

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

\* \* \* \* \*

MAY 9, 2005

3:00 P.M.

\* \* \* \* \*

W.T. YOUNG LIBRARY  
FIRST FLOOR AUDITORIUM  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

\* \* \* \* \*

AN/DOR REPORTING & VIDEO TECHNOLOGIES, INC.  
179 EAST MAXWELL STREET  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40508  
(859) 254-0568

\* \* \* \* \*

ERNIE YANARELLA, CHAIR  
GIFFORD BLYTON, PARLIAMENTARIAN  
REBECCA SCOTT, SECRETARY TO SENATE COUNCIL  
LISA E. HOINKE, CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER

CHAIR: Let us call the May 9th, 2005 Senate Meeting to order. First order of business is approval of the April 11th minutes. Are there any corrections or enmendations that any one would like to make with regard to those minutes?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Hearing none, the April 11th minutes are approved.

I'd like to take note that the tool design workshop on bicycle planning will take place this afternoon. It may already have begun, but it will continue past the Senate Meeting hours in Senate Cou -- in Senate -- pardon me, the Student Center 231. Faculty input is being sought regarding a development plan that will involve the University and the larger community.

Bob Grossman, do you have anything to add to that, since you asked me to make that announcement?

MR. GROSSMAN: No.

CHAIR: Thank you.

I also want to take note of the fact that Provost Mike Nietzel is departing.

Mike, if you would not mind coming up here for just a second?

(MR. NIETZEL APPROACHES THE CHAIR)

CHAIR: I'd like to issue an expression of thanks from the University Senate and the faculty community.

First of all, I'd like to thank you for your ma -- for many things, not least of all your three decades of scholarship and administrative service to this University. I'd like to express our gratitude for your intellectual and administrative labors to advance the national status in recognition of the UK Department of Psychology and to nurture the talents and the commitments of many of its faculty, some of whom have served on this body, who have contributed to innovations in undergraduate and graduate education, both those who have been singled out for their teaching and other achievements

and those who remain unheralded but deeply respected by all of us.

I'd like to take special note of your shepherding this University through the process to a unified Provost system with only slight and customary rough spots along the way.

I'd also like to spotlight your successes in moving this University forward with important initiatives in undergraduate education, like the expansion of the Honors Program and the advancement of the winter intercession.

I want to acknowledge your judicious balance between uncommon patience and commitment in negotiation and compromise when dealing faculty objections on the one hand and the form -- formulation of extraordinary col -- ordinarily colorful metaphors and analogies in private conversation with me and others when your patience approached an end point. I remember those, Mike.

Finally, I'd -- I'd like to imagine circumstances in which you might have stayed, but as someone who finds really little value in hindsight, I wish instead, on behalf of the entire Senate, to offer our best wishes for a rewarding and challenging next phase in your career. I hope that you will carry with you fond memories, enduring friendships and lasting good will into your Presidency from those who will continue the collective work of making this University a better place to teach and learn and serve new generations of Kentuckians.

MR. NIETZEL: Thank you.

(SENATE MEMBERS APPLAUD)

MR. NIETZEL: Thank you very much. I will be brief. I took to heart some advice I read from Mark Twain that was directed at commencement and commencement speakers over the weekend, so I'll apply it my opportunity to be in front of you for a minute.

Mark Twain said that -- that there were a couple if characteristics that the

corpse at a funeral and to the speaker at a commencement shared. One is that you really needed each of them to be present for the event took place, but, second, nobody really expected either one of them to have very much to say.

So I just want to say how much I have appreciated the chance to be colleagues with all of you over the years, and to be a Senator at one point and to -- to work with the Senate. There is a natural and, I think, health tension between faculty and administrators that we came over the years to learn how to harness and -- and use for the institutions benefit.

I learned from and really had a fine opportunity to work with three Senate Chairs, Jeff, Ernie and Bill Fortune. And I think that the relationship between the Provost Office and Senate Council and the Senate was a productive one even when the -- that natural tension sometimes we got a little more focused on than we might have wanted to, we were able to come away with -- with, for the most part, I think, I very productive outcomes for the University.

So I really have appreciated the chance to work with and -- and for you, and have appreciated the good skepticism of the faculty which is something that really does benefit the University in the long run in -- in many, many ways.

