist together and they really complement one another very well. And I think we have a unique opportunity to do that for the State of Kentucky as well here at the University of Kentucky. So, I - I certainly would like to speak for this proposal very strongly in that regard. I -- I keep hearing an issue regarding statistics versus biostatistics, and even though I'm sensitive to that, I think they have a

wonderful opportunity to coexist very nicely here on this campus.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Is there any other discussion from somebody who's not spoken on a point other than that related to statistics. Steve.

YATES: Steve Yates, Chemistry, not Statistics. I - I see, once again, where establishing a small college with the rationale being that accreditation plays a major role. Small colleges, by their nature, are somewhat inefficient. We have another college on campus, Arts and Sciences, that's ten times its size. Medicine, it's huge compared to this. So, I think the message is that if you really want to have success in getting your own program, then History should get an accredited program, and then they can have their own college. I really don't - I really hate to see this as a driving issue behind any of these things.

CHAIR DEMBO: Anyone from History want to rebut that point?

(AUDIENCE LAUGHS)

CHAIR DEMBO: I think I hear the discussion winding down. We're 17 minutes overtime, but I hope there's no objection to

bringing this to a vote now. So you've heard about the College of Public Health proposal positive recommendation from the Senate Council. All those in favor, please raise your hands.

(SENATE VOTES)

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. All voting members who are opposed to it, please raise your hands.

(SENATE VOTES)

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. All but one. Any abstentions. Thank you very much. I'm going to skip order here for a second because Dean Waldhart from the College of Engineering is here. He has a limited amount of time with us. So, I want to skip ahead to item, I guess it's labeled 7, the Center for Visualization and Virtual Environments. Tom, thank you very much.

WALDHART: Thank you very much. Thank you to the Senate also.

CHAIR DEMBO: John, take care. Okay, Bruce, I just want to introduce what the College of Engineering submitted as its description for what this Center does. Visualization is depiction of computer-generated data of scientific or engineering processes and rendering

virtual environments or recreation of remote real environments. The proposed Center will congeal and further basic research. It's going to be housed in the KU building. The initial funding comes from a grant from the Office of the New Economy versus the Kentucky Economic Development Finance Authority with sustained funding based on extramural funding that the faculty would obtain and the indirect cost savings. And the core research faculty in this proposal have been identified primarily from the College of Engineering, some of the departments there with allied faculty in other colleges across campus. The routing sheet for this has taken it through the faculty in Engineering through Dr. Chart and her Senate committee on Academic Organization and Structure and through the Senate Council where it comes to you - to the floor with a positive recommendation from the Senate Council. So, first, are there any other questions about the substance or nature of this proposal? Okay. Is there any discussion about the proposal itself. It's on the floor because it came from

the Senate Council.

STABEN: May I ask a question, by the way? What is meant by --

CHAIR DEMBO: Please identify yourself.

STABEN: Oh, I'm sorry, Chuck Staben from Biology. What is meant by being funded by indirect cost savings by virtue of this being off-site?

CHAIR DEMBO: Dean Waldhart.

WALDHART: Yeah, Chuck, eventually, what we hope, we have extramural funding on the order of about \$5 million in addition to the seed funding that we've gotten right now. We're taking that through the traditional indirect models. We're not doing anything to obfuscate that. But, eventually, we're going to knock on Wendy Baldwin's door and say: Look, we're creating a Center here. We're creating infrastructure that will enable other faculty, not just in electrical and computer science, but other faculty around the University to apply for and to possibly get grants at a much higher level. We would like to see some of that indirect cost come back to the Senate. And there are precedents out there for this model right now. We want to prove our merit first before we

actually knock on Wendy Baldwin's door.

If you look at it in the proposal, if you have that in front of you, there's a graph of milestones to sustain funding, and you will see a small sliver of that actually proposed as indirect cost coming in 2007-2008 like time frame. And I think, Chuck, in this current environment, you need to think creatively. You're not going to see a lot of resources granted to Centers like our proposal coming from dais Macanus (PHONETICALLY) type places. You have to think, you know, what's the benefit to the University as a whole and can people like Vice President Baldwin then justify changes in indirect cost structure to support that?

CHAIR DEMBO: Other discussion? Hearing

none, bring it to a vote. The proposal is to approve the Center for Visualization and Virtual Environments.

All in favor, please raise your hands.

(SENATE VOTES)

CHAIR DEMBO: Thank you. Any opposed? Any

abstentions? Thank you, Bruce. Okay.

The next order of business is to resume where we left off with material that's

come from the Senate Rules and Elections Committee. Over the course of the year, Professor Tagavi and his committee has taken a look at a number of things, some of which they were charged to do and some of which came up in the -- in the course of business with the Senate. The first is the definition of a family. This question originated from the academic ombud office. David, I saw you here. David, in a 30-second overview, why did this question come forward?

DAVID: A student came to our office in the fall. She was in a partnership with another woman, another student. That student's grandmother was dying, was in a hospital. The student who approached our office wanted to know from the instructor if she could have an excused absence to go to the hospital and later on to the funeral. The instructor said, no, because a grandmother is not immediate family, and you are not immediate family. So those two issues, we felt like, needed clarification, and referred it to the Rules Committee.

CHAIR DEMBO: So, Professor Tagavi, tell us about -- how this definition arose.

TAGAVI: I think that we - we

approached this in two different ways.

One was the immediate rule

interpretation. And it's so long ago

that I might be somewhat sketchy.

(AUDIENCE LAUGHS)

TAGAVI: The interpretation was, as much

as we would have liked to be included,

that grandparents were not immediate

family. And on the domestic partner, if

I'm not mistaken, we ruled that it

doesn't include the interpretation. But

upon the request of the ombud or the

implied request of the ombud, we came up

with a new rule that redefined the

definition of immediate family to include

grandchildren and grandparents and

include people like domestic partnerships

and a roommate of a student. We thought

there's no sense if a roommate of a

student has died, to force the student to

have a quiz when they are not ready to

take that. So, we - we added language

that would include roommate, some

students, and grandparents and domestic

partnership.

CHAIR DEMBO: So, let's back up for a second.

So, the significant changes here are what

are in yellow. Significant illness of

the student and a member of the student's household, and the same in B. And then finally, at the end of this rule, there's already one interpretation that was done in 1994, and now a second interpretation that will be listed on there as well as who is the immediate family. Just recently the Senate Council had a discussion with Greg Moore who's the director of the University Health Service, and faculty will be receiving a broadcast e-mail, reaffirming that in the end, excused absences are a matter between the student and the faculty for mutual negotiation and for a matter of working out whatever differences there are, but - so there's always going to be exceptions and, well, what if this, what if that, but on the other hand, it was time to look at some basic wording and see if the guidelines needed to be changed. So that came forward from the Rules Committee and went to the Senate Council with a positive recommendation.

TAGAVI: May I quickly add that this is not per se interpretation. This is a new rule.

CHAIR DEMBO: Yes. I'm sorry. What I meant to say was that in addition to the

previous interpretation, an additional -

an addition to the rule is - is added.

So, this represents a proposed change in

the Senate Rule. Questions? Professor

Grossman.

GROSSMAN: Who is going to define
significant and serious in part A?

CHAIR DEMBO: A quick answer to this is not
going to the University Health Service.

(AUDIENCE LAUGHS)

CHAIR DEMBO: Because they are no longer
going to give out forms stating that the
student had a - had an appointment
there. So, again, it gets back to the
trust and the relationship between the
student and the faculty. Professor
Peffer.

PEFFER: Sean Peffer, School of
Business. Two things, one, the
household - well, one, probably, first,
so if this goes in, does this then mean
that if a student comes to me as a
professor and says: I can miss that. I
don't care what your rules say; I can
miss that because this says so. Is
that - does this override? Because
you're turning around and saying it's
between the professor and the student,

but at the same time, if they take me to the ombud, will I lose because this rule says it? That's thing A. Thing B, household, how does that work with frats and sororities? Anybody in the sorority is sick, the whole sorority gets to miss. Household is a dangerous work, so how does that work?

CHAIR DEMBO: So let's take question one to Professor Royse.

ROYSE: Yes.

(AUDIENCE LAUGHS)

ROYSE: How would you respond, Jeff?

