

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE COUNCIL

* * * * *

REGULAR SESSION

February 14, 2005

3:00 P.M.

W. T. Young Library
First Floor Auditorium
Lexington, Kentucky

DR. ERNIE YANARELLA, CHAIR

AN/DOR REPORTING & VIDEO TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
179 East Maxwell Street
Lexington, Kentucky 40508
(859) 25409568
University of Kentucky Senate Council

AN/DOR REPORTING AND VIDEO TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
179 East Maxwell Street
Lexington, Kentucky 40508

1 CHAIR YANARELLA: Good
2 afternoon, and welcome to the
3 February 14th, 2005 Senate meeting.
4 We have a tall order today in terms
5 of the agenda, and I hope that we
6 can try to keep on task as we go
7 through most of these agenda items.
8 All of the action items have been
9 recommended -- have been sent
10 forward to the Senate with a
11 positive recommendation from the
12 Senate Council, so they will be --
13 they will, in effect, be on the
14 floor with a motion, positive
15 motion, for consideration by the
16 Senate. We also have a number of
17 guests who are here and who will be
18 providing us with essential
19 background on those various action
20 items for our consideration. The
21 first order of business is approval
22 of the minutes. Are there any
23 corrections or emendations that
24 anyone would like to make with
25 regard to the minutes from our last

1 meeting in December, the December
2 13th meeting? There being none, the
3 minutes are approved. Again because
4 of the size of our agenda, I had the
5 announcements circulated by e-mail.
6 If there are any questions that
7 people would like to raise about any
8 of those announcements, I'd be happy
9 to entertain them. If not, we will
10 consider a brief update from Bob
11 Goldman on his Academic Offenses
12 Policy Committee. Are there any
13 questions regarding the
14 announcements? Okay. Bob, are you
15 here?

16 BLACKWELL: Bob Grossman --

17 GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman's here.

18 CHAIR YANARELLA: Grossman.

19 Who did I say?

20 GROSSMAN: Bob Goldman.

21 CHAIR YANARELLA: Goldman. If
22 there is a Bob Goldman here, I
23 apologize to him as well. Bob?

24 GROSSMAN: Actually my evil
25 twin.

1 CHAIR YANARELLA: It's possible
2 that he had more interesting things
3 to say about this, but we'll give
4 you the forum.

5 GROSSMAN: Okay. Just very
6 briefly, our committee has been
7 working on putting together a new
8 policy for handling academic
9 offenses. We're not dealing with
10 definitions of academic offenses,
11 just what happens when an academic
12 offense has been discovered. The
13 current version of the proposal,
14 which was updated earlier this week
15 after input from various people,
16 including Dean Blackwell, is up at
17 the Senate Website, /USC/new. Is
18 that right?

19 SCOTT: Uh-huh (Affirmative).

20 GROSSMAN: So you can go there
21 and visit it. There are two
22 documents there for you to look at.
23 One is the actual rules themselves,
24 for those of you who can read
25 legalese. For those of you who are

1 not literate in that ancient
2 language, there is also a summary of
3 the proposed changes to the rules,
4 the two most important changes being
5 that we're proposing that a new
6 grade of XE be initiated to indicate
7 failure due to cheating in a course,
8 and that will be on a -- appear on a
9 transcript; and also that for first
10 offenses, for most first offenses,
11 permitting instructors to give
12 grades of less than an XE in the
13 course. The rationales for all
14 those changes are up there. Any
15 suggestions you may have about
16 improving the current proposal,
17 please send them to me, and I'll
18 circulate them to our committee.
19 We're meeting at least one more time
20 before we present this to the Senate
21 Council and then to the Senate for
22 possible approval. If you don't
23 like the changes in general, that's
24 fine; you'll still have a chance to
25 vote against them. Okay? But if

1 you have a way of making the
2 proposal better, that's something
3 that I would like to hear from you.
4 Thanks.

5 CHAIR YANARELLA: Bob, whatever
6 your last name is, I want to thank
7 you and your committee for taking on
8 such a large task, and I look
9 forward to the Senate Council and
10 the Senate getting a very careful
11 look-see at the proposals as they go
12 up through the process. Our agenda
13 item indicates that the Board of
14 Trustees reps will provide us with
15 an update. Both reps had a
16 considerable amount of material that
17 they did want to provide to the
18 Senate in the way of important
19 information, and they were kind
20 enough to be willing to defer
21 providing that information until our
22 March 7th Senate meeting. This will
23 provide them with some additional
24 time, at that March 7th meeting, in
25 order that we might conduct our

1 important business today. We turn,
2 then, to the action items on the
3 agenda for today. As I mentioned a
4 moment ago, all of those items are
5 taken forward to the Senate body
6 with a positive recommendation from
7 the Senate Council, and the first
8 item that -- action item that we
9 will consider is the Honorary Degree
10 Candidate item, and I'd like to call
11 Jeannine Blackwell -- do I have your
12 name right -- Jeanine Blackwell
13 forward and ask her if she will give
14 her presentation for us.

15 BLACKWELL: Thank you, Ernie.
16 I'll try to make this short and
17 sweet. The honorary degrees for
18 2005 are presented to you on behalf
19 of the Honorary Degree Committee
20 that is chaired by Deneese Jones
21 this year. Other members are Wendy
22 Baldwin, Dean of the Graduate
23 School, Bernard Hennig, Michael
24 Karpf, Executive Vice-President for
25 Health Administration, Terry Mobley,

1 who is the Director of Institutional
2 Advancement -- I think that's what
3 his title is -- Mike Nietzel,
4 Provost, Sue Roberts, another
5 faculty representative, and Marianne
6 Smith Edge, who is the Board of
7 Trustees' representative on this
8 committee. We passed -- I presented
9 the candidate who you will see for
10 your consideration today at the
11 Graduate Faculty meeting on Monday,
12 January the 31st, and the honorary
13 degree nominee -- we have only one
14 this year -- is Stanley Platek.
15 He's the former vice-president of
16 research and development of
17 Commonwealth Aluminum Corporation
18 and an innovator of aluminum
19 production in partnership with the
20 University. He's received seven
21 U.S. patents and has transformed the
22 aluminum industry by reducing energy
23 consumption and emissions in the
24 production of aluminum, producing a
25 more durable, quality-controlled

1 product, including the first
2 automotive grade strip acceptable
3 for commercial vehicles of recycled
4 material and pioneered a process to
5 produce quality aluminum from scrap
6 metal. He initiated a research
7 program with the University of
8 Kentucky in 1986, a program that
9 continues to this day. This program
10 annually provides funds to the
11 University, as well as supporting
12 one to three graduate students and
13 research fellows per year, every
14 year, all year since the mid '80's,
15 and has worked with the University
16 in securing funding, as well, for
17 the continuation of that center.
18 Dean Thomas Lester, the Dean of the
19 College of Engineering has this to
20 say of him: "As the Dean of the
21 College of Engineering at the
22 University of Kentucky, I would be
23 pleased if the University were to
24 recognize this distinguished
25 scientist for a career whose