I always tried to think of myself as a faculty member who's DOE need for administration just kept getting pushed up over the years, and -- and try to keep that as a -- as a mind set about the work, and that -- that gets hard when the DOE gets -- for administration gets to 98 percent or so, but I think it was something that as a -- as a reminder or as a check on my own impatience sometimes and -- and instincts was very useful.

By the same token, I do think that working with the Senate was -- was these past couple of years a -- a chance for us to --

for you to see some of the viewpoints of administration, take those into account and we came to some pretty good resolutions over a number of important matters that faced the University.

Thanks very much, Ernie, for the very kind remarks and for, again, the opportunity to work with all of you over the years.

CHAIR: Thank you.  
(SENATE MEMBERS APPLAUD)

CHAIR: I'd like to turn, then, to our next agenda item, proposed changes to Senate Rules regarding the ACMC. This has been forwarded to the Senate with a positive recommendation from the Senate Council.

Jeff Dembo has -- has chaired this ACMC Review Committee, and I would like to call on him to offer a quick overview on the various recommendations that we are bringing before this Senate with a positive recommendation.

MR. DEMBO: Before I start, I want to add my thanks to Mike Nietzel for all the formal and informal conversations. I think that a transition to a Provost model, especially at a time when a university is undergoing major budget cuts and other challenges, makes it particularly difficult. I think a lesser man, Mike, would not have shepherded us through that as smoothly as you did.

Thank you for everything you've done.

I want to give you two seconds of history about whence this came and why it's before you once again. Since we're talking about the move to the Provost model, along with that came a lot of details and bookkeeping and rules making that we had to attend to to accommodate a Provost model.

It was noted back in November of '03 at a Senate Council meeting that the Senate rules did not detail where the Academic Council of the Medical Center fit into the picture because there was no longer a Medical Center. It was now one campus

under the -- the jurisdiction of the Provost.

Up till that time David Watt had been acting as the Chair, and the Senate Council endorsed his continuing to act as the Chair pro tem until such a time as the Senate Council and the Senate could figure out who should properly Chair the ACMC consistent with the Provost model.

At that time, the most logical committee to address this was the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure to try figure out what the new model was going to be.

In a letter from Kate Chard, who was then Chair of the Committee, she wrote to the Senate Council that they recommended the creation of a new position similar to that of the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils. If the new position could not be created, her committee suggested that one of the deans of the original Medical Center assume the responsibility with a nod to the Dean of Medicine, and if a new position is created suggesting that staff support be available.

The Senate Council considered that, and there were a number of things going on during the beginning of -- of the year 2004. The Senate Council considered this over the summer and recommended a slight modification to what Kate Chard and her committee suggested.

The suggestion was to rotate the Deans among -- the Chairship among the Deans of the Medical Center. This was presented to you, the University Senate, in September of '04.

Now, there were some problems with this. In some discussions with the Provost there was concern about whether this could be implemented. The Provost urged delay in implementing this for several reasons. There were some issues that needed to be cleared up. Among other things, staff availability; the issue of whether or not the Deans were prepared to undertake this added responsibility and they have the staff to do

it.

So the Senate Council discussed this with the Provost and amongst themselves, and decided that we could have handled it differently had we done some of our homework ahead of time and decided what the next course of action was going to be.

Graciously, Dean Blackwell of the Graduate School agreed to Chair the Academic Council of the Medical Center until we could determine what should be done, and she not only graciously did this but provided staff support and also agreed to be on this Review Committee and for that we're -- we're very grateful.

The Senate Council at that time appointed -- appointed an ad hoc committee to evaluate this issue and figure out what to do.

At the 12/20/04 Senate Council Meeting, the charge to this committee was created and in the wisdom of the Council, which I think was very bold, they recommended that the whole issue of this Council be evaluated; not only who should Chair it, but what the composition should be, the role, the functions and its scope in terms of being able to virtually open up the rule book once again to see if we needed to change anything regarding our Council structure.

The other charges talked about ex -- spanning the full range of possibilities from abolishing this Council to expanding the present scope of responsibilities, and the Senate Council charged that this Committee should be composed of one regular and one alternate member from each of the colleges of the Medical Center, selected by the elected Faculty Councils and there should be a student member as well Dean Blackwell.

