

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, NOVEMBER 11, 1996

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, November 11, 1996 in Room 115 of the Nursing Health Sciences Building.

Professor Jan Schach, Chairperson of the Senate Council, presided.

Members absent were: Allan Aja, M. Mukhtar*, Gary Anglin, Michael Bardo, Patricia Birchfield, Thomas Blues*, Darla Botkin, Fitzgerald Bramwell*, Joseph Burch, Mary Burke*, Laretta Byars, Berry Campbell*, Ben Carr, Edward Carter, Scott Coovert, Frederick Danner, Frederick DeBeer*, Philip DeSimone*, Andrew Dreibel, Richard Edwards, Robert Farquhar*, William Fortune*, Donald Frazier*, Richard Furst, Thomas Garrity, Philip Greasley, Ottfried Hahn*, Issam Harik*, Christine Havice, Robert Houtz*, Betty Huff*, Laura Keith, Michael Kennedy*, Monica Kern, Craig Koontz, Thomas Lester, Mandy Lewis*, C. Oran Little, Joyce Logan*, Loys Mather*, A. Lee Meyer*, David Mohney, Donald Mullineaux*, Santos Murty, David Nash*, Phyllis Nash, Wolfgang Natter*, Anthony Newberry, James Noll, Jacqueline Noonan, William O' Connor, Melanie Shay Onkst, Rhoda-Gale Pollack*, Deborah Powell, Thomas Robinson, Michael Rohmiller, Avinash Sathaye, Horst Schach, David Shipley, David Stockham, George Wagner*, Charles Wethington*, Eugene Williams, Lionel Williamson, Paul Willis, Stephan Wilson*, Phyllis Wise, Craig Wood.

The Chair made the following announcements:

Regarding the selection of chairs to chair Senate Committees. There was a question at the last meeting as to non-senators serving as chairs of Senate Standing Committees. The Senate Rules state, "Chairs shall be appointed by the Senate Council, the Chair and at least one half the members of the committee shall be senators except as otherwise specified." The exception is in cases where an appropriate individual within the Senate is not able to be identified, then we have to go outside the Senate membership for those chair positions, so the rules are waived. All of the Senate Committee membership, including the Chairs, are approved by the Senate Council.

For your information, there are 103 elected members of the Senate, 18 of those are students and 85 are others. There are somewhere between 13 or 14 exofficio voting members from various ranks of the Administration, depending on whether it is an even or odd year. There is one voting member from the emeriti faculty. So be certain when you come to a meeting and vote you are eligible to vote. It takes 45 eligible voting members to constitute a quorum.

There was an error on the Senate Council election forms. Hans Gesund is not in Arts and Sciences. A correction ballot has gone out. * Absence Explained

The Senate Council met at the last meeting with Merl Hackbart who is serving this year as a special assistant to the Governor and is involved very much with the Task Force on Higher Education. There was a good discussion on issues of concern of the University of Kentucky and the Task Force. He encourage the Senate Council to develop a position paper on the role of the University of Kentucky as the key research institution in the state. Jim Applegate has written a very good version of that and it will be forwarded to the Governor.

Chairperson Schach recognized Professor Marcus McEllistrem to present a resolution on Bud Cochran. Memorial Resolution for Lewis W. (Bud) Cochran (1915 - 1996)

An extraordinary leader, and one of a small number of men who transformed the culture of the University of Kentucky, left the

planet on July 11, 1996. Lewis (Bud) Cochran devoted forty-three years of service to the institution he loved, with a depth of passion and conviction matched by very few people in the recent history of the University. He was particularly marked by his ability to exercise profound and strong leadership without deliberately seeking to advance his own fortunes or status. He was propelled into major leadership by his passionate devotion to the University and Commonwealth, his natural capacity for leadership, and his vision of major research status for our University.

Bud Cochran was born near Perryville, Kentucky and had his early education in Boyle, Lincoln, and Casey counties. He earned his baccalaureate degree from Morehead State University in 1936, and immediately enrolled as a graduate student in physics here at the University of Kentucky. Thus he began his career at our University as a Master of Science candidate and half-time instructor. He achieved the M. S. degree two years later, at age 23. He then taught for a few years each at Morehead State and at Cumberland College, before entering the Army during World War II. He became an officer, and saw service in the Pacific, particularly in Japan during the last stages of occupation of that country.

Prof. Louis A. Pardue had decided to build an electrostatic accelerator at our University, with construction commencing in 1939; this innovative accelerator development work had helped attract Bud here for his M. S. degree. But both for Bud and the faculty, the war terminated their efforts. The accelerator effort did continue during the war, but under government agency management, connected with the nuclear powered aircraft attempts of the mid-1940s. After the war Bud Cochran returned to UK as an Assistant Professor and a candidate for the PhD degree. He joined a new group of faculty recruited to complete the accelerator and begin a nuclear physics research program. He earned his doctoral degree under the joint tutelage of Profs. T. Marshall Hahn, Jr. and Bernard Kern in 1952. Bernard retired from our Physics and Astronomy Department several years ago. Marshall Hahn went on to become President of Virginia Polytechnic University and eventually CEO of Georgia Pacific. Lewis Cochran had returned to UK to stay for the rest of his career.

Lewis Cochran was in the late 1940s a slender, intense young man with enormous optimism and confidence in the future of the University of Kentucky. He was such a dynamic, forward looking young professor that five years after earning the PhD he was a full professor, and served as Chairman of the Physics Department during 1959. He was appointed Associate Dean of the Graduate School in 1963, working with the famous Albert D. Kirwan, then Graduate Dean. BUD'S NATURAL CAPACITY FOR LEADERSHIP ACCOUNTED FOR HIS RAPID development as an administrator and leader within the University. Bud served as Dean of the Graduate School for three years, from 1967 to 1970. At that point he was appointed Vice President for Academic Affairs, a post he held until his retirement from the University in 1981.

In the mid-1950s this University was noted for its many strong programs in undergraduate education, but had fewer graduate programs which could be accounted as strong. One leading physics professor of that time told me that research and scholarship were activities for graduate students; after one had the PhD degree, teaching was all that really mattered. That single-minded focus on teaching was very strong in much of the University during that period. Bud and a few other leaders set out to transform the entire University into a major research as well as teaching institution. His efforts, and those of others he inspired, bore particular fruit when the late John Oswald was appointed President of the University

in 1963. President Oswald understood, endorsed, and implemented the structural reforms worked out by Bud Cochran and his colleagues during several earlier years. Bud's position of leadership six years later was so strong that it seemed only logical that he should be appointed Vice President.

