

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

FEBRUARY 9, 2008

3:00 P.M.

* * * *

* * * *

W.T. YOUNG LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY CAMPUS

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

* * * *

* * * *

DAVE RANDALL, CHAIR

STEPHANIE AKEN, VICE-CHAIR

KATE SEAGO, PARLIAMENTARIAN

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

LISA E. HOINKE, COURT REPORTER

* * * *

* * * *

CHAIR: So the same mantras as every meeting: When you speak, please give your affiliation, your name loudly enough so they can hear there at the -- at the desk,

and once again, please, communicate with your constituency. This is the business of the University faculty, and we certainly want to keep them informed.

So the minutes for our last meeting, December 8th, were distributed on the 3rd. There was one change, a correction, that's indicated there. You can see it. It was just on a name, an incorrect name is on page 13 of the handout. The recommendation is that someone move the Senate approve the minutes of December 8th, as amended. Yes.

HAYES: Jane Hayes, College of Engineering. I move that the Senate approve the minutes from December 8, 2008, as amended.

CHAIR: Second?

BOLLINGER: Second. Chris Bollinger, Department of Economics.

CHAIR: Discussion? Any further corrections? All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Thank you. All right. Minutes and announcements. You remember last meeting we had a handout that was that thick, and it was pandemonium over at the office trying to get that thing together. Sheila and I got to talking about that, and it turns out that aside from salaries, the single largest cost we have at Senate Council is for paper and we're all tree huggers to some degree. What we'd like to do is gradually phase out actually providing hard copies of the agenda, unless someone specifically requests it. If there's reasons that you can't get a copy, make a copy, we would certainly provide it. Sir?

BOLLINGER: This is Chris Bollinger, Economics, can I make a point that probably what's going to happen then is that we will all simply print it out and bring here because I can't -- don't have a computer that I'm going to bring here, and I doubt if anybody else is. So all you're doing then is shifting the cost of printing that out to the departments.

CHAIR: Recognized that that is probably so.

BOLLINGER: It's not going to change the amount of paper; it's not going change the

cost to the University; it just changes where the accounting is.

CHAIR: Well, you can -- what I do is I take all my old handouts that students don't want, and I print stuff on the other side, so you might try that. Yes?

PETERSON: Peterson, College of Medicine. I look through the agenda, find out the things that I feel I really need to print a hard copy. The rest, I look at the PDF on my screen. So I have a much smaller handout today.

CHAIR: Sheila is, I think for the first time today, she's provided a complete PDF, and so you can go to the website, just click on that PDF, and it's all there. I suspect that at least many of us can bring a laptop and just look at it on the laptop. We're going to give this a try, see if it works. If it doesn't, if it doesn't save any paper, if it's a pain, we'll go -- we'll go to doing it as we will, but let's at least try it and see if we can make it work. If you need a copy, simply e-mail the office, and there will be a copy available for you.

Waivers, occasionally Senate Council waives a rule, usually for expediency purposes in something minor. In this case, the first case, we -- we voted to allow an individual to earn a fourth Bachelor's degree. Apparently, the -- the rules specify the possibility of two. This individual had earned a fourth, and we allowed that.

Just to inform you that our own Ernie Yanarella will be giving the Chellgren Center Lecture kickoff address, Shakertown and the World of Tomorrow. That will be on Thursday at 3:30 on the eighteenth floor of the Office Tower building, so go support Ernie.

There is a drive, Pennies for Pediatric Oncology. This is an initiative of the Staff Senate that's participating in this fund-raising, and they've asked that we -- we inform you of this, and here are places where you can go drop your pennies in to support this cause. There's a complete list on the -- the last page of your handout.

This is a major issue. We're simply informing you of where things stand. We have been looking, Senate Council and a

number of individuals, have been looking at the ARs, particularly as deal with the review for tenure. And several months ago or six months ago, perhaps, the first round was completed where two of the ARs were melded together. And that was announced, and it's now been placed in -- on the web as -- as the revised AR. So that was the first round where they were combined -- where two of them were combined into a single AR on faculty policies and procedures which is now implemented. A recent round of revision was presented or precipitated by the Provost's Top Twenty Faculty Policies whitepaper that you may recall was issued. And among the changes that we're looking very carefully at are what we call a comprehensive tenure review and explicit language for a terminal review reconsideration of tenure after a negative decision. So what does this all mean? You know, a comprehensive tenure review will be, should it be enacted, the assurance that every faculty member being in a tenure-track line at assistant professor level, will have one comprehensive review that nobody can stop. And so it will be initiated sometime at or before the sixth year. And it will go forward all the way; no dean can stop it; nobody can stop it. I think we'll all agree, but we'll have a chance to discuss it, I think we'll agree that that is an improvement over the present circumstance. Difficulty then or the next consideration is: Suppose an individual were to decide to go up early, say, in the fourth year. If that comprehensive review were not approved, then the next year would be a terminal year appointment. And the next issue is, under what circumstances would a terminal-year appointment be -- be allowed? So this is something that we're discussing very aggressively within Senate Council, and we will keep you informed as things go along and whatever language comes up with, you'll certainly have an opportunity to have input to. But it's an important enough initiative that I want to be sure that you were informed and Provost office wanted to be sure that you were informed as to how things were progressing.

All right. The second issue here is a program deletion, a minor in

Quantitative Financial Analysis. Professor Kelley, so, yes, please, come up and give us a quick proceed of -- of what that's involved and -- and stand any questions from this very aggressive group here.

KELLEY: This is a program that was run through the process about five years ago. So it was created about five years ago. In that time, to our knowledge, at our college, there have been literally no students that have pursued this minor. Did I say major? I meant minor. This minor. And there's been a bit of a shift in the focus of our finance faculty away from -- from this, so because of a lack of student demand, literally no demand, and -- and the inability to resource this, we request to delete this program.

CHAIR: So to proceed, we need a motion that the University Senate approve deletion of the minor in quantitative financial analysis.

BOLLINGER: So moved, Chris Bollinger, Economics.

CHAIR: Second?

STEINER: Second, Shelly Steiner, Biology.

CHAIR: Discussion or questions for Professor Kelley?

SNOW: Diane Snow, Med Center. Our financial situations are changing dramatically all over the world, so when a couple of years from now this becomes a hot area and somebody wants to pursue it again, are there other ways for them to get into this area?

KELLEY: I think the -- the courses that are included in -- two of the three courses that are included in this minor are also part of the finance major, so a student would still be able to access this content to -- through a major in finance.

CHAIR: I should mention that all of these recommendations come with a positive recommendation from the Senate Council. We've discussed them, and part of the issue we discussed there is, it is possible to simply suspend a program. And then it's easier to start it up. After a fairly considerable discussion of this possibility, we thought it was much more realistic to simply terminate the program. Other questions. Yes.

ROHR: Jurgen Rohr, College of Pharmacy. Well, what is the disadvantage of letting

it sleep, so to speak?

BROTHERS: I'm sorry, could you -- I'm sorry, I didn't get your name.

ROHR: Rohr.

BROTHERS: Could you spell it for me, please?

ROHR: R-O-H-R. I always have to spell my name.

BROTHERS: Sorry.

KELLEY: I think that's a good question.

It's a question that came up when I met with the -- the Council. And this was Shelly's answer actually, so I'll give credit where credit is due, but his thought was that it might be a more honest way to -- to do this if we have no intent of bringing this back because if we suspend it, it still looks like it's out there, and in some way it may be deceptive to the students thinking about something like this. Although to date, there haven't been any that we're aware of.