At that time, I was appointed Chair of this ad hoc committee. I contacted the Faculty Councils of each of the six colleges of the Medical Center, and we got two representatives from each. And even though there was supposed to be a regular and an

alternate member, in reality most representatives attended each meeting that was held. And the Student Senator was an FGA rep who was actually the College of Dentistry, John Newcomb.

The ACMC Review Committee met and came up with a draft of recommendations. This draft was sent to all Faculty Councils in the six Medical Center Colleges for review and comment, and the ad hoc committee met once again to consider those comments and incorporated them into the final review that was sent to the Senate Council.

The ad hoc committee packaged them in two recommendations. The first recommendation was bookkeeping, such as the election of -- of folks, the renaming, et cetera. The second aspect was the more global look at the scope of the Council. The committee felt it was critical to get some of the bookkeeping stuff out of the way first so that even if there was a problem wrestling with some of those deeper issues, at least we get the bookkeeping stuff out of the way first.

So recommendation one contained the following suggestion: The Council could continue to act as a Council of the Senate; the Council should be renamed the Healthcare Colleges Council. The reason for that is there is no longer an academic medical center as an academic unit. So this was felt to be the closest to what it represented. And -- and then finally, in fashion, analogist to the two other councils, the Chair of this Council should be an individual in the Provost's office at the level of Associate Provost or other appropriate level. Staff support should be provided by the Provost.

Recommendation two was the more broad reaching recommendation concerning the scope of responsibilities. It recommended expanding the role of this Council, including giving this Council final approval authority for select types of academic processes. And the Council talked at length about what this



should include. The Council was noted -- the acting Council of the Medical Center was noted to have worked very effectively in the past, and could easily handle some of the things from colleges that were particularly of a professional curriculum. So the Committee recommended that this authority should extend to areas that did not require by the Board, did not approval by the Kentucky Council of Post Secondary Education or did not require approval by one of the other Councils of the Senate.

The Senate Council then considered these recommendations and the Senate Council Chair, Ernie, contacted the Provost to assure that these were reasonable and implementable.

There were three concerns raised by the Provost. One is the name. Should it be named the Health Center College Council versus the Healthcare College Council, and the thought of the Committee was that -- that the word Center, once again, could imply an academic unit, per se, and there was none so the Committee felt that Healthcare might be the better term.

The Provost said that this should not involve the creation of another Associate Provost position. So while in theory it could be nice to have an Associate Provost for healthcare or some such model, at this time it does not seem to be warranted to create another layer of administration.

Finally, there was some concern about the wording of having elected members and whether this would eliminate the Chair of this Council from being a voting member, and this certainly would not. In the wording of the other Councils, Graduate and Undergraduate, there's nothing to prohibit those Chairs from voting in the Council matters so it felt that there should be nothing in this wording that would prevent the Chair from voting either.

May 2nd the Senate Council discussed not only the concepts, but also how to embody this in the wording of a rule

change for Senate Rule 1.3.4, and with a few changes and amendments to the recommendations the Senate Council voted to send it forward with a positive recommendation and that's what you're seeing right now.

The wording -- this is the old rule: The functions were elaborated in Roles A through H, and this was not the same as the way the Undergraduate/Graduate Council Rules were set forth.

So one of the attempts of this Committee was to make them consistent so that all three Councils would have similar wording. Hence, the new rule was organized in the same fashion to have, A, course procedures; B, program procedures, and then a new section was added called Limitation of Authority and this embodies the scope -- the new scope of the Council that was recommended by the Committee and it has the wording similar to what I mentioned before.

Notice this one thing here: The Senate Council and University Senate shall always retain the prerogative and authority to review any proposal or decision of this Council and, furthermore, if it's unclear as to whether something is within the final approval authority of this Council it shall send it forward to the Senate Council. So that way the -- this Council, the H Triple C as it might be called, if you agree, will never take chances on thinking it can give final approval authority when, in fact, it doesn't exist.

In the old rule the composition -- and these were merely wording changes -- the HCCC also includes now the sixth college of this area, the College of Public Health and the wording, an individual from the Provost Office in the position of Associate Provost or equivalent.

And, finally, the election of members. This has not changed very much except the term of this position was not included in the original wording so we added what has been the practice up to now,

September 1, and adding that the quorum shall consist of the elected voting members or alternates.