Lewis Cochran had a very strong image of the experience required of the top officer of the University. He once told me that although he could serve well as Vice President, he thought that it was probably inappropriate for him to aspire to the Presidency, since his total academic experience had been limited to Kentucky. He thought that the demands for leadership in that time period required one with broader educational experience. Thus he never expected to succeed to the Presidency. Bud is, however, the only senior, hands-on academic officer other than the President to serve as leader of all three sectors of the University. Bud managed the leadership of the office of Vice President for Academic Affairs, overseeing all sectors of the University, with a very modest staff and budget. He succeeded partly because of his prodigious memory for details, and his capacity to read and understand documents from all parts of the University. Many a faculty member appeared before him to plead a cause, planning to explain to Vice President Cochran the context of his proposal, only to have Bud explain aspects, connections and consequences that the faculty member had not realized were important. He would then almost always find a way to encourage his faculty members, and enable them to implement their dreams for the University. After he retired his post was retired. Major university academic responsibilities were divided amongst the three sector chancellors.

Lewis Cochran throughout his leadership engineered many developments which helped the University grow rapidly in stature, including, for example, the area system of review of promotion-proposals which enabled different parts of the University to monitor the rate and quality of growth of each other's programs. Two particular accomplishments were of major importance to Physics and Chemistry. The then new building for the two departments was designed largely by Cochran. He had managed a basic structural design modeled largely on a similar building at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, which enabled large reductions in bids from contractors, since the steel and concrete needs could be accurately estimated. Much of the interior design and layout, particularly for the Physics Department, was also completed almost single-handedly by Lewis Cochran. His efforts enabled development of the building for about \$5.5 million, even then a very low figure for a 247,000 square foot building. A second major accomplishment affecting the future of the Physics Department was the collection of funds from a variety of sources to purchase a major accelerator, at a cost of about \$500,000. With ventures like that, and other similar ones, Bud encouraged the practice of making significant investments which would advance the University's ability to attain research achievements and the associated research funding.

The transformation of the University into a major research institution was effected largely by recruiting faculty of the highest quality possible, and with an intense desire to develop research and scholarship programs. This recruiting was carried out especially throughout the 1960s and 1970s; then Bud worked to provide the administrative framework which would encourage them to strive for maximum productivity with quality. I remember Bud complaining to me during the late 1960s and early 1970s, which was a time of unrest throughout American academia, that the powerful scholarly results he had hoped for were too long in coming. Why

aren't superb results coming faster, he would complain. He used to walk through laboratories, after helping them achieve as much finding and personnel support as he could encourage, and say 'I want to hear some loud Eureka!'

His passion to bring the University into excellence in the modern world was extraordinary and unflagging throughout his career. Bud's passing from our planet is not to be mourned or lamented, but he is to be remembered for his eminently successful efforts to advance the cause of the University of Kentucky.

Madam Chairman, since I am not a member of this body, I ask that a motion be offered to spread this resolution upon the minutes of the University Senate, and to forward copies to members of Lewis Cochran's immediate family.

The Chair asked the Senate to rise for a moment of silence.

Chairperson Schach then introduced Dean Dan Reedy to speak on the State of Graduate Education. Dean Reedy has been dean of the Graduate School since 1988, entering that position as former Chair of the Spanish Department. We have all been fortunate to enjoy the leadership of Dean Reedy. There are few individuals on this campus who is more universally respected by all faculty and staff. He is truly an academic administrator in the finest sense of that tradition.

Dean Reedy made the following remarks: The State of Graduate Education at the University of Kentucky Permit me to begin these remarks by expressing my sincere thanks to Dr. Jan Schach and the Senate Council for their invitation to comment on the State of Graduate Education at the University of Kentucky. This is an appropriate time, I think, to look at what our academic units have accomplished, to assess where we are in our progress toward our institutional goals, to look at the priorities which should guide our decision making for the future, and to dream about where we would like to be as a Research I doctoral granting university at some point in the foreseeable future. For those of you who like visual effects, you will find hard copies of the data to which I refer on the tables at the back of the room as you depart. During the past year President Wethington's Task Force on Graduate Education prepared an excellent report which has been widely circulated among the faculty and administrative ranks. The Graduate Education Task Force report should serve as a kind of blueprint for the improvement of graduate education at UK during the remainder of this decade and into the 21st century. The Graduate School itself was reviewed approximately 2 1/2 years ago, and a Search Committee has been appointed and has begun its activities to advise on the appointment of a new graduate dean. Strategic Plan/Strategic Indicators: As part of its institutional Strategic Plan, the University set forth measures of anticipated achievement for graduate education. These Strategic Indicators have not been met in their entirety, but substantial progress has been achieved in most of them..

* Graduate Enrollment in Fall 1996 was 5240, estimated to be unchanged from Fall 1995, and short of the strategic indicator of 5,500.

* 236 doctoral degrees were awarded in 1995-96, surpassing the strategic indicator of 230 for the first time.

* The combined total of master's, specialist, and doctoral degrees awarded reached 1296 in 1995-96, exceeding the strategic indicator of 1200.

* In Fall 1996 the number of postdoctoral appointments rose to a high of 145, exceeding the strategic indicator of 130.