CHAIR DEMBO: Well, in the end if there is -- if there's a contest that somebody feels their academic rules - rights have been violated, they can always go to the Appeals Board. The Appeals Board will make the final determination, and if it affected the grade, the Appeals Board can make any one grade into any other grade.

PEFFER: Yeah. What I'm wondering that since this is written down, you know, they could pull it out of their pocket and say: Hey, look, you know, here it is. You lose. Because I do, I do lose, that's written down and you've given this to them, and it's kind of like a contract. So that's part A that worries

me. And I haven't heard that said no to
in here. Okay. How about if that - if
that is the answer to part - I know
you've got a --

TAGAVI: Part A, can I answer that?

PEFFER: Yeah.

TAGAVI: With regard to these, the only
new stuff is the yellow stuff. So we are
not changing that. It was already
written that if there is a serious
illness of a member of student's
immediate family, you lose.

PEFFER: That's fine.

TAGAVI: That has not changed.

PEFFER: Household.

TAGAVI: Okay. So we answered your
first one, your first concern.

PEFFER: Yeah - well, no, you didn't
answer the first concern. You told me
that if somebody had something, and it's
anybody in their entire fraternity, I do
lose.

TAGAVI: No, that's the second - that
was your second point. Your first point
was this is not written. The students
would show it to you and say: I don't
care what you say, you lose. Yes,
professors lose when they want to insist

after the death of a family a student

should take the test.

PEFFER: No. No. No. Okay. No. No.

No.

TAGAVI: The authority --

PEFFER: I'm not saying that the family.

I'm not saying - don't - don't put me
in a box like that. I'm not saying death
of a family member. I'm not going to
have a guy come: Oh, my dad died. Will
you excuse me? Me say, no. All I asked
was if this is written, the way it is up
there with the yellow, the way it is
proposed, then if they come to me and
they say: I have a fraternity member or
somebody in my house because there's 32
people that live in my house, and they
are ill, I get out of it. Your answer to
me then, I want to get this straight is,
yes.

TAGAVI: No, I haven't said that.

SPEAKER: I'd say probably you would
lose.

PEFFER: Okay, that's - that's the
answer.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Chard.

CHARD: Kay Chard, Education. But,
wait, you missed the part that Jeff Dembo
said at the beginning about the change in

student health. Students now - you can ask for verification, as you always could. No more do you get those little green slips handed to you. They actually have to go. That means you're going to have to have a student in a fraternity, a sorority, go and get a doctor's statement of what was actually wrong with them, be willing to release that, according to HIPPA, give that to their buddy in the fraternity, sorority to give to you. You're not going to get a lot of that. So, I really don't think the situation of one person getting 30 doctor's excuses, photocopying them with HIPPA issues and giving them to you to get out of a test is going to happen. This change in student health is going to make a difference for us.

CHAIR DEMBO: Other comments, discussion?

SPEAKER: Can I -- can I clarify? I'm a member of the group community, and I just want to tell you we took a philosophical - sorry - we took a philosophical approach on the definition of family, a broad approach, because what's the point of lecturing to some student whose heart is somewhere but

physically his body is in - in -- in the
classroom? So we took a very broad
definition of family, and that's how we
came up with. Okay? That's the
rationale of this. Thank you.

CHAIR DEMBO: Thank you. Other comments?

Professor Grossman.

GROSSMAN: I would like to propose an
amendment --

CHAIR DEMBO: Yes, sir.

GROSSMAN: - to A. I would like to -
I'm not absolutely sure of the wording of
the amendment at this point. But there
needs to be something in here to say that
the instructor's decision is final. The
instructor shall decide definitions --

CHARD: No, it's not.

GROSSMAN: This is my amendment. This is
my amendment. The instructor shall
decide whether an illness is significant
and whether a person is truly a member of
the student's household as defined - as
intended by this amendment.

CHAIR DEMBO: So the wording would be
something like: The instructor will have
final right of interpretation of this
rule?

GROSSMAN: Yes.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Is there - hang on. We

have to have a second before this discussion. Does anybody second Professor Grossman's amendment? The amendment fails. Other discussion on the original proposal? Okay. I think we'll bring it to a vote. All in favor of the amendments, the change of the Senate Rules as listed, please raise your hand.

(SENATE VOTES)

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. All opposed?

(SENATE VOTES)

CHAIR DEMBO: Michelle, could we get a count of those opposed, please?

SOHNER: 15.

CHAIR DEMBO: 15 opposed. Any abstentions?

(SENATE VOTES)

CHAIR DEMBO: One abstention. Thank you very much. The motion passes. Item 6B, Professor Tagavi and Dean Blackwell from the Graduate School mutually decided, I believe, it was time to revise and to revisit the composition of the Graduate Council, and I think through a very thorough and painstaking process, the two worked together along with the Graduate Council to come up with changes that seemed logical and seemed to reflect the - the current makeup of the

University. So, the print that's in red is what was deleted and everything in yellow was added. Kaveh, can you give like a ten-second overview as to what the major changes were here?

TAGAVI: It'S -- changes but the only difference is the total number of 14 that used to be proportioned in a - in a way is now proportioned in a different way. The biggest change is College of Pharmacy used to be with College of Medicine. Pharmacy being a very small college and Medicine a very big college, now all of it has been reshuffled and bunch modified. No other changes have been made.

CHAIR DEMBO: So, by way of interpretation, before it used to be two members of the Graduate Council had to be from the Colleges of Pharmacy, Dentistry, Health Sciences and Nursing, correct? Dean Blackwell.

BLACKWELL: Yeah. If I could just add to that. We needed to incorporate the new College of Design into our structure and also to take into account the - the movement of parts and Human Environmental Sciences to other places in the University. And, of course, if the

College of Public Health comes about, we'll be back next year with another proposal to incorporate them into the election structure.

CHAIR DEMBO: And very wisely, they've included one final paragraph to state that it doesn't have to come back to the Senate every year because the composition will be reexamined by the Graduate Council, so this should be the last time we'll have to take a look at it. Any discussion? Okay. All in favor of these amended rules for Graduate Council?

(SENATE VOTES)

CHAIR DEMBO: Any opposed? Any abstentions.
Thank you. Passes.

Item C, the ten-day rule states that all agenda items for the University Senate have to be promulgated to Senators and all academic departments ten days before the actual Senate meeting. With this administration, with the speed of electronic communication, things happen very quickly, and sometimes there have been proposals that have come to the Senate Council, essentially, the week before a Senate meeting. And thereby, we have to defer that under the current

Rules until the following Senate meeting or we have to ask the Senate to waive the ten-day rule. So, a proposal came up with the idea that now that we can post everything on the Web site and with the ease of electronic communication, would it make sense to ask the Senate if it was acceptable to circulate by e-mail and by Web posting an agenda six days prior. What that would do is it would permit something acted on, for instance, at last Monday's Senate Council meeting to immediately get posted onto today's Senate meeting without having to ask the Senate to waive the ten-day rule. And it's with some trepidation that we ask the Senate to waive the ten-day rule because it's asking you to - to take a leap of faith about something that could potentially be controversial or may not be. This could eliminate the need to do that. Questions? Professor Yates.

YATES: Yeah. In our college, we've had some discussion about the ten-day rule whether that's really a two-week rule, meaning is this six calendar days or working days. If it's six calendar days, I suggest adding the word "calendar."

CHAIR DEMBO: It was meant to be six calendar days. So, we consider that a friendly amendment then?

YATES: Yes.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Thank you. Other comments? This is something that - could you live with it? Okay. All in favor?

(SENATE VOTES)

CHAIR DEMBO: Any opposed?

(SENATE VOTES)

CHAIR DEMBO: One opposed. Any abstentions?

Thank you. Okay, finally, modifications for the ombud search, in Senate Rule 6.2.3, there's a variety of descriptions of what needs to be - to be done to constitute a search for the academic ombud. It involves a committee that's - that reports to the provost representative of the academic community. And the only recent change to this Rule was when LCC joined us back in 97 that we had two ombuds instead of one University ombud. The proposed change is that the existing Rule is unclear as to what happens if the incumbent ombud chooses to serve again. Does one have to constitute and whole search committee and have

people take time from their already busy schedules to sit down and meet and talk about it? And, so, we had some discussion about it with the Senate Council. We came up with this proposal that either of the ombuds may be reappointed to a second term without, essentially, constituting a whole search committee if three parties agree to it, the affected ombud, the Provost, and the Senate Council. And if there's not agreement by any one of those, then, of course, the usual search committee would be constituted. And there was some concern brought up about ombuds who tend to serve multiple terms that if you went on for a third or fourth term without the oversight of the search committee, you might lose the fact that, maybe, there's somebody very well qualified waiting to come in, or, maybe, the person in the position is no longer serving the University very effectively. Hence, the wording that if it should go for a third term, that the usual search would apply.