So there before you are the proposed rule changes for 1.3.4 HCCC renaming of the Academic Council of the Medical Center.

First, I'd like from the Provost Office, are there any comments?

MR. NIETZEL: I think the proposal as you've explained it and as you present it now would be acceptable to the Provost Office. The questions I asked were -- were relatively editorial or small in nature, and you've clarified those. So from Administration's point of view, this would be acceptable.

MR. DEMBO: From the Senate, are there any questions I could answer on behalf of the Committee?

By the way, again, thanks to all the Committee members who gave up their time and numerous e-mail interchanges back and forth. They serve the Medical Center community very well.

Darrell Jennings.

MR. JENNINGS: Darrell Jennings, College of Medicine.

I read this on the Web site there was one section that I believe was referring to the Chair of the Committee saying that the -- that the Chair of that Committee should have either no conflict of interest, but the no was bolded in there. And as I read it, that was the only component, other than the not that refers to the -- to the scope of authority of the Committee that was bolded. And I felt for a Senate Regulation -- a Senate Regulation that says no conflict of authority means no bolded or unbolded and I felt like that was out of place in that -- in -- in this context of a Senate Regulation.

MR. DEMBO: So what you are referring to are the words be impartial as one of the list of the characteristics of the person who should Chair this. The Senate Council agreed with you that it should not have been bolded and

that the assumption would be -- and, Ernie, tell me if I'm speaking out of turn, that anybody who would be appointed to this position from the Provost Office would be an impartial individual looking at the broadest scope of -- of the academics.

MR. GROSSMAN: It was deleted completely, wasn't it, that line?

MR. JENNINGS: That was deleted completely --

MR. DEMBO: To be deleted -- Okay.

MR. GROSSMAN: And that was on the -- that was on the posting.

MS. SCOTT: If I may, we never voted on that and that's why it was remaining in the document. It was never proposed as an amendment and voted upon at that meeting.

MR. GROSSMAN: I move that we delete that line.

MR. CIBULL: Well, it can be a friendly amendment if...

MR. DEMBO: And that too is just the rationale. Not if that wording is included in the rule itself. It was just the rationale for why this type of person would be the person to -- to do it.

MR. CIBULL: Would you accept that as a friendly amendment?

MR. DEMBO: Well, it's not even an action item because it's not part of the rule, so I'll defer to Chair Yanarella.

CHAIR: I would accept it as a friendly amendment, yes.

Okay. Are there other questions?  
Ernie?

MR. BAILEY: In the Senate Council Meeting I thought that we had on this last sentence deleted the two words "or alternates". I recall there was a discussion about the fact that there needed to be one voting member from each college; that an alternate would be a voting member. The way it's worded now you could have your voting member -- or an elected -- I don't know what they call them -- the first elected person and an alternate, and you could end up with colleges not represented.

MR. DEMBO: I remember that discussion.

MS. SCOTT: It was not part of a motion.

MR. JONES: I thought it was a friendly amendment (inaudible) the Senate Council.

MR. CIBULL: It's just clarifying the wording really.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah. That's all.

MR. JONES: Ernie, would you accept that that's a friendly amendment and we can go back to the Senate Council minutes on the friendly language that we actually came up with?

CHAIR: I would accept this also as a friendly amendment, yes.  
Anything else?

MR. CIBULL: I guess. Yeah. I would just like to commend Dr. Dembo and his Committee for making what was a total mess into a very rationale proposal, and I think he did an -- they did an outstanding job. I just want to commend them.

CHAIR: I plan to express my thanks to them as well, assuming this is passed. If it's not, I'll have a different view.

MR. CIBULL: My comments are not contingent on it passing.

MR. GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Chemistry.  
I just have one question. You prefaced all this with the discussion of who the Chair would be, and so do we currently know who the Chair will be or is that to be announced after this passes?

CHAIR: I think the issue of who specifically will be Chair is -- is, if I hate to use the word academic, but I think in this -- in this situation it's irrelevant to the -- to the action item that we have before us.

MR. GROSSMAN: Sure, except that Jeff began the whole discussion with the issue of who should Chair it.

CHAIR: Jeff, do you want to answer that?