CHAIR: Further discussion? Shelly?

STEINER: Shelly Steiner, Biology. It would be in the bulletin is the point. It may come out of the.... So if somebody is looking through the bulletin -- if they're not offering it, and they want to get rid of it, it seems like a good way to go. I mean, people flip through the bulletin; they see this course, and they think: I like that. It's not going to be offered. It's just -- it's a more honest way to do it, basically. The bulletin contains everything. Unless you drop it, it doesn't get essentially voided. The course would they stay there, basically.

CHAIR: Further? Yes.

MOLITERNO: David Moliterno, College of Medicine. Is there anything, I guess, in retrospect that the Council or the Senate, in general, can learn? Did somebody go back and look at the petition five or six years ago to see why it came about, and is there anything to be learned about its success or failure, I guess?

KELLEY: You know, I don't -- I'm not probably in a great position to answer that because I was a distant, outside observer when that process was enacted. I think when this program was put in place, there were thoughts that more resources would be coming -- coming that way, and over that period of time, but we weren't able to

resource it. I don't think in the foreseeable future we would be able to resource it. I suppose from internally in our college, I think one of the things we might have been able to do a little better is -- is get some sort of assessment of potential student demand. I'm not sure that we did that as well as we might have.

It's a good question.

CHAIR: All right. All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Motion carries. Thank you.

All right. A New Graduate Certificate in Distance Education. Professor Smith, yes.

SMITH: We have two departments in the College of Education that are -- have been heavily invested in Distance Education for at least a decade. One of those is the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation Counseling. And the other one is the Department of -- is the Instructional Systems Design program in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. And we discovered that both of those were planning to offer a Graduate Certificate in Distance Learning. And so we decided to -- to offer a joint program. And so there is a cost for Instructional Systems Design and a cost for the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation Counseling. And by putting these together, we can share the courses from each other's program. And we've had a lot of expressions of demand for this program from all kinds of different educational levels. The community college, in particular, has expressed a need for a structured way of getting this type of training, and they would also like a way of demonstrating on transcripts from University of Kentucky that a particular participant has been through that certificate program.

CHAIR: Questions? So we need a motion. Please.

HAYES: Jane Hayes, Computer Science, I move that the Senate approve this New Graduate Certificate in Distance Education, effective immediately.

CHAIR: And a second, please.

PARKER: Second, here.

CHAIR: All right.

BROTHERS: Sorry, your name, please?

PARKER: Steve Parker, Department of
Kinesiology, second the motion.

CHAIR: So discussion or questions for
Professor Smith.

HAYES: I have a question, and I
apologize, it really should have been in
the previous discussion, but it's a general
question. Is there any kind of a rule that
says, if you have something that was
deleted as a minor or a program, that it
can't come back in to the Academic Programs
Committee's list for N years? I'm -- I'm
on that committee, and I'm looking at our
workload, and all of a sudden, it occurred
to me, oh, there might be some of these
that we delete, and they come back around
in two or three years, but we already have
this big pipeline full of things waiting to
be approved.

CHAIR: At least it hasn't happened that
I'm recalling, and the answer, I'm pretty
sure, is, no. Starts from ground zero.

All right, thank you.

All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Motion carries. All right. I
believe, Dr. Smith, your -- yes,
consideration of a Dual Degree, PharmD and
Masters of Public Health. And okay.

SMITH: Good afternoon. I'm Kelly Smith
from the College of Pharmacy and wish to
present to you an application or petition
for a joint degree very much in the mold
that we have a joint degree offering with
our Public Administration colleagues, as
well as our Business Administration
colleagues and Economics. So we have three
existing programs. The model for this is
very similar as far as logistics and the
give and take between the two sponsoring
organizations. And as you can see if
you've had a chance to read some of the
background, there are a handful of programs
that are similar to this across the
country, many of which occur at our
benchmark institutions from within the
College of Pharmacy's perspective, as well
as the University's perspective. This is
also in keeping with a number of
professional organizations in terms of
their emphasis on pharmacists and their

role in Public Health.

CHAIR: So I need a motion that we effectively approve this.

MOLITERNO: David Moliterno, College of Medicine, so moved.

CHAIR: And a second, please? Joe.

CHAPPELL: Joe Chappell.

CHAIR: Discussion or questions for Professor Smith?

BLACKWELL: I just want to clarify that it is a dual degree and not a joint degree. I'm Jeannine Blackwell, Dean of the Graduate School, and I am the picky, old aunt who insists on those things.

CHAIR: Yes, please.

WOOD: Connie Wood, Arts and Sciences. For tuition purposes, what is the status of the student?

SMITH: The student would pay tuition to their primary enrollment in terms the full-time enrollment in that particular semester. By virtue of this, the majority of that would be in the College of Pharmacy with the course schedule as -- as they were taken.

WOOD: So you're saying the majority of the hours --

SMITH: Of -- of the time that they will spend. There is one additional semester in which they'll be engaged, a summer course work, perhaps, where they may not be enrolled in the College of Pharmacy.

CHAIR: Other questions? Kaveh.

TAGAVI: I know for sure that if you don't have -- you don't have to have a BS degree in order to get a PharmD because I know that because my son --

SMITH: Yes.

TAGAVI: -- has a PharmD. But is it possible if you don't have a BS degree or a BA degree to get the dual degree, PharmD and the MS in Public Health?

SMITH: As -- and we've indicated here, we have the process in place where essentially they're going to be pursuing these degrees simultaneously. There's a minimal level of course work that they must have achieved prior to successful application in the graduate school, and that is obtained essentially by fulfilling their pre-pharmacy requirements, as well as their first year of academic requirements in the College of Pharmacy itself. So this is an intricacy of the Pharmacy School, but

we -- we have some success stories thus far.

TAGAVI: So the answer is?.

SMITH: Is -- is it can be done as long as they meet certain requirements along the process.

TAGAVI: Could somebody end up with a Master of Public Health without any undergraduate degree?

SMITH: They cannot. They -- they must achieve a Pharmacy degree before they can be officially awarded that MPH degree if they have not achieved the BS requirements. Now, there are some provisions and stipulations in your document here that should one course of desire or your dream fail in one area, perhaps Pharmacy, that as long as they meet the requirements for both a BS and an MPH, that they could potentially seek that as a resolution.

TAGAVI: But as a technicality, Pharmacy degree is not an undergraduate degree.

SMITH: Correct. It's a professional degree.

CHAIR: Questions? Thank you.
All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Motion carries.

So one of the -- one of the things that we've been doing this year in the Senate is to -- is to bring to the Senate's attention some important issues about the campus. And one of those is certainly the status of Coldstream here. So I've asked Len Heller to come and fill us in. So it's a pleasure to have you and thank you.

HELLER: I'll run through the slide presentation in ten minutes.

As you know, the Board of Trustees reorganized Commercialization and Economic Development several years ago, and it is now one unit that reports to my office, that reports directly to the president. It begins with Intellectual Property and it ends with Coldstream and creating businesses and that type of thing. So today I'm here to talk to you about Coldstream, solely. And if at some point we want to talk about other things, I'd certainly be happy to do that.

Next slide. Where would I have that?

BROTHERS: Oh, do you still have the slide thing?

HELLER: So that's the vast land of Coldstream. As you will see, it's laid out as a large industrial park, 20 acre plots, looking to have buildings with 50 -- or from 100 to 200,000, plus, on each of those lots.