Any questions, comments, discussion?

MARCHANT: Mary Marchant, Ag Economics.

How long is the term?

CHAIR DEMBO: It's a year-to-year

appointment, and most ombuds have served one or two years. Professor Edgerton served three years. I served four years. Professor Royse is at the end of his first term right now. Other questions, discussion?

BAILEY: Ernie Bailey, Veterinary Science. When -- when we discussed it in the Senate Council, didn't we say reappointment beyond the second term? What happens if someone goes to a fourth term? Isn't - doesn't this - worry to leave that open?

CHAIR DEMBO: I'm not sure, remind me. Kaveh.

TAGAVI: No. We - the Rules Committee was not asked to comment on this, but it didn't stop us.

(AUDIENCE LAUGHS)

TAGAVI: And we said that, perhaps, a third-year - a third-year appointment should not be done. So two years and then that's it. But the Senate Council Chair preferred that this should be done at a different time, getting input from the cabinets. So, no, we did not act on that. We -- we brought it up, but we did not act on it.

CHARD: Senate Council said third or

subsequent. Reappointment to a third or subsequent term should go through the normal search process.

CHAIR DEMBO: So, we're missing a word there.

CHARD: In council, yes.

CHAIR DEMBO: A third or subsequent?

CHARD: Yes.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. So, that will be a typographical error. We're not amending anything. We're just making sure the right wording gets in there.

TAGAVI: So we can change that then.

CHARD: Right.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Rebecca, you have that?

SCOTT: Got it.

CHAIR DEMBO: Marla? Okay, thank you.

Any other comments, questions? Okay.

All in favor, please raise your hands?

(SENATE VOTES)

CHAIR DEMBO: Any opposed? Any abstentions.

Okay. Thank you. I'd like to beg your indulgence here. We have four items from four different colleges, whereby, the colleges want to change some of their academic process or procedure. One involves promotion, another involves admission. All of these have been

through each college. They've been through the - through Wally Ferrier and the Senate Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards. I don't think there's anything wrong with bundling these together, and I'd like to - I'll open it up for any questions about any of them. I would like to compliment Wally. Unfortunately, he couldn't be here. He had a family commitment. He spent time with each of the deans from each of the colleges. And, in fact, in the case of Pharmacy, worked very closely with Bill Lubawy to tweak a little bit of the wording that made it -- ended up making it more clear, I think. And Bill and his colleagues were very - very willing to do that. I do want to point out one other. So, this is Pharmacy and it's in your packet. Medicine, there was one very minor change that I spoke about with Darryl Jennings, Dean in the College of Medicine, that in this college now step two of the Licensing Exam has a clinical portion, and in the current wording it said: Students have three attempts to pass before dismissal with appeals. And it wasn't quite clear whether they had

three attempts to pass the two parts together, or if they had a three attempts to pass one of the parts and three attempts to pass the other part. And, Darryl, when I spoke to you, you said that it would be more accurate to add those words to pass each part. So, in other words, total, they could try up to six times to pass each of those two - two parts. So, with - this didn't come out of Wally's committee, but with your permission, I'd like to recommend that that gets added in there. Nursing graduation requirement, they're adding - proposing to add one more phrase. And in the College of Communication Information Studies, they're changing their admission deadlines. Instead of having two acceptances, two admission dates, they want to have one admission dates, and they have some other things allowing students to waive requirements and what the admission procedure is. All of these came out of the Senate Council with a positive recommendation. And before I put it on the floor as a bundle, I'd like to see if there's any particular questions or if any members of these colleges have a comment they want to

make. Professor Blandford.

BLANDFORD: Blandford, Engineering. I have one question. It says that on this Pharmacy one: May be placed on probation or may be suspended. It seems to me like that's a little bit vague. Can't - they should have made up their mind whether it should have been suspension or probation. It seems like it's left up to the Dean or somebody to make that determination.

CHAIR DEMBO: Dean Lubawy.

LUBAWY: Just depends on how severely the grades were or what was going on, whether the students - when the faculty felt the student had some redeeming social value.

(AUDIENCE LAUGHS)

LUBAWY: And, yes, they are terribly subjective judgments. But we figured that was prerogative of the faculty. The committee is made up of the faculty, who teach the students in that semester. We've had situations where students have reasonable backgrounds, just kind of mix. Some students had all Cs but they're high Cs. Some students have all Cs but they're right next to a D. And, so, the faculty sit down and look at how well

that student performed, what's going on,
what their chances are of doing things,
and they make a decision. And they
wanted that particular judgment to rest
with them.

CHAIR DEMBO: In the professional college in
the Medical Center, there's some very
active academic performance committees
that track each student very closely and
individually. So there is the ability to
look at the student's individual
progress. Other questions? Professor
Tagavi.

TAGAVI: On page 14 of the handout, the
last line.

CHAIR DEMBO: Which one is that?

TAGAVI: The handout that was given to
the - page 14. The last line, I think,
Professor Lubawy confirmed - we
discussed that dismissal should be
dropped at the Senate Council, and it was
decided that it should be dropped. So,
I'd like you to remind us again.

CHAIR DEMBO: Which phrase is it? I'm sorry.

TAGAVI: Page 14, last line.

CHAIR DEMBO: Thanks. 14, last line.

TAGAVI: The word "dismissal". There is
no dismissal at the University of
Kentucky for academic performance. There

is twice suspension.

CHAIR DEMBO: Is it correct - I think, Kaveh, that you commented on it. I don't think that we actually --

TAGAVI: No, he - Dr. Lubawy agreed. It was my understanding that we dropped it.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. You okay with that, Bill? Okay. So, first, is there any objection to lumping these together? Okay. So we have before you four different action items from the Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards from Wally Ferrier. All in favor, please raise your hands.

(SENATE VOTES)

CHAIR DEMBO: All opposed? Any abstentions?

Thank you very much. We are now only five minutes over schedule. I'm going to - I'd still love at the end of all of this a couple of minutes just to talk with the Senate, but the most pressing issue right now is our Senate business of talking about the USP Oral Communication requirement. I need to give you some background on this. This first came before the University Senate as a discussion only item, December 9, 2002.

The formal proposal from the University Studies Committee which is a committee of the Senate came forward on the 22nd in a letter signed by that - by its Chair Phil Kraemer, saying, basically, that significant enrollment, diminished funding, the Oral Communication requirement can no longer be implemented without impacting students' timely graduation. So, the recommendation was to delete this requirement. The next stop for this proposal - oh, I'm sorry, there was some other thoughts there about the value of Oral Communication skills and that there were - there could be under undergraduate programs that continue to require some of these courses, but there are alternative pathways that can be employed for students to gain these skills. Again, forgive me, I'm - for shortening this.

The next stop that this proposal took was at the University Senate Council on 2/23. The Senate Council responded in this way: First, we charged the USP Committee to develop a concrete plan through which responsibility for developing these skills would migrate to the departments because it wasn't clear at that time how

it would happen should the proposal eventually be approved. There's also an amendment including the plan information regarding how many programs would require specific courses coming out of the College of Communication Information Studies, for instance, Com 181, and how Communications would continue to serve those students. Finally, the Senate Council requested that some specific information from the department and from the college talking about current and projected enrollment, trying to find out what kind of resources would have to be reallocated if there were decreases in enrollment should this proposal be approved. So there was some concrete information that was sought. After that, there was another Senate Council discussion and to this, it was attended by Department Chair Nancy Harrington from the Department of Communication, Dean Johnson from the College, and Enid Waldhart from the College and also on the USP Committee - Committee, and she's also intergrally involved with Oral Communications courses. The way this - this meeting was as follows: Kay Chard

moved it to - to the Senate with no recommendation but with a suggestion of implementing a moratorium with reevaluating the requirement in three years, and it was properly seconded. At that time we had to - there was further discussion about what happened. Bailey suggested changing it to suspension, and we needed to be specific about which students would be affected, incoming freshmen and transfer students. I'm sorry, the Provost was at the meeting as well. And, finally, the sentiment changed a little bit to make it a positive recommendation, given that the proposal is now a suspension rather than a permanent deletion of the requirement. I asked who would evaluate this or reassess the requirement after three years, and it was suggested that it go to the Senate, and in particular, the USP Committee. So this is the final Senate Council motion that's now brought to you on the - on the floor to suspend the Oral Com requirement for three years for entering freshmen, transfer students with reevaluation by the Senate. USP Committee will -- will develop guidelines for reevaluation. It'll apply to the

entering classes of 2004, -5, and -6, and it's come before you with a positive recommendation.

