



MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, NOVEMBER 8, 1999

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., November 8, 1999 in the Auditorium of the W. T. Young Library.

Members absent were: Walter Abbott, Wael Ahmed, Anna Allen, Ali Amoli, Leon Assael, Suketu Bhavsar*, Deborah Blades, George Blandford*, Rachel Bomberger, Douglas Boyd, Fitzgerald Bramwell, Joseph Burch, Sandra Carey*, Edward Carter, Robert Dahlstrom*, Fred Danner, George DeBin, Susan DeCarvalho, Henri DeHahn, Marc DeJesus, Jeffrey Dembo, Vincent Fields, Richard Furst, Eugene Gaetke, Amber Gatlin, Jonathan Golding*, Philip Greasley*, Howard Grotch, O. J. Hahn*, Steven Haist*, David Hamilton, Issam Harik*, Patrick Herring, Kay Hoffman, James Holsinger, Mike Inman, Ling Kwey Jeng, David Johnson, Benjamin Karp, Michael Kennedy, Philipp Kraemer, Thomas Lester, C. Oran Little, William Lubawy, David Mohny, James Morris*, Nathan Neltner*, Miles Osland, James Parker, Doug Poe, Shirley Raines, John Rawls, Luke Riddle, Thomas Robinson, Elizabeth Rompf, Ramona Rush, Margaret Saunier*, Jan Schach, Claire Schmelzer, Robert Shay, Kelley Shields, David Sloan, David Stockham, Thomas Troland, Henry Vasconez, Enid Waldhart*, Retia Walker*, Monica Weltzer, Carolyn Williams, Emery Wilson.

Chairperson Moore called the meeting to order.

The Chair said the first item of business was the minutes of September 27, 1999 and October 11, 1999. There were no corrections or additions to the minutes, and they were approved as circulated.

Chairperson Moore made the following announcements:

The next meeting will be December 13, 1999. There will be a presentation by Eugene Williams on Campus Technology. Lloyd Axelrod will make a presentation on the University Marketing Plan. There will also be discussion and a possible vote on the Tenured Senior Faculty Review Proposal.

On Tuesday, December 14, 1999, from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. the annual Holiday Social will be held in the King Alumni House. Board of Trustee members have been invited.

The Chair made the following introductions:

First, I would like to introduce the Board Officers who will be speaking today. We will start with Mr. Billy Joe Miles, Chair of the Board of Trustees; Steven Reed, Vice-Chair; and Dr. Daniel R. Reedy, Secretary. The other Board members who are present are: Mr. Jack Guthrie, Dr. Loys Mather, Dr. Elissa Plattner, Mrs. Marion Moore Sims, Ms. Alice Sparks, Ms. Joetta Wickcliffe, Mr. Russ Williams, and Ms. Elaine Wilson.

I am very pleased to have these Board members present today and to have Mr. Miles, Mr. Reed, and Dr. Reedy address us.

* Absence Excused

I would like to go over the instructions for the nomination process. First, in order to vote, you must be a voting member of the Senate. There will be no nomination speeches and no nominations from the floor. You were provided with a list and there are some extra copies. This list is the individuals who are eligible to serve; you do not have to be a senator in order to be eligible to serve on this committee or to be nominated. The first thing you should do is take out the small envelope with the yellow dot. There should be four cards that say "Initial Nomination." You are to nominate exactly four individuals, and they must all be eligible to serve. If they are not eligible to serve, all your nominations will be invalid. If you do not nominate exactly four, your nomination will also be invalid. Be sure to print the full name and the college or department, if you wish, of the individuals you are nominating--one person per card. When you have finished your nominations, you must sign in the upper left-hand corner of the small envelope. When these nominations are counted, the top twelve individuals will be displayed on the overhead projector. You will then vote for six individuals. After arriving at those six names, we will have a mail election. Everyone who is eligible will receive ballots in the mail to vote. See Attachment I.

The Sergeants at Arms today, who will be taking up the ballots, are Melanie Collins and Jacquie Hager.

I would like to introduce a special guest, Dr. Charles T. Wethington, President of the University.

The counting committee consists of Jane Wells, Brad Canon, Bill Fortune, Charles Coulston, and Don Frazier.

I am very pleased to welcome the members of the Board of Trustees and President. I have asked the Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary of the Board to speak for a few minutes. We will then open the floor for questions and discussion. As you know, these new officers were just elected about two months ago. We are very pleased to have them speak today.

Mr. Billy Joe Miles made the following remarks:

We have already spoken to the Senate Council a couple of weeks ago. I assume, if the rumor mill is like it is in the rest of the world, you probably already know what we are going to say. We are glad to be here, and I want you to know that there are twenty people on the Board, and they are an outstanding, diverse group of people, very knowledgeable.

There are a couple of messages I want to bring to you. Time really passes in a hurry. We look forward, we look back and when we look back to the first day of school, it looks like it was yesterday. When we think about a year, two years, or five years from now, we think about it being a long time. If we are going to do what we need to do in this State we have really got to get with the program. We have several problems to overcome here in the State of Kentucky. The biggest problem we have to overcome is money. Just to prove a point, I drove around and around this place and could not park. I ran that little parking thing up and down, but it did not work in any of the four places. When I went in the Senate facility and showed the guy my sticker, he said "How long are you going to be here?" and I said a couple of hours. He said, "It will cost you four dollars." I told him I could arrange four dollars, just let me in. When we look at salary levels you are no where near the top twenty and where we are going to be and where we are trying to be in the future. There is a lot of confusion and a lot of rumors that came out of our election, and I want us to forget about all that. Yesterday is over, and we have to look at tomorrow. There is no doubt the faculty is the future of tomorrow. When I look at the money and look at the budget and the money he has had to operate with, I think that Dr. Wethington has done a tremendous job with that money. When we as a Board look at the budget and try to figure out how we are going to be not a top twenty, we have to be the best. I never did like to be second in anything I did,

and I don't think you want to be second in anything you are doing. We have to be the best. We have also got to be The University of Kentucky. Steve Reed and I have talked about this a lot of times, being from West Kentucky, Southern Kentucky. When you see people and families that don't have the budget, they have to really budget what clothes they buy, and when you look at the clothes they wear, they say the University of Kentucky on them, really a source of pride out there in this State. We can not let those people down.

When I came on this Board, I did not know a lot about the University. I knew mostly about the Ag Department, all the way back to my 4-H days. When you look at the different schools of this college, really the perception, the number one failure here at this place has been the perception of where we are nationally as a school. I don't know of a college here as I know those and travel around the world and see others, really for the amount of money we have and the amount of money we are being paid we are by far, if you divided the dollars spent, we are number one today. I am not going to talk very long and we are going to have a lot of questions--anything you want to ask, we do not have any sacred ground. That is the one thing we want to be about. We are probably going to be criticized in the media. Your honeymoon with the media lasts about one column. The best example I have, and I am bitter about it, our local paper, the county south of us, McClain County has a middle school that is top in the nation. In almost every test they have taken, that little school has been in the top 8 or 10 in America. Never had one line. One fellow dyed his hair and in the school picture would not put his helmet on, and we had a color picture headline in the Owensboro paper. What does that tell us? It tells us we really have to work at what we are doing to make the public aware of what we are as the University of Kentucky.