The first thing that we started to do was challenge this as a good model for Coldstream. So we did a density study, and let's see, this is Coldstream campus here. This is the profile of Coldstream campus. Many people don't understand what size Coldstream is. Well, if you take downtown Lexington, you can put four downtown Lexingtons inside of Coldstream. The next one looks at the University of Kentucky and its entire campus, including the stadium, and you'll see that Coldstream is the same size as what the campus is. So it is a large piece of acreage. What we are doing -- this is a quick review. We have been doing a master development plan. It's been going on for eight months. We've consulted with some deans and some faculty. We've looked at four major campuses in other universities that we think parallel ours. And we hope to have that study done by the end of March. And so that will be available, and it will be a draft study because it's going to have to go through a lot of charades with you and with the City and others to see how this flies.

The second thing is we were successful in getting six-and-a-half million dollars this year from the State to do redundant power out at Coldstream. And what that -- and that's a big hit for us. That differentiates us in the marketplace in the top two percent of parks in the Midwest. And what redundant power is, is we'll have one source coming from downtown to Coldstream. We'll have another separate power source coming from Georgetown to Coldstream. Separate power stations; separate transformers; dual loops inside the campus. So you'll be able to have triple redundancy when that's installed. That will be available in March of 2010.

We have the State Mental Health facility that's going out there. It's

under design right now. The money is still there. There have been no changes in the plan. That's going out behind the Mental Health-Mental Retardation Bluegrass facility.

We have the Public Safety Operations for the City, Lexington Fayette-Urban County, coming to Coldstream.

And then, of course, in Agriculture, the Livestock Disease Diagnostic Center is getting a \$2.8 million renovation.

This is one case of Exstream Software that's now out at Coldstream. It started there two years ago. It is now Hewlett Packard. And Hewlett Packard purchased Exstream Software in the neighborhood of 900,000,000 plus, to take over this small company that's been there -- they've been around for 10 years in the community, but they've been out there.

One of the things that started doing a master plan was in talking to Hewlett Packard, IBM, data centers, the Googles of the world, is that we need a campus where it will attract young professionals from the coast, East Coast, West Coast, where they can have a certain lifestyle. It seems that studies are saying that our young professionals are more interested lifestyle, then career, and then loyalty to the company. And so they started saying, well, if you can create a lifestyle out there that makes it different, that will create an energy that will help us recruit more people there.

This is the next project. It's -- you've probably seen one building up. It's 640,000 square feet to be developed, 332 are under construction. And then we have 45,000 under contract. So that's what's going on in the park. The Lexhold Center is a 50 million multi-tenant facility, 320,000 square feet, and more than eight businesses now have signed up. So the recession has not caused us a problem in signing up new businesses to come to Coldstream. But it will be two buildings that face each other. And you can see the architectural design there.

This is a little statistic: We now have 48 companies out at Coldstream. That's 11-percent increase. There are now over a thousand employees there, a

15-percent increase. There are 11 new companies, and the occupancy rate of the space that we have available to lease is 95-percent occupied. So we have a demand, and growth has been good.

This is just some of the -- a list of the companies that are out there. I would highlight Allylix, who's been very successful, starting with Joe Chappell in the College of Agriculture. This company has received several rounds of investment capital. They started out as a flavors and fragrance company. They've now been asked to make biofuels using the same technology of taking genetically-modified yeast to produce -- produce the material. Bluegrass Angels Venture Fund is something that I was involved in starting three years ago. We invest in IP and technology and scientists coming out of UK. We also invest in the community. So we're there -- we have two meetings -- one meeting a month to get two presentations, and we coach you how to do a business plan and how to make a presentation and how to make your (unintelligible) to the investors.

Coldstream Laboratories, of course, is the spin out with Dean Roberts and the College of Pharmacy. It was CPST. It was spun out to be a for-profit corporation. That was a miraculous event. Essentially in four months, we made it a stock-growing company. We transferred 30 employees out. We reassigned contracts, not sponsored grants but contracts to CLI and was able to convince the State that we can lease the building. Usually it's reserved for not-for-profit buildings, but they agreed that to make that a variance. So we've been in business for two years. It's on target, and we have 54 -- 50 employees. It won the fastest growing business award in Lexington this year. And we have 26 pharmaceutical companies and other types that are now working on contracts with CLI. Let's see, I -- I'll just stop with that. I don't need to go down this list. I'd be happy to talk to any of you about any one of them.

Well, I talked about Coldstream. LevTech came out of UK Technology. It was sold last year to ATMI, which is a national company, for 27 million dollars. And it's based on a technology for mixing pharmaceuticals in an environment where

there's no contamination, by levitating the propellers.

Allylix, I talked about that.

Laura's Lean Beef was sold to Meyer Natural Angus. And that's out at Coldstream.

New Vision: I just wanted to put a few words up here to try and capture the vision that we're trying to portray. And I'll be happy to answer questions when I get done. This has to be an international culture, high energy for young professionals, high end experiences in technology, advanced research, and businesses that are research oriented. It has to be a 21st century designed professional community. And it will be -- I can't explain -- I'll explain in a minute. But it has an international showcase for the scientists and the industries. Okay. With the integration of arts, education, service, research and businesses and some high tech manufacturing.

Research facilities will focus on equine, agriculture, pharmaceutical, automotive, IT, engineering, and medical prototype development. The other things that can go out there are tier 3 and tier 4 data centers with redundant power. And we also plan to do -- try to do something with government labs at Coldstream as well.

I guess here's the plan. This is just some features, and we're not finished with the final draft, and this is the last slide. We've had national firms doing a study, economic studies on this place and also doing the campus layout. And we used 3 campus as our beginning model. We designed this thing to be 7 million square feet in 20 years. There will be a core project which is mixed use which will be 50 acres. That will be the one that will get most attention from you. Final draft completed in March. First step is university and community buy-in. And then we're going to do an international competition, in the sense, for the architects here and the College of Architecture, this is really an RFQ where we are asking for credentials both financially and capability in doing something like this. We will have a panel that consists of the community and the

university and one international architect who will referee and select three. And then we'll select one and make an award of probably \$50,000 to the other two, if they are unsuccessful -- whether they're unsuccessful in the competition. So it's truly set then.

Now, this got started about six months ago when one developer said: I'll put -- you know how they talk, but he was pretty serious, a half a billion dollars into Coldstream. I wanted to know what that was. I had an architect who's done MIT, Stanford, and Harvard, this type of thing, and most of their discussions to me are: You have to have a core center of energy to get the part on task and going. A core center, if I can describe it, it may look like Paris. Essentially, you have some retail on the first floor. No -- no box stores. We're not doing shopping centers or anything like that but boutiques. Companies will have businesses on the first floor if they're selling to the public or other places. The second floor above it and the third floor are reserved for -- for businesses and faculty and for research both dry and wet land. And the third floor is a condominium apartment complex. So essentially if you look up, you would see the retail, the businesses, and the condominiums. So you can live in the park; you can work in the park, and that's what it's about. And then have a lot of amenities for people that are there. I've seen several of these new urban centers. Architecture can tell you more about that. But that is the design to do that. So it's truly integrated. I've seen one place where they've integrated a 300,000 square foot competitor of Microsoft into this community so it looks pretty much like it's in the community. But that's -- that's essentially the story I have today. I'll take any questions and then move on.

CHAIR: Any questions?

YANARELLA: I have a simple question: Is this a money-making operation for the University now, or yet or will it be?