I want to take an extra minute to have Nancy Harrington present a little bit of the background because that's the critical feature as to the nature of the discussion the Senate Council has or had on this. So, Nancy, why don't you come up and present the point of view of the College.

HARRINGTON: All right. Thank you, Jeff.

You did a very good job summarizing the discussion. I hope everyone has had a chance to look at the Web presentation that was posted for you-all because that's the long presentation I made at the Senate Council meeting. And what I want to do now is just hit a couple high points, I hope. Uh-oh. Okay. The University Studies Program has been around since 1988, and every since that time, it's such a massive and complex program. I think we all recognize that, that there's been a lot of talk, and, in fact, one of the strategic indicators in a former strategic plan for the University suggested that we streamline

this USP program. Since that time, there have been some changes. In fact, a point that's not up here in 1997, it was approved to accept alternate paths to Oral Communication because people were recognizing that it was a significant barrier for students to graduate. And a couple of years ago, the cross-disciplinary requirement was removed because it was difficult to achieve as well. And then most recently, of course, the written communication part of USP. There's an interim proposal to change that from the two three-credit hour courses to one four-credit hour course followed up by a second course later on. And, so, now, as Jeff indicated and as you-all know, what we're looking at now is no longer to delete Oral Com from USP, but rather to give us the opportunity for some breathing room, to suspend the requirement for the next three years, incoming and transfer students, 2004, -5, and -6. The USP Committee will develop guidelines for reevaluation, and the department will work very closely with that committee and that charge. And, again, the suspension will apply for the next three years. Why

now? Well, we all know we're looking at an incoming class of 4,000 students. It's very huge. We've all been facing budget cuts. The department budget has been affected, and the department has been supporting Oral Com for several years now through funding PTI sections, through supplementing our lecturer's salaries. And, so, with budget cuts, we really can't do that anymore. The Graduate Program, as well, has received budget cuts, and so that impacts TAs. The four-year graduation contract when that was accepted for the trial period, and we looked at that and said: My goodness, what does this mean now for students who cannot meet the Oral Com requirement because they simply can't get in? That's a pressing problem. And, of course, SACS issues are always omnipresent. And with SACS now not liking PTIs so much anymore, not liking TAs for that matter, we're going, my goodness, if we have to have all lecturers teach this, what are those implications? I need to be very crystal clear, we will still offer Oral Communication classes. Basic Public

Speaking, Interpersonal Communications, Small Group, Persuasive Speaking, those courses will still be offered. They'll be offered for the students whose programs require them for accreditation, programs in Engineering, in Business, in Education, other programs. That's one of the things we're going to be working with the USP Committee to get a real handle on is to find out who, exactly, needs these courses. We have a sense for it, and we know it's a large number of students, but we'll get an answer. In addition, we will be able to address the backlog that is, again, building up. If you look at the Web presentation, you'll see - you will have seen the backlog, we were eating away at it for a while. But when the classes started increasing, that backlog started going right back up. And, so, we hope with this suspension for three years, we will be able to address those needs of those students who are already here and who need it for graduation. Again, during this suspension period, we're going to explore alternate approaches. And we've been doing this all along. We really have. At one point, we were working closely

with English to see if there was a way we could couple our courses with their courses. That didn't work out for several reasons. We have Com 199, a one-hour credit course that we couple with some programs. That's complicated for several reasons, but that's something we can look at. We can look at other alternatives as well. We'll use that time to do this. Also, we'll explore assessment strategies because assessing a three-hour course is one thing, but assessing all sorts of alternate paths is something else entirely. So we'll need to look at that very carefully for SACS. And, also, we will look at criteria and, again, this is working with the USP Committee, of course, to evaluate what is going on during this three-year period so that three years from now when we look back, we can say, well, where were we, where are we now, has any good come of this, and what should we do now? So, again, here is the proposal. It comes with a positive recommendation from Senate Council, and at this time, I hope I can answer any questions for you. I will let you know that Dr. Waldhart, Enid

Waldhart's in the audience as well. She has expertise, unmatched expertise. And our Dean David Johnson is there in the back. He may be able to answer some questions as well. Thank you-all.

CHAIR DEMBO: Before we start the discussion, we had some very passionate discussion at the Senate Council because there are two very clear opposing forces. One, is the fact that as purists, we should hold education as highly and as - as clearly as we can in terms of what we're trying to accomplish in creating a scholar to leave the University. And the realists among us said, well, you know, that's all well and good, but when you only have X number of dollars, and we have decreasing dollars every day and increasing students, you know, how are you going to do it? You're going to always end up with a less than adequate product despite trying to -- to head for the best. So there was some very passionate discussions. The Provost was there, and one of the things that, I think, made a difference in my mind was at one point Nancy was asked: Well, honestly, you know, how would it take - how much money would it take right now just to keep up

with the current demand and not even worrying about next year or the year after? And the number turns out to be about \$600,000 to hire new faculty, not PTIs.

HARRINGTON: Or lecturers, yeah. Because lecturers come with things like benefits and -- and such that really add to the cost.

CHAIR DEMBO: And the Provost said, he says: I can get \$600,000 tomorrow. He said: I'll take it from Ag and Education and Dentistry and Medicine.

HARRINGTON: We don't want that.

CHAIR DEMBO: And that's - that's where we are. So, first, are there any questions for Nancy about the specifics of this before we get into the philosophy of it? Professor Yates.

YATES: The proposal was to put the program in abeyance for three years. After three years, would you care to speculate what the - the outcome might be?

HARRINGTON: I'm still working on my psychic powers. But after three years, we'll - we'll have a better power idea of enrollment at the University. We've all

watched as it has gone up and up and up over the years. I will be curious to see how high can it go. After three years, although we have studied very seriously alternative paths and from our department perspective, we're not comfortable with the alternate paths. We feel the best way to educate our students in Oral Communication skills is with a three-credit hour course in the classroom, small classroom sizes, but we are willing to look. We really are.

And, in fact, at our most recent faculty meeting just last Wednesday, we discussed this at length. And I asked the faculty: Look, I'm -- I'm getting to speak to the Senate on Monday. Tell me what your feelings are. And there were mixed emotions. There really were. Several faculty said, gosh, we've really got to get these skills out to all the students.

At the same time as Jeff indicated, there are concerns of - of reality. But I don't think I'm answering your question.

In three years, I don't know. If - if we have something viable that our department's comfortable with and that the Senate is comfortable with, I think we would be willing to go with that. It

may be that nothing is viable and
everybody goes, okay, we're going back.
And so be it.

CHAIR DEMBO: Steve, is there just a follow
up to that?

YATES: Yeah, it's just a follow up.
Because, of course, USP looked at all of
these proposals that were presented, like
Communications, didn't see a light at the
end of the tunnel. I just wonder whether
this is delaying action. In three years,
you're going to be at the same place once
again.

HARRINGTON: It may be but for right now the
only positive recommendation that was
able to come out of Senate Council was
this delaying action. Folks were not
comfortable with just deleting it.

CHAIR DEMBO: I don't frequently give my
opinion. I'll do it right now: That it
would be just as much a mistake to -- to
treat this in isolation over the next
three years, as it - as it has been to
consider that once somebody fulfills all
their USP, they are a scholar. So, I
think, Phil, you probably agree with me
that the whole notion of general
education does need to be revisited.

PHIL: No, that's true.

CAVAGNERO: Michael Cavagnero, Arts and Sciences. Has the possibility of allowing students to test out, has this been considered and discussed?

HARRINGTON: We have been doing a bypass exam for Com 181 for several years.