1 contributions have reached far into
2 our academic community and whose
3 impact on the aluminum industry is
4 still being realized." Dr. Das, who
5 is the president and CEO of SECAT
6 and the director of the U.K. Center
7 for Aluminum, says, "Mr. Platek has
8 had a distinguished and innovative
9 career which has influenced the
10 world-wide aluminum industry and the
11 University of Kentucky's research
12 and educational missions." "His
13 more than 16-year association with
14 the University has benefitted many
15 graduate students and faculty who
16 have had the opportunity to work
17 with him," from Dennis Ray,
18 Vice-President of Manufacturing in
19 Commonwealth Industries. "Stan is a
20 no-nonsense practical engineer who
21 can reduce a theoretical concept to
22 a commercially viable one," from the
23 President of Hazelett Strip-Casting
24 Corporation. I also wanted to just
25 add my own personal comments to

1 these quotations that are taken from
2 the materials to support a
3 nomination of Stanley Platek for an
4 honorary degree, and that is that
5 his contribution and his influence
6 on students and their understanding
7 of how their science, their
8 research, can impact the world, the
9 environment, the global economy by
10 the reduction of emissions and by
11 the possibility of recycling is
12 something that was commented on by
13 many, many of the people who
14 supported his nomination. I think
15 that that combination of both
16 linking the University with industry
17 but also linking responsible and
18 environmentally sound use of
19 research in the progress of one's
20 degree, that that message brought to
21 students is something that's a
22 powerful and important message. And
23 I like to see that, as the Dean of
24 the Graduate School, that our role
25 models and supporters are people who

1 practice what they preach. And with
2 that, that is our only nominee for
3 the honorary degree this year. I'd
4 like to point out to you that this
5 year we had considerable difficulty
6 locating honorary degree candidates
7 who were still available for
8 attendance at commencement this
9 year, and that is one of our
10 requirements, that all honorary
11 degree candidates attend
12 commencement. Because of that,
13 we've had a structural -- or a
14 procedural change on the nominating
15 committee so that we are now trying
16 to make preliminary determinations
17 and nominations one and two years
18 out so that we can go ahead and make
19 tentative bookings with people who
20 are nationally prominent, people who
21 have many venues for attendance and
22 performance. And so I think for the
23 future that we'll be able to secure
24 a full slate, if you will, a full
25 slate of honorary degree candidate

1 nominees. We are doing this by
2 moving forward with the nomination
3 procedure to graduate faculty and
4 asking graduate faculty for their
5 full nomination and then at that
6 stage going forward to make
7 tentative bookings for 2006 and
8 2007. And with that, I'm finished.

9 CHAIR YANARELLA: Thank you,
10 Jeannine. Let me mention that we
11 have a new court reporter, Karen
12 Kleier, who is with us today, and it
13 is especially important if you have
14 comments to make clear your name
15 before you give them.

16 BLACKWELL: Yeah, Davey.

17 CHAIR YANARELLA: Davey?

18 JONES: I just have to ask --
19 Jeannine, please don't sit down. I
20 have a question that I'll hold until
21 after the vote.

22 BLACKWELL: Okay.

23 CHAIR YANARELLA: Any other --
24 any questions regarding the motion
25 for approval of this candidate,

1 Stanley Platek, for the honorary
2 degree?

3 GROSSMAN: Bob Goldman, A&S.

4 CHAIR YANARELLA: You're on tap
5 later, and I'm going to call someone
6 else. Go ahead.

7 GROSSMAN: No, I was just
8 curious, what degree are we giving
9 to him, and what degree does he
10 already have?

11 BLACKWELL: He has a Bachelor
12 in Mechanical -- I'm getting -- I
13 can't remember right now --
14 Mechanical Engineering, and we would
15 be giving the Doctor of Science.

16 CHAIR YANARELLA: Any other
17 questions? There being none, I'd
18 like us to vote on this. All those
19 in favor of the motion to grant an
20 honorary degree to Stanley Platek at
21 our upcoming graduation ceremonies,
22 please indicate by raising your
23 hands. All those opposed? Are
24 there any abstentions? The motion
25 carries. Davey Jones?

1 JONES: Jeannine, just a
2 question. I -- it dawned on me when
3 this went by the Senate Council that
4 the Honorary Degree Committee is
5 actually -- it's not a Senate
6 committee, and I don't know that
7 it's a Graduate Council committee or
8 yet a faculty committee. I think
9 it's a president's committee. There
10 are -- there's some faculty on
11 there, and I'm not making, you know,
12 any comment about the faculty who
13 are already on there. But through
14 what body are faculty names vetted
15 to the President from which the
16 President then selects who's going
17 to get on this committee, the --
18 which faculty get on this committee?

19 BLACKWELL: Good question. I'm
20 not sure. I do know that that list
21 of presidential committees is
22 circulated to the deans, and I'm
23 assuming to other administrators,
24 for suggestions and nominations of
25 those that should be considered for

1 the presidential committees, and
2 this a presidential committee. And
3 I also wanted to add just one thing
4 about the process of the nominations
5 for honorary degrees. The
6 nominations -- the call for
7 nominations traditionally goes out
8 in the fall for nominations that
9 arrive in my office in November, and
10 we are going to continue with that
11 same process so that we have the
12 input of the whole faculty in the
13 nomination procedure; it's just that
14 we are going to be rolling those
15 nominations into the process for
16 extending out a couple of years so
17 that we can bring in prominent
18 people whose schedules get filled up
19 more than a year in advance, but
20 that does not preclude the
21 possibility of nominations coming
22 from the faculty and moving forward
23 within the same year. So we're
24 holding that door open, as we have
25 in the past.

1 CHAIR YANARELLA: If there are
2 no other questions, I'd like to
3 thank Jeannine. Jeannine, I believe
4 that there is still cause for
5 keeping this motion secret and the
6 name of the individual secret until
7 this is -- all of the negotiations
8 have been consummated and this has
9 gone to the Board of Trustees. If
10 that's correct, let me ask everyone
11 to embargo this information until
12 those other aspects have been taken
13 care of. Our next agenda item is
14 the academic calendars. The
15 academic calendars for the
16 University and its various divisions
17 have been vetted through the Senate
18 Council. The Senate Council
19 forwards these calendars with a
20 positive recommendation on all. Is
21 there any discussion in regard to
22 the academic calendars? There being
23 none, I'd like to call for a vote.
24 All in favor of approving the
25 academic calendars, please indicate

1 by raising your hands. All those
2 opposed, like sign? Any
3 abstentions? The motion has been
4 approved. Agenda Item 5 is composed
5 of four recommendations emanating
6 from Admissions and Academic
7 Standards Committee. Michael Braun
8 is not able to be here today to
9 provide an overview on these. Is
10 there anyone from the Academic --
11 the Admissions and Academic
12 Standards Committee who is here who
13 might want to say a word or two
14 about any of these? Please identify
15 yourself.