MR. DEMBO: I'll answer that. In the Senate Council we did discuss that Jeannine Blackwell, while she graciously has given up her time, is -- is already involved in the Provost Search Committee as a co-Chair, so if and when this is passed it will be incumbent

on all of us to make sure that it's as quickly as possible.

MR. GROSSMAN: To be announced, in other words?

CHAIR: TBA.

MR. DEMBO: To be announced.

MR. GROSSMAN: TBA.

MR. DEMBO: Yes.

CHAIR: Okay. Are there any other comments or questions that you would like to raise or address to Jeff Dembo regarding this motion?  
(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Okay. There being none, I would like see if we could vote on the entire recommendation, both the -- the entire proposal, both recommendation one and two.  
Jeff, correct me if I'm wrong, by implication the Senate Rule change that also vetted through the Senate Council is included in this entire package; is that correct?

MR. DEMBO: (NODS HEAD AFFIRMATIVELY).

CHAIR: All right. All those in favor of this -- this package, please indicate by raising your hand.  
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: All those opposed, please raise your hand.  
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Any abstentions?  
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Okay. Motion carries.

MR. DEMBO: Thank you.

CHAIR: Now, I would like to offer my special thanks to Jeff Dembo, the ACMC Review Committee, but also to Jeannine Blackwell who as interim Chair of the ACMC Committee took on this responsibility and do so with due diligence. We certainly appreciate that -- that time and effort on her part.

Because Jeannine Blackwell has a meeting with the President currently and because she was interested in appearing for at least one of the action items that the -- that are being brought forward by the Academic Programs Committee, I would like to assert the prerogative of the Chair to move to item 4, and then move back to those items

under the third agenda item.

Okay. All of the proposals under this agenda item were brought to the Senate Council by the Academic Organization and Structure Committee and then forwarded on to the Senate by the Senate Council with -- with positive recommendations. These are a series of name changes, and I would like to ask Ernie Bailey if he would say a word or two each of these name changes as we proceed to dispose of them. Ernie.

MR. BAILEY: The first one listed here is a change in the name for the Mining Engineering Program, their Master's Degree and their Ph.D Degree, and they considered that Mining Engineering would become -- that the graduate programs in that area would become Mining Engineering and also Minerals Process, so to have a more accurate name for the program they are proposing this change.

The Academic Organization and Structure Committee met by E-mail basically, it seemed quite a simple proposal, quite reasonable. There was no routing sheet with it at the time and we weren't sure that it had been vetted by the faculty and the different Councils.

Since then we've gotten a routing sheet and I believe that that was posted online, and that was the only objection that the Committee found in connection with this, we weren't sure that all the faculty had sent it in. But it had been voted by the entire faculty of the -- of the College of Engineering, it was voted on -- re-voted on, actually, between April by the faculty of the Mining Engineering Department.

So there was nothing controversial about this proposal.

CHAIR: Yes. Please identify yourself?

MR. LINEBERRY: G.T. Lineberry, Mining Engineering.

I hate to bring up one small element of controversy, but the letter that I think was sent to you, Dr. Bailey, May the 4th of 2005 had erroneously stated that we wished to change the degree programs for the

Master's and the Doctorate to Mining & Minerals Engineering when, in fact, we really intended for it to be, and it is reflected as such in the earlier documentation, as simply MS and Ph.D. in Minerals Engineering. So if you go back to the original documentation with the forms for the Request for Change in the Master's Degree Program and the Senate Review and Consultation Summary Sheet you'll see that the name is MS and Ph.D. in Minerals Engineering, and this was simply a typographical error, and I'm -- I was sent here by my Chair who could not attend because he's traveling to -- in case this came up.

CHAIR: Did he decide to travel when he discovered this?

MR. LINEBERRY: He went to California. But he thought that this perhaps could come up because of the error he had made in his original memorandum to Dr. Bailey.

MR. BAILEY: The sheet that I have, the Request for Change, for example for the Doctoral Program. The old name is Mining Engineering, the new one it says Mining & Minerals Engineering.

CHAIR: We have on the floor a motion that has gone -- a proposal that has gone through the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils under the name that is listed here. It was my view that if the -- there is to be a change to simply Minerals Engineering that this proposal will need to go through those other bodies before the Senate sees this. It's not altogether clear to me that there is agreement within the Department of Mining & Engineering.