CAVAGNERO: I see.

HARRINGTON: And we have about 20 students a year, about, who take advantage of that. Yeah.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Lesnaw, did you have your hand up?

LESNAW: I had one question.

HARRINGTON: Yes, ma'am.

LESNAW: How are our benchmark institutions dealing with this issue? Can we get any --

HARRINGTON: Absolutely. Basically, they're - they're not doing it the way we do it. I did a survey of our benchmark institutions about two years ago, and of the 17 responding, only 3 had an Oral Communication requirement for the whole entire student body. The others, they might offer Communication, and it could fill an elective. Others, it would offer it and it wouldn't fill an elective. And, so, there were only 3.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Staten and then
Professor Bailey.

STATEN: Teresa Staten, College of
Nursing. I have two questions. One, is
could you tell us what you mean by
reevaluation? What is that going to
encompass? And secondly, you said
several times that the alternative
pathways may not be adequate. On what do
you base that?

HARRINGTON: Right. Excellent questions.
The first question, it would be addressed
over these three years. I mean, we would
work with the USP Committee to decide
what those criteria should be so that
when we get to the end of the three
years, we'll be able to decide whether
this is a good thing or not. As far as
alternative paths, in 1997, that's when
folks were able to say, okay, we're not
doing any of the Oral Com or the TA 225,
by the way, which is an option but a very
small number of students are served
there. And, so, anywhere from 13 to 19
alternate paths kind of emerged, and,
frankly, we're not sure how evaluation is
going on with those alternate paths right
now. So, we don't know. And that would

be something that we would be looking at,
especially if we create new alternate
paths during this three-year period.

CHAIR DEMBO: Enid, did you want to add to
that?

WALDHART: Yeah. Let me just add to that

because nursing and ag are probably two
of the departments that have very strong
alternate paths, but it took us a long
time to get there. And, so, we are
looking at that kind of thing. Like,
some of the things that come up when we
talk about teaching a discipline, we've
tried to come up with good parallels or
good kinds of analogies, and it's been
very difficult, asking people to teach
something that is not their expertise.

Like, many of you responded when there
was reference to a second writing course
that could come from the disciplines.

And people said, oh, not me. I - I
don't want to teach. I can't teach

English Writing or -- or whatever. And
that some of the same kinds of questions,
I think, are likely to come up here.

Some people are very comfortable teaching
it, and some are very, very not
comfortable. Some are well prepared, and
some are not and that looking at

alternatives for workshops with faculty,
workshops with people who are going to -
to have to do this kind of evaluation of
Oral Com skills in whatever alternative
is offered, it takes a lot of time. And
I think, this goes back to what Steve was
asking: We don't know what it's going to
look like. It may come up that there's
lots. Several of the alternate paths
that were started that seemed very strong
in 1997 have just simply reverted back
to - to taking one of the other COM
courses or the TA course because their
faculty just didn't feel comfortable with
it. And, so, I don't know that we know.
I think we need to work on it. And this
hiatus, this suspension, is something
that, I think, will allow us a chance.
Right now we're - we're trying furiously
to catch up with the people who haven't
had the course yet. And that if we could
have a breathing space, would allow us to
investigate some of these other
alternatives. And that's really what -
what this suspension would, I think, help
us do.

CHAIR DEMBO: Thanks, Enid. Professor
Bailey.

BAILEY: Veterinary Science. In partial answer to - to Professor Yates' question about - about what would happen after three years, we certainly could be in the same place after three years if nothing happens. But when we discussed it in the Senate Council, the interest was that these alternate paths be developed. I mean, that's the hope. If that happens, then there may be some resolution, and that was part of the thing that led a very skeptical and critical Senate Council to come through and make a positive recommendation on a three-year suspension of the evaluation.

HARRINGTON: And to echo something Enid said and that Ruth brought up a minute ago, Topsy Staten, we did work very closely with nursing and had several meetings and looked at the course content and looked at assessment strategies and so on over and over and over again, and now have something that is a good example of what can happen.

CHAIR DEMBO: Kaveh. Then Ray.

TAGAVI: On the handout below the - the courses, it says the department would continue to search through the programs required one of these courses. So, in

partial answer to Professor Yates'
comment, also, I'd like to say there is a
way of making this effectively and gain a
USP requirement even before the three
years by different programs, making this
a requirement. If it's very important
for any program, just make it a
requirement, and it will be so.

HERRINGTON: Thank you. That's true.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Ford.

FORD: Ford, Family Studies. This is
a clarification. When you say
reevaluation, are you talking about
reevaluation of the oral communication's
requirement, right, not reevaluation of
the suspension, correct?

SPEAKER: No.

TAGAVI: Of the suspension.

FORD: It's reevaluation of the
suspension rather than reevaluation of
the --

HARRINGTON: Well --

FORD: Do you see the difference?

HARRINGTON: I do see the difference, and -
and it's, actually, I think, it's both.

FORD: Well, both is fine.

HARRINGTON: Sure.

FORD: That's what I'm wondering is

if it's going to be a reevaluation of the Oral Communication's requirement, then that seems like reasonable. But if you're just going to reevaluate the suspension without getting down to the basic question, you won't be where you want to be.

HARRINGTON: Yeah - no, are the alternate paths working? Did the suspension lead to good outcomes, things like that.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Jackie.

NOONAN: Noonan. This is a question as I don't know anything about this, but if this is a requirement all students have to take, is there not a way that you can have students confirm that they know how they speak English before they come to college by doing something at the high school level? Can they not take an exam before they come in, or do something? There must be some that don't need this requirement.

HARRINGTON: Sure. And we --

NOONAN: And the same thing for the writing one. I mean, some of them go to high school and write themes and things all the time. Can't you opt out a number of students and only take those that need it?

HARRINGTON: Right. Well, with the oral communication requirement, we do have a bypass exam that we make available for students.

NOONAN: But you said only a few take it.

HARRINGTON: Well, sure.

NOONAN: And -- well, why wouldn't you make them take it then, and if they don't pass, then they have to take the course?

HARRINGTON: I think even Enid has a response.

WALDHART: Can I interrupt on this one because the logistics of having everybody do this before they come in is a nightmare. Way back when I was an undergraduate, we tried this at the University of Wisconsin, and it - it was horrific because of the numbers of students going through trying to do this. The expense of it now, I mean, we were talking 600, 1,000 students doing this, and it - it was very difficult. One thing that, I think, is very important to remember, SACS used to require a course in communication skills. SACS no longer requires a course. What they require is

Oral Communication competency. So, if there are ways that - that alternative programs can provide that means to competency, then SACS requirements have been met, and then it's less critical that all students take Com courses. So, I think, there's just so many things that we truly don't know, but we need - we need time to try them and to see if it will work and - and the time is what we're really asking for now.

CHAIR DEMBO: By extension, it also means that each college or each department could very - could try to identify what types or what depth of communication skills their majors or their students require. There was a hand up over here. Professor Braun.

BRAUN: Accounting. I wanted to ask just a point of question. In 2004, -5, and -6, did they just not have to - will they have to substitute a course so that it's just they'll take four credits less of University Studies requirement?

HARRINGTON: Well, three credits, yes. They just - they would not take that Oral Communication part of USP. And, so, all other graduation requirements would still be in place, 120 hours, all of that kind

of thing. It's just that they would have three hours that they did not need to fulfill with Oral Communication. And a point we probably should make is that if at the end of these three years everybody goes: None of this worked; we want Oral Com back in USP. It would not be retroactive for those three years worth of students. On one level, that goes without saying, but on another level, I think it needs to be said.

BRAUN: Just one other minor point.

HARRINGTON: Sure.

BRAUN: In the four-year contract thing, using that as a justification for this, sticks in my craw a little bit just because, you know, we're only going to be trying this thing out, right? And I think there was a pretty wide and diverging opinions about whether that was going to be a good thing for us to be doing anyway, given the budget situation and all, and now to all of a sudden see that as a justification for this, I think, is pushing the envelope.

HARRINGTON: Well, I'll tell you it was for us kind of a last straw, frankly, because there were so many other pressing reasons

that we've been grappling with for so long, and then this came along, and we thought: Oh, my gosh, if this does pass, sure, it's a trial right now, but if it does come to be, then what? And, especially, when you consider that the students' home departments would be responsible for paying the tuition of the students to take those courses they couldn't get into in four years, wow, that would be really a disaster and a lot of ill will and trouble. So, it's not a major part; it's a small part.