What we have asked for as a Board is for each department to pick someone who has a vital interest in their department and for that member to be the Chairman of the Board with that department. We are not trying to micromanage for Charles Wethington, and we are not trying to run the college. But if we don't know what your problems are and we do not know where you are trying to go, we can not help you. We want to be there to help you. Jack Guthrie appeared with the meeting with alumni. As far as the alumni, in my mind, Jack Guthrie is the Chairman of the Board. At the Fellows Meeting, Steve Reed was at the head table. We are going to be twenty members who are going to participate with you.

There are a couple things I want you to understand. When you look at the State of Kentucky versus states like North Carolina and California we don't have the tax base to get us where we need to go. If we are going to be number one in every department, you are going to have to be innovative and when we look at research colleges, that is going to completely separate us from the regional universities. As we look at it in the past, we went to the legislature and we tried to get our share of the money out of this big pie. We are not in that pie any more. Our goal is to be the top Research University. I am looking way past this University. I am very concerned--when I travel around and see what is going on, see the Internet, the sales on the Internet, the transformation of energy--that Kentucky is going to become a third world country in the middle of a prosperous nation. The key to that not happening is not at the regional universities. The money flows to the research universities and Fortune 500 companies. The innovative companies of the world want to be where the brain power is, where the professors are, where they share those students in their labs. They want to be in that circle. We are there in a lot of ways today. But we have a secret; we have not told the world about that. I am going to tell you a little story. The money will come in that circle, and it is almost like the tide coming in. As the prosperity rises your salaries are going to rise. The money we are going to have, but we have to bring it along with that. The legislature is going to have everyone tugging at their strings; we have to get our share of that money, but we also have to get our money from the industry of the world. You are doing it today, and we have to tell the world that. The Board has to be part of that.

There's one thing I want you to remember. As I went through school, I had a lot of teachers. Every day I go back to a lesson that they taught me, and I am driven by what I learned from the professors and teachers all the way back. My first real hero was in the second grade. I can tell you something about every one of them. I had some that did not really impress me. I do not really remember a lot about the principal. There is a lot of discussion. Probably the focal point of what you are thinking about is: Who will the next president be? The next president is not nearly as important as who you are. The students that come through here probably won't really remember the next president except in name only. But I will guarantee you, they will remember you and the things you taught them and the example you made.

We are going to start a search and we want the base to be a broad base. I don't want anyone in Kentucky to say that they did not have a voice in the selection and that goal of getting us to where we are. We have two years, and we can not waste those two years. They are critical because time is of essence, every day. You just look at the inventions and the things that have happened in the last two or three years with things like cell phones and the Internet and the information technology. We can not waste a day. We have to go out of this room and make tomorrow part of the future. We are going to pick this person--he, she, or who ever it is, worldwide. It is not really important the last few months of the search because if we make this broad base enough and we listen enough, we listen to the faculty, the alumni, industry, everyone out there should have their say. Once that broad base is created, and we select those people who fit in that, any of those final five or ten people, you could draw a name and they would be okay. The real creation to success is within this room. The faculty of this University has got realize that you can make this University number one in the public's opinion right now. We have kind of failed at that, and I say we. I say that it is a big part of the Board's responsibility. When we don't interface with you, it is not about micromanaging, it is about promoting you and what you do and who you are.

I am amazed every time one of the colleges comes to the Board meeting. At the last Board meeting, Lexington Community College was there. I did not know a lot about them. They are doing a tremendous job in the amount of people they are educating and filling that need. But we are going to elevate you above that, and when you become a Research University, the money is going to flow. Really, the prosperity of this state is going to depend on you. Time is of essence. When you go home tonight and look in the mirror, whether you are shaving or putting on makeup, that is the person who is going to get us to where we have to go. We are here to help you as a Board. We do not want to take away from the next two years.

I have already learned my first lesson with the media. I tried to avoid the Associated Press. A guy showed up and said, "I am going to write a story, whether you talk to me or not." I told him I would do a story if he would print one statement - "I want Charles Wethington to look back and for these last two years to be the best two years of his advancement of the University of Kentucky." I wanted that to be printed because I did not want to create a fight anywhere within the system. I didn't want to look at the past. I want to look at the future. He said he would agree to print that. That was the first lie the AP told me. We have to do everything we can. We can't depend on the press to promote us.

Mr. Miles was given a round of applause.

Bill Maloney (Civil Engineering) - My question is future oriented. I did my doctorate and then taught for ten years at Michigan, which is one of our benchmark institutions. We went through our accreditation just last fall, and Michigan is going through it now. Their average salary for full professors is \$30,000 a year more than here. Their staff budget is fifteen times our staff budget. Their budget for graduate assistants is fifteen times ours. This comes mostly from the fact that their tuition is more than

double ours, plus a much higher state appropriation. How are we going to get up to the level of these benchmark institutions if we can not count on the state for the foundation we need?

Mr. Miles - When Jesse James robbed the bank, all he got was the money that was in the bank. That is kind of where we are with the legislature. I think the vital link that we failed to work with is economic development. I have a little company. I went to Iowa State University and worked within the food science lab. The reason I went there was because of economic development, and the governor came to the meeting and asked us to come and got economic development in there. We don't have the tax base in this state. When we become a research university, that is why we need your help. We need you to bring industry and research here, but we have to make a deal with economic development if we bring another Toyota or anyone. Toyota is not a good example because they are not research. You are a good example with the industry you are in; you are a high tech industry. If we give them incentives, it is a two way street. They also have to locate within the University, and they have to bring money to you and your staff. That is done all over the world. I just got back from Mexico, and the meeting I was in they gave \$85,000,000 to a university to build a building on that campus and agreed to hire thirty people. That is what I am talking about.

Steve Reed made the following remarks:

I have been on the Board now for six years and I am honored to be invited here. I am glad that I am able to meet with you and speak to you. I will give you my name and telephone number. I come from a similar but slightly unique perspective, according to what Mr. Miles says. I want you to have my name and number and encourage you to give me a call. I went recently and got a cell phone, which is essentially my UK phone. I got this telephone because I was beginning to get more calls now that I am Vice-Chairman of the Board. People were calling me at work, and I was missing some phone calls and playing phone tag. I got this phone so I could be accessible immediately. I would encourage each of you, as you probably already know, that the answers to our future lie in the collective. Mr. Miles does not have all the answers, and he is the first to tell you that. I will be the second to tell you I don't have all the answers either. It would be so easy if I could come here and say, "Here is what we are going to do, and this is how we are going to quickly get to the top twenty." All we have at this point is a commitment from the Governor. We have the spirit of commitment from the Governor, and we have action from the Governor. We have the spirit of commitment from all the Board members to act on that. I would encourage each of you to consider ways to help us help you reach that top twenty status. I have a two-year-old son and four-year-old son at home. Twenty years, top twenty, sounds great to me. Sounds great to me personally because I have two boys at home, and it sounds great to me because I am a Kentuckian by birth and by life. I have lived here, and I've gone to Michigan, New York, and Washington and I have heard comments about our education. I want to do my part to change where we are in education and academia in the state of Kentucky. I am committed to that. Unfortunately, I do not have all the answers and I don't have the wealth of Bill Gates to a ten billion-dollar endowment. But I do have the heart, the commitment, and the will to do anything within my power to raise the excellence at this school. I just can not say enough about how committed we all are. I am so grateful for the commitment from the top. I want the faculty to be innovative. We realize we don't have the resources that Michigan has. It would be great to say, well Michigan has this much money and we need this much money so we can catch Michigan. Then Michigan raises its money and we raise ours and we will never catch Michigan. That is a fact of life--if we try it that way only. That does not preclude us from trying that way, to adding more money, but at the same time spending some time wondering about how we could do this differently. How can we inspire greater results from our research efforts? Inspire more of our kids to stay here and get PhDs here? More kids to come and be educated here? More companies to