16 CLAUTER: Nancy Clauter, and
17 I'm on the committee that reviewed
18 this from the presentation at the
19 meeting, and it's -- was unanimously
20 approved.

21 GROSSMAN: "This," meaning all
22 of -- all of the items?

23 CHAIR YANARELLA: Were all of
24 the items approved unanimously?

25 CLAUTER: Yes.

1 CHAIR YANARELLA: They were.
2 Each of these proposals were vetted
3 through the Senate Council, and
4 they, too, were favorably voted on,
5 and they are, therefore, before you
6 with positive recommendations. I
7 don't honestly know whether we had
8 unanimity on all of them, but each
9 one of them is positively
10 recommended. I'd like to take each
11 of these in serial order, starting
12 first with SR 5.2.1.4, which is a
13 proposal from the Advising Network.
14 The basic gist of the proposal is to
15 standardize deadlines across the
16 University. This has been an issue
17 that has been discussed and debated
18 within the Advising Network, and
19 it -- it came up through our
20 Admissions and Academic Standards
21 Committee. The proposal was
22 approved by the Senate Council in
23 its January 24th meeting, with a
24 positive recommendation to the
25 Senate. Is there any discussion,

1 any questions that you may have?

2 Davey Jones?

3 JONES: Do you have to have a
4 Power Point that actually shows the
5 wording that's being voted upon?
6 Because I'm on the Rules Committee,
7 and, you know, we want to make sure
8 we know which language is coming
9 down -- I see in the handout here,
10 on Page 21 of the handout, it looks
11 like there's an underlining and
12 italics that might be the sentence
13 we're voting on, the sentence of
14 addition. Is that the rule; is that
15 -- or do I not understand?

16 CHAIR YANARELLA: On Page 21 of
17 the handout, that is correct.

18 JONES: Okay. So the
19 underlining with italics is the new
20 language that will be voted on and,
21 if accepted, goes to the Rules
22 Committee?

23 CHAIR YANARELLA: That is
24 correct. Is there any other
25 discussion or questions regarding

1 this particular proposal? If there
2 are no other questions or comments,
3 I would like to call for a vote.
4 All in favor of the proposed
5 revision and the deadlines as
6 contained in the SR 5.2.1.4
7 reinstatement, please indicate by
8 raising your hand. All those
9 opposed, like sign? Any
10 abstentions? The first agenda item
11 from the Admissions and Academic
12 Standards Committee is approved. If
13 we turn, then, to the -- the second
14 item, this is the College of Nursing
15 Enrollment Cap proposal. The
16 essential aspect of this proposal is
17 that the College of Nursing would
18 limit enrollment at 200 for newly
19 admitted prenursing students.
20 Again, this was favorably acted upon
21 by the Senate Council at its January
22 24th meeting, and it comes to the
23 Senate with a positive
24 recommendation. Is there anyone who
25 would like to -- from the College of

1 Nursing who would like to say
2 anything about this proposal?
3 Failing that, are there any
4 questions? Bob Grossman?

5 GROSSMAN: Yes, Bob Grossman,
6 A&S. You might want to mention the
7 Sunset provision that was added at
8 the Senate Council.

9 CHAIR YANARELLA: Why don't you
10 mention it for me?

11 GROSSMAN: It was passed at --
12 the proposal that was recommended to
13 the Senate was that this cap expire
14 in three years; that if it be
15 renewed, that if the College of
16 Nursing wants it to be renewed, that
17 they must come back to the Senate
18 Council or the Senate and ask for it
19 again. Isn't that right?

20 CLAUSER: Yes.

21 SCOTT: Three years.

22 CHAIR YANARELLA: That's
23 correct. I was just testing you,
24 Bob.

25 GROSSMAN: Okay.

1 CHAIR YANARELLA: I just want
2 you to know. Yes?

3 BURKHART: Hi. Pat Burkhardt,
4 College of Nursing. I'd just say,
5 too, that this did come before the
6 faculty at the College of Nursing
7 and was supported.

8 CHAIR YANARELLA: One of the
9 concerns that the Senate Council
10 expressed in its deliberations was
11 that evidence be provided that the
12 faculty of the College of Nursing
13 had had an opportunity to vote on
14 that. Such evidence was submitted
15 in a timely manner, and it is for
16 this reason that it is now before
17 the senate. Yes?

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: A
19 question -- (Inaudible) Medicine.
20 This is capping the prenursing
21 students, not the ones that move on
22 to nursing; is that correct?

23 CHAIR YANARELLA: That's
24 correct.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just the

1 prenursing?

2 CHAIR YANARELLA: That's
3 correct. Phil Kramer?

4 KRAMER: Phil Kramer, Associate
5 Provost. Just a question for
6 nursing. The process that you're
7 going to use to determine who gets
8 into prenursing seems to be a first
9 one in line rather than any kind of
10 quality indicators. Is there a
11 rationale for that?

12 BROCKOPP: Well, the students
13 come into prenursing, and they take
14 their basic sciences. We then have
15 very specific criteria to have them
16 come into the nursing program. We
17 have slots in anatomy and -- we have
18 200 slots in anatomy and physiology
19 for applicants to prenursing. We
20 have no more space. At the end of
21 that time, we can only take 80
22 students into the actual program.
23 With rolling admissions, we can get
24 to 200 and then beyond, and we feel
25 that we are misleading students if

1 we say they are in prenursing,
2 because they cannot register for
3 their courses. They are then
4 automatically in a five-year
5 program.

6 KRAMER: Well, I support the
7 general rationale, and I'm just
8 wondering if we aren't, in a sense,
9 you, nursing, shooting yourselves in
10 the foot. What if you aren't
11 getting the best students into the
12 prenursing? You won't get them into
13 the nursing --

14 BROCKOPP: For --

15 KRAMER: -- because they're a
16 little late.

17 BROCKOPP: For ten to 12 years,
18 we tried to develop criteria that
19 would be predictive of students'
20 success in the basic sciences and
21 then on to the College of Nursing.
22 And all of those years, we had
23 between 15 to 20 percent of the
24 students who did not do well in
25 anatomy and physiology or chemistry

1 and could not progress. So I guess
2 what I'm saying is, we and other
3 schools have not been able to
4 predict how well high school
5 students will do in that first year
6 of basic sciences. That's why we
7 don't have another set of criteria.

8 CHAIR YANARELLA: There were
9 other questions. Mike Kennedy?

10 KENNEDY: When you say it's
11 first come first serve, does that
12 reset every year, or people who
13 requested to come in, would they be
14 on a list for the next year?

15 BROCKOPP: We do not keep a
16 waiting list, for a whole set of
17 reasons that we could go into, but
18 certainly anyone can reapply and can
19 write us a letter that we will take
20 into consideration if they had been
21 late the year before. We take all
22 of that information into
23 consideration in terms of
24 application to the actual program.