CHAIR DEMBO: Chuck. Then Jim.

STABEN: Chuck Staben, Biology. I have almost a completely different take on this issue that makes this discussion largely irrelevant in my own mind. We talked mostly about the requirement itself, and I don't think that's what this discussion really should be about. It's suspending a degree requirement due to resource limitation. And we're going to face a lots of resource limitations in this University over the next several years. So, I guess, I'll go back to being an idealist. If we want to reconsider the Communication's requirement, that's a fine discussion to

have in the Senate. I welcome that. But I'm going to set that completely aside and say: We're saying that for 4,000 students per year, 12,000 people we're going to admit to the University of Kentucky, we philosophically accept that resource limitation changes their degree requirement. And - and presumably if we accept that in this case, we'll accept that argument in any future case or many future cases. And when Chemistry comes and says we can't teach Organic Chemistry to the Biology majors, we'll accept that argument. When Biology says we can't - we can't teach Biology to these majors and those majors because we must do this or that, we'll accept that argument. I think this is incredibly dangerous and is - is not anything I'm - I'm inclined to support.

HARRINGTON: I - I think that concern was discussed at the Senate Council meeting as well, but, please, I ask you to remember it doesn't mean that 12,000 students aren't going to get Oral Communication skills training. A significant number of those students will receive it because their programs do

require it, and we'll continue to offer it. In addition to that, we do continue to look at alternative paths. But then, to answer your question, you know, ideal versus money or resources, I don't have an answer for that other than on the receiving end of the department, I don't know what to tell parents when they call, and I don't know what to tell students when they show up when we just can't do it anymore.

CHAIR DEMBO: This is an important point.

Jim and Kay, you had your hands up. Do you have separate points to bring up?

CHARD: Mine is in reaction to that --
Senate Council floor.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Could we just for a second iterate what was just brought up?
Jim, I'll get back to you. Okay?

CHARD: I don't think that that's how the Senate Council saw this. And I - I surveyed a fair number of Graduate School faculty who feel - and no knock against Communications here, but feel that TA instruction is a poor way to teach communication. And when they compared graduate students from other institutions to UK, the UK students fail when it comes to having good, solid, Oral Communication

skills. And there are many people in the Senate Council floor who thought this is an opportunity for Communication to get out of this TA model that SACS is already criticizing and move into a better model that will improve Oral Communication throughout the curriculum just like writing across the curriculum is where we ought to be going as well, some people think. And it's not at all an issue of us saying, we don't have the money to do it. I think it's a two-fold issue that we put squarely back into Communications' hands.

CHAIR DEMBO: Mike. Then Ernie if you're talking about this specific point?

CIBULL: Yeah. I think a couple of things. I think it's even worse than what you stated because at the same time we're doing this, we're raising tuition, so, you know, we're charging them more, educating them less, and compromising based on resources. However, it's also an opportunity for us to develop better ways of educating students. And I think that it - it probably won't - we won't be able to find ways of doing that with every single course. Maybe, you know,

Biology for Chemistry majors and
Chemistry for Biology majors, we won't be
able to find a better way than the
traditional way. But my guess is we can
find a better way than teaching separate,
free-standing Oral Communication courses
when, essentially, every discipline
requires public speaking of some sort.
And we have the - we have a resource
department that, hopefully, would be
willing to help each of us develop those
programs. SACS requires competency. It
does not require a course. That
competency requirement still exists
whether we - whether we suspend Oral
Communication or not. So, I think, there
is a reason that resources are shrinking.
We're going to have to do something.
This is a good area to do something.
There's a hell of a lot of students
involved in this. You can save a lot of
money in Oral Communication. I don't how
much money you can save in, you know,
like architecture or what have you, the
small courses. So, I - I - I argued
with this - this young lady when she
presented this to the Senate Council, and
I still have reservations. And, I think,
we need to hold their feet to the fire in

terms of developing a - a viable
program, but I think we should give them
a chance to do that.

CHAIR DEMBO: Ernie, were you going to
comment on this point?

YANARELLA: Yes. I - I want to echo both

Chuck and Mike's comments in this regard.
I think I said to you, Jeff, after the
meeting: Welcome to the resource wars of
the 21st century of higher education. We
are now confronting, I think, a very
serious issue where we risk educational
policy being sacrificed on the altar
of - of budgetary exigencies. We need
to effect extra space, an open, candid
debate with - and discussion with higher
administration about this. If our area
of policy - if our area of concern is
educational policy, we cannot with any
sense of equanimity be very happy or
satisfied with - with requirement after
requirement going by the boards. It
seems to me that - that perhaps next
year one of the things - one of the
priorities that we might say would be to
explore this in greater depth. It is not
clear to me that the administration has
shown its cards on this. It seems to

have found a neat little formula for -
for holding at bay the wolves, but it has
not genuinely dealt with the kinds of
vines that are being - being set -- set
upon in English and communications and --
and, perhaps, in other - other areas as
well. I hope that out of the next three
years of reevaluation, that some kind of
a dispersion model that - that some of
us have talked about will become - will
become viable, that we'll allow for
communications competency to be - to be
taught here at this University. I think
this is a very, very important element of
general education. And to see it pass
after three years, would be a real
heartbreak to me.

CHAIR DEMBO: For a point of information,
at last Tuesday's Board meeting, in the
same breath that the President informed
the Board of Trustees that unless things
get better, we're going to continue to
lose our faculty to Vanderbilt, he also
showed us a slide, among other things,
that the toll that this budget is taking
on the University is a proposal that the
Senate is now deliberating over. So, he
announced that to the Board as one of the
many palpable ways that we're suffering

because of - of the budget shortfall.

Darryl, are we on the same point?

JENNINGS: I completely agree with -- with

all the points that Chuck made and with Mike - that Mike made, and I just come, though, to a different conclusion, and that is as we as Senators are not driving this compromise in the quality of education that we're offering. The State Legislature is driving this compromise. And because there comes a point they can't cut enough money beyond which no idealism on our part can preserve the quality of education. As long as Frankfort can cut money and see no real consequence, as long as we bend and cover over, whether that be through offering mediocre programs or whatever, they can continue to cut. There has to be some visible documentable bleeding before Frankfort will recognize it. And in one breath we criticize administration for being unwilling to make the hard decisions to make the cuts as opposed to just weakening everything across the board, I think we have a very well-reasoned, thoughtful proposal to make a painful yet necessary cut, and I think we

need to set an example as faculty that we are willing to make the kind of hard decision that we expect from administration, and I think we need to send through the Board of Trustees that message to Frankfort, that, yes, indeed, this may be the first step in that slope, but this is what will come down the road if Frankfort continues to make those kinds of decisions.

CHAIR DEMBO: Did any of you read the recent Chronicle issue where they talked about California and the plight of their budget cut there? On one hand, it was deeply reassuring to realize you are not alone. On the other hand, California starts out at a very different home base than we do. As a flagship institution and a state that has classically been behind - under the median in so many different areas. Jim, should I get back to you?

ALBISETTI: It was on a different point.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay.

ALBISETTI: Probably directed to Phil Kraemer as much as anyone. Students of this University when there are changes in requirements, always have the option to graduate what they entered under but also if they prefer a new requirement. Are

you prepared for the students who entered
in 2003 are going to say: I would like
to not have to fulfill Communications or
is a suspended requirement not a change?

KRAEMER: I could have said that to
you, Jim. That's an issue, but I think
in this circumstance, it really - this
is a better compromise. I mean, we're
not in a good situation on this one. I
think there have been some very pointed
comments made. I think - I want to
remain optimistic that this three years
give us a period to look. I would argue,
though, that the slippery-slope argument
doesn't trouble me much. We're not
voting an algorithm here. This is an
aspecific case. We are going to have to
take that - each case at a time. And I
think - I'm encouraged by Ernie's
comments. I think this Senate needs to
have a real dialogue about where we are,
what quality is that we can provide. But
there's no question that quality
education has been hurt by the state's
behavior. And if not this, what else?
Because realize this is not a question of
this or not this. It's this versus that.
The Provost could reallocate funding to

cover this, but if we continue to put ourselves in that position, we're going to really go to war at each other.