come here? How can we make ourselves more accessible? There has to be a way to use certain inherent disadvantages to our advantage. That is what I encourage you to help us do. If we do that, the future is really unlimited. As a follow-up to the question that was asked by the Civil Engineering professor, the way we are going to have to handle that is we are going to have to say that we can not raise ourselves up only by the money from the state. We do need the state to give more money. We can not raise ourselves up only by the faculty generating more research--we do need the faculty to generate more research. We can not raise it only by telling the best students in Kentucky to come here, although we do need more of our greatest students coming here. We can not do it only by having top industry come here and say "you do it"--although we do need that. What I am getting at is that every one of us in multicapacity have to do everything we possibly can. If we all do that, we will reach that objective. We may reach it or reach it sooner or even go higher than top twenty, as Mr. Miles aspires. I hope so. I want to give you my telephone number and ask you to call me. The number is (502) 648-9597. Let me say this. One time I gave my number out, and someone commented not to do that if I did not mean it. I am going to put it back on you. Don't write it down if you are not going to call. I mean it, sincerely. I really hope to hear from you. I went to school here. I went to Law School here. I love this University, and the promise here is unbelievable. It is a great time to be in Kentucky, it is a great time to be a friend and part of the University of Kentucky family. The present is great, and the future is limitless.

To touch upon what Mr. Miles said about partnering with certain colleges and departments, let me say this. As a graduate of the law school, I go to the Law School Dean about this time every year and ask him to identify for me ten to twenty outstanding perspective students that the law school desperately needs, desperately wants because if we don't get them they are probably going to go to Harvard or Yale. I personally write them a hand-written letter, and then call them and encourage them to attend this University. Not only do I send them that initial letter, but I want to stay with them and write them after they have accepted entrance here. I write them and call them and send word through the Dean that Steve Reed said you may not remember him, but he encouraged you to come here, and he wanted me to tell you hello and see if you were doing okay here. I do that because I can't ask the governor to be a historic governor for education. I can't say let's go out and get a world class president, faculty. You do all this great research. Let's bring in students and you study more. Don't go to Harvard. Come here if all I do is go to basketball games. I have to accept a greater role as a trustee, and that means that I have to think outside the box. Does that have all the answers? No, but it is a start. Anything that I can do to help those students that I have worked with, I try to work with them in terms of law clerk positions for federal judges, other positions with private law firms, any little thing that I as a trustee can do to help this University move ahead. Thank you very much.

Mr. Reed was given a round of applause.

Dr. Daniel Reedy made the following remarks:

I will keep my remarks very brief. I think that my role as an officer of the Board is primarily my ability to speak in tongues. Let me tell you why I did accept that responsibility. After thirty-three years, I still believe that the University of Kentucky is a much better university than most people know that it is. It has been on the verge of having magnificent opportunities at one time or another with different presidencies, with different governors, over the past period of time that I have been here. On many occasions, the economy went south and so did our opportunities. Right now, we have a harbinger of good things continuing to flower. I think that President Wethington has provided the right kind of leadership in this period since House Bill I to help move us forward in terms of the professorships, the fellowships, and the other funding that has been here. The question is, how are we going to get to where

Michigan is? Well, we are never going to get to that or to any other mark that we set up on the wall unless we start, unless out of the sense of commitment, we continue to progress toward that goal. President Wethington and the strategic plan approved by the Board of Trustees has set that model in place, and we need to make sure that this remaining year and a half of President Wethington's tenure as President of this University is as successful as it has been during this period of time of fund raising as we go into the next legislative session. The University is and has been entrepreneurial in many, many ways. I am looking at Alan Kaplan, and I remember that Alan Kaplan served on the Task Force on Research and Graduate Education, and one of the things that Alan insisted go into that document was a capital construction request for a building in the biosciences, and Alan's reason was that with the National Institutes of Health, that was a major source of funding for the future. That did go forward from this institution as a major request. I do not know exactly what the status of it is now. But that in itself can help this institution potentially to I believe Alan, if I remember your promise--"five fold increase"--in research funding from that potential source alone.

Those are the entrepreneurial moves. There is another attitude that we could adopt, if we wish one that I hope we do not, and that is, "Why bother". We have this Governor for four more years, but my friends whether you voted for this person or not is of no consequence if you consider that fact that this is an individual that even in his acceptance speech after the election made reference again to the commitment to education in the Commonwealth. You all may be as close to retirement as I am by the time you see another governor that is going to have that as a major commitment. If we fail to take advantage, if we fail to move forward in these next two years with another president and leadership in the future, we will have failed in our role as faculty members, as students within this institution. My point is we know what the marks are that we need to attain. None of us have any difficulty determining those. We are not going to attain them certainly in the year and a half before I retire, so I am not looking forward to that great salary. If you think about your colleagues that are going to follow you and the students that they are going to serve and the needs of the Commonwealth, and your commitment to the Commonwealth, then indeed we don't want to slow down the race at all. We need to move it very rapidly ahead. I feel a true sense of enthusiasm after thirty some years here of seeing starts and stops. We are on an upward slope, and we are not coasting backwards. We are headed up, and we need to take every advantage of that so we can to move toward whatever that benchmark is, whether is it salary or whether it is research funding or service to the Commonwealth. Now is the opportunity, and we really need to take advantage of it. I think that we can and that we all will. I think that there is a sense of commitment and even of excitement within the University about moving into that future.

Dr. Reedy was given a round of applause.

Dr. Reedy said the officers would like to know what vision the Senate had for the institution.

Mr. Miles asked what the Senators thought. How do they see them as a Board?

Bill Maloney said his question was this. UK has a mandate to become a top twenty research university. In all the discussions on campus, he had never heard the criteria for a top twenty public research university. Is it strictly how many federal research dollars they generate?

Mr. Miles - We are back to that mirror that you have to look in. Who knows better than you do when you look at your peers around the world? Who knows better than you? I think that Steve said it. We need to know from you what it is going to take and we have to get there. Not only this Board, but also we have to go back into state government and go back to the economic development and get to that point. I think that I know as I travel around and see different places and things I like and don't like, but

when I look at the potential here, we have the potential. We have never looked at it that way. It is about perception.

Geza Bruckner (Allied Health) - I think that part of the question that we are all asking is, even though we each have visions for our own areas, there has to be a collective vision to move forward. Unless we can identify, we have done some of that with Tier I, Tier II ratings but that includes some people and excludes others. I think that we need to look at the collective vision. I think that what we are asking is the direction to move in because it is hard beating your head against the wall if the rest of the support is not there.