MR. LINEBERRY: I'll beg to differ. There's an agreement in the department there was error in the paperwork, so -- and I cannot argue against that.

MR. BAILEY: I think we'd have to see it again if it's a name change because, again, we -- we basically passed it by the departments, for example -- actually one of the questions came up was for Geology to look at it, and



then Geology faculty comment on it -- you know, I think the responsible thing would be to send it back through. Would you want to recommend that we withdraw this?

MR. LINEBERRY: I'd like to see it approved with Minerals in the hearing contingent on some sort of follow-up confirmation, if that's possible.

CHAIR: Ernie, what is your view as the Chair of the Academic Organization & Structure Committee?

MR. BAILEY: These are such minor things and seems like a small deal, but on the other hand sometimes a small deal sometimes you come up with an issue. I -- I'd almost prefer that if we're not going to vote on this one and bring it through -- and this paperwork or not that we wait. We could convene and we could change this, but it would -- it wouldn't be until the next Senate meeting this fall. I mean, that was one of the reasons we were kind of bringing it to you now because we're trying to get it through before the fall.

CHAIR: Yes.

MR. GARRITY: Tom Garrity, Medicine.

I'm on the Academic Organization & Structure Committee, and I've been on it long enough to see how small things can throw a monkey wrench into the works.

And I think Ernie is right, it probably needs to go back and be approved as -- as they want it approved at each step because that's the only assurance we have that everybody who might have some unpredictable sort of objection would have an opportunity to object.

And if it's gone through and been approved with some incorrect name, they can come back later on and say, we never approved this, and -- and it's just amazing sometimes to hear the kinds of objections that can arise.

So I think Ernie is right. I think the thing needs to go back and go through the steps with the proper paperwork.

MR. GROSSMAN: Do you need a motion to table?

CHAIR: We have a motion on the floor from the Senate Council with a positive recommendation as we understood the name change. A motion to table would be in order for those individuals who feel as Tom does.

MR. GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Chemistry.  
I move that we table this until it goes through the process again with the name change that the department originally intended.

CHAIR: Is there a second?

MR. DeLUCA: Second.

CHAIR: We have a motion to table, and all those in favor of tabling this please raise your hands.

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Those opposed?

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Any abstentions?

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: The item is tabled, and tabled indefinitely.

UNIDENTIFIED: That was the simplest one.

MR. BAILEY: The next one is also simple. It's a name change from Family Practice and Community Medicine. They want to change the name to Family and Community Medicine to reflect the academic aspects of the program. And in the letters that I got was that family practice was a service activity and they want to indicate that family medicine was the activities that -- the emphasis of the program; had a complete routing sheet that had been seen by the faculty, had been seen by the ACMC. We -- again, there were no objections raised to this one.

Are there any today?

CHAIR: Are there any?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: There being none, let's vote.

All that is in favor of the name change, please indicate by raising your hands.

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: All opposed.

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Any abstentions?

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: The motion carries.

MR. BAILEY: And the next one was the Center for Women's Health, and they wanted to change the name to the Center for the Advancement of Women's Health. This is a center that was created in the year 2000. They want to change the name because they believe the Center for the Advancement of Women's Health better reflects the name.

There is one other aspect of the proposal that was perhaps more significant was that they wanted to redefine the reporting line of the Director of the Center from the Chancellor of the Medical Center, which doesn't exist any more, to the Dean of the College of Medicine. At the time we didn't have a routing sheet attached to this. We asked the people that were making the proposal to go back and provide documentation, one, that the faculty were in support of this -- the name change, as well as the change in the routing structure. We also asked to get information about the response of Deans of the other colleges -- from the other Health Care -- what is it, Health Care Colleges. Yes. And -- and we did get that. I think we got an affirmative response. At the time of the Senate Council meeting, I think there was one -- there were two Deans that we had not heard back from yet, but there's no indication of any particular problem. People basically were very positive about the reported structure going to the Dean of Medicine.

CHAIR: Okay. We have a motion on the floor to undertake this name change. Are there questions that you'd like to raise?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: There being none, let's vote.

All those in favor of the name change -- change, please signify by raising your hands.

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Any opposed?  
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Any abstentions?  
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: That motion carries too.

MR. BAILEY: And the last one was a Bachelor of Health Science was formerly called Health Administration and they want to change the name to Clinical Leadership and Management.