CHAIR DEMBO: Topsy.

STATEN: I guess I want to support this, but I would like us to kind of separate these issues out. I think a good evaluation of the Oral Communication requirement and how students may have that when they come in, how we can meet it in their time here, how we can document it at the end is really a great thing for us to do, and probably ought to do more across the board with the USP. But this is one issue about this budget, but think of the number of times we have had faculty come asking to assure that students can be successful in their program, thus, they've asked us to set second admissions to their program. Am I saying that clearly? You know, that - that you have to have a certain GPA and make certain grades in a course. Those really are at the same issue. How many students can you manage, whether it's Oral Communication or in the College of Communication, how many students can you manage with that major? We are not having that dialog, and we've got to have

it. I just want to support people's comments about that. We have got to talk about how we can do that and be very real about it because it is affecting the quality of education and the opportunity for education for some students.

CHAIR DEMBO: So the topic is enrollment management, is that --

STATEN: And quality education.

CHAIR DEMBO: And quality education. Are there other topics that --

GOVINDARAJULU: Question.

CHAIR DEMBO: Is there a question?

GOVINDARAJULU: Question.

CHAIR DEMBO: Yes.

GOVINDARAJULU: I want to know if - if the faculty - if it costs \$600,000 to manage the program, and if there are faculty primarily interested in Oral Communication, what happens to those people if this program is suspended?

HARRINGTON: Well, it would take about \$600,000 if we transformed the program to be able to address the needs of 4,000 incoming students and meet that with lecturers. Right now the program is not set up that way at all. We have four lecturers. We have a lot of TA and

PTI-taught classes. We have a budget that is kind of cobbled together. We have one set of money - one set of money? Some money that could serve about 2,400 students, 25, 26, when - when this all first started. And since that time, there's been some influx of funds, some recurring, a lot non-recurring. I mentioned earlier that the department funds a lot of it. And, so, as part of this three-year suspension period, we'll get a real handle on the budget and - and know which students really need our three-hour courses and the alternate paths and things like that. And, so, it's not like there's \$600,000 that will materialize.

CHAIR DEMBO: We just have a few minutes left. I'd like to encourage those that have new points to bring them up. Professor Grossman. Then Professor Tagavi.

GROSSMAN: Yeah, I have two but I'll just bring up one. When the English Department was facing similar problems, they came up with a proposal to bring to us to change their requirement in a way that was pedagogically sound. They didn't ask for a suspension. I

understand why a suspension is necessary for communications, why you haven't already come up with proposals. We've been seeing this come down the pike for several years now. I don't understand why we need - why communications needs a suspension, whereas, other USP programs are constantly trying to find new ways to meet their demand.

HARRINGTON: Right. As I tried to indicate, we have been looking at alternate paths for several years now. Part of it is a philosophical concern, where, when we look at what our colleagues are doing at institutions across the nation, we see courses very similar to what we offer, three-hour skills based courses, small classrooms, and I think, in our hearts we believe that this is how you should do it. And, so, with alternate paths, it's like, well, what concessions are we willing to make? Some, it's Com 199, the one-hour course. That's supposed to be offered early in a student's career so that later when they get to their upper division courses in Engineering or wherever, that they can build on those skills. What we find is that it

flip-flops because of the course demand.

They can't get it until their final semester, and then it's good for them but it's not as good for them. And, so, we really have been grappling with this at the same time that we've been trying to manage all of this demand. And, so, with this suspension, it will give us the breathing room, a phrase I used earlier that I'll use again.

CHAIR DEMBO: Kaveh. We have to sort of wind this up pretty soon.

TAGAVI: I don't think I heard - I might be wrong, but I don't think the answer to Senator Albisetti's question. Assume a student at the end of this semester, he's going to have all the credit required, all - all the courses that are required, he has it except for Com 181 which is required by USP, would that student - could he work this - and we should say that's an unequal right now because this is a big deal for that particular student.

ALBISETTI: It's clear to me as I read the proposal it speaks about incoming students. The average student, so it is - it's - I think it is clear we need to be redundant and say it, but that's

what we want to say that a student who -
a current student who's enrolled in the
University of Kentucky would not be
covered by this hiatus.

HARRINGTON: Well, and let me say that when
the incoming class when not all 4,000
students need these classes, that should
open up some seats then for those
students who are trying to get a seat and
graduate.

CHAIR DEMBO: Steve.

YATES: Yeah, Steve Yates, Chemistry
again. I serve on the University Studies
Committee. We spend a lot of time on
this issue, and other than giving our
students credit for cell phone time, I
don't see a way to address it.

(AUDIENCE LAUGHS)

YATES: But, I guess, I'm really taken
by Chuck's comments because at the time
University Studies was proposed, I don't
think Oral Communications was originally
included - was included in it. They
argued very strenuously that it should be
included, and on the basis of principle
it was, if history serves me correctly.
Basically, what we're doing is we're
renegeing on that principle. And I don't

see that a suspension, a moratorium, a putting this in abeyance is really the answer because we've looked at the solutions, and it's going to take a lot of effort by people in other programs to come up with -- roots. In the - in the time of diminishing resources, I don't see people going that direction. And, so, I would prefer to vote up - vote this USP requirement for Oral Communications either up or down. I don't like the idea of the suspension. I think it just puts off this decision. We're going to thrash around for three more years. We've thrashed around for several years already. There is no obvious solution other than more resources. And if we aren't willing to support what we believe is a - is a good program with those resources, then we should discontinue it; we should move on.

CHAIR DEMBO: There can be many changes, however, in funding from Frankfort, the budget of the University and its various programs and colleges between now and then. So, either something will get a whole lot different showing us which way to go, or it won't, and then we may be back to considering a permanent

suspension of this. We need to - I think I sort of hear things winding down, and if there's nobody else that has a pressing issue that has not been brought up, I think we're ready to bring it to a vote. Professor Grossman.

GROSSMAN: Yes, I'm sorry. But I do.

This idea that departments are free to require their students to - to take Com courses, it's going to require that - that departments amend their programs, and then these amendments are going to have to go through the system somehow, and at what - how fast are they going to occur, and are they going to occur in time for students to join the majors, and when will these students apply?

HARRINGTON: Yeah, actually --

GROSSMAN: Has all this been thought through?

HARRINGTON: That's an excellent question, and I think, Phil, you can help me remember. This was actually brought up in the discussions of the USP Committee, and there was talk of somehow streamlining the process, bundling the applications to address that very concern. You're right, we don't want

something to take an extra - God knows

how long to get through.

KRAEMER: I think the beginning point, Bob, would be that the programs themselves meeting to discuss and deciding whether Oral Communication would be a part of the program. And then try to present that through the normal channels, but try to expedite that in some way. But during the three-year period, I think we have more than sufficient time to be able to do that.

GROSSMAN: Well, what - I mean, what if the Chemistry Department decides they want all freshmen entering in 2004 to have to take communication courses?

KRAEMER: Well, you already do. We have an altering problem.

CHAIR DEMBO: Could I --

GROSSMAN: For the third credit, COM 199 credit. Okay, the Physics department doesn't have the alternative.

CHAIR DEMBO: Could I step in to answer that for a second. That's part of the academic approval process that the Senate Council is involved in.

GROSSMAN: But it's not a part of the requirement when they enter the University, if they sign up for the

department, and then the department changes its requirements, is the student going to be able to say, oh, no, I don't have to take this because it wasn't part of it when I started?

CHAIR DEMBO: That was in place when they were admitted to the University.

GROSSMAN: So in other words, as - as long as the - if the program that -- when they were admitted to the University, so in other words, it won't be required of any student - of any student who - who enrolls in the fall of 2004 --

CHAIR DEMBO: Unless --

GROSSMAN: Unless the -- at all, because there's not enough time to change it. There's no way for the program to require it.

HARRINGTON: Right. In the fall of 2004, I believe you are exactly right, that they will not be required to meet that requirement as the USP requirement or as a program requirement unless they - it is already in effect.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay, I'm going to --

HARRINGTON: In 2005, that changes.

CHAIR DEMBO: I'm going to close the

discussion. It's five o'clock which means we are on schedule except for one minute I'd really like to have you hear me out, but, first, I would like for us to take a vote to the proposal now is a three-year suspension of the Oral Communication requirement. I hope it's clear who that applies to, and the rationale for it. All in favor of this suspension, please raise your hand?