Dr. Reedy - I think that you have the answer, and I think that Billy Joe was suggesting that as well. You are only going to be as good as your units want to become. If you hire a new faculty member that has lesser credentials than yours are in a market in which you can do better with greater potential, then you move backwards. Every appointment that you make, the students that you should recruit, should be an act of improvement over an earlier stage. Sometimes the resources are not going to be there. I think that we are looking at--there is no blessing of a mantle of a top twenty institution per se. There are lots of different measures that are out there. Mike Nietzel made a presentation to an Arts and Sciences Advisory Council not long ago, and he was using the national measures. But it is indeed perception of your peers. If I asked you, I bet you can tell me the top five or six departments in your field without any difficulty whatsoever. All the rest of us can do the same. All the university is not going to get there at the same time. That is just not a reasonable expectation. But as you float the ship higher in some parts, you are going to tend to float it higher in the water in others also. You will never achieve a top ranking in any area unless the persons within that area--the faculty and, particularly, the staff who support them really want to move to that other level. When they ask, "What is your vision," is this something worth going after for the next twenty years? It really is the institution and whoever comes in as president in two years, maybe there will be a different kind of vision. What are you expecting in that leadership? Do you want them to try to help to move the institution forward toward the goal that is mandated? That is what I think you need to answer as a faculty and representatives of those faculty groups.

Mr. Miles - When we talk about the money and the sixty million dollar matching fund and about attracting high level faculty, don't you really think in the concept that we are talking about with the partners out there in industry coming and working with you and with boards working with you, money is not the key. I think that we have the nucleus within this college. There is probably a lot of people, if they had the finances that, in five years people from around the world would be trying to recruit them. I don't think it is a matter of going out and bringing people to the University. I think that we need to empower you. I know a lot of faculty members and a lot of faculty members around the world. A guy who works for me took me to Cambridge and as we went and met his professors, it is almost like the basketball team. I could pick five members here and five members there and go head to head with any university in the world. We have to empower you to be what you can be. I know that you have been discouraged with facilities and especially with salaries. That has to be a problem. You are going to have to help us solve that. You have people within your staff that can be the best in the world if they are empowered to. I see that all over this campus.

Kaveh Tagavi (Mechanical Engineering) - What would please me is that in 2020 we would like to be top twenty, from what I gather in talking to my colleagues is that last little mini step is the toughest one, from about twenty-five to twenty. So if it takes ten years to go from the twenty-five to twenty, so in 2010 we want to be twenty-five, so it seems reasonable that in 2005 we want to be thirty-five. The

reason I am asking this is that in 2020 most of us are not going to be here, our next president is not going to be here, and the governor is not going to be the governor. To know that we are on track, maybe it is not by the governor, but internally we can decide that perhaps by 2005, which is five years from now, the board will perhaps be the same and the next president will still be the next president. Tell us what we want to be?

Mr. Miles - I am pretty impatient. I'm worried about my grandkids, and they are a lot older than Steve's kids. I think that we could do this a lot quicker if we attract industry and we work together. We really have never tried to be a research institution. We have been in this battle with the regionals over the dollar, and we have to get out of that, because we are up here and they are down here. I think that we can be whatever we want to be, especially if we all work together. Some departments are going to far excel others. That is human nature. We have people out there that want to win and those are the people who are going to surface. There are people who are going to call Steve quick and put the pressure on.

Mr. Reed - Let me follow up too on your question. Someone once told me in regard to a lot to do a certain project, and the question was whether to have four years to do it or a year and a half. The person told me that it really didn't matter. The way they saw it they had people who were committed and give me people who are innovative, if you give them four years to do it they do it in four, if you give them a year and a half they will do it in a year and a half. It depends on the commitment. The top twenty by the year 2020, that is a rough timetable. It gives us time to go about this methodically. But keep in mind we are not starting this methodically. We are starting this with the bucks for brains. We are starting this with an infusion of a tremendous amount of capital from the legislature. We are asking for another infusion of capital, which is being matched. Sixty-seven, match the sixty-seven, do that again, match for another sixty-seven, you add that up and take what we already have and take inspiration from great professors, get the trustees involved and who is to say that we have to wait until 2020? We could be top twenty far sooner than 2020. I think that 2020 would be a timetable for perception to catch up with us, because as you know people generally regard where the top twenty universities are and sometimes there is a lag between. Many universities may have moved up, but in the eyes of the public, it may take a while for the public to catch up with that. I suspect that if we commit ourselves the way that I think we are and do what we are capable of, I think that we will be in the top twenty well before 2020. There will just be the question of how much higher can we go and how much do others recognize where we are.

Dr. Reedy - Kaveh, I would like to think that it is the difference between let's say the Humanities and Mechanical Engineering. Mechanical Engineers would probably not be as involved in metaphorical thinking as we in the Humanities are. Is that a safe assumption? Not to say that they are less imaginative, but not as involved in metaphorical thinking. Top twenty status is in my opinion, a metaphor. It is a metaphor as you set a goal in life of what you want to achieve. Whether it is achieved across the board is not of as a great of consequence as it is that you keep the goal and the metaphor out there as something symbolically that you are working toward. That means that you may not all be marching together. So, whether it is 2005 or 2010 or whether someone argues over the fact that we have achieved or we haven't. If we have moved the university significantly forward toward that metaphorical goal of top twenty status among public institutions, that is what is important. Mr. President, I don't do this for any reason other than to make a point, how many professorships and endowed chairs were increased this last year, approximately?

President Wethington - We went from 21 to 66 endowed chairs in this last year plus. I believe we are at 118 professorships, from about 58.

Dr. Reedy - It makes my point. It may not be top twenty and it may not compare to the University of Texas at Austin or the University of Michigan, but we are farther along than we were two years ago. If the metaphor is there that we are trying to rise to and we are all sharing in that sense of moving toward, then each of these steps become steps of great consequence--because we are farther along than we were, and that is a very significant movement that, as I recall, as we were setting some of those goals, there was real doubt that that was achievable. But we have achieved and surpassed some of those goals we set. This is what I would encourage in our thinking. Is this something that you think this University should attempt to do? Call it top twenty, call it top ten, call it number one. It does not matter what you call it. It is the metaphor that you drive toward that is extremely important. It is a symbolic value that will, in turn bring nonsymbolic steps to achievement.

Bill Maloney - You have all talked about perception, and one of the perceptions on campus is most of our departments are under funded. My question deals with perception, I keep hearing rumors that the athletic department is looking at building an oncampus arena. What perception does that generate to the public when we are saying we are under funded for education, and we can spend a hundred fifty million dollars to build an on campus basketball arena?