* Enrollment of Black Kentucky Resident graduate students

(181) surpassed the EEO Strategic Indicator of 5.2%. Enrollment At UK and throughout the Nation, the past decade in higher education has been marked by continuing enrollment growth in graduate education; however, that pattern of substantial growth each year has flattened out considerably as we approach the end of the century. Nationally, there were 1,192,973 graduate students enrolled at all U.S. universities in Fall 1994, an average increase of 2.0% per annum over the Fall 1986 semester. Increases in graduate enrollment at UK have been much higher than the national average, as they have been generally at most major institutions in the southern region. Annual applications for admission at UK have been at the 8,000 mark or above since 1990-91. In Fall 1987, for example, UK enrollment stood at 3,896; the Fall 1996 enrollment figure of 5,240 marks an increase of 25.6% over the intervening decade. Enrollment during the past two years appears to be stabilized at approximately 5,250, plus or minus, for the present. In the university context, graduate students represented 17.4% of total university enrollments in Fall 1987; ten years later, they constitute 21.5% of enrollment. Total number of graduate students enrolled during 1995-96 (fall, spring, summer terms) numbered 6,738. UK's graduate student body in Fall 1996 is composed of 34.2% doctoral students; the remaining 65.8% are in master's, specialist, or non-degree studies. The percentage of women and men enrolled in Fall 1996 stands at 54.7% women; 45.3% men. Were we to examine the ratios of enrollment in master's vs doctoral programs, however, we would see that during academic year 1995-96 there were 1,144 male doctoral candidates to 890 females; at the master's level women candidates numbered 1,844, whereas men totaled fewer at 1,127. Enrollment of African Americans graduate students increased by 15% in the Fall 1996 semester. Degree Productivity: Although graduate student enrollees constitute only 21.5% of the student body, the 1,269 graduate degrees awarded during 1995-96 represent 27.4% of all baccalaureate, professional, and graduate degrees granted by UK during the past year. Arts and Sciences awarded 66 doctorates-- the largest number of any single college; Social Work produced the largest number of master's degrees at 192. Enrollment Management: As we noted above, graduate student enrollment seems to have reached a plateau for the time being. If these numbers are to increase in the future, it will largely be the product of extending our graduate offerings to clients outside Fayette and contiguous counties. New programs at the master's level will account for some increases as will new doctoral programs; however, the number of graduate students enrolled in some of our degree programs has the potential to exceed good judgment. My point is that we need to make sure that the numbers of graduate students in a given graduate program do not exceed a reasonable ratio to the number of qualified graduate faculty that we have to serve them. Doctoral programs in which some graduate faculty members may have as many as 12 or even 15 doctoral mentees have clearly exceeded that qualitative norm. Most doctoral programs would agree, I think, that a ratio of 3 to 5 students per graduate faculty member can ensure quality support and guidance from the mentor. Master's programs in which the number of master's students exceeds a ratio of 20: 1, i.e. of students to faculty, jeopardize the effectiveness of the program. The ratio should be decidedly less in programs requiring a master's thesis and individual thesis guidance. In most graduate program areas where full-time enrollment is the norm, the availability of financial support from assistantships often determines the size of the graduate student body; other limitations may include the availability of laboratories or of placement sites for practicum experiences, for example. The University needs to conduct a

self-examination aimed at determining the optimum size of its graduate enrollment. A number of questions need to be raised in this determination: What is the appropriate optimum size of enrollment in each graduate program area? What are the most desirable ratios of graduate faculty to numbers of graduate students? Is the resource base sufficient to provide financial support for students who need to be enrolled full-time? Are faculty members involved in the graduate program research active? Are student applicants highly qualified for graduate study? What level of degree productivity should the program consider in light of market demand? Support of Graduate Students Financial support for graduate students at the University of Kentucky is generally available in the form of Graduate Teaching Assistantships, Research Assistantships, Administrative or Service Assistantships, and Fellowships. In the Fall 1996 Semester, there are 775 TAs, 693 RAs, 54 Administrative/Service Assistants, and 343 fellowship awards, While there is some overlap in awardees, i.e. persons who may hold half of a Taship and half of a fellowship, a total of 1814 are among those reported to the Graduate School. This represents approximately 34.6% of the graduate students who are receiving some type of financial support. From time to time, criticism is voiced that the University relies too heavily on teaching assistants in its lower-level classes. I for one want to emphasize that "TA" is not a "four-letter" word, nor is their utilization in the instructional workforce prompted by a need for "cheap labor". The training of graduate students for academic positions elsewhere is one of the central functions of this or most other major research universities. We are highly selective of the persons we hire as Teaching Assistants; they are, in the main, highly knowledgeable in their field or discipline, well-trained, and dedicated in their commitment to their classes and students. This type of training is a fundamental part of what land-grant universities are about. We should offer no apology for using graduate teaching assistants--in fact, we should point out that most of them have the educational attainment of the master's before they undertake sole classroom responsibilities. Some educational institutions which tout themselves as using only full-time faculty and no teaching assistants fail to point out the percentage of their faculty who do not hold the doctorate in their field and whose educational level may be considerably less than that of UK's graduate assistants, not to mention the currency of the base of knowledge. Do we want nurses, dentists, or medical doctors who have not had practical training in the health care environment? Then why would we want to produce future academics who have had no teaching experience? We should pause to note that a competitive grant from the Pew Charitable Trusts under the auspices of the American Association of Colleges and Universities and the Council of Graduate Schools has made possible seminars for UK graduate students in the field of college teaching. Designed to enhance the preparation of our degree recipients for the marketplace, these seminars have now been institutionalized and are being offered by the Center on Teaching and Learning in collaboration, in many cases, with companion courses offered by the student's disciplinary department or college. The near doubling of research funding at UK from external grants and contracts during the past 8 years has also produced a parallel increase in the number of Research Assistants. Decisions in Washington, D.C., may have a major impact on both our research funding and research assistant funding in the future, depending on the availability of such funds and our faculty's competitiveness in winning them for the University of Kentucky. Recommendations

contained in the Graduate Education Task Force report, were they to be implemented, will go far toward keeping the University of Kentucky competitive with other universities for the best and the brightest of potential graduate students. The group's number 1 priority is to fund in-state tuition scholarships for graduate research assistants as it currently is provided for teaching assistants and fellowship recipients. The committee also recommended that the University determine the feasibility of implementing a plan whereby graduate students may be permitted to purchase the same health benefits as are offered to faculty and staff. Such programs of benefits for graduate assistants, in particular, are gaining wide acceptance at other universities in the U.S. In recent years, it has become increasingly apparent that the University's academic-year fellowships are not sufficient in either stipend level or duration of award to be competitive nationally. The success of UK's Quality Achievement Awards and its multi-year Lyman T. Johnson initiatives point to the need for the University to seek ways to offer a multi-year academic fellowship program which is nationally competitive. This will require fellowship awards of at least 3 years duration for doctoral student, 2 for master's, at levels comparable to those of NSF fellowships, i.e. \$15,000, plus tuition and fees, per year. On a limited basis, this approach can be implemented in the next biennium by reformulating the current academic-year graduate fellowship program, utilizing the current base of resources, and by seeking development funds from alumni and other major donors to provide on-going support of a highly competitive graduate fellowship program.

Diversity: One of the areas which the University needs to continue to give highest priority is the diversity of the graduate student body, as well as that of the university's faculty and staff. Affirmative action plans in many parts of the country have come under attack through the courts and other venues. Most recently, voter approval of Proposition 209 in California has focused public attention on affirmative action and equal opportunity plans. How does all this affect UK? Will these decisions ultimately have an impact on UK's attempts to develop a more diversified constituency of students, staff, and faculty? At the graduate level, approximately 4.5% of our current students are African American. In the Fall of 1990, only 89 African Americans were enrolled in UK's Graduate School, compared to the 235 unofficially enrolled in the Fall 1996 semester. The total of 181 Kentucky resident African Americans surpasses for the first time the Institution's Strategic Indicator of 5.2% representation. Can we be satisfied with meeting this minimum level of expectation? I hope not! In the face of continuing opposition to programs whose aim is the diversification of our student population, the University's Lyman T. Johnson fellowship program and the Commonwealth Incentive Awards for Kentucky minorities and women in underrepresented areas of study have produced beneficial results. However, the University's commitment to diversity must continue to be emphasized at all levels. Thus, it is likely that the University will want to reorient some of its current initiatives and develop new approaches in order to continue to promote energetically a diversified university.