25 CHAIR YANARELLA: Mike Seidle?

1 SEIDLE: I'm Mike Seidle. It's
2 also true that you can get into
3 nursing school from something other
4 than the prenursing curriculum, so
5 someone --

6 BROCKOPP: Yes.

7 SEIDLE: -- in Liberal Arts
8 could get into nursing school if
9 they met the requirements. So this
10 doesn't limit applications to the
11 nursing school, per se; is that
12 correct?

13 BROCKOPP: That's right.

14 CHAIR YANARELLA: Are there
15 other questions or comments?

16 GROSSMAN: Yeah, I just wanted
17 to mention the rationale for the
18 cap, because I would have voted
19 against this if it hadn't been for
20 the cap at Senate Council -- or not
21 the cap, the Sunset provision. The
22 limitation to the number of
23 prenursing students seem to be this
24 anatomy and physiology course. And
25 nursing is not the only part of the

1 university community that is facing
2 increasing enrollments and larger
3 and larger classes and seeing the
4 limits, especially in laboratory
5 classes. Other parts of the
6 University are dealing with this as
7 best they can but are not putting
8 limits on the number -- as far as we
9 can tell, don't seem yet to be
10 putting limits on the number of
11 students who can get into certain
12 courses that are crucial for their
13 advancing in certain degrees. And
14 so the reason we put the Sunset
15 provision on it is that we're hoping
16 in the next few years Nursing and
17 Anatomy and Physiology will be able
18 to work out a way that they can
19 accommodate more students so that
20 there will no longer need to be a
21 cap on the number of prenursing
22 students.

23 CHAIR YANARELLA: Thank you,
24 Bob. Any other comments, any other
25 questions that you would like to

1 have addressed? If there are no
2 others, all those in favor of the
3 motion to approve the enrollment cap
4 for -- I'll give you one last
5 chance. Or are you already voting?

6 CLAUTER: No, it wasn't a
7 question.

8 CHAIR YANARELLA: Okay. All
9 those in favor of the motion to
10 approve a College of Nursing
11 enrollment cap of 200 for newly
12 admitted prenursing students with
13 the amendment of the Sunset clause
14 tacked on by the Senate Council,
15 please indicate by raising your
16 hand. All those opposed? Any
17 abstentions? The motion carries.
18 Our next item is the Master's
19 Time-to-Degree proposal. This a
20 proposal that has come up through
21 the Graduate Council, I think was
22 carefully discussed and debated. It
23 involves shortening the time limit
24 to degree to six years with
25 allowances to appeal. I believe the

1 information that you have in your
2 packet is quite complete. Jeannine,
3 are there -- is there anything you
4 would like to add to this?

5 BLACKWELL: Yes, I'd just like
6 to say two things: The appeals
7 process for a time extension goes
8 for two years and then an additional
9 two years, as we currently have the
10 time limit to masters. This simply
11 shortens the whole process by two
12 years. In addition, programs have
13 the option of bringing a petition to
14 Graduate Council if their program is
15 so -- is structured such that it
16 would be a detriment to their
17 program or to the -- to a large
18 number of their students to have
19 this time limitation. This was a
20 compromised decision that came out
21 of Graduate Council. And so
22 programs can come and ask for that,
23 for a differing time to degree to be
24 voted on by Graduate Council. And
25 if that's approved, then that time

1 limit -- adjusted time limit applies
2 to all students in that program and
3 that program only.

4 CHAIR YANARELLA: I should also
5 point out that, if approved, this
6 would be implemented for new
7 students who are admitted for
8 January, 2006. And beyond that, I
9 should also mention that this was
10 approved by the Graduate Council.
11 It was favorably voted upon by the
12 Graduate faculty on -- approved on
13 October 20th. It was, on January
14 24th, favorably acted upon by the
15 Senate Council and has come to you
16 with a positive recommendation. Are
17 there any questions that you have
18 about the Master's Time-to-Degree
19 revision? Yes.

20 EDGERTON: Roughly what
21 percentage of students is this
22 likely to impact?

23 CHAIR YANARELLA: Lee Edgerton.

24 EDGERTON: Yeah. Sorry.

25 CHAIR YANARELLA: I'm sorry,

1 Lee.

2 EDGERTON: No, I appreciate
3 being recognized, Ernie. The
4 question was what percentage of
5 students is this likely to impact?

6 BLACKWELL: It's probably
7 between three -- two and three
8 percent of students that have to go
9 into time extension mode.

10 CHAIR YANARELLA: Yes?

11 FORGUE: Ray Forgue,
12 Agricultural. The appeal you're
13 referring to here is a repeat appeal
14 of the program, so that the whole
15 program could have a longer time
16 frame. There is an appeal process
17 for individual students, as well,
18 right?

19 BLACKWELL: Right. There are
20 two different processes. One is the
21 individual student who has reached
22 the six-year limit and the director
23 of Graduate Studies presents the
24 case for the student to the dean
25 and/or to the Graduate Council for

1 the -- a two-year extension and then
2 an additional two years, and that
3 additional two years goes to
4 Graduate Council.

5 CHAIR YANARELLA: Yes, Brian.

6 JACKSON: Brian Jackson,
7 physiology, undergraduate school.
8 Could I just clarify, please? Did
9 you say to take effect spring of
10 2006? I believe this could become
11 effective the fall of 2005, if
12 approved.

13 SCOTT: May I? I'm sorry. My
14 review of the minutes indicated that
15 you had said students who were being
16 admitted for spring, 2005, since
17 students -- or 2006, since students
18 were already being admitted for
19 fall.

20 JACKSON: I think that was the
21 other -- the second proposal to
22 come -- the final proposal.

23 CLAUSER: Right, yeah.

24 SCOTT: That may be my mistake,
25 then. I apologize.

1 BLACKWELL: We would prefer to
2 have it be for fall of 2005, since
3 that's when our big cohort comes in.

4 CHAIR YANARELLA: Okay. We
5 will make any corrections that are
6 necessary on that, then. All right.
7 Any other questions? Brian, I
8 appreciate your catching that.

9 SCOTT: Sorry about that.

10 CHAIR YANARELLA: Other
11 questions, comments? If not, we'll
12 vote. All in favor of the
13 time-to-degree master's change,
14 please indicate by raising your
15 hands. All opposed? Abstentions?
16 The motion is carried. Our next
17 agenda item, and the last under "5,"
18 from the Admissions and Academic
19 Standards Committee, is the Graduate
20 School Conditional Admission
21 proposal. The gist of this proposal
22 is to combine, as we understand it,
23 tentative and provisional admission
24 into a single category known as
25 "conditional." I don't know who I

1 should call upon, Brian or Jeannine,
2 but I'd like one or the other of you
3 to say a word or two about this to
4 help us unpack this.