Mr. Miles - I think that it is all relevant. That is the hero, and basketball and all of athletics need to broaden their base of perception of what we really are. A lot of people see all athletes and the cheerleaders as part of the pride. You never see a tee shirt that they sell at a vendor of someone studying Spanish; it all kind of goes back to that hero type thing. I was in the entertainment business, and sold things that I thought people had to have. I have been in food agriculture, engineering, energy, and banking. When I started those three things, I thought those were three things that were essential. But the most money I ever made in my life was selling tickets to something that was the stupidest thing you ever saw in your life. So the perception of the public and whether we like it or not it is that way. But the one question I want to ask--I want you to show me a show of hands of anybody in this room that thinks you are inferior to your counterpart at another university. There is not a one of you in here. You know that you have the potential, and we have got to get around this athletic thing and we have to fund it as a Board. Education means more today than it has ever meant. The next president will be here overnight, because a couple of years will pass in a hurry. We can not waste that. You are going to pick a committee that is going to select that president, and we are going to have an open ear and probably going to listen more to you. In my opinion, every board member will be different. But who knows better what it takes to lead than you. So we are going to listen a lot to you. Jimmy came to us a couple of weeks ago about increasing the number of students on the committee. Jimmy, we need you to select from the broad base of graduate, undergraduate, and the professional students and give us probably ten names to select from and their backgrounds and why they want this to be the best university. If we don't pick the future, and the future will happen in just a few minutes, it is going to be your fault for the selection and your fault for not inspiring that student.

I really appreciate what you are doing. I have a lot of pride, but my pride is all over the state. Everyone out there that probably comes to Lexington once or twice. Some of them even in their lifetime never come here but, still holds you as number one in the world. I think that we have to get this research, you have to be different than you have been in the past, if you are going to help us find the money.

Alan Kaplan (Medicine) - Actually, I like your idea about tee shirts, and there is a university, The University of Chicago, that gave up football many years ago, and they have a tee shirt that lists their seventy-two Nobel laureates. It might be a good idea if the Board used its influence to get our bookstore to start putting out tee shirts with some of our faculty and some of the things that the faculty

have accomplished.

Mr. Miles - I will tell you that I sold tee shirts with monster trucks on them, at a million dollars a year. Do you know who needs to print those tee shirts and get them out? You need to look in that mirror and be proud of what you are doing.

Alan Kaplan - I would like to followup on something Dan said earlier--that is, there was a \$65 million, 150,000 net square research building that was in the document. According to the paper, this weekend that building is not fairing very well at the Council. I would certainly hope that the Board has some aggressive plans to use their influence in seeing what can be done about that building, because the College of Medicine in the Medical Center is going nowhere unless a building like that is built. Because as ingenious as we try to be, we can not do research in the hallways, and we are out of space.

Mr. Reed - That is the precise kind of feedback that I enjoy as a trustee. I was glad to hear the gentleman's comments about the need for this research building because it helps me to be a more informed trustee when we have a trustees meeting, so when we discuss it with the president and with others as we make our priorities. So when I give you my telephone number and ask you to give me a call, it is that type of thing that I want to hear. Tell me the importance of that building, and tell me what it will mean to this university if we have it and what it will likewise mean if we don't. Not just that building, but any program that you happen to know about. That kind of information is very helpful. I agree with the importance and the priority of the research building.

President Wethington - Just to update you on the research building, as of noon today, we have regained a little of our momentum in that the Biomedical Sciences Research Building is back on the list for recommendation by CPE with a recommendation the State fund 60% and the University fund 40%. My comment was that I appreciated very much the recommendation getting the project alive again, but that in fact we would continue to push for full funding for this facility because it is a critical research facility for the University of Kentucky. Our expectation is that the State fund this Biomedical Sciences Research Building for the very reason that Alan Kaplan and others have commented--it is critical to this University's progress toward that top twenty research status. We made some headway today. We have a long way to go--both in terms of getting it recommended for full funding and to get the Governor and General Assembly to recommend and approve it in that January to April period.

Marion Sims - I live in Lexington, and you can call me and it won't be a long distance phone call. I love information that enlightens us as far what your needs and concerns are. I think that all of us would welcome comments. We vote independently, as you well know. We would like very much to have your thoughts. Nothing would be too trivial for me in my thinking. Maybe there could be a published list.

Chairperson Moore - We will make sure you get that. I would like to recognize Jimmy Glenn, who is on the Board of Trustees as well.

Jimmy Glenn - I am a student member of the Board of Trustees. I live in town also, and am always in the SGA Office. I know many of you are on campus, and if you have time, stop in the SGA Office. I am more than willing to work with you, especially on a number of the proposals going through the CPE. This year's Kentucky Board of Student Body Presidents is working to get more active and working with the CPE and the legislature. My door is always open, my phone is always on, and I am willing to listen to you.

Mark Meier (Chemistry) - The few people in the room who know me will tell you that I can throw a

dark cloud over just about anything. I am going to warn you that I don't think that you have until 2020. The reason is the following: While I understand that President Wethington has done the best job possible with the budget that he was given, I am concerned that his successor will not be given a significant improvement in those resources to make top twenty happen. Here is the scenario that I fear is going to play out. When I look at my own department, in the last several years we have doubled the research funding in the department. This department is an exciting place to be because everybody sees that we are poised and ready to launch and as we are moving up and we can feel ourselves moving up and producing better graduate students, better undergraduates. Everything is on the up and up, including the frustration level. The frustration level is going to hit a fever level pretty soon, based on not only space issues but also other frustrations in dealing with just the whole university setting as it ranges from the difficulty in advising students to our whole undergraduate program. The difficulty in finding internal matching funds which I hear is threatened. Space, of course, for us is a critical issue because we are like the Medical Center; we are getting pushed in the hallways. We have faculty members who are among the best in the world, and others who are moving toward that status. They are not going to wait. Somebody else, the Michigans, they are going to take them off our hands. Some of these people will leave kind of shedding a tear, regretting it, not wanting to go, but understanding that both professionally, for the future of their own careers and personally because of the finances and their own families, they have no choice. We don't have twenty years. We are going to have to be obviously moving in the right direction in a much shorter time frame, or the other universities that are already there are going to pick the eyes out, and we are going to be on that backward coast again--a lost opportunity, for a different reason.

Mr. Reed - Let me respond to that. That is not a dark cloud. That is just inspiration for me to get going.

Mr. Miles - The thing that I worry about is not only you but this whole state is in that same situation. When you look at the average income, the resources, you are the only hope those people have. We have appointed an ad hoc committee, and Loys Mather is on that committee, to look at how other people got to where they are. We are going to have to be smarter in getting the money. We are going to have to let Loys and that ad hoc committee look at other universities and we need your help and advice. I think when I see the money and industry that is going out and not coming here. It goes back to robbing the bank; you have to go to where the money is. I not only am worried about you; the whole future of the economy of this State is in the University of Kentucky's hands. It is a big vote that you are supporting.

Chairperson Moore - Thank you very much.

The speakers were given a round of applause.

Chairperson Moore - The process for voting now is that the second envelope is for you to select six names from among these twelve that are being displayed. Those will then be narrowed down to the final six, which will then be submitted for the election process that will take place by mail.

Professor Fortune - These are the twelve people who gathered the most votes. I will show all the names at once. They are alphabetical, not in order of votes.

The following names were on the list:

Bill Fortune
Don Frazier

George Herring
Alan Kaplan
Judith Lesnaw
Loys Mather
Lee Meyer
Karen Mingst
Roy Moore
Erla Mowbray
Don Mullineaux
John Thelin

Chairperson Moore - So you select six names, write one name on each card, and then sign your name on the outside of the envelope.

Bill Fortune - At this juncture, our reading of the rules is that there is no declining. Even if a person might not be here, they are not stricken from the list. It is at the next level if a person can not serve another name is put on. Our reading of the rules is you just vote for six based upon this list.

The committee appointed to count the votes left the room while the chair continued the business of the Senate.