Graduate Programs During the past 10 years, the University has continued to develop and implement new graduate programs designed to meet the needs of the Commonwealth. Since 1989, new master's programs include the Master of Health Administration, the Master of Mining Engineering, the M.S. in Physical Therapy, and the M.S. in Manufacturing Systems. Most recently two additional master's degree programs were approved by the Council on Higher Education: the Master of Historic Preservation and the Master of Engineering for

extended-campus delivery. Degree development at the doctoral level has been much slower paced: the Ph.D. in Nutritional Sciences was approved and implemented in 1989; a Ph.D. proposal in Family Studies remains under consideration; and the Ph.D. in Gerontology was approved by the Council on Higher Education in July of 1996. If current trends hold into the future, new degree program development will likely be in the professional-master's programs and in interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary areas at the doctoral level. The doctoral program in Gerontology, for example, draws on the well-established research base of the Sanders-Brown Center on Aging. UK's doctorate is the fourth in the field of gerontology nationally and is the first to focus on clinical specializations as well as on policy issues as they relate to research on aging. In many respects, UK is better positioned than many first-echelon institutions in terms of capitalizing on its multidisciplinary research potential. A comparable program is being developed in the field of Bio-pharmaceutical Engineering, combining the research activities of faculty in Pharmaceutical Sciences, Chemical Engineering, and Chemistry. Were this doctoral program to be implemented in the next year or two, it will become the first of its kind in the nation and a training program for academic researchers as well as for the private sector. A doctoral program in Social Work will soon be under consideration by the Council on Higher Education. This proposed program will be unique to the Commonwealth in that it is the first submitted as a joint degree from both the University of Kentucky and the University of Louisville. Proposed as a single degree program, both UK and UL will provide joint administrative and academic oversight. Students accepted into the program will be able to designate one of the two universities as their prime institution, but they will benefit from course offerings at both universities. In this joint endeavor, UK and UL will be able to combine their faculty resources and maximize their programmatic offerings and specializations for the benefit of their students. Doctoral Quality Recent public remarks by Murray State University's President imply, perhaps, that UK's doctoral programs are not serving the Commonwealth, and he also infers that according to last year's National Research Council's evaluation of Research Doctoral Programs in the U.S., UK is not as competitive as we should be. It goes without saying that UK expects its doctoral programs to be competitive nationally with those of other major land-grant, Research I universities; however, we are mindful that we are a "state" institution of higher education and that our programs are attuned to meeting the State's needs. For example, a quick review of faculty listings of the regional universities and the University of Louisville reveals a total of 206 faculty members who received their doctorate from UK. These figures do not include staff persons or other administrative personnel who do not hold faculty rank. The Graduate School's data on the impact of UK's doctoral recipients on the Commonwealth during the past 4 years show that significant numbers of UK doctoral recipients take academic or administrative positions in all kinds of educational environments: from Kindergarten to secondary positions, from Lindsay Wilson to Berea College, from Lexington Community College to the University of Louisville. Other doctoral recipients returned to or took positions within Kentucky in the private sector (business and industry), in federal, state, and municipal agencies, and in self-employed situations. UK's doctoral graduates have also remained highly competitive for postdoctoral positions and for academic or research positions throughout the nation and abroad. Had Murray State's President chosen to do so, he could have pointed out on the basis of

the NRC data that UK's doctoral programs have remained very competitive nationally, despite the budgetary constraints which the University has encountered in recent years. If one takes into account the total number of doctoral programs nationally in a given field, rather than using the number of those which chose to be evaluated as the base of the NRC study, UK's status is quite competitive. Four of its doctoral programs stand in the upper 25%; fifteen rank above the median, i.e. in the 26th to 49th percentile; and only six fall below the median but not below the sixth decile. The fact that our university's doctoral activities in such multidisciplinary fields as toxicology, molecular and cellular biology, and ecology provide us with our highest national rankings should be a strong indicator that UK has utilized its research and faculty resources well to make us competitive in areas of new initiatives in graduate education. Extended-Campus Graduate Programs Most of you are aware that UK, like other major state universities, has a long history of providing courses and programs at off-campus sites. In the mid-1970's UK began joint doctoral activities in Education with four of the state's regional universities and with the University of Louisville. In 1977, the Council on Higher Education approved the establishment of the first Graduate Center in the state whereby UK entered into an agreement to provide graduate courses and degree programming at NKU. During 1989-90, the Graduate School established a task force to survey unmet graduate education needs across the Commonwealth and to determine how best UK could expand its efforts to meet those needs. With funding from the University for technology, instruction, and support services in 1990, extended-campus graduate sites were established at Paducah and Owensboro, to be followed the next year by sites at Ashland and Hazard. Through this initiative, more than 100 doctoral students have enrolled in Ed.D. programs offered by the Departments of Administration and Supervision and Educational Policy Studies and Evaluation. The first 7 doctoral degree recipients--public school administrators, community college faculty members, others--received their degrees in 1996. Inter-active video technologies connect UK at the sites mentioned above and at the UK/NKU Graduate Center. T-1 connections to Southeast Community College, Somerset, Elizabethtown, and Henderson have expanded this network which should be completed to each of UK's community colleges within the next two years. On-site instruction and satellite transmission of other courses have made possible the delivery of degree programs at the Master's level in Engineering, Social Work, Special Education, Nursing, Physical Therapy, Mining Engineering, Library and Information Science, and other fields of graduate study. Presently, more than 420 graduate students are enrolled in extended campus graduate courses around the Commonwealth, and many of them will ultimately be recipients of graduate degrees from UK. While the extended-university concept remains suspect and questionable for some of us, we must note that the University of Kentucky has been a leader in planning and implementing the kinds of extended-campus or distance-learning programs which other major universities are only now initiating. The idea of a "virtual" university is not a new concept to UK in terms of the innovative uses of instructional technology to take graduate education to place-bound clients. If we are to be the major graduate education, doctoral granting university in the Commonwealth, we have an obligation to provide that leadership and to ensure that the quality of that undertaking is no less than what it is in Lexington on the UK central campus. An increasing number of our professional graduate programs, particularly in health-related areas and at the master's level, will

be in high demand around the Commonwealth. We must be prepared to see that these needs are met within the limitations of our faculty and financial resources. Achieving Nationally Competitive Standing: As the University moves toward revisions in its Strategic Plan during 1997, it should look carefully at the recommendations of the Graduate Education Task Force which has dealt specifically with issues relating to the quality of graduate education at the University of Kentucky. Many of the ingredients for high quality graduate education are in place at UK:

- * Quality of graduate students. The quality of graduate students enrolled at UK depends on the standards we set for ourselves academically in the admissions and degree certification processes, on our ability to recruit effectively at nationally competitive levels, on the competitive level of our stipends for assistantships and fellowships, and on the reputation of our degree programs

- * Quality of our graduate faculty. UK does a great job of attracting outstanding faculty members at the junior level; were it possible to create endowed chairs or professorships to retain or to hire senior scholars in strategic areas, it would have a decided impact on our reputational standing.