5 BLACKWELL: Okay. I'll speak.
6 This is Brian's brainchild. We're
7 trying to streamline things in the
8 graduate school somewhat, and we had
9 an inherited set of categories,
10 tentative, that was for things that
11 were missing from a student file or
12 certain kinds of materials that
13 needed to be turned in within one
14 month of registration at the
15 University; then we had provisional,
16 which was things that were longer
17 than one month. And we decided that
18 we needed to just have the one
19 category, because we found it
20 confusing to students who were
21 admitted both tentatively and
22 provisionally. It sounded like we
23 were definitely damning them with
24 faint praise, and we thought that it
25 would just clarify things if we got

1 only the one category and if we
2 sorted out which items that we, the
3 graduate school, would be held
4 responsible for and which items,
5 predominantly academic performance
6 indicators, that the program itself
7 could make its own judgments on.
8 And so we've tried to separate those
9 out and streamline the whole
10 process.

11 CHAIR YANARELLA: I had thought
12 about a new category called
13 "ambivalently," but I decided to
14 pull that back in our Graduate
15 Council discussions, Jeannine.
16 Okay. Is there clarity on the
17 essence of the motion? Are there
18 other questions that you may have
19 that could be addressed by Brian or
20 by Jeannine for further clarity?
21 There being none, let's vote. All
22 in favor of the graduate school
23 conditional admission proposal,
24 please indicate by raising your
25 hands. All opposed, like sign? Any

1 abstentions? The motion carries.
2 This concludes the -- those
3 proposals brought forward by the
4 Admissions and Academic Committee.
5 I want to thank all of its members.
6 Please, Nancy, if you will convey
7 that to those who were not here
8 today, including Michael Braun, for
9 their hard work and diligence in
10 bringing these proposals forward.
11 Okay. Agenda Item 6 includes two
12 proposals from the Academic
13 Organization and Structure
14 Committee. Ernie Bailey, I would
15 like to call upon you to present
16 these two items, noting that both of
17 these items have been brought forth
18 with a positive recommendation from
19 the Senate Council.

20 BAILEY: Last fall, there was a
21 proposal that came through the
22 Senate to create a Department of
23 Orthopedics from the Division of
24 Orthopedics and the Department of
25 Surgery, and we passed that. At the

1 time, the name of the department was
2 listed as shown up here with this
3 particular spelling. It was a
4 change because the division had a
5 spelling that was p-a-e-d-i-c-s, and
6 they were quite insistent on that at
7 the time. After changing the name,
8 they had second thoughts. They
9 polled the faculty, and there was
10 unanimous support that they would
11 like to have the spelling a-e.
12 That's the spelling that's used by
13 the other departments around the
14 country, by the various boards, and
15 so it's a fairly simple proposal.
16 It actually didn't go back to the
17 Academic Organization and Structure
18 Committee. We asked them simply to
19 send the justification and the
20 faculty responses to the Senate
21 Council.

22 CHAIR YANARELLA: Thank you,
23 Ernie. Are there any questions that
24 you'd like to address to Ernie
25 Bailey or to anyone who is here

1 representing the -- representing
2 Orthopedics? Okay. The Senate
3 Council, when this proposal was sent
4 forward to us or it came to our
5 office, the feeling in the Senate
6 Council office was that this issue
7 did need to get vetted through
8 appropriate levels, but we thought
9 that we could put this on quick
10 time, and so we had this brought
11 forward quickly to the Senate
12 Council and now to this forum for a
13 decision. If there are no other
14 questions -- yes, please.

15 GARRITY: Looks like that --

16 SCOTT: I'm sorry. Ernie --

17 CHAIR YANARELLA: Please give
18 your name.

19 GARRITY: Tom Garrity,
20 Medicine. It looks like the
21 proposal is not Department of
22 Orthopedics but Orthopedic Surgery?

23 CHAIR YANARELLA: That's
24 correct. Okay. Other questions?
25 If not, let's vote. All those in

1 favor of the motion to approve the
2 renaming of the Department of
3 Orthopedic Surgery to the Department
4 of Orthopaedic Surgery, a-e-d-i-c-s,
5 please indicate by raising your
6 hand. All those opposed? Any
7 abstentions? The motion carries.
8 Ernie, would you say a word or two
9 about the proposal on the
10 cardiovascular research center?

11 BAILEY: Yeah, we -- last -- or
12 during this last month, the Academic
13 Organization and Structure Committee
14 met and discussed a proposal to
15 create a cardiovascular research
16 center. Dr. Watt and Dr. Daugherty
17 came and spoke on behalf of that.
18 Are either of them here? And
19 Dr. Cassis was also here.
20 Dr. Cassis is the -- I forget what
21 her name actually -- she's the
22 director of --

23 DAUGHERTY: Director of the
24 Center for Nutritional Sciences.

25 BAILEY: Yes. Is she here?

1 DAUGHERTY: No, she's -- had to
2 go to (Inaudible).

3 BAILEY: In any case, the main
4 point was, is that there is a
5 critical mass of faculty and
6 research in the area of
7 cardiovascular research. There is
8 the -- let me get this right -- the
9 Gill Institute, Gill Heart Institute
10 at that hospital. The center that
11 Dr. Cassis runs, it's nutritional
12 research, but a lot of the faculty
13 that are involved there are
14 interested in cardiovascular
15 disease, and there was a belief --
16 or it was their expectation that
17 there will be an advantage to the
18 student faculty if there's a
19 cardiovascular research center, that
20 it will benefit funding, and
21 Dr. Cassis was -- also felt that it
22 would also strengthen her center.
23 She didn't have any objections to
24 this. She didn't see it as a
25 (inaudible). Dr. Daugherty, would

1 you like to say -- add anything
2 about the --

3 DAUGHERTY: Just basically that
4 the reason this came up is because
5 U.K. has become such a powerhouse of
6 cardiovascular research, especially
7 in specific areas, and it's become
8 apparent how (inaudible) has been
9 jerry-rigged in terms of getting
10 this together in terms of
11 (inaudible), seminar series, journal
12 quotes. And just as the structure
13 got bigger and we recruited more
14 faculty in this area, we felt it
15 would be advantageous to have a
16 formal structure that could really
17 bring people together and also be
18 a -- sort of a fund-raiser both from
19 a pharmaceutical, a philanthropy and
20 also from a KRH perspective to bring
21 together these people to help. We
22 also felt like it would help the
23 mission of the clinical unit there,
24 which is the Gill Heart Institute,
25 because especially the revamped

1 building, that I'm sure people have
2 seen, and the revamped faculty we've
3 had this year -- they really need
4 help in trying to stimulate their
5 translational and clinical research,
6 and we felt like having a strong
7 center would help recruit people to
8 the clinical center of Gill Heart
9 and also facilitate both the faculty
10 and the fellowship development.

11 BAILEY: And this went to a
12 number of committees for evaluation.
13 There's a routing sheet in here. It
14 isn't actually up to date. It
15 includes the College of Medicine.
16 The College of Medicine Faculty
17 Council approved it unanimously.
18 There's been no issues raised so
19 far.