Chairperson Moore - I want to just mention to you that the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for the regular title series which the Senate passed about a year ago have now been approved and will take effect for those individuals who are hired after December 31, 1999. Those individuals who were hired prior to that date will come under the current administrative regulations regarding regular title series. Those also will be posted on the web and an official announcement will probably be out in the next day or two. There were a few changes that were made, but it is basically as passed by the Senate.

The Chair - The first action item will be a proposal to modify the University Senate Rules IV and V of the College of Dentistry Policies on Grading, Academic Discipline, Graduation, and Admission. We have two guests to do a summary of that and answer any questions, Richard Mitchell and Karen West.

Richard Mitchell made the following remarks:

I am chair of the Faculty Council of the College of Dentistry. We are asking you to support changes in the College of Dentistry's grading policies, academic disciplinary policies, and admission policies. Since the College of Dentistry opened, we have had an honors pass/fail grading system. The reason for changing to what is essentially a letter grading system are the following. Our faculty over the years has become increasingly frustrated with what turns out to be a large passing range. It is very difficult for us to document students who are barely passing. We also worry because of that large passing range that students who can not achieve honors sometimes lack an incentive to work as hard as we would like. The final reason is that the students themselves are very much interested. Almost half of our students go onto some sort of residency program, and they feel that they are at a disadvantage, compared to students at other dental schools that have letter grading systems. We have a convergence of the faculty and students on changing to a letter grading system. The proposal you have in front of you passed the dental faculty with only two opposing votes. We also, as a result of changing the grading policy, needed to change our academic disciplinary policies. You have before you policies on probation, suspension, and dismissal. The dismissal policy is a new policy; the college did not have one up until this policy. It incorporates something that we did not have in our policy before and that is placing a student who did

not pass part of the dental national boards on suspension if they failed it enough times. This is something that is consistent with what the College of Medicine does. It is increasingly consistent with what other colleges of dentistry do. We think it is an ethical matter also, not to keep a student in school who in fact can never practice in the profession they are training in, unless they pass the exams. The admissions policy is a little bit different from the rest of this. It does not have to do with the grading system. The admissions policy itself is a change from a very loosely defined admissions policy, which did not have many required courses in it. The proposed admissions policy has a number of required courses in the basic sciences included in it. In the past the College of Dentistry was trying to encourage a very diverse student body. We are still trying to do that, but we feel ethically that we can not accept people into our curriculum who do not have a real background in the basic sciences that will allow them to succeed in our program. We feel that actually requiring some courses is a good change. All of these policies have now been passed by vote by the dental faculty. They have passed the Academic Council of the Medical Center, and the Senate Council has reviewed them. We would be happy to answer questions.

Karen West made the following remarks:

As a representative from our College of Dentistry Administration, I would like to say that we do fully support these proposals from our faculty. When you look at the current trend in dental education, as Richard Mitchell said, we are one of the few remaining dental schools who have an honors pass/fail system. We may even be the last at this point in time. When students are accepted into the dental profession, they come to us from a variety of backgrounds. It is our job as faculty and administrators if they are skilled and competent to practice dentistry. The admissions process is key to this--if they have the necessary background, knowledge, and ability to successfully negotiate our curriculum. Also essential is our ability to measure and document how they are performing in their matriculation through our college. Our faculty feels that they are not able to do this with our current honors pass/fail system. Because of this, they have proposed a change in grading policy. They have proposed more strict admission requirements, and they have added a more stringent probation, suspension, and dismissal policy. It is our belief that setting a higher standard will allow students to achieve a higher standard. We urge your support for this policy.

Chairperson Moore - This proposal has been approved, as indicated, by the Dentistry faculty, the Academic Council for the Medical Center, the Senate Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards, and the University Senate Council and requires no second. The floor is open for discussion.

ACTION ITEM 1 - Proposed Changes in College of Dentistry Policies on Grading, Academic Discipline, Graduation, and Admissions

Grading Policy

Current Rule:

Section V - 5.1.2.2 College of Dentistry: Honors, Pass, Unsatisfactory are the designations for the College of Dentistry students. The H,P,U designations are utilized only for dental students. The few graduate and/or undergraduate students in essentially dental classes are graded as is the rest of the University.

Proposed:

Policy Statement: An **A**, **B+** or a **B** is within the expected range of performance. A **C** is a marginal level of performance. To remain in good academic standing and to graduate, a student must maintain a

grade point average (G.P.A.) of 2.75 or more. Student performance will be reported to the Registrar's office as follows:

A Represents exceptionally high level of performance; four (4) quality points are awarded to each credit hour.

B+ Represents a high level of performance; three and one-half (3.5) quality points are awarded for each credit hour.

B Represents the minimum expected level of performance; three (3) quality points are awarded for each credit hour.

C Represents a marginal level of performance; two (2.0) quality points are awarded for each credit hour.

E Represents an unacceptable level of performance; zero (0) quality points are awarded for each credit hour.

P Represents a passing grade in courses taken on a pass-fail basis. It is not used in G.P.A. calculations.

F Represents an unacceptable level of performance in courses taught on a pass/fail basis. It is not used in G.P. A. calculations.

I Incomplete; course objectives have not been completed during the allotted course time due to circumstances usually beyond the student's control. An **I** grade shall be given only when there is a reasonable possibility that a passing grade will result when work is completed. An **I** must be replaced by another grade within 12 months or before graduation, whichever occurs sooner. After this period, an **I** grade will automatically convert to an **E** or an **F** grade as appropriate.

W Withdrawn; this grade will be awarded to a student who withdraws from a course or from the College. It shall be awarded only after recommendation by the Academic Performance Committee and approval by the Dean.

Responsible Agent: The Course Director will evaluate the performance of each student with respect to the course objectives and assign the appropriate grades.

Probation Policy

Current Rule:

5.3.3.4 College of Dentistry: The following academic disciplinary policies for students in the Professional Dental Educational Program are initiated upon unsatisfactory academic performance.

Academic Probation

A student who fails a course is placed on academic probation. Additionally, the Academic Performance Committee may recommend to the Dean that a student who is performing unsatisfactorily in one or more courses be placed on probation. In each case, the duration of academic probation is at least one complete semester.

Students who are on academic probation will be excluded from participation in certain curricular privileges or extracurricular activities of the College of Dentistry including the following:

A taking certain enrichment courses;

B beginning a totally self-instructional course before the official starting date unless this course is part of a special curriculum developed by the Academic Performance Committee;

C serving as an officer or committee member of any College of Dentistry organization or committee, and,

D participating in any College of Dentistry extracurricular activity or in the activity of any College of Dentistry organization if the participation involves the expenditure of an appreciable amount of time.

A student is removed from academic probation by the Dean when the terms of probation are met.

Proposed:

Objective of the Policy: To describe the conditions that will result in a student being placed on probation, the terms of probation, and the conditions for removal from probation.

Policy Statement:

A student will be placed on probation if he or she has:

1. a grade point average (G.P.A.) for the academic year less than 2.75;
2. received a failing grade (**E** or **F**); **or**,
3. failed one or more parts of either Part 1 or Part 2 of the National Dental Board Examination

Terms of Probation. The terms of probation will be established by the Academic Performance Committee. The duration of probation will be at least one semester. Passing a course that has been failed is a condition of all probations. Additional terms of probation may be established by the Academic Performance Committee. Students on probation may be ineligible for certain curricular or extracurricular College activities.