Again, it came to us without a routing sheet. We saw no controversy in the name change. We -- we asked for a routing sheet; we also asked the people making the proposal to contact the Chair to get a response from the faculty and the Community Leadership and Development Department, since the name is similar. That department reported back that there -- or the Chair reported back that the faculty have no objections to that name change; there were no objections found.

CHAIR: Okay. I ask the Senators, are there any questions?  
Yes?

MR. JONES: Just to clarify, you did a get a routing sheet and the directly affected faculty in this unit here were supportive of that name change?

MR. BAILEY: Rebecca, did you post the routing -- I don't recall -- I did get a routing sheet back on this one, and I did get -- and independent of that I got a response back from Gary Hanson in the Community Leadership and Development Department stating that he had polled the faculty and what the response was.

MR. JONES: That's not the faculty of this unit, though.

MR. BAILEY: Correct.

MR. JONES: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED: (INAUDIBLE).

MR. BAILEY: There were, what, three faculty that were involved, yes. That's right. There was -- actually, I have a letter from each of them endorsing this name change.

CHAIR: Any other questions?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Let's vote on this -- on this name change.

All those in favor of the name change, please indicate by raising your hand.  
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: All those opposed, like sign?  
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Any abstentions?  
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: This motion carries.  
I would like to go back to Item No. 3, if I can get some assistance here. These items have been -- were brought to the Senate Council, all with positive recommendations by the Academic Programs Committee.

Bob Grossman is here, and I would like Bob, if he would simply introduce and say a few words about each of these.

MR. GROSSMAN: Sure. Do you want me to talk about all them and then we vote --

CHAIR: Talk about them each individually.

MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. The first one, the dance minor and certification is a proposal coming out of education. It's actually -- it's a dance education minor and certification, but there was -- there was no controversy over this one at all and the Committee voted unanimously to approve it.

The -- all the appropriate routing sheets came to the -- to the Committee, so we recommend unanimously that it be approved.

CHAIR: Are there any questions you'd like to address to Bob or to raise as part of a concern on this particular item?  
(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: If not, let's -- let's vote. All those in favor of the motion relating to dance minor and certification please indicate by raising their hands.  
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: All those opposed like sign.  
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Any abstentions?  
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: That motion carries.

MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. The next item, the Master of Arts and Teaching World Languages, this is a proposal coming out of Arts & Sciences, the Modern and Classical Languages Department, Lang -- Modern and Classical Languages, Literatures and Cultures Department to be complete and it's -- was crafted with heavy input from -- the college and department of education's name escapes me at the moment. John --

MS. BLACKWELL: Curriculum & Instruction.

MR. GROSSMAN: Curriculum & Instruction. Yes. When it first came to us the proposal suggested that administratively this program would be housed in the Graduate School. When that question was raised as to why it was being housed in the Graduate School and not in the MCL Department and Arts & Sciences, it was apparently because of a misunderstanding about CPE requirements versus University organization.

Anyway, the -- it is now going to be housed in the Modern Classical Languages Department.

A routing sheet did come to us but some -- there was some controversy about this at the Senate Council level. The routing sheet from the Arts & Sciences side is completely proper in terms of the faculty at each level approving it. And, as I said, the Curriculum Instruction Department in the College of Education had very heavy input into crafting this proposal.

Because this was coming out of Arts & Sciences, though, apparently Dean of the College of Education and the Associate Dean there made the decision that it wouldn't need to go through normal approval channels in the College Education and this later led to something of a -- of a tempest at the -- at the Senate Council.

But in the end the Senate Council voted six to one, I think, that the proposal should come forward anyway with a positive recommendation because -- because it -- this was an interdisciplinary program, so approval

methods were not quite clear. It could have been done better, certainly. Everyone agreed on that, but that it shouldn't hold up what was -- a program that everyone agreed was a worthwhile one.

So the program is a new program in Arts & Sciences that is intended eventually to replace a program in education that has been -- recently been rather moribund anyway, I think is the best way say that.

Would you say that's a correct, Jeannine, way of describing it?

MS. BLACKWELL: A track of one program.