20 CHAIR YANARELLA: Other
21 questions you'd like to raise to
22 address either to Ernie Bailey or
23 Dr. Daugherty in regard to this
24 proposal? There being none, let's
25 vote on the Cardiovascular Research

1 Center proposal. All those in favor
2 of this proposal, please indicate by
3 raising your hands. Those opposed?
4 Any abstentions? The motion is
5 carried. Ernie, let me thank you,
6 and please extend our appreciation
7 to the Academic Organization and
8 Structure Committee members for
9 their good work. Our next agenda
10 item emanates from the Academic
11 Programs Committee. I'd like to
12 give Alvin Gold- -- Grossman, Chair
13 of the AP -- I'm sorry. I
14 apologize, Karen. This -- we will
15 probably beat this joke to death.
16 I'd like to --

17 GROSSMAN: Ask Dr. Hoch what he
18 called me after -- when he sent me
19 my letter of tenure.

20 CHAIR YANARELLA: I'll ask him
21 after the meeting.

22 GROSSMAN: Okay.

23 CHAIR YANARELLA: Bob, I'd like
24 to call on you to give an overview
25 and offer some comments on the

1 proposal for a B.S. in computer
2 engineering. I would like to note
3 also that this proposal, as well, is
4 forwarded to the Senate with a
5 positive recommendation from the
6 Senate Council.

7 GROSSMAN: Yeah, this proposal
8 is a joint program of the
9 Departments of Computer Science and
10 Electrical Engineering to create a
11 new program in Computer Engineering.
12 The chairs of the two departments,
13 I'm sure, can explain the -- better
14 than I can, the differences between
15 Computer Science and Electrical
16 Science and then this new program,
17 Computer Engineering, but they did
18 have a compelling rationale for
19 presenting this proposal in terms of
20 recruiting undergraduate students,
21 comparing those universities that
22 have such programs with those
23 universities that do not have such
24 programs. The ones that have them
25 have increased enrollment; the ones

1 that do not have decreased
2 enrollment. All the "i's" were
3 dotted and the "t's" crossed in
4 terms of resources that would be
5 provided for this new program. Most
6 of the resources are already in
7 place. Most of the courses are
8 already in place also. So the --
9 there was -- those were the only
10 questions that came out of the
11 Committee, and they were
12 satisfactorily resolved, and that's
13 why we recommended that it be
14 approved and continue to do so.

15 CHAIR YANARELLA: Okay. We
16 effectively have a motion on the
17 floor to approve the B.S. in
18 Computer Engineering. Are there any
19 questions that you would like to
20 have addressed, either to Bob
21 Grossman or to anyone else who may
22 have been part of the writing of
23 this proposal? Anyone? Jim?

24 ALBISETTI: Jim Albisetti, Arts
25 and Sciences. On the very first

1 page, it says it will take place in
2 a Department of Electrical and
3 Computer Engineering. Does that
4 already exist as a department, or is
5 there Electrical Engineering and
6 there's Computer Science?

7 GROSSMAN: No, that department
8 does exist.

9 ALBISETTI: So we're not
10 creating a new department?

11 GROSSMAN: No.

12 CHAIR YANARELLA: Thank you, an
13 important point of clarification.
14 Are there any other comments,
15 observations, questions that you
16 have in regard to this B.S. in
17 Computer Engineering? There being
18 none, I'll call for a vote. All
19 those in favor of the proposal to
20 initiate a B.S. in Computer
21 Engineering, please indicate by
22 raising your hand. All those
23 opposed, like sign? Any
24 abstentions? The motion carries.
25 Bob, let me thank you and your

1 committee for shepherding this on
2 through.

3 GROSSMAN: Who's Bob?

4 CHAIR YANARELLA: Thank you.
5 All right. Our next agenda item
6 reflects a creature of the
7 University Senate, and that is the
8 Honors Program. Over the years, the
9 Honors Program has been a -- I think
10 a shining light at the University of
11 Kentucky. Many of us outside of the
12 Honors Program itself have been
13 beneficiaries of their fine work in
14 the students who have majored in our
15 individual programs. Of late, there
16 has been interest that has
17 developed, partly initiated from the
18 provost's office, to expand this
19 very successful program, and we have
20 a number of people here who have
21 played one role or another in the
22 consideration of this proposal to
23 us. I'd like to call on Kathi Kern,
24 who is the chair of the Honors
25 Program Steering Committee, to the

1 front and give her an opportunity to
2 say a few words about the proposal
3 and to help us define what it is
4 that is being brought before the
5 Senate at this juncture and what
6 other materials and proposals would
7 likely emanate over the next year or
8 so. Kathi?

9 KERN: Thank you, Ernie. I'm
10 joined here by David Durant, who's
11 the director of the Honors Program,
12 and also Richard Greissman, who
13 served on our committee. We began
14 working this summer, a faculty
15 committee that was interdisciplinary
16 in nature. We had folks from
17 College of Med, Agriculture, B&E,
18 Engineering, Arts and Sciences, two
19 members from the current Honors
20 Program, and our goal was to think
21 about how we could expand --
22 particularly expand the curriculum
23 of the current Honors Program. As
24 Ernie indicated, we started from a
25 premise that the Honors Program is

1 something that we felt very proud of
2 as a university, and we wanted to
3 think about how we could capitalize
4 on its success but also bring more
5 faculty from across the University
6 into play in the Honors Program. So
7 we spent the fall considering the
8 benchmark data that Kirsten Turner,
9 from Arts and Sciences, had gathered
10 for us. We worked with faculty,
11 called for faculty to suggest
12 proposals for new curricula that
13 could be offered in the Honors
14 Program. We vetted those proposals,
15 and we spent a lot of time meeting
16 with various deliberative bodies on
17 campus, all of whom have been
18 endorsing our efforts. So we've
19 talked with USP and Undergraduate
20 Council, the Educational Policy
21 Council for the College of Arts and
22 Sciences, Senate Council, et cetera,
23 and now it brings us here to you.
24 Specifically what we'd like to ask
25 you to do, to endorse, is what's on

1 Page 147. And I say this because if
2 you've read all of the materials,
3 you know we have four new sequences
4 that we're piloting in the fall, and
5 these we would like to run for two
6 years and to assess them before we
7 put forth any kind of permanent
8 change, but we would like to get a
9 permanent change approved, as
10 indicated on Page 147; and that is
11 that we'd like to offer -- under the
12 current sequence, you'll see the
13 Honors Program is four seminars and
14 then an advanced seminar or
15 independent project, and we'd like
16 to also allow students to graduate
17 with the Honors Program citation by
18 doing the proposed sequence. These
19 are the new sequences, which will be
20 three seminars and then two
21 additional courses at the upper
22 level. Those might be study abroad,
23 those might coordinate with a
24 department based or college based
25 Honors Program. We have a long

1 list, if you read the materials, of
2 the kinds of programs, most of which
3 are independent based, research
4 based, the things that we would like
5 our best students at a research
6 university to be involved with. So
7 that's specifically what we're
8 asking for you to approve, this
9 change. Questions that David or
10 Richard or I could --

11 CHAIR YANARELLA: David?

12 DURANT: Just a word to say
13 that the committee, which worked
14 really quickly and well, has kept
15 many of the attributes of the
16 present Honors Program, although
17 it's going to be different in
18 structure. The Economics faculty
19 thought that it was important that
20 the classes that were linked to each
21 other, as the present program is
22 (Inaudible) remain in this new
23 program. We thought that it was
24 vital that they be
25 interdisciplinary, that these

1 courses are on (Inaudible) and that
2 they be involved in small classes
3 with active learning. All of these
4 courses will do that, and they will
5 fulfill the same sorts of USP
6 requirements that our courses now
7 do.