If a student has failed a National Dental Board Examination, taking the examination the next time it is offered and passing it shall be among the terms of probation. the terms shall also include required activities to help the student prepare to pass the examination.

Removal from Probation. A student will be removed from probation by the Academic Performance Committee when he or she has at least a cumulative 2.75 G.P.A., has at least a 2.75 G.P.A. in the current academic year, has passed any failed course, and has satisfied the terms of probation in the judgment of the Academic Performance Committee.

Responsible Agent: The Academic Performance Committee

Suspension Policy

Current Rule:

Academic Suspension

A student is suspended from the College of Dentistry if the student:

A fails to meet the terms of academic probation,

B is placed on academic probation a second time;

C has been in residence in a dental curriculum for five (5) academic years and has not been graduated within one(1) year following the end of the time period agreed to upon admission, or,

D fails two or more courses during an academic year.

Any student subject to academic suspension may request a review by the Academic Performance Committee prior to suspension. The student placed on academic suspension may apply for reinstatement under probation. The reinstatement may not become effective until at least one complete semester has passed from the time of suspension. (US:4/30/79)

Proposed:

Objective of the Policy: To describe the conditions that will result in a recommendation that the Dean suspend a student from the College, the process for requesting a review of a recommendation to suspend, and the conditions for reinstatement after suspension.

Policy Statement:

The Academic Performance Committee (APC) shall recommend to the Dean that a student be suspended if two conditions exist. The first condition is that the student has **either**:

1. received two or more failing (**E** or **F**) grades;
2. received a failing grade (**E** or **F**) while on probation;
3. failed to meet the terms of probation; **or**,
4. after the second year of the curriculum, achieved a cumulative GPA of less than 2.75

The second condition is that, based on the available evidence, the APC has determined that the student is capable of completing the curriculum after receiving counseling and/or completing work outside the College. The committee's recommendation will include a description of any circumstances the Dean should consider in reaching a decision. It will also include suggestions on what the student needs to accomplish to be considered for reinstatement.

Second failure of Part 1 of the National Dental Board Examination. If a student fails the Board Examination a second time, the APC shall recommend to the Dean that the student be suspended. The committee's recommendation will include a description of any circumstances the Dean should consider in reaching a decision. It will also include suggestions on what the student needs to accomplish to be considered for reinstatement.

Review. A student subject to suspension may ask the Dean for a review. Review procedures will be determined by the Dean.

Reinstatement following suspension. A suspended student may not be reinstated before one semester has passed from the date of suspension. When the student demonstrates that he or she can perform at the level required to graduate from the College, the Dean may reinstate him or her. A reinstated student will be placed on probation, subject to terms recommended by the Academic Performance Committee and approved by the Dean.

A student who has been suspended because of a second failure of Part 1 of the National Dental Board Examination shall not be readmitted unless she or he takes and passes Part 1 the next time it is offered.

Responsible agent: The Dean.

Dismissal Policy

No Current Rule

Objective of the Policy: To describe the conditions that will result in a recommendation that the Dean

dismiss a student from the College and the process for requesting a review of a recommendation to dismiss.

Policy Statement:

The Academic Performance Committee (APC) shall recommend to the Dean that a student be dismissed if two conditions exist. The first condition is that the student has either:

1. received two or more failing (**E** or **F**) grades;
2. received a failing grade (**E** or **F**) while on probation;
3. failed to meet the terms of probation; **or**,
4. after the second year of the curriculum, achieved a cumulative GPA of less than 2.75

The second condition is that, based on the available evidence, the APC has determined that the student is not academically capable of completing the curriculum or is otherwise unsuitable for dentistry for reasons that include, but are not limited to: unacceptable personal hygiene, the inability to establish rapport with patients, the inability to work effectively with other health care team members, undependability, or lack of integrity, initiative or interest. The committee's recommendation will include a description of any circumstances the Dean should consider in reaching a decision.

Previously suspended students. If a student is subject to suspension and has been previously suspended, the APC shall recommend that she or he be dismissed.

Review. A student subject to dismissal may ask the Dean for a review. Review procedures will be determined by the Dean.

Reinstatement following dismissal. The dismissed student shall not be reinstated.

Responsible Agent: The Dean.

Graduation Policy

No Current Rule

Objective of the Policy: To define the Doctor of Dental Medicine program graduation requirements

Policy Statement:

A student will be eligible for graduation when all courses have been satisfactorily completed and all of the applicable requirements that follow are met:

1. a student has at least a 2.75 cumulative G.P.A.;
2. a student has passed Parts 1 and 2 of the National Dental Board Examination;
3. advanced standing students must complete the curriculum within one year following the time period agreed to at admission;
4. all terms of probation have been satisfied; and
5. all patient responsibilities and other obligations to the College or University have been satisfied.

Responsible Agent: The Dean

Summary of Revisions

for the Policies on Grading, Academic Discipline, and Graduation

Summary. We have simplified our policies. The **U** grade has been deleted. The **I** grade has been simplified. The **C** grade has been defined so that its meaning is no longer ambiguous. The academic policies have been revised to clarify the conditions that will subject a student to suspension and dismissal.

The philosophy that underlies this grading system is competency-based education (Chambers and Gerrow, 1994). The American Dental Association through its Commission on Dental Accreditation (CODA) has mandated that each graduate of U.S. dental schools be competent to begin the independent practice of dentistry. All graduates must be evaluated as competent on each competency that CODA identifies and on any additional competencies that a dental school self-identifies. In the proposed grading system, we view a **C** grade as a level of performance that indicates that a student has not quite reached competency. With further work that will be provided elsewhere in the curriculum, we expect that this student will become *competent*. We recognize that many students will occasionally perform at the C-level. Our goal, however, is that our students perform at a higher level. The **B** grade indicates that in the course director's judgment the student is *competent*. High grades (**B+** or **A**) indicate that in the course director's judgment the student is moving towards *proficiency*.

Note that we do not include a **D** grade in our system. We omitted the **D** because we feel that D-level performance implies that the student is incompetent and cannot become competent through experiences offered elsewhere in the curriculum. Performance at less than a C-level is failing performance because a graduate who performs at such a level cannot become ready to begin the independent practice of dentistry without retaking the course.

1. The meaning of the C grade has been clarified. It is defined as a "marginal level of performance." By contrast, the **A**, **B+**, and **B** grades are defined as the "expected range of performance."

Explanation: Our goal is to establish a marginal grade that, if received infrequently, will allow the student to continue in the curriculum, but which will communicate that he or she has not performed at the expected level.

2. The threshold for good academic standing has been set at a 2.75 G.P.A.

Explanation: This threshold ensures that the student can occasionally slip to the **C** level without becoming subject to academic disciplinary procedures.

3. To make it unnecessary to refer to the academic disciplinary policies to understand the impact of the C grade, the 2.75 G.P.A. threshold is cited in the first paragraph of the grading policy.

Explanation: Members of the Academic Council of the Medical Center suggested that the grading policy state the threshold G.P.A. Together with assigning 2.0 quality points to **C** grades, this clearly defines the **C**.