- * Identification of priority areas in research and graduate education. The University has endeavored to maintain uniformly high quality research and graduate education programs to serve the Commonwealth despite the realities of resource restrictions in recent years. The recent National Research Council report on doctoral education, and even the remarks by President Kern Alexander, point to the fact that the University is competitive in many areas of graduate education; in some, in fact, it is on the brink of achieving national and international recognition. When the NRC report appeared last year, one of our UK Public Relations called to ask how many of our doctoral programs ranked in the top 10 nationally. I answered the "sports-minded" query with a response which suggested that we were playing in a good league (Carnegie Research I, Doctoral Granting Institutions) and that we were competing respectably in the league (some programs near the top, a lot of them grouped around the middle, and none of them at the bottom). If we do not have the resources to move all of our programs into that top tier of competitors, are the University's academic administrators and faculty leaders prepared to identify key areas of endeavor in which the University can and will maximize the use of its resources to achieve and sustain high academic and research distinction? Such decisions may mean preferential treatment in terms of the distribution of the University's resources, but they would represent a determination by the University to achieve and sustain high distinction in select fields of research and graduate study. Postscript: In 1965, the University of Kentucky began the celebration of its second-century by assessing what kind of university it had been and what kind of institution it wanted to become. One of the major outcomes of those deliberations was the development of a concept of shared governance within the University--a concept that envisioned faculty and administrators as partners in the academic enterprise. My visits on many other university campuses across the nation and my conversations with colleagues at other institutions have long lead me to believe that UK's decisions in the 1960s and early 1970s were crucial to the continuing mutual esteem enjoyed by faculty, staff, and administration. Many universities across the country are envisioned more and more as "big business" enterprises. Presidents or chancellors are CEOs; deans and department chairs are middle

management; faculty are the production-line workers; and students are the product which must be produced on schedule if company quotas are to be met. It is still within our power, of course, to maintain an academic, collegial environment in which administrators, faculty, staff, and students all "share" in making the place work better, in improving the quality of our mutually beneficial learning experiences, in identifying and resolving the problems which keep us from being as effective as we might. UK has a long tradition of "shared governance". If we continue to value that tradition, then we need to make sure that we participate in the process through departmental committees, college assignments, participation in university-wide task forces, membership in the University Senate, and a host of other service activities that we often consider intrusions. If we fail to participate, then the decisions will be made for us. In the best of all environments, they may be the decisions that we would likely have made ourselves. But what if they are not?

Dean Reedy was given a round of applause.

Chairperson Schach asked for a waiver of the ten day circulation rule for the College of Dentistry Reorganization Proposal. ACTION ITEM 1: College of Dentistry Reorganization Proposal Chancellor James Holsinger has forwarded to the Senate Council the following Proposal for the Reorganization of the College of Dentistry which consolidates the two departments currently existing into one and appoints the Dean as Chair of the remaining department. Functionally there will be two groups charged with either day to day operation of programs or with faculty issues, thus maintaining the matrix under which the College has functioned for the past several years. The first group, the College Council, will be composed of individuals charged with conducting those programs deemed necessary to fulfill the College mission. This group will be responsible for College planning and routine operation. The other group, the Council of Division Chiefs, will be responsible for faculty matters including recruitment, development, evaluation, and recommendations for merit increases and promotion and tenure. Background: The Senate Council has voted unanimously to recommend against the proposal and concurs with the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure that the lack of support of the College faculty and the distrust between the administration and the faculty resulting from the proposal make it difficult for a one-department structure to function positively at this time. The Senate Council shares the concern that current Governing and Administrative Regulations do not sufficiently address the division as an educational unit. Finally, the Senate Council does not find any compelling evidence to support the argument that such a restructuring would result in significant cost savings and has advised President Wethington and Chancellor Holsinger to withdraw the proposal. Attached you will find a chronology of the proposal as it has proceeded through the review process. US Agenda Item: 11.11.96 CHRONOLOGY OF COLLEGE OF DENTISTRY REORGANIZATION PROPOSAL January 1994 Proposal for reorganization into one-department structure developed by Dean Nash. December 1994 Department of Oral Health Practice Section Leaders discuss proposal. February 1994 A copy of the elements of the proposal distributed to all Dentistry faculty with a request for letters of support or non-support for inclusion with formal request for approval. January 3, 1995 College of Dentistry Council meets to discuss positive and negatives of Nash proposal. January 17, 1995 College of Dentistry Council meets to discuss positive and negatives of Nash proposal. Two alternative plans are presented with no action taken. January 18, 1995 College

of Dentistry faculty meet to discuss proposal. No minutes kept and no votes taken. February 1995 Dean Nash presents proposal to the College. April 1995 Dean Nash forwards proposal to President Wethington. June 1995 Academic Council for the Medical Center unanimously approves proposal. June 1995 Proposal for reorganization brought to the Senate Council. August 1995 Proposal forwarded to Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure for review and recommendation. Committee meets with Dean Nash and two faculty groups representing support and opposition. Approximately 35 Dentistry faculty communicate with Griffith along with letters supporting the proposal and a petition opposing it. 28 faculty send individual letters to the Committee supporting the reorganization and 27 faculty sign a petition opposing. November 1995 Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure recommends that no action be taken on the proposal at this time and that it be sent back to the College for clearer articulation of the duties of division chiefs, mechanisms for appointment and removal of chiefs, lines of authority, system of checks and balances, etc. Senate Committee also recommends sufficient effort be made to achieve a more unified faculty, to reestablish an atmosphere of trust, and that on-campus mediation services be consulted. November, 1995 The Senate Council votes unanimously to recommend against proposal and urges the parties involved to adopt the recommendations of the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure. June 1996 Chancellor Holsinger appoints a bipartisan Ad Hoc Reorganization Committee to develop a one- department reorganizational strategy that responds to the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structures recommendations. The Ad Hoc Committee reaches consensus on an amended proposal which is forwarded to the Dentistry faculty in the form of a sealed ballot vote. Amended proposal is rejected by a 28 to 24 vote. The Ad Hoc Committee recommends against the amended proposal. August 1996 Amended proposal forwarded to the Senate Council by Chancellor Holsinger. October 1996 The Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure, chaired by Professor Bill Griffith, completes evaluation of the amended proposal and recommends against. October 1996 The Senate Council votes unanimously to recommend against the proposal. The Senate Council concurs with the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure that the amended proposal lacks the support of the College faculty and the distrust between the administration and the faculty resulting from the proposal make it difficult for a one-department structure to function positively at this time. The Senate Council shares concern that current Governing and Administrative Regulations do not sufficiently address the division as an educational unit. The Senate Council does not find any compelling evidence to support the claim that such a restructuring would result in significant cost savings. Senate Council Chair Schach recommends to President Wethington and Chancellor Holsinger that the proposal be withdrawn. November 1996 Dentistry reorganization proposal brought to the Senate floor. US Agenda Item: Dentistry, 11.11.96

The Chair recognized Professor Jim Applegate, Chair-elect of the Senate Council to introduce the item.