MR. GROSSMAN: A track of one program. One track of one program, that track having been moribund recently. And it's been decided that the -- the best place to try to revitalize preparing new foreign language teachers is in the Modern Classical Language Literatures & Cultures Department, and that's the -- the rationale for this proposal. So...

CHAIR: Okay. Do we have comment or questions about this?

John Thelin.

MR. THELIN: Yes. Just to elaborate a little bit on Bob's good summary, there was no compliance with the informational requirements of the Senate; simply to provide information to the College of Education faculty.

Second, the issue of whether this should have been run through the College of Education Curriculum Committee and full faculty, the determination on that was made by the Dean of Education, the Associate Dean of Education and the Dean of Graduate School.

Now, they could get their heads together and they could decide that 2 plus 2 equals 5 and agree among themselves, but that doesn't make it accurate or correct.

This will still have certification through the College of Education faculty. There was no opportunity for other units in the Curriculum and Instruction Department to be included, so whether -- the courtesy or

the letter of the regulations I don't think were followed, and, with all due respect, Dean Blackwell is a member of the program faculty that's suggesting this and she said to the Senate Council that she had been the Department Chair of Modern Languages when this was originally circulated.

So I don't think it's the best days for shared governance in terms of the faculty in terms of the curriculum now.

MS. BLACKWELL: Just a point of clarification: I was the Chair of one of the four constituent departments before it was merged into Modern & Classical Languages, and the proposal did not go forward for several years. That was the initial meeting that we had with Curriculum & Instruction, was back in 2000.

CHAIR: Ted Fiedler, do you have anything to add to this? I know you appeared before the Senate Council speaking on behalf of this proposal when it was originally brought to the Senate Council.

MR. FIEDLER: Well, actually, the only thing I have to add here is that this is an important new initiative. We have approximately 23 perspective students who are waiting for this Master of Arts Degree to be approved, and I think that it would be shame if it were now held back because of a decision that was made as far as circulating or not circulating it through the Curriculum Committee and the College of Education.

I, as the initiating Chair, did make a point of asking the people in education -- or of informing them that this perhaps ought to be sent through their Curriculum Committee and at one point I was informed, no, it's not necessary.

So I have nothing further to say on the procedural issue, but the content of this proposal is certainly very solid and I guess understand that there might be concerns about procedures being followed but I think the issue now ought to be: Is this a worthwhile program or not.

CHAIR: Thank you.



Davy Jones?

MR. JONES: Ernie, at the level of the Senate Council, perhaps you could advise us, you had some interaction on the point that John brought up -- some interaction back with the Dean of the College of Education, and would it be your estimation that that Dean now has a heightened sensitivity to the procedures to follow in the future?

CHAIR: If you mean by that when I did not get a -- an initial response from the -- the Dean of the College of Education, I then wrote the very following day a second e-mail in which I suggested that if he did not follow a certain course of action it is li -- it was likely that the Senate Council would view that with a skance, yes, indeed, I do believe that he has heightened sensitivity. Whether that response, you know, in a direct fashion to the concerns that John Thelin brought to the Senate Council or -- is quite another issue.

Enid Waldhart?

MS. WALDHART: Communication.  
My question has to do with certification. If the certification for these mastered trained students goes through education, doesn't -- doesn't it have to have the entire College of Education -- I mean, doesn't that have to be part of it?

This is just asking a question. I -- I -- because it seems to me that -- that if the certification is approved by the College of Education that that stamp has to be part of what we're doing.

CHAIR: Jeannine, could you say a work about that?

MS. BLACKWELL: I think has more --

MR. FIEDLER: I think I'm in a better position to address that. The certification -- shall we say the formal part of certification that is getting teachers placed into the school, et cetera, is being handled by academic services and teacher certifications but the content of what's going on is being handled by MCL. Okay.

We just don't want to, you know, create new facilities, et cetera, the students pay some kind of fees who get processed by education. But the substance of this program is run entirely from MCL. Okay?

MS. WALDHART: Okay.

CHAIR: Enid, does that satisfy you?

MS. WALDHART: Yes.

CHAIR: Okay. Are there other concerns, other questions?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: If not, let's vote. We have a motion relating to a new Master's of Arts in teaching world languages. All those in favor, please indicate by raising your hand.

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: All those opposed like sign?

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Any abstentions?

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: The motion carries.

MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. The next proposal is for a graduate certificate in