HELLER: Okay. Well, the source of revenue that's coming to the University is primarily over the leases. And so in that sense, we are leasing the land and revenue is coming back to the University. There is

no way we can build roads out there or put up buildings. A developer will have to come in, and that's why you have to give them a large section of space because it's on their back; it's on their investment to design this thing in comparison to what we put out in our RFP for study. So we'll need some more space. Now, KTI which you know is the for-profit arm, we probably will be doing some ventures in terms of building buildings out there for research. And hopefully, I can announce one soon. But -- so KTI will do that, and they'll have ownership of the building, and they will make money that way, so... Still, these have all got to make money, otherwise, we don't do it; can't be any other way.

CHAIR: Thank you, Len --

HELLER: Thank you.

CHAIR: -- very much.

HELLER: I have some brochures I'll leave in the back if you want to catch those.

CHAIR: So we're asking you next here to deal with a process, not necessarily a form. So SACS requires review of all Distance Learning courses. And our current review process is perhaps somewhat marginal. So we're trying to develop new procedures which will satisfy the -- the accreditation process. So your handout contains a form which is based on the SACS policy statement, what they want to see in terms of review of Distance Education courses. So what we're going to ask of you here and in the next issue as well, that you approve the requirement that the Distance Learning Form be submitted with any course form requesting a Distance Learning delivery. Now, we are not asking you for approval of the form. We don't want to have to come to the Senate to approve every -- every dot and jittle of a change in the form. We would like the Senate to approve that the -- that the form, modeled after what you see there, be presented for approval with each Distance Learning course. So if someone would so move, we'll then discuss this. Do I have a motion for this?

YANARELLA: I so move.

CHAIR: Second?

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, second.

CHAIR: Thank you. Discussion. Yes.

YOST: Scott Yost from the College of Engineering. You -- on the top of your form here, you have a course form that requests a change in delivery mode, but you just said, if any Distance Learning course is seeking some type of change or approval. And I'm trying to get an understanding, is this only if a course is re -- a new course request be a new delivery Distance Learning course, or is this for any existing or new course that has -- that -- that's involved -- involved with Distance Learning have to follow this form?

CHAIR: I suspect that if has occurred in Distance Learning, it's already been reviewed and approved; is that --

BROTHERS: Yes. There's no -- there's no intention to go back and redo any forms. The intent is for future reviews. You can ask for a new course to be created. You can ask -- currently people can ask for a new course to be created, and they can also ask for a new course to be created and include Distance Learning delivery. They can also -- individuals can also change a course to request Distance Learning. So there will be a situation if somebody wants to either add delivery of Distance Learning to a new course or add it to an existing course, this form will need to be used. But there's no intent of asking currently approved DL courses to go back and fill out this form.

BLACKWELL: Can I add something?

CHAIR: Please. Dr. Blackwell.

BLACKWELL: This is a companion piece to several other things that we're working on in the Distance Learning program. Connie Baird -- is Connie here -- has developed a toolkit for any faculty member who -- or program or department that wants to start Distance Learning. And Distance -- the Distance Learning program will help guide you through the process. Help you with preparation of materials and also with filling out this form. And that -- we're -- we're calling that the toolkit, and it is already available. The second thing that we're doing as a companion piece is that we are forming a committee, an advisory committee, that is going to start reviewing currently existing courses and programs that have already been designated as Distance Learning. We are going to be

using the Quality Matters which is sort of a national assessment tool for looking at those programs to make sure that they're in accord with the SACS definitions of Distance Learning, and that we have gone through the sort of quality measures that SACS will be expecting at our next SACS visit. And that's going to be a gradual process, and we'll be in contact with the deans, department chairs and directors of program study, DGSs and DUSs about that schedule. But we'll have to take it out over time because we have so many current and existing courses and programs.

CHAIR: Yes.

YOST: I guess just for a follow-up question -- again, Scott Yost from College of Engineering. Why is it -- in other words, if I had an existing Distance Learning course that I'm -- currently on the books, and if I ask for a change in the future, whatever that change may be, just some type of change, a normal change in a course, why is it that I would be exempt from this form because the way this wording is, this wording is only for new delivery modes. It doesn't include if I have any change in an existing Distance Learning, why -- why would I be exempt from this form?

CHAIR: All right.

BROTHERS: Currently, the opinion of the Registrar and the Senate Council is that once Distance Learning delivery is approved, you are approved for Distance Learning delivery. So if you want to change how you deliver via Distance Learning, that's not something that will be requested -- or that's not something that has to be approved. So once you -- once you receive approval for Distance Learning delivery on the -- for the course, then you don't have to ask for it if you want to do a different type of mixture Distance Learning. Does that answer your question?

YOST: It does, I guess. But I'm -- just by what Dr. Blackwell mentioned about the fact that they are reviewing Distance Learning courses, if this form was mandatory for all Distance Learning courses, either future or present, if they're making changes, this would also basically allow them to review them more formally, not just the process we're going

through. I mean, from what stated, we're going to be through this process to review it. I -- I would kind of make sure that every existing Distance Learning course, assuming, again, going about -- the form you put together here looks reasonable as far as the things you're asking from the -- the type of stuff they're doing in the Distance Learning. Why not always have them refresh if they're going to seek a change? Is it too much paperwork for a course or something? I don't know.

CHAIR: We could accept that as a friendly amendment.

BROTHERS: Can you -- now are you asking that the Distance Learning form be used for every time a change in the Distance Learning delivery be offered?

YOST: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

YOST: This form here would be the one that any Distance Learning course, new, existing or whatever, would be the form that they would use.

BROTHERS: Okay.

YOST: That would be my suggestion.

BROTHERS: There's currently no differentiation between if you want to offer a course via Distance Learning in one like Blackboard or be it offered the Distance Learning course with other components. There's currently no requirement that you ask for permission on how you're going to offer the Distance Learning. So if somebody changes the course in terms of the content, they'll send in a course change form. But the delivery -- the Distance Learning delivery is approved at that point, and it doesn't change unless they say they want to drop the Distance Learning. But they don't have to go and get approval for each type of delivery. But if that's what you suggest, obviously then....

YOST: Well, I guess, maybe I'm just misunderstanding the notion of the form. I mean, I think of Distance Learning as -- also a bit of background (UNINTELLIGIBLE) Council. I see there's been a little bit of confusion. In my limited time here, I see a little bit of confusion as far as Distance Learning, what it means, standards, so forth and so on, which is part of what Dr. Blackwell said we're going

to try to bring up to speed with those things, and I'm under the impression that this form is one that's trying to help us come up with a standard by which all Distance Learning courses should kind of be very mindful of when you're putting together a Distance Learning course. So why not also be mindful of past courses if they want a change?

CHAIR: Connie.

WOOD: I'd like to second what my esteemed colleague is saying. I believe the suggestion is that any course that has been prior approved for Distance Learning, if a change in that course is submitted, that this form also accompany that request for a change in a course. The rationale being that if you receive approval for Distance Learning via some medium, and you want to change, drastically change, either the content of that course or the method of delivery, then that also should be part of the approval process.

CHAIR: Yes.

MITCHELL: Richard Mitchell, Dentistry. I have -- I'm confused about one thing. It says, the Distance Learning form, and in your introduction, I understood that we were not approving a particular form. Should it read: a Distance Learning form?

CHAIR: I think that would be a wise change. So can we take that as a friendly amendment?

PARLIAMENTARIAN: If the person who made the motion will accept it as a friendly.