8 CHAIR YANARELLA: I know that
9 Richard Greissman has a -- what I
10 would characterize -- or he
11 characterized as a touch of
12 pneumonia and is still here, and I
13 want to, at the very least, thank
14 him for his appearance here. It
15 shows the strength of the
16 endorsement of the --

17 GROSSMAN: Or foolishness.

18 CHAIR YANARELLA: Either one.
19 Those of you who wish to move
20 further away from him should feel
21 free. Richard, would you like to
22 say even a word or two about this?

23 GREISSMAN: I could not add to
24 what Kathi and David said.

25 CHAIR YANARELLA: Thank you.

1 Okay. All right. Questions from
2 the floor? Steve Yates.

3 YATES: Steve Yates, Chemistry.
4 This is an expansion of the Honors
5 program, and surely it's going to
6 lead to a greater number of
7 students. Do you have an estimate
8 of how many students, additional
9 students, it's going to impact? And
10 who's going to be teaching those
11 students? I know there was some
12 concern about having full-time
13 faculty involved in the Honors
14 Program.

15 DURANT: Well, I should say
16 that at least at the outset we don't
17 intend to increase the number of
18 students coming in. We admit about
19 nine percent of the incoming class
20 now, and I think that our target
21 might be ten percent. One of the
22 reasons for this change is that only
23 50 percent of the courses in the
24 Honor Programs are now taught by
25 full-time faculty, and so we hope to

1 get closer to the 80 percent. It
2 would seem preferably in doing that,
3 and so we will have larger numbers
4 of faculty, large percentages of
5 faculty, teaching in these things
6 but not a larger incoming faculty.
7 And the question as to who is going
8 to teach them? We have commitments
9 from various departments and deans.

10 CHAIR YANARELLA: Kathi, would
11 you say a word or two about the
12 tracks that you have -- that the
13 Steering Committee has already
14 approved?

15 KERN: We've approved four
16 tracks to begin next year. And, in
17 no particular order, they are world
18 food issues, which is a
19 collaboration between the College of
20 Arts and Sciences and Agriculture.
21 We have a new track in
22 nanotechnology, which is growing out
23 of the College of Engineering but
24 involves faculty as guest lecturers
25 from a variety of colleges that are

1 looking at the cultural implications
2 of technological change. We have a
3 new track on space, place and
4 culture, which is a collaboration
5 between cultural geographers and
6 literary critics and people working
7 in foreign languages, and we have a
8 very interdisciplinary program
9 called the Social Sciences, which
10 brings people from a variety of
11 different colleges, Arts and
12 Sciences but also B&E, Education,
13 and these are looking at
14 interdisciplinary approaches to the
15 Social Sciences around topical
16 issues like violence, that kind of
17 thing. So we -- we've met -- both
18 David and I have met extensively
19 with all the faculty who are
20 proposed. We're really excited
21 about the kind of people and the
22 creativity that's come forward in
23 these proposals, and we think
24 that -- we're starting small because
25 we want it to succeed, but we think

1 that as the momentum grows around
2 these sequences that more and more
3 faculty who could also teach in
4 these sequences are going to come
5 forward and volunteer. So we think
6 that actually we will ultimately be
7 able to expand the number of
8 students, if not immediately.

9 CHAIR YANARELLA: Would you
10 also say a word or two about when
11 you would anticipate course
12 proposals and other proposals coming
13 down the pike to the -- through the
14 normal vetting process?

15 KERN: Right. We have set a
16 goal of having all of the course
17 proposals and changes in place by
18 fall of 2006. And the reason that
19 we did that is we thought that we
20 would run and assess the program --
21 at least let it run for a full year
22 before we make any changes permanent
23 in terms of the courses, but they
24 are -- David has already organized
25 for all the courses to be listed as

1 Honors 101, 102, et cetera, so
2 they're appearing in the schedule
3 book as Honors courses, but we will
4 eventually go through that very
5 specific process of bringing the
6 courses to USP and Undergraduate
7 Council and ultimately to the
8 Senate.

9 CHAIR YANARELLA: Are there
10 other questions that you may have?
11 Jim Albisetti?

12 ALBISETTI: Jim Albisetti, A&S
13 and Honors Program. I'd just like
14 to emphasize for the Senate a few
15 facts about this. One, this is
16 something that started at the
17 Provost. It did not start with
18 existing faculty, nor did it start
19 with student discontentment with the
20 existing program. I think that
21 should just be made clear. Much of
22 the current faculty is concerned
23 that this is going to mean Honors is
24 no longer a program; it is going to
25 be a collection of different tracks

1 that someone's sense of community
2 and the Honors students (inaudible)
3 tradition of the Honors Program
4 where we have fair numbers of
5 children of former Honors students
6 that's going to be greatly diluted.
7 We're concerned by the small size of
8 the new tracks that may be offered
9 in one section each. The Honors
10 Program works because we offer
11 sections at virtually every class
12 hour possible so students can find
13 one to fit in. But if you're
14 offering one section of the second
15 or third semester of a new sequence
16 and people have other courses, then
17 there's going to be lots of problems
18 with people trying to transfer and
19 saying, "What do I do to substitute
20 for this? How will I complete what
21 I've signed up for?" And to the
22 extent that the Provost is
23 encouraging, rather strongly, that
24 people do such courses as overloads
25 for extra compensation, it seems an

1 aspect of speed up, you don't get a
2 raise, so you get extra money by
3 teaching an extra course that I
4 personally find somewhat offensive
5 as well.

6 DURANT: Certainly some of
7 those difficulties are ones that
8 we've thought about, specifically
9 the problem with students who come
10 into one track and don't have a way
11 to keep on with that, but we think
12 we have solutions for that.
13 Actually, I think at least in this
14 first iteration, we won't have
15 anyone doing it as an overload. I
16 think there'll be people doing it
17 within (Inaudible). And I agree. I
18 suspect that the Provost, indeed,
19 would prefer not to have it simply
20 as an (Inaudible).