Professor Applegate reviewed the background of the proposal and stated the Senate Council had voted unanimously to recommend against the proposal and concurs with the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure that the lack of support of the faculty and distrust between the administration and faculty as a result of the proposal make it difficult for a one department structure to function at this time. It is being brought before the

Senate for discussion.

Chairperson Schach recognized Dr. Tom Lillich and Dr. Tom Mullaney from the College of Dentistry who served as co-chairs of the colleges Ad Hoc Committee on Reorganization to present the proposal and some of the committees actions. Also Bill Griffith, Chair of the Senate Committee on Organization and Structure, presented the actions of that committee.

Dr. Lillich made the following remarks:

I am the Chair of the Department of Oral Health Science, one of two College of Dentistry departments in 1989 when the college was reorganized. At that time, the College went from eleven to two departments. I have been chair since 1989 and Associate Dean since 1994. I think the proposal is a good idea.

Everyone received as part of the agenda for this meeting a list of events that occurred beginning November 1995. I would like to fill in a gap November 1995 and June 1996 as the College of Dentistry responded to issues raised by the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure. There was a series of debates and discussions held in the Fall of 1995 that resulted in a recommendation from the Academic Organization and Structure Committee. That precipitated a meeting with Chancellor Holsinger and the College of Dentistry faculty in early January of 1996. Out of that meeting came a request by Chancellor Holsinger for Dr. Mullaney and myself as the two chairs to convene an Ad Hoc Committee to respond to the issues raised by the Committee on Academic Organization and Structure.

In a January 9, 1996 memo to Dr. Mullaney and myself, Chancellor Holsinger charged this committee to clarify the College of Dentistry's proposal by describing; 1) division structure within the department, 2) division chief responsibilities, 3) procedures for appointment and removal of division chiefs, and 4) a system of checks and balances. All these issues had been raised in the Academic Organization and Structure Committee report. He expected the committee to do this using a process that would give all interested faculty an opportunity to be heard. He also advised that the recommendations must be consistent with University Governing and Administrative Regulations.

Dr. Mullaney and I then constituted an eight member committee consisting of individuals representing both sides of the issues. From mid January until mid May 1996, we held a series of meetings. We reviewed the University Administrative and Governing Regulations. We had discussions with Juanita Fleming and Gay Elste, the Medical Center Legal Counsel. We reviewed material from the Colleges of Nursing and Pharmacy which have single department structures. We held several open faculty meetings including one with a representative from the College of Pharmacy. After reviewing and analyzing this information, we developed a proposal and submitted it to the college faculty for a vote in late May 1996. The proposal was as follows: The College of Dentistry will be organized as a single department with the Dean as Chair. Functionally there will be two groups charged with either day to day operation of programs or with faculty issues thus maintaining the matrix under which the College has functioned for the past several year. (The matrix structure was something that was implemented with Senate approval in 1988.) The first group, the College Council will be composed of individuals charged with conducting those programs deemed necessary to fulfill the College mission. This group will be responsible for college planning and routine operations. The other group, the Council of Division Chiefs will be responsible for faculty matters including recruitment, development, evaluation, and

recommendations for merit increases and promotion and tenure. The Division Chief job description is appended.

The Committee called for a faculty meeting on Wednesday, June 16, 1996 to discuss the proposal and to initiate a vote by secret ballot.

Dr. Tom Mullaney made the following remarks:

I am the Chair of Oral Health Practice which is the other department. It consists of about 41 full-time and 28 part-time faculty. Before that I was chair of one of the smaller units when there were 11 departments. I was chair of Endodontics for about 25 years.

As Tom Lillich said, we went through a rather prolonged process in order to do justice to the charge we as a committee had from the Chancellor. I will review the report to Dr. Holsinger.

Quotes from the report to the Chancellor of June 18, 1996:

ÊIn order to meet our charge to our committee of January 9, 1996, we have met numerous times over the last several months.¾ e finally arrived at a consensus on a structure acceptable to our committee that we submitted to the faculty for a straw vote to see if there was a consensus of support or nonsupport for the proposal. The vote was held on a proposal that the College be reorganized as a single department with the Dean as Chair and with two councils that would be advisor to the Dean, a College Council and Council of Division Chiefs. The vote was held by secret ballot on June 11, 1996. Fifty-three out of fifty-five eligible faculty cast ballots. The proposal was voted down with 28 against and 25 for, that included the Dean's vote. ÊIt is obvious to the committee and to our College that there is no consensus on this issue of a single department. This vote confirms the objections to the prior proposal for a single department which was unanimously rejected by the University Senate Council on November 21, 1995 for the same reason. We, as a committee, have exercised our charge as best we could considering we had great difficulty in reaching a consensus on an organizational proposal that would meet your charge. Our committee reached consensus, submitted the proposal to the faculty, and it was rejected. It is our opinion that a single department structure does not have the support of the faculty necessary to implement such a structure.¾

The members of the committee were Tom Lillich and I, Roland Duell, Don Falace, Jerry Ferretti, John Kemper, Bob Marciani, and Dean White who represented a bipartisan group who were evenly split in opposition.