CHAIR: Person who made the motion accept that as a friendly amendment that the word the be changed to a? Ernie.

YANARELLA: I made the motion. Sixes and sevens. We have -- this is the Distance Learning form. And it seems to me that what the -- the sense of the recommendation is, or the motion is that -- that it's the requirement of this form being -- being submitted for any future course, and it's not the issue of the Distance Learning form itself. If, a, would obviate any confusion on that, I'm -- I'm amenable to that as a friendly amendment.

CHAIR: All right. I think it would. Who seconded it? Who seconded the motion?

BROTHERS: Anderson, Debra.

ANDERSON: Yeah, that's fine.

CHAIR: All right. So it's now the

a Distance Learning form be submitted with any course form requesting Distance Learning delivery. As I read that, that would include the situation that you have

--

YOST: As long as that's the intent. I'm just going back -- by what's at the title, the top of the form. It just says that there's a change in Distance Learning.

CHAIR: Yeah.

YOST: And I'm fine with it -- I mean, I -- my motion, my friendly amendment motion would be that whatever form we have, whatever form the University puts together be included with any and all Distance Learning courses, new, existing, or whatever.

CHAIR: I read that this way. There was another comment here. Yes.

JENSEN: Jane Jensen, College of Education. I -- if you'd like to clarify what course form means, currently when you submit a new course form, that's one kind. We also submit change of course forms. And I don't know that there really is any other option for approval. It's a new course or a change of course, right?

BROTHERS: Yeah. Unless you -- yeah, unless you --

JENSEN: So those are the two -- those are the two times that this distance form would be attached. It would not catch -- I think what Sheila was trying to point out, it would not catch if -- if I -- if I had a course that was approved for distance delivery, and I originally said I was going to be using a Blackboard show, but now because it's easier for my graduate students, I decided to use a SharePoint interface, I wouldn't be submitting anything new to the graduate council or undergraduate -- I mean, you wouldn't catch me on that one. You'd have to trust that I'd chosen the right platform. But it would catch everything else that is going through a review.

BLACKWELL: Yes, that's -- that's right. And when we have our periodic review of the courses as they're being taught by our subcommittee, that's when it would get caught if somebody was playing fast and loose and, you know, substituting roller skates instead of SharePoint, then that would be the point of the quality control,

and we would ask them to do a change of course.

JENSEN: I'll try not to do that.

CHAIR: I think we've got this square. Other issues? All right.

BROTHERS: Excuse me, I want to make -- I want to make sure that I understand this because a lot of people will be using this course, and I want to make sure I have -- or this form, I want to make sure I have it right. The sense is that any change to a course that is delivered via Distance Learning should include this DL form, even if it's not a change in the delivery mode. If it's a change in any type of -- if it's a course change, it needs to have this form with it as well. Okay.

CHAIR: Yes, Davy.

JONES: What Sheila just read back, could she use some word that's -- other than should? Like shall?

UNIDENTIFIED: Required?

CHAIR: Should or shall --

TAGAVI: Does that include minor changes, the way she said it? Any change, including minor change? Then it's not really that minor anymore if you have to do all of this.

CHAIR: I don't see that as part of the motion. In other words, this is a requirement that this form must be submitted, though I see the word, should, but that's not part of the motion. All right. Is your issue satisfied?

TAGAVI: I'm satisfied.

CHAIR: Yes.

BOLLINGER: Chris Bollinger, Economics. I'm getting increasingly disturbed by the vagueness of this recommendation. We're not clear on which kinds of course changes we're talking about. We're not clear on which form we're talking about. I mean, the friendly amendment that I read is now any Distance Learning form that I get from anywhere could be submitted. Whereas, what I read up there is there's a SACS' policy statement regarding this form that we're trying to comply with. I'm increasingly uncomfortable with this resolution. And I'm wondering if perhaps it should go back and be made clear exactly what it is we're doing here.

CHAIR: We -- we can do that. You want to make a motion to table?

BOLLINGER: Sure.

CHAIR: Name and

BOLLINGER: Okay, Chris Bollinger. I move to table this. And do I need anything else?

CHAIR: Table until next meeting.

BOLLINGER: Table until next meeting.

CHAIR: Second?

JONES: Davy Jones, Toxicology, second.

CHAIR: All right. Discussion of the motion to table.

BROTHERS: Well, one thing in the interest of trust and transparency, we have told departments that they can use this form until it is approved by the Senate. So as it is, it's out there. It's got big language as you can see in your handbook that it's pending approval. But if -- if you want this form for some reason to stop being used, you need to let me know specifically.

CHAIR: But I agree, we can come back with greater clarity. Yes, please.

JENSEN: Rob Jensen, Art Department. The only problem with fussing over this form is that I serve on the -- on the Graduate Council, and we get, every time we have a meeting, which is every two weeks, a new program, a new proposal for a Distance Learning class. And we are in desperate need of guidelines that this form would actually deliver, you know, on that. So the Senate is automatically going to postpone action, I think, on a number of new proposals and changes that are going to move forward to Graduate Council. If you want to do that, that's fine, but there are consequences to this action.

NADEL: Point of order.

CHAIR: Yes.

NADEL: Is the table to --

BROTHERS: I'm sorry. Your name, please?

NADEL: -- is the motion to table open to debate? Alan Nadel, A&S. Is the motion to table open to debate? I believe it isn't, but I'm not sure.

BLACKWELL: It's not.

NADEL: So this debate is out of order.

CHAIR: All right, all right. So all in favor of tabling, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay?

AUDIENCE: Nay.

CHAIR: We shall count. All in favor

of tabling, raise your hand, please.

MICHELLE: Thirty-eight.

CHAIR: All right. Against, nay?

MICHELLE: Twenty.

CHAIR: Motion is tabled. We'll bring it back here with greater clarity. Thank you.

All right. Syllabus guidelines.

There have been requests that there be some syllabus guideline faculty can refer back to in preparing syllabus for a course. So this set of guidelines was created based on the ombud's language and input received from individuals. And so the recommendation is, the form is in your -- your handout. We're not asking for approval of the form, but that the Senate approve the use of the syllabi guidelines by the Graduate Council, Health Care College's Council, and the Undergraduate Council when reviewing course applications.

I need a motion so we can discuss it.

WILLIAMS: David Williams, Agriculture, so moved.

CHAIR: Second.

CHAPPELL: Joe Chappell.

CHAIR: Discussion? You see the -- the example that is in your proposal -- in your -- in your agenda. Comments? Thoughts?

TROSKE: Ken Troske, Economics. I guess it is -- these are just suggestions to faculty about things they might want to put in their syllabus for their course. These are not requirements or anything. They're just suggestions of things to think about?

CHAIR: No. Kaveh, please.

TAGAVI: It's -- it's not even that. This is not for faculty for their syllabus. This is syllabus when you submit an application to Senate apparatus. The councils have requested that when you do that, we'd like to have uniformity among these syllabuses, syllabi. So it's only for that. So if your course was recommended for approval 10 years ago, that syllabus now would be this form, but after that various faculty wanted to teach that course, they would use their our syllabus. This is not recommendation to faculty members, but only for Senate procedure.

TROSKE: Thank you.

CHAIR: Yes.

NIEMAN: Tom Nieman, Landscape Architecture. I am curious in the -- you've got -- talks about 400-, 500-, 600-,

700-level courses. What do we in landscape architecture do that have 800-level courses? It's an undergraduate program.