21 CHAIR YANARELLA: Richard?

22 GREISSMAN: I'd like to respond
23 to, in part, what Jim said. While
24 it's true it was a Provost
25 initiative, it's based on faculty

1 input in that two successive program
2 reviews, mounted, piloted, steered
3 and recommended by faculty, program
4 reviews that are faculty driven, not
5 administratively driven, have
6 recommended just this change. Two
7 successive program reviews have said
8 the Honors Program, while a hallmark
9 of undergraduate education here at
10 U.K., should favorably consider an
11 expansion to move Honor into --
12 Honors into all careers of
13 undergraduate study and to expand
14 beyond a limited, albeit brilliant,
15 humanities curriculum. So to say it
16 was somehow in isolation suggested
17 by a Provost, foisted on an
18 unwilling faculty, begs the history
19 of this process, which in fact began
20 by a Provost paying attention to
21 faculty after two successive program
22 reviews recommended this.

23 CHAIR YANARELLA: I would just
24 add one other point, and that is I
25 believe that the Social Science

1 Honors Program really preceded any
2 initiative on the part of the
3 Provost, formal initiative on the
4 part of the Provost, to get this
5 proposal rolling. There was
6 interest in Arts and Sciences and in
7 Communications and in B&E to put
8 forward a -- an Honors track in the
9 Social Sciences that we believe
10 had -- whose day we believe had
11 come. And while there are surely
12 legitimate differences that exist
13 among faculty on the advisability of
14 this particular proposal, I think
15 it's important to underline that
16 there is considerable enthusiasm
17 manifested among a -- I think a
18 critical core of faculty in the
19 Social Sciences. And I think, as
20 well, the fact that the current
21 committee was able to solicit and to
22 perhaps, as well, encourage these
23 additional tracks to emerge is a
24 manifestation of a much wider degree
25 of interest among faculty than might

1 appear if it is simply labeled as a
2 provost initiative. Phil Kramer?

3 KRAMER: Ernie, I don't want to
4 hurt the proposal, but I do want to
5 endorse it. I think it's a very
6 good idea. I think this is a step
7 forward. I meant, by "my
8 endorsement," I don't want to hurt
9 the (Inaudible). It's a little bit
10 late for you all. I think it's also
11 really clear that this proposal that
12 we're seeing, regardless of what
13 inspiration or process led to it,
14 this is a faculty proposal, not a
15 change in the Honors Program. I
16 think it's a good one for students;
17 it's certainly going to be a good
18 one for recruiting, and I think it
19 will be a good one for faculty.
20 Having the opportunity for more
21 faculty to participate as this
22 broadens out horizontally is a good
23 thing for faculty to be engaged in.
24 So I do endorse it strongly.

25 CHAIR YANARELLA: Other

1 comments, observations, convictions,
2 points of views on this? Okay. I'd
3 like to, then, call for a vote on --

4 SCOTT: Ernie --

5 GROSSMAN: Ernie --

6 CHAIR YANARELLA: Sorry. Yes?

7 JENNINGS: Since you --

8 CHAIR YANARELLA: Name, please?

9 JENNINGS: Darrell Jennings,
10 Medicine. Since you concluded with
11 "convictions" -- I was wasn't going
12 to say anything, but since you
13 added, "convictions," it seems to me
14 that an idea which has substantial
15 merit, that everyone agrees upon,
16 that a discussion over its origin is
17 rather fruitless and somewhat
18 absurd.

19 CHAIR YANARELLA: You have
20 clearly expressed a strong
21 conviction. It is obvious that
22 others feel differently and --

23 JENNINGS: That's my
24 conviction.

25 CHAIR YANARELLA: -- whether

1 that should color an individual vote
2 on this --

3 JENNINGS: No.

4 CHAIR YANARELLA: -- is a
5 matter for personal decision, for
6 sure. Kathi and David, Richard and
7 Phil have offered their strong
8 support for the merits of this. One
9 of our own here, Jim Albisetti, has
10 raised issues that have been part of
11 an ongoing consideration of this.
12 My job is not to repress that at
13 all. It's really to try to provide
14 an opportunity where we can make a
15 reasonable decision.

16 JENNINGS: I'm offering strong
17 support for this proposal. I'm just
18 saying that whether -- if an idea is
19 good, if it benefits this
20 University, if it benefits students,
21 whether that idea came from
22 students, staff, faculty, Provost's
23 office, President's office or Board
24 of Trustees, seems to me to be a
25 moot point, that this body should

1 have the ability to discuss ideas on
2 the quality of the ideas, not on the
3 source of their origin.

4 CHAIR YANARELLA: I do
5 understand that in the philosophy of
6 science that there is such a thing
7 called the genetic fallacy, the
8 truth that the -- the origins of a
9 truth is not important or not. In
10 academic politics, I have learned,
11 over 34 years, that indeed there is
12 no genetic fallacy and that many
13 people deny that there is at all. I
14 appreciate your contribution to the
15 debate, and I ask if there are
16 others who would like to offer
17 additional comments or perspectives
18 on this? Yes?

19 OWEN: Michael Owen, from the
20 College of Medicine. Is -- are the
21 new tracks replacing completely or
22 in part or just in addition to the
23 old sort of great books curriculum?

24 DURANT: There continues to be
25 a sizeable portion of the program

1 that this is developing. There are
2 some six sections of the 23
3 sections -- 20, 23 sections that
4 will be given the experimental
5 track.

6 CHAIR YANARELLA: Anything
7 else? I'd like, then, to call for a
8 vote on the alternate structure --
9 approval of alternate structure for
10 the Honors Program. All those in
11 favor of the motion, please indicate
12 by raising your hands. All those
13 opposed, please engage in a like
14 sign. Any abstentions? The motion
15 carries. Our last item is going to
16 be postponed. This will allow us to
17 leave early. The proposal was
18 temporarily withdrawn out of the
19 discovery of last minute concerns
20 from various administrative quarters
21 about the particulars of the
22 proposal. At the almost literal
23 11th hour, I received a memo
24 indicating that those issues had
25 been resolved with a slight tweaking

1 of language and a -- in one case, an
2 addition of a sentence or two. I
3 felt compelled as the Chair of the
4 Senate Council to give the Senate
5 Council one last opportunity to
6 examine these, and so I did not
7 regard these as sufficiently trivial
8 or minor considerations. The Senate
9 Council had approved recommendation
10 of this to the Senate at a recent
11 meeting. We will review the small
12 changes that have been proposed to
13 accommodate concerns that have been
14 raised, and I would anticipate that
15 at the next meeting, or certainly no
16 later than the meeting afterwards of
17 the Senate, we will consider this.
18 Let me offer this concluding
19 reminder. The next senate meeting
20 is scheduled for March the 7th
21 instead of March 14th. As some of
22 you may have noticed as you were
23 beginning to engage in what in
24 academia is long-range planning --
25 that is, thinking two or three weeks

1 down the pike -- March 14th falls on
2 the first -- on the Monday of spring
3 break, and we were trying to be
4 realistic about our possibilities of
5 holding -- of having a quorum. So
6 the next Senate meeting will be
7 March 7th. Do I have a motion to
8 adjourn? So moved. All in favor?
9 Any opposed? The motion has been
10 finally carried. Thank you very
11 much for your time.

12 * * * * *
13 THEREUPON, the Senate Council meeting of
14 deposition of February 14th, 2005 was concluded.
15 * * * * *

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