There are a couple of items that I would like to clear up on the outline sent to the University Senate. The date December 1994, the second item on the list should be January 24, 1995 - Department of Oral Health Practice section leaders discussed proposal. Oral Health Practice is divided into seven sections; Endodontics, Oral Surgery, Orthodontics, Pediatric Dentistry, Periodontics, Prosthodontics, and Restorative Dentistry. We had regular meetings, twice a month, with the section leaders and discussed various things. I will read you a comment from the discussion from that particular meeting. This is before the first time it went through the Organization and Structure Committee on January 24, 1996. Item 5 states Êa continuing discussion of the reorganization proposal was held with the restatement of concern for the potential loss of checks and balances. The Chairs are viewed as the only authority figures in the eyes of the University that can adequately serve as the buffer and advocate for the faculty. The questions of responsibility, authority, and trust were some additional concerns mentioned and the need to have an organizational structure that will

provide faculty advocacy from more than one individual. Also, if they go to one department it will be difficult to add other departments in the future, if needed. Finally, overall, there was very little support for the one department model, in fact some expressed the rationale for a third department and additional administrative directors to run education and research combined and patient care and public service combined.^¾

Also there is an important note regarding the original date for the College of Dentistry faculty to discuss the proposal, January 18, 1996. We had other meetings regarding the proposal and during those meetings the Dean was present. At this particular meeting the Dean was not present; the faculty felt free to speak up and did. Quite often in the other meetings there was a coercion factor present. I think our faculty will back that up as they did when the material was presented at the hearing for Dr. Griffith and the Organization and Structure Subcommittee. At that meeting of the faculty on January 18th, several very important items were raised; there were questions related to the checks and balances, very good points they thought. These points were never answered. The next thing they knew, the entire basic proposal, unchanged, was sent forward to the Senate to be reviewed by the Organization and Structure Committee in spite of the fact that none of those questions were answered.

During that time we had a time of writing letters and people did write letters either in support or against. Not everyone wrote letters initially. A memo was sent from the Dean's office requesting that those faculty who had not written letters to send letters to him to be included in the dossier. I objected to that and sent a memo to the faculty saying that they did not have to respond if they did not want to and quoted the rules of the Senate Rules and Organization Committee. The main problem in the entire process was the rules of the Senate Organization and Structure Committee for organizational changes were not followed with the initial proposal.

The Academic Council for the Medical Center unanimously approved the proposal. This was not known widely in the college that it was even being considered as an agenda item. Once it was considered and approved, no one was informed officially that it had occurred.

On August 1995 the proposal was forwarded to the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure for review and recommendation.

I am opposed to the proposal for the reasons already expressed through the various Senate Committees.

A question was raised if the vote had been 28 for and 25 opposed would it have gone forward. Dr. Mullaney answered that the committee was under the idea that if they were to go forward they would need about 75% support from the faculty to recommend it strongly as a possible proposal.

Chairperson Schach made some corrections on the chronology, on the first page February 1994, should be February 1995. On the August 1995 section on page 2, the last sentence should read "26 faculty send individual letters to the Committee supporting the reorganization and 25 faculty signed a petition opposing."^¾

Bill Griffith Chairperson of the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure made the following remarks:

As you can tell there have actually been two proposals that came before our committee. One year ago at this time we reviewed the first proposal and made a recommendation, Gretchen LaGodna was the Chair of the Senate Council at that time. Let me review how we

looked at the first proposal and recommended what we did.

We began meeting early in the Fall of 1995 and were using the guidelines for reviewing proposals that John Piccoro had sent out. They were developed, I believe, in 1993. We met with the Dean and two different groups of faculty from the College of Dentistry. I had a lot of phone calls and letters, both of support and opposition for the first proposal. We had the following findings for the first proposal. The consultation with faculty was less extensive with the first proposal than we would have expected and various questions had never been fully resolved or addressed. In fact on January 17, the College of Dentistry Council met and the minutes of that meeting indicated that the positives and negatives of the first proposal were discussed. Then there was a list of questions to be answered and needs to be addressed. Two other proposals besides the Deans were presented. The minutes of that January 17, 1995 meeting stated that the discussion of these proposals will continue in this forum as well as in upcoming college faculty meetings.

In Dean Nash's documentation there was only one more discussion and that was the next day and no minutes were kept and no straw vote was taken. Dean Nash presented his proposal on February 2, 1995 and forwarded it to President Wethington on April 24, 1995, essentially in its original form. This proposal and this process led to some very serious divisions within the College. There was a lack of communication and a lack of trust between the Dean and a significant number of faculty in the college. We were very concerned and felt for the college to move ahead and for the new structure to be successful there would have to be some unity. In our recommendation we made two suggestions. We asked that details be added to the proposal because the original proposal really contained very few. We suggested that they use a mediator to help bring some unity to the college. In fact, at that time there was beginning to be some defection from the supporters of the original proposals, so the numbers would change. The numbers from the Spring of 1995 reflected more support than was there October 1995. It was a very difficult situation and we thought if they would take it back, add some detail, and work out the problems and try to add some unity in the college that some good would become of it. Gretchen and I went to visit Chancellor Holsinger. He appointed a bipartisan committee. The cochairs of that committee represent both sides. You've heard what their work was and heard the recommendation that they gave to Chancellor Holsinger last summer, which was that a single department structure does not have the support of the faculty necessary to implement such a structure.

We are also concerned about the fact that the current Governing and Administrative Regulations, do not sufficiently address the division as an educational unit. Although they did put considerable into that proposal, there are still some questions, such as if there were to be future reorganization how would that be done? The Governing Regulations do not address what happens when divisions are reorganized.

Finally we felt the real reason was to produce savings. Yet there was no compelling argument which would describe how much savings there would be. The documentation was inconsistent on this point. In light of that and the fact there was still was such strong division in the College of Dentistry, we felt in order for this to be successful a large number of people had to buy into the idea and obviously they had not. It was our recommendation to the Senate Council that the recommendation to the full Senate be negative.

Chairperson Schach said that the Senate Council had recommended unanimously against the proposal. The reasons are in concurrence with the Senate Committee.

Doug Boyd (Communications and Information Studies) asked what the Senate Council concluded about the pedagogical reasons for the reorganization and learning outcomes that would result. The Chair said she did not believe that they went into an in-depth discussion of pedagogical rationale; it was more the process and the outcome administratively. Gretchen LaGodna said that some of the faculty who opposed the change did so on pedagogical grounds. Jess Weil stated he was on the Committee for Organization and Structure for both considerations and that issue was not addressed very strongly in the proposal.

A senator asked if the issue of streamlining of patient care or clinical concerns was addressed in the proposal? The Chair answered no.

Bill Freehling stated he did not understand why the proposal was on the agenda. The Chair said that the reason it was there was that the Council believed it was an important enough issue with possible ramifications across the campus, particularly relating to faculty governance, that it was worth bringing to the floor of the Senate despite the recommendations against.

Chancellor Holsinger said that the procedures that are undergone for such a reorganization is that it does go to the University Senate for its recommendation to the Chancellor and the President. He believes it is appropriate for it to be discussed for exactly that reason. This body has the right to make a recommendation to the President and to the Chancellor. This is a good proposal, a proposal that he feels would work, otherwise he would not have sent it forward to the President. He feels the University Senate needs to give their recommendation. The administration can not make a determination until they know what that is.