BROTHERS: The -- the reason that -- the reason that I have it differentiated just for those two types or those three types is because we get a lot of courses that come through that Undergraduate Council and the Graduate Council that are -- that are 400-G or 500 level, and they don't have -- they don't have the different expectations. They have -- the faculty may forget that graduate students may take it. And so we have to go back and ask that they specifically include the different expectations for graduate students as compared to undergraduate students. The reason 800-level and 900-level courses aren't addressed is, I mean, it would be relatively -- the assumption is, all of these will apply to any course, but for these particular courses, you have to have undergraduate expectations, and then for these particular courses, you have to have graduate expectations. If you'd like, we can easily add some other phrase, but that's why the seven and eight -- or the eight and nine hundreds were mentioned.

CHAIR: We'll take care of that if there's a problem there. I don't -- since we're not approving the form, we'll see that that's appropriate. I saw another hand.

JENSEN: Rob Jensen, Art Department, again. This is just sample syllabi for course approval, right? So why would there be information like final exam, date, time, duration and location since that would change every semester?

CHAIR: My impression is that it's telling the instructor that this is information that needs to be on the --

JENSEN: That needs to be there.

CHAIR: Yes. And to read anything more into it than that --

JENSEN: It's just that I'm, you know, I get confused. I was confused.

CHAIR: All right. Okay. All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, any?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Motion carries. We have a new University Scholars Program, a Bachelor of

Science Hospitality Management and Tourism with a Masters in Hospitality and Dietetics Administration. Professor Kurzynske, yes, please, come on up and tell us about this. We'll be very hospitable.

KURZYNSKE: Good, thank you. Do I need a mike? Can you hear me?

AUDIENCE: We can hear you.

KURZYNSKE: You can hear me, all right. We're proposing actually -- can I do both of them together?

CHAIR: I'd rather do them one at a time.

KURZYNSKE: Well, you're going to make my life difficult. This is a proposal for university scholars. We have in the Department of Nutrition and Food Science, we have three majors, hospitality management, dietetics, and human nutrition. I will not be talking about human nutrition because human nutrition, their Master's programs typically go into pharmacy, physical therapy. They don't usually get a Master's in nutrition, per se. So we're really looking at the two programs that would lead into our Master's degree. Hospitality Management has around 130, 140 students. We get very few students into the Master's program anywhere in the U.S. because Master's programs -- because most of the students are picked up ahead of time by their internship. At the end of their four years, they have an internship within an organization like Hyatt or Sheridan or something along those lines. And students get picked up for working, and then the degree becomes not as favorable to them. We believe that they can gain a lot by furthering their education and getting the further degree. So we wanted to develop a way that would entice them to look at possibly going for the Master's degree. So it's the combination where 12 hours of the undergraduate and 12 hours of the graduate program would be combined so they would be -- those 12 hours could count as both a graduate level or undergraduate. Those would be either 400-G level courses, 500-level courses, or even a graduate level course. The requirements would be the overall GPA of these students would be 3.2. Their GPA in a major would be 3.5. We feel that this would also have us increase the level of students because we would be getting to pick the students that were of

the highest caliber in our programs to lull them into our Master's program.

CHAIR: Right. So I need a motion to approve; then we'll discuss.

McNEILL: Sam McNeill, College of Agriculture, so moved.

CHAIR: Second, please?

WILLIAMS: David Williams, Agriculture, second.

CHAIR: Discussion, questions for Professor.

TROSKE: You indicated that not a lot of students get Master's degrees --

BROTHERS: I'm sorry, name, please?

TROSKE: Oh, Ken Troske, Economics, sorry.

You indicated not a lot of students get a Master's degrees anyhow. We canned a program already today that didn't have an interest. Is there -- have you done any studies to suggest that someone might be interested in this?

KURZYNSKE: Oh, they are interested in it. You have to remember that our Master's program is a combined program, so we have a viable Master's program. It's just the smaller side of the house is from hospitality management rather than dietetics. Most of our students come from dietetics. There are -- there are a lot of Master's programs out there. There's a lot of interest, but when you're offered coming out of a BS with 50, 60, \$70,000, students tend to be lulled away from working on a degree. Whereas, if you offer them a degree which actually cuts off one semester, we believe, and we've got indication from the students they'd be much more likely to come back in and work on that degree.

CHAIR: Additional discussion? Okay. All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Motion carries. All right. Well, we've got one more here.

KURZYNSKE: All right. This is more or less the same proposal, only this is from the dietetic side of the house. We have around 175 dietetic students. This proposal is a little different in that our dietetic students and all dietetic students to become registered dieticians must have an internship program. In order to go through

the UK internship program, they have to be admitted to Graduate School. They don't have to work on a Master's, but they have to be admitted to Graduate student -- School. So when you talk about the number of hours that these students go through to get what is equivalent to a BS degree, it's 128 hours for their degree, and then it is a seven -- a seven-month internship afterwards. We -- a lot of the students do do Master's, but we're trying to figure out a way to give them a little bit more flexibility on their hours because they have so many to meet the registered dietician requirements for our program and for American Dietetics Association. And so we're proposing the same type of program where 12 hours would count as an undergraduate, as well as graduate. Again, those would be 400-G levels, 500-, 600-level courses. It would also include the 3.5 for a major for these students in that major, and a 3.2 overall for those students.

CHAIR: Yes.

BOLLINGER: Chris Bollinger, Economics. Just a question. Those students --

PARLIAMENTARIAN: We need to get the motion on the floor.

BOLLINGER: Oh, I'm sorry. So moved.

CHAIR: Bless you. So moved. A second?

CHAPPELL: Joe Chappell.

CHAIR: All right. Now.

BOLLINGER: So when these students -- and I know there's other university scholars' programs out there, so I'm sure this has been dealt with, when these students take a 400-level G course, and then they count it in both places, do they give the G option them?

KURZYNSKE: Yes.

BOLLINGER: Okay.

KURZYNSKE: They have to do the G option.

BOLLINGER: I figured but....

CHAIR: Further discussion? Yes.

WERMELING: How does this affect the scholarship of the department?

BROTHERS: Name, please?

WERMELING: Wermeling in Pharmacy. How does this affect the scholarly productivity of the faculty of the department when you go to one of these programs?

KURZYNSKE: Could you explain what you're asking for?

WERMELING: Well, it seems like papers and presentations and other things that count on the Provost' checklist, you know, like patents and citations, things like this, he counts those, and so how does this help you out (unintelligible) with the Provost?

KURZYNSKE: Well, hopefully, it will give us more graduate students. A lot of these students when they go through, they do research, and that would be undergraduate and graduate research and papers. The Creed which is the organization that is over hospitality management has a program for Master level presentations and research where students do apply for review of their papers. A similar thing with -- with dietetics with ADA. We have meetings, and they would get to do papers. So I think all in all, it would improve the checkoff list.

CHAIR: Okay. All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Okay. Opposed, nay?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Motion carries. Thank you.

KURZYNSKE: Thank you.

CHAIR: All right. Honorary degree, so it is our responsibility within our purview to approve honorary degrees, but there's a bit of a wicket here in that when I told you about going back and inform your constituents, doesn't hold this time. In other words, we want to keep these nominations under cover, essentially until the Board of Trustees has an opportunity to approve I, so we don't want this information out. So if we were to vote on individual nominations by name, that would appear in the minutes. So we're going to try and do some end around here to both preserve the confidentiality and assure us that we're -- we're approving each and every degree and each and every individual. So I've asked Dr. Blackwell if she'll stop after each bio-sketching. We'll discuss that briefly, and then at the end we will vote on this, each and every altogether.