(SENATE VOTES)

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. All opposed. Let's take a count, Michelle, please.

(SENATE VOTES)

SOHNER: I think, 12.

CHAIR DEMBO: Keep your hands up, please.

SOHNER: Yeah, 12.

CHAIR DEMBO: Thank you. Any abstentions?

Thank you very much.

I just want to say two words please, give me - give me two minutes of your time. I've not taken much time as the Chair for - for my own personal viewpoints, and part of that - much of that was deliberate. The goal that I had over the past two years was to affirm and strengthen the role of the University Senate in the governance of the University and in the decision-making

process. We had been through a hellacious time in many ways over the last many years. And things didn't change in terms of the number of obstacles that we faced. My goal in terms of presiding over the Senate was to help create a cohesive rational and autonomous group of people that could effectively make decisions. And in order to do that, it required giving them the freedom to experiment and to succeed and to fail and to, finally, congeal. I was delighted to - to see that happen with the Senate Council over - it took - it took a while for the personalities to mesh. And now, while we may all disagree, we all know that we have a fair degree of respect for one another. I think we've achieved that in the University Senate. If you look at what we've dealt with over the past several years, the list is quite astonishing. A changeover in many personnel in central administration, proposal for and migration to the provost model, a dissolution of one college and the reapportionment of all of its students, faculty, and staff, a proposal to create

a new college, a proposal to decrease retiree health benefits, trying to define what is appropriate faculty representation on task forces and committees, a proposal just recently to separate an entire and integral part of our University, namely, our community college, and to send it off to an uncharted territory, reacting to SACS accreditation requirements, and then after getting the recommendations, having to further react to those, and, finally, we, as a Senate, had the - the loss of our Senate Council office through a fire and underwent several different iteration, and, finally, we had the departure of a longtime Senate Council employee. So, I think, we've been through an awful lot. I probably haven't touched on -- on half of them there. We've accomplished a whole lot, however. I think we've properly codified for all of the community what the Senate expects to have happen in terms of the due process along the way. I think we've reemphasized, not just to our community, but to our Board of Trustees, and, hopefully, to Frankfort what the voice of the University community is. And I

daresay that the Board of Trustees now at every one of their meetings when they're considering academic affairs, they make sure to put in there what the University Senate has said about something, and to my gratification, there were individual Board members that came over to me privately during a break, saying: Jeff, what do you really think about this? And I hope, Ernie, you have the same experience with developing that relationship. On a personal note, I need to give thanks to just a few people. Please bear me out. First, is to my family who's been very understanding over these past six years, and it's one thing to carry a beeper for patients that are on call, it's another thing to be responsive to the entire academic community when the latest crisis arises. Also, thanks to my own College and to my Dean who have also put up with my other halftime appointment. In reality it was two full-time appointments. Thanks to all of you for the friendships that I developed over the years and have permitted me to work with very talented and caring individuals. Specifically, I

need to thank An/dor Reporting and Marla and her colleagues for the good work they've done in transcribing our Senate meetings. To James Forrest for his good work and all the aid and support we've gotten from him. James, you're always there, thank you very much. To Michelle Sohner who, once again, has helped us out as Sergeant at Arms. Michelle, I really would have liked to have seen you eject somebody. A personal thanks to a person who's become a dear friend, Gifford Blyton, through whose eyes I've learned what it means to be a dedicated teacher over your entire lifetime and who truly knows the meaning, not just of parliamentary procedure, but the intent behind it. Gifford, I'm deeply appreciate to you, thank you so much. There are a number of people who work behind the scenes for the whole University Senate. These include support people at each of the different councils: Retha Higgs at Undergraduate Council, Lisa Holland at the Graduate Council, Kathy Owen at the Medical Center Academic Council, Sylvia Williams at LCC. In addition to folks in the Registrar's office who work tirelessly to make sure

that all the I's get dotted, T's get crossed for your departments and your colleges. That includes Cleo Price, Jackie Hagar and Tonya Prince. Finally, there's some people who also have been a unique help this year. I mentioned Phyllis Nash during her time as the Chief of Staff of the University of the President's office. Kris Hobson in the Provost's office has been an incredible help, and I don't know how she does it all, and it's -- she does it well. All the Deans' staffs have done a wonderful job for us. Angel Clark, you may remember her, she was our part-time employee that helped during that transition period, and she's no longer with us. She's gone on to greener pastures, but she did a wonderful job. And then, finally, chairs of the various committees: Chuck Staben, there's nobody who knows more about the University finance right now other than Dick Siemer and yourself, as Chair of the Institutional Finance Resource Allocation Committee which has been working very hard this year. Bob Grossman, thank you so much for staffing the - chairing the

Academic Programs Committee. Wally Ferrier is not here. He did a masterful job with the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee. And Kate Chard, I have a confession, when I first asked you if you would consider chairing it, I think I used the excuse that it's probably going to be the most active committee that we'll ever have. I was making that up, but it turned out to be the truth, and I'm deeply appreciative for the quality work that you did and your attention to details. Thank you very much. All the Senate Council members, I appreciate your friendship and your collegiality. There's a few people I need to thank. Braphus Kaalund is not here. As the student member, he showed up for every meeting, and the voice of the students is always incredibly important. And Braphus did a masterful job at giving sage advice and wisdom at just the right time. I look forward to a career in leadership for him whatever he chooses to do. Lee Edgerton, as Vice Chair, I truly appreciate your counsel and wisdom. It's been a privilege to serve with you. Peggy Saunier will be leaving the Council on June 30th by virtue

of the fact that LCC is no longer a direct part of our family. Nonetheless, Peggy has a memory like no other that I've seen, and she could quote word and verse sometimes even better than Davy Jones. Peggy, thank you so much for everything you did on the Council, and I will miss you. And, finally, to my colleague, Ernie Yanarella, to whom I'm going to give the gavel is just a moment, I have no doubt that the utmost confidence in the whole University community, but in myself, personally, in the job you're going to do to lead us forward. Finally, I wouldn't be finished without saying a very big thank you to someone who's made a place for herself in a very difficult situation. When you step into the shoes of somebody who's held an office for 30 years, and who the University has known in the position, whether it was a certain way of doing things, it can be very disruptive and sometimes it can be, actually, very disheartening to have to fill that slot and to exert a new influence, a new personality. When we interviewed for the new Senate Council Chair Administrative

Coordinator, Enid Waldhart who was
Co-chair at that time and I interviewed
some candidates. And when Ms. Scott left
that office, she - Enid and I just
looked at each other. We said: That's
the one. Rebecca Scott came across with
an incredible degree of knowledge,
enthusiasm, already present skill by her
work in the -- in the Graduate School as
the degree - degree officer -
degree-granting officers. And, I think,
you said you were also known for your
attention to details, sometimes to the -
to the rue of some of the graduate
students. But since coming into the
office, Rebecca has worked tirelessly,
not just to learn the ropes, but to make
sure that the Senate Council office acted
in the spirit of what we all envisioned
it should be as a representative to the
University and of the University. And,
so, it was a privilege to build that with
you, Rebecca, and I'm deeply
appreciative, not just of all the work
you've done, but your friendship, and I
will miss working with you that closely.
Thank you.

And, now, I take pleasure in
handing over the gavel. It feels, oh, so

heavy - to my friend and colleague,

Ernie Yanarella.

(AUDIENCE CLAPS)

CHAIR DEMBO: And as I said before, all in
favor of adjourning, please rise.

* * * * *

(MEETING CONCLUDED AT 5:10 P.M.)

* * * * *

STATE OF KENTUCKY)

)

COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

I, MARLA FRYE, Certified Shorthand Reporter, BCR, and the undersigned Notary Public, in and for the State of Kentucky at Large, certify that the foregoing transcript of the captioned meeting of the University of Kentucky Senate is a true, complete and accurate transcript of said proceedings as taken down in stenotype by me and later reduced to computer-aided transcription under my direction, and the foregoing is a true record of these proceedings.

I further certify that I am not employed by nor related to any member of the University of Kentucky Senate, and I have no personal interest in any matter before this Council.

My commission expires: January 23, 2007.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunder set my hand and seal of office on this the _____ day of _____, 2004.

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