Pamela Kidd would have liked to look at the details of the proposal. She can not address what the faculty concerns are without seeing it in its entirety and what the issues are. She feels rather uninformed to discuss the issue. She also wondered about mediation. Did they act on the suggestion for mediation for the second issue?

Chancellor Holsinger said the committee was offered multiple opportunities to have mediators, there were names available if the committee needed them. As they understood, the committee was evenly split between those opposed and those who approved. They were able to come to a consensus on their own. They came forward with a proposal which they as a faculty committee had consensus about and went to the full faculty. The offer for mediation was always available.

Robert Spedding (Dentistry) said this was simply a matter of trust. It is a matter of checks and balances and belongs to the Senate because it is an academic matter. The Chairs of the departments of all the Colleges of the University are academic appointments and they represent academia. If they go down to one department, they will not have the checks and balances. If trust was not a matter of concern the proposal might have been unanimous.

Jesse Weil said that he helped draft the proposal that there be mediation. The thought about the mediation was that the faculty of the College of Dentistry was split down the middle. It appeared that there was no chance for such a proposal to work with the college split in that way; it would be a house divided within itself. They felt the only way they could come up with a proposal would be to start at the bottom and the faculty to have mediation.

The Committee of Organization and Structure saw as one of the flaws in the proposal is that it is a proposal from the top down, it did not arise out of perceived needs in the faculty to meet academic issues, to meet clinical treatment issues, or any other issues in the college. Because of that, we have this situation now, with some people for and some against, and if it is adopted he felt it would be disastrous for the College of Dentistry.

Gretchen LaGodna said she would like to call upon what Dr. Spedding had said and to perhaps repress this also in view of what Jan said earlier about the importance of continuing a path of shared governance. Part of that shared governance has to do with decisions that are jointly made administratively and faculty wide. One of the issues that most concerned the Senate Council during their deliberations, was that the department is the basic academic unit in the Governing and Administrative Regulations. There is no smaller recognized academic unit. What this means for faculty is that if you have anything that is less than or different from a department, it can be reorganized without faculty vote, approval, and without going to the Academic Organization and Structure Committee. This is an issue that they have some very real concern about. She could not think of any departments that had been added, but of some that had been deleted. As long as the department is the basic academic unit, then there are some real issues that need to be considered.

Bill Witt (Medicine) said he did not know what all the proposal was, but that they gone through the formation of a group practice in the College of Medicine, which he hated, but at the same time recognized that it was essential that they did it. It involved giving up a lot of individual autonomy; a lot of department autonomy. It came from the top down and at the same time recognized the current health care climate. It was obvious they had to do it. Whether or not patient care issues came into the discussion, he feels in a very short time they will. In a time of decreasing research funds, we are talking increased collaboration in research efforts. In a time of decreasing health care dollars, we are talking increasingly about collaboration in delivering patient care. In a time of decreasing income from whatever source, clearly the only way we can maintain budget is to cut costs. Looking at it objectively, it would seem that if the issue is just a matter of trust, all the paperwork in the world isn't going to prevent a bad outcome if the trust is misplaced. By the same token if there is good reason to be trustworthy then we are just dealing with fears and they will pass. He would suggest he could see a lot of merit in this type of thing, whether this particular one is right or not. Increasingly we are consolidating all the time, giving up autonomy, that is going to be the future. Dr. Reedy mentioned that it did not matter where we are, it matters where we need to be in ten years. It would seem we need to do more consolidation not less.

Ray Mullins (Dentistry) stated he was in favor of the proposal. He would like the Senate to understand that you can not, in his opinion, rationally consider this proposal without understanding it also evolved in a climate of a dispute over major program direction in the College of Dentistry. It is difficult to air dirty linen in public. We have been through a time period where we have had a split among our faculty about program direction. Those sorts of issues lead to issues of trust; issues of interpersonal disagreement. That is what you are seeing in this vote. He personally believes that there are more checks and balances to protect faculty in the proposal than the system they currently have. He also respects the opinion of a lot of his colleagues that it is not the case. He would certainly not want it

to be viewed in isolation, not understanding that there has been a lot of programmatic disagreement and interpersonal differences that have influenced the nature of the process.

Mike Cibull (Medicine) addressed Dr. Witt's points by saying that the reorganization of the practice plan has taken place perfectly fine in the setting of the department system of the College of Medicine. There has been no need to dissolve departments in order to get the practice plan instituted. He agreed with Dr. LaGodna that dissolving the last symbolism of checks mainly the department in favor of streamlining the process is not a good idea in the long run. One of the most important things that Dr. Reedy said was that the University has been fairly unique in shared governance and the University of Kentucky goes forward because everyone buys in eventually to the plan and goes forward. It is not going to happen in you remove all the power from the faculty and make it a slave of the Administration. The enthusiasm will disappear at that point. If you have a problem programmatically, you address the problem programmatically, you do not try to restructure the organization to circumvent the problems.

Jordon Cohen (Pharmacy) said that over the last fifteen years or so, the division structure has worked well. He says that to try to convince them that new kinds of thinking about structure are going to be important. Rather ironically, they are considering a possibility of consolidation towards departments. He would not want to get stuck on this over the fact that you would assume that faculty would lose authority or autonomy in shared governance, just by the mere fact that you no longer have a department structure. He feels they can hold their college up high as an example of one that has worked very well in a divisional structure over a long period of time.

Mike Friedman (Theater) said he felt his colleagues in the College of Dentistry have already spoken on this issue through their division. He said it was an insult to their process to favorably commend this proposal to the Chancellor. The pros and cons of the proposal have been debated by their colleagues in Dentistry. In fact a bipartisan commission has been appointed and has concluded by insufficient consensus exists in that unit to support this reorganization. He feels not apt to ignore their recommendations, and to ignore the recommendations of our own Senate Council and our own Senate Committee to grant a favorable recommendation to a proposal with which he is completely unfamiliar. He does not need to see it, it is enough for him that the people who have fought longest and hardest about it have seen fit to reject it.

Bill Witt felt he should respond to Dr. Cibull's comment about his remarks. Departments have not been eliminated in this Institution, but around the country, departments in fact are being eliminated in large numbers. Specifically for needs to streamline in the market place.

The question was moved. Motion to stop debate passed in an unanimous voice vote.

The motion to deny the proposal for the College of Dentistry passed in a voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Betty J. Huff

Secretary, University

Senate

Minutes, University Senate, November 11, 1996

* Mary K. Kelly * University of Kentucky Registrar's Office *

* 12 Funkhouser Bldg., Lexington, KY 40506-0054 *
* mkell101@ukcc.uky.edu * (606)257-7169 *