BLACKWELL: Okay. The cone of silence descends. First, I would like to thank the members of the Honorary Degree Committee. Here you see them all listed. This committee met earlier in the fall and vetted all of the nominations that we received this year, and my thanks to them.

And here are the three nominees that come forward from our committee: Mark E. Davis, William B. Brett Kirwan, and Helen Thomas.

Mark E. Davis is the Warren and Katharine Schlinger Professor of Chemical Engineering at the California Institute of Technology. He has won the Alan T. Waterman Award of the National Science Foundation, a member of the National Academy of Science, as well as of Engineering. He's the founder of a couple of startup companies, and is a member of the Experimental Therapeutics Program of the Comprehensive Cancer Center at the City of Hope Hospital. He holds three chemical engineering degrees from the University of Kentucky. And while at UK, was enrolled here on a track scholarship, lettered in track, received the out -- the outstanding scholar-athlete award -- award at UK and is -- was inducted into the UK Engineering Hall of Distinction in 1999. So....

CHAIR: Any discussion of this nomination? Davy.

JONES: Again, I -- I don't know this area, this discipline of.... There are a lot of people who have done a lot of important things out there, and I can see a Kentucky connection with this individual. Could somebody comment a little bit more, why is this person particularly distinguished to get the honorary degree?

BLACKWELL: Can someone speak to, particularly the Waterman Award?

KALIKA: Yeah. Doug Kalika, Chemical Engineering. I'll comment that I had no involvement with this nomination and -- and was not aware of it, but quite pleased to see it. I've been here about 20 years, and so have heard a lot about Mark over the years. He was originally at Virginia Tech, did some very pioneering work in the area of molecular control catalysis with zeolites. That was the basis for his Waterman Award -- Waterman Award in 1990. The Waterman Award is a \$500,000 award. It's awarded to a young investigator under the age, I believe, of 35. Mark Davis was the first engineer to receive the Waterman Award, and I believe at this point, only two engineers have received it in the -- in the course of the award. He left Virginia Tech in the early '90s and went to Cal Tech. Around 1996, I believe, his wife was

diagnosed with breast cancer, and as she was undergoing initial treatments, and he came to be familiar with the treatments and the options, he decided that he was going to completely change the course of his career and immerse himself in looking at therapeutic drug delivery applications at the nano scale for cancer treatment. And so that is what he has done for the last 12 years. He's currently got a couple of different therapies that are in clinical trials that have had a very significant impact. I would consider him probably to be one of the three to five most influential chemical engineers for people working at the engineering-medicine interface at this juncture. So I certainly consider the level of distinction to -- to certainly match with the honorary degree.

CHAIR: Please.

TROSKE: Ed Troske, Economics. As a new member of the faculty Senate, maybe someone could help me. Why -- what am I -- what am I trying to decide on? Obviously, this gentleman has impressive academic credentials. There may be some other people who don't have impressive -- are we worried about their academic credentials? Are we making an award based on their academic standing? Is there some reason we're making -- why -- why are we -- what's the point of this?

BLACKWELL: The -- the honorary degree is to award excellence and long-standing, outstanding performance in a -- at a premiere level in a discipline or an area. It does not have to be academic only. And it is desirable but not necessary to have some connection to the Commonwealth of Kentucky or the University of Kentucky. And that is at-large. It can be in a variety of ways: interest in the University of Kentucky, contributions to, or some personal connection to either the University or the Commonwealth, but that is not required.

CHAIR: I was involved for the first time in -- in the process whereby these individuals were selected, and I think I can say I've not observed a more careful or heart-wrenching kind of series of decisions because there were some very, very good people. And we finally -- we finally came up with these nominees exemplified -- and I

think particularly the Kentucky connection was important to -- to many of us. So it's a very careful process to bestow this honor which will -- and -- and one of the requirements is that they be willing and able to come to -- to graduation. So these will be bestowed at graduation.

TROSKE: I mean I wasn't -- I'm not quibbling with the process that you went through. I just was sort of -- apparently, I'm supposed to be able to judge the criteria and whether it was applied appropriately, and since I didn't know what -- what that was, it would be --

CHAIR: We have the greatest confidence in our Senators.

TROSKE: Yeah.

CHAIR: Other comments? Yes.

NOKES: Sue Nokes, College of Ag. I have a naive question. I thought honorary degree was to give them a degree from this University, and he has earned every degree possible from this University.

CHAIR: It's an honor.

NOKES: So it's above and beyond, see, I just assumed they were like honorary doctoral degrees or something.

BLACKWELL: They are. They're honorary.

NOKES: But he's got one.

UNIDENTIFIED: No, he's got a real one.

NOKES: Yeah.

BOLLINGER: Which would seem -- which would seem like that the real one would make the honorary one a little --

NOKES: Obsolete.

BOLLINGER: -- pale.

NOKES: Yeah, that's....

UNIDENTIFIED: Honorary degrees are very highly valued.

BLACKWELL: Right. The titles of the honorary degrees differ from the names of our actual degrees, and so you can see the honorific of the -- in the -- in the title, and that would be listed on a -- on a CV in a separate place in honors and awards rather than in educational attainment.

JONES: What's the actual honorary degree title for this individual being proposed?

BLACKWELL: I believe we were going to have --

CHAIR: Honorary Doctor of Engineering.

BLACKWELL: -- Doctor of Engineering.

JONES: Honorary Doctor of Engineering.

BLACKWELL: Yeah.

CHAIR: All right, if you would, next.

BLACKWELL: Okay. Our next nominee may be familiar to many of you all, but Dr. Kirwan is currently the Chancellor of the University System of Maryland. He has been the President of Ohio State University and the President of University of Maryland at College Park. He is also renowned as a mathematician and was appointed to the National Commission on Mathematics and Science -- Science Teaching for the 21st Century, a national level commission. He's a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and has won a variety of awards, including the Maryland House of Delegates Speaker's Medallion, recognizing Maryland citizens who have demonstrated exemplary service in the House and the State of Maryland. He is the co-chair of the Knight -- he was the co-chair of the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics which you may know played a role in reforming intercollegiate athletics and is named among the 60 most influential Marylanders. He received his BA from the University of Kentucky in mathematics, Master's and Doctorate from Rutgers. And here is a quote from the letter of nomination: A scholar and a highly recognized academic leader. His contributions to his academic field are outstanding and well known in particular -- in his particular area of mathematical analyses. His leadership in higher education on the national level has been recognized by some of this country's highest elected officials. And I would like to add to that that he has concerned himself, particularly with science and math education and has collaborated with our team on the Appalachian science/math initiatives that we have around on campus. And you may also recognize the name that this name is the name associated with one of our most prestigious prizes for research that's given annually here at the University. Rick Kirwan and his brother endowed that prize in the name of their parents. His father was a president of the University of Kentucky.

CHAIR: Discussion? All right. Please.

BLACKWELL: Okay, moving on. Helen Thomas served as -- 57 years as a presidential correspondent and later bureau chief for

United Press International. Among -- and you will recognize her as the front row of presidential press conferences. She was the president of the Women's National Press Club, the first female president of the White House Correspondence Association, and the first female president of the Gridiron Club. She was named one of the most -- 25 most influential women in America. And has been the subject of an HBO documentary, Thank You, Mr. President, her renowned last words, Helen Thomas at the White House. She's commonly referred to as the First Lady of the Press, former White House Bureau Chief, is a trailblazer, breaking through barriers for women reporters while covering every president since John F. Kennedy. She was inducted into our Kentucky Journalism Hall of Fame as part of the first class in 1981. And Ms. Thomas was born in Winchester, Kentucky. And I can personally tell you that Ms. Thomas is thrilled and honored to be considered for this nomination. I met her at the Smithsonian a couple of weeks ago, and she was aware that she had been nominated for this award, and she wanted me to send greetings to everyone.