4. The U grade has been eliminated.

Explanation: Under our initial proposal, a student would receive a **U** grade if he or she had failed a single portion of a course. He or she could then pass the course by retaking only the failed portion.

Instead of the **U** grade, we will address this type of failure through the College's remediation policy. One reason for dropping the **U** is simplicity. The grade was difficult for some to understand and, in the judgment of the Academic Council of the Medical Center (ACMC) and dentistry's Faculty Council, the

potential for misapplication of the **U** grade was large.

5. The **I** grade has been simplified. The requirement that the **I** grade be accompanied with a letter grade indicating the student's current status (e.g., **I-A**, **I-B+**, **I-C** etc.) in the course has been eliminated.

Explanation: The purpose of paired grades was to give students additional information regarding their status. The College will achieve the same result by requiring faculty members to provide written comments whenever an **I** grade is awarded.

6. The suspension and dismissal policies have been simplified and clarified.

Explanation: These policies have been rewritten to make it clear that two conditions are crucial. If both conditions are satisfied, the APC must recommend suspension or dismissal. The first condition is the same for both policies: one of four (previously six) situations has occurred. The second condition determines which policy is applicable.

7. Failure of Part 1 or Part 2 of the National Dental Board Examinations will trigger academic disciplinary actions (probation and suspension). A student must pass both Part 1 and Part 2 to be eligible to graduate.

Explanation. Since dental graduates cannot practice dentistry without passing the Board examinations, we feel that it is unethical to allow students who cannot pass Part 1 to continue in the curriculum or to allow students who cannot pass Part 2 to graduate. Earlier we proposed complicated policies that were designed to ensure that students gave high priority to passing the Dental Board examinations. We believe that the present approach is simpler. Moreover, in requiring passage of the Boards, we are following the lead of the College of Medicine, which has a similar policy.

Reference:

Chambers DW, Gerrow JD (1994). Manual for Developing and Formatting Competency Statements. *J Dent Educ* 58:361-366.

Admissions Guidelines

Current Rule:

4.2.3.4 College of Dentistry The requirements for admission to the College of Dentistry of the University of Kentucky reflect the adoption of the standards set forth by the Council on Dental Education. These appear in the "Procedures for Evaluation, Requirements and Guidelines for Dental Education Programs" (May 1971). Because of the academic requirements of the dental curriculum, it is usually necessary for the applicant to have completed at least two years of preprofessional education. The majority of students accepted will have three or four or more years of preparation. In general, the less academic preparation an applicant presents, the stronger his performance and/or experience must be. Students should demonstrate their competence to undertake the biological and physical science courses of the dental curriculum. However, specific courses in the basic sciences during the undergraduate curriculum are not required of applicants. Applicants for admission must furnish information regarding their character, the quality of their preprofessional education, health status and aptitude for and interest in a career in dentistry.

Proposed Policy:

Admission Guidelines Doctor of Dental Medicine Program

Number of Years	Bachelor's degree desired
Limitations on Junior College Hours	60 semester hours maximum
Required Courses	<p>General Biology with lab* (2 / 3)I General Chemistry with lab* (2 / 3)I Organic Chemistry with lab* (2 / 3)I Physics with lab* (1 / 2)I English Composition with emphasis on Communication Skills* (2 / 3)I</p> <p>* or equivalent; I (semesters/quarters)</p>
Suggested Additional Preparation	<p>Applicants are encouraged to pursue a well-rounded curriculum including courses both in the sciences and the humanities. Applicants are encouraged to take additional basic science courses. Examples of courses that will be helpful include biochemistry, microbiology, immunology, genetics, cell biology, molecular biology, and physiology. An applicant's curriculum will be enriched if she or he also takes courses or has experiences that expand social awareness and ensure manual dexterity. Examples of such enriching courses include courses in the social sciences, history, literature, economics, philosophy, and psychology.</p>
Other Selection Factors	<p>Since a caring attitude is central to the practice of dentistry, applicants should demonstrate a commitment to service and a desire to help others. Applicants may wish to highlight volunteer and service activities. Applicants shall gain exposure to the practice of dentistry through observation experiences. We are interested in assembling a student body that includes students from a wide range of urban, rural, economic, and cultural backgrounds.</p> <p>The University of Kentucky College of Dentistry will consider for admission any applicant who demonstrates the ability to perform or to learn to perform, the skills listed in the College's Technical Standards policy. The specific standards are included in the new <i>College Bulletin</i> and <i>Student Handbook</i>. Applicants are not required to disclose the nature of any disability, but an applicant with questions about these technical requirements is strongly encouraged to discuss the issue with the Assistant Dean for Student Affairs. If appropriate, and upon the request of the applicant, student or faculty, reasonable accommodations for a disability will be provided.</p>
DAT or Canadian DAT	Mandatory; scores of 17 or higher preferred

GPA	3.00 or higher preferred
------------	--------------------------

Background: The proposals have been approved by the Dentistry Faculty, the Academic Council for the Medical Center, the Senate Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards and the University Senate Council.

Proposed Implementation: Fall Semester, 2000

Note: If approved, the proposed changes will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification.

Kaveh Tagavi - I have the following friendly amendments. On page 3, in the fourth paragraph, line 2 the "t" in the should be capitalized. On page 4, under policy statement, number 4 "or" should be "of". In the paragraph beginning "The second condition," add "for suspension (as opposed to dismissal, see policy on Dismissal later in this document)." On page 5, in the middle of the page, the paragraph starting with "The second condition," starting with the fourth line the items should be separated by semicolons, except for the one that says lack of integrity, it is correct with commas. On page five, "reinstatement following dismissal" should be italicized.

Chairperson Moore - Those items are accepted as friendly amendments.

The policy with the friendly amendments passed in a show of hands.

Chairperson Moore - The last action item is on the calendar. It has also been approved by the Senate Council and does not require a second.

ACTION ITEM 2 - Proposed Changes in College of Dentistry Calendar, second-year

Background: At the request of the Faculty Council of the College of Dentistry, and upon approval by the Senate Council, a change in the academic calendar of the College of Dentistry is proposed.

Proposed: Second-year dental students are currently scheduled to end their academic year for Fall 1999-Spring 2000 on July 21, 2000. Based on a miscalculation of weeks within the 1999-2000 academic year, the second-year dental students are scheduled to meet for 48 weeks when, according to the College bylaws, they should meet for 47 weeks. In order to adhere to the College's bylaws, a new ending date for second-year dental students is proposed: July 14, 2000.

Proposed Implementation: Upon passage

The proposal passed in a show of hands.

Chairperson Moore - As you know, under the rules, I will contact each of the final six individuals and make sure that they are interested and willing to run. Even if someone declines, the ballot you will receive will include at least six names.

The final six names for ballot:

Bill Fortune
 Alan Kaplan
 Judith Lesnaw
 Loys Mather

Lee Meyer
Roy Moore

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Donald Witt
Secretary, University Senate

You are visitor Unable to open config file for reading *since December 3, 1999*

Return to [University Senate Page](#)
Return to [University Senate Minutes](#)
Return to [Registrar's Home Page](#)

This page was last updated on 3 December 1999.

If you have [questions or comments](#) about this web page, please use this [comment form](#)

URL: <http://www.uky.edu/USC/Minutes/sm110899.html>