CHAIR: Davy.

JONES: What are the honorary degree titles for Dr. Kirwan and Helen Thomas?

CHAIR: That's on the next slide.
We'll --

JONES: Oh, okay.

CHAIR: I'm not sure I remember --

BLACKWELL: Did you -- did you do one? No, not on there. It was the Honorary Doctorate of Letters for Helen Thomas, and the Honorary Doctorate of Science for Dr. Kirwan.

CHAIR: Look at all the business we've done. It's been so much fun, so quickly. Further discussion? All right. If someone would please move to that effect.

ANDERSON: I move that we accept the recommendation that these three faculty receive the Honorary Doctorate as named on the slide.

CHAIR: A second? Joe.

CHAPPELL: Joe Chappell, second.

CHAIR: Discussion of the motion? All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Motion carries. Thank you,
Dr. Blackwell.

There is a list of candidates
from BCTC and for a short while yet we
still need to approve these, so if someone
would so move?

JONES: Davy Jones, so moved.

CHAIR: Second?

WILLIAMS: David Williams, Agriculture.

CHAIR: Discussion? All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Thank you. So I want to fill you
in on where we stand with respect to the
curricular teams. And Richard has so very
graciously agreed to help me with this as
we navigate through a web page here.

As you know, there are 10 courses
or -- or 10 groupings of -- groups, and --
and the generic types of courses which were
incorporated in the Learning Outcomes. And
so 10 teams have been assembled to develop
the guidelines for those courses. The
process where by the members of those teams
were chosen is that the Provost submitted
some suggestions. And the procedure
essentially was we agreed. We of the
Senate Council agreed that on a third of
them, there's no way that these individuals
were not appropriate. We suggested a third
of the individuals for the group, and the
Provost suggested on his own a third, in
point of fact, came up with members of the
faculty whom I think we all agreed on.
There were, in fact, 130 names, and I
think, Richard, you said that all but about
10 percent acquiesced to serving on the --
on the committee, so that's something of a
surprise. The -- the committees will all
have met for at least the first time by
this morning. So what we'd like to do is
to -- to show you here the web page, as
Richard is -- is going through it, of the
individuals that are on these committees.
And you and our general faculty will
certainly want to know these names so that
there can be a very aggressive and open
interaction between members of the
committee and members of the University
community as these course outlines,
guidelines are developed. And so this is
on the web page, and you can go to it

and -- and see what -- what is there. The committee -- the -- the schedule of the committee meetings is on the web page. And to do that you go to the GenEd SharePoint. Click on this, enter in your logon and your password, and this is what you see. And so you can see the rosters in the lower right there. Just click on that. It will give you the rosters. And then go to any given group, and there will be copies of the most recent summaries of the meetings. I know there's something in there. I think the intent here is to make this as open a procedure as possible where anyone can go and see where things stand. Now, the original intent was to have a report in March, and I think we'll try and have something of a report in March. But there will be a first reading of the guidelines in April. And there will be a May meeting. Both the April and the May meetings are going to be very involved and probably pretty long. So, please, reserve the second Monday in May. We don't normally have a May meeting, but we're absolutely going to have to have a May meeting.

Questions about the web page? Go back home, look it over, and I think you'll see it's manageable. Yes, Joe.

CHAPPELL: Richard, can you comment about the co-curricular team -- teams?

GREISSMAN: The academic advising network and student advising folks for two years have been working on co-curricular matters. It began probably with the call from the President -- from the Provost for a war on attrition. That was -- would stiffen the resolve to try to respond along with faculty, of course. When the group submitted it's final report after a second of two conferences on making a difference, the Provost thought it came at a propitious time, his words, in that the 10 faculty curricular teams had been established. He wanted to do something to both recognize and account for the contribution that academic advisers of student affairs do do, not only help reinforce what happens in the classroom, but to do those things that perhaps happen best outside the classroom. Things happening in a residence hall with living, learning, that kind of things, extracurricular and co-curricular (inaudible). So he asked the Advising

Network Executive Council of the Student Affairs' division to recommend each five members of a co-curricular team to think about how the co-curricular work at UK should align with the proposed GenEd proposal and come up with an action plan, both immediate and long-term. We're picking up on those things in GenEd that could either be reinforced in a co-curricular way outside the classroom or perhaps best done in that co-curricular role outside the classroom. So it isn't technically the province of faculty, and therefore it -- it's something that the Provost did on his own, but it's meant to have the co-curricular activities at UK better aligned with what the faculty say should happen in GenEd in an attempt to make sure that what's done outside the classroom best reinforces what's happening inside the classroom. So it's happening simultaneously. The committee met for the first time last Thursday, and it plans to watch and read what's happening in the 10 curricular teams and their recommendations to the administration overseeing co-curricular life, the Vice President for Student Affairs, Jeannine Blackwell in her role as Associate Provost, and Provost, of course. And make sure that what happens outside the classroom is in concert with what's happening inside. That's the whole and short of it, things like, for instance, the transition from high school to college, things that academic advisers arguably do especially well -- arguably especially well rather.

BLACKWELL: Could I just augment that with three examples? If you think about experiential education and internships, our career center wants to be on board and -- and have their materials planned to deal with the kinds of activities that they anticipate coming from the new curriculum. And in study abroad, they want to be able to look at the global connections that are emerging from the curriculum to see if they need to make adjustments. And finally, some of our students affairs' people have been collaborating on developing a student portfolio, an online student portfolio, and they have tried to align that with the learning outcomes of the new Gen Ed.

GREISSMAN: If I may, one last comment.

Thank you for asking the question, Joe. On the GenEd Website, the www.uky.edu/GenEd, is a way to the co-curricular team. It has the -- a synopsis of what I just said in terms of an excerpt from the President, the Provost charge to the committee. And then further down, it lists the committee members. So for more information and for a link to that -- they're quite remarkable making a difference final report, you can go right to the GenEd Website. And again the SharePoint site has a URL that even I who have worked on it, refuse to remember. So please know that on the GenEd Website is this link to the SharePoint site. So you don't have to remember; you just come here, click on this link, and it takes you right to the Website. Your pass -- your ID and password are the same that you use to get into your exchange account or myuk or sorts of things.

CHAIR: And if you push on Richard Greissman, you can send him all kinds of e-mails.

Further questions? I think that's it. Motion to adjourn?

AUDIENCE: So moved.

* * * * *

THEREUPON, the University of Kentucky Senate Council meeting for February 9, 2009 was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

* * * * *

STATE OF KENTUCKY)

COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

I, LISA E. HOINKE, the undersigned Notary Public in and for the State of Kentucky at large, certify that the facts stated in the caption hereto are true; that at the time and place stated in said caption the UK Senate Council Meeting was taken down in stenotype by me and later reduced to computer transcription under my direction, and the foregoing is a true record of the proceedings which took place during said meeting.

My commission expires: January 26, 2011.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 22nd day of February, 2009.

LISA E. HOINKE
NOTARY PUBLIC
STATE-AT-LARGE
K E N T U C K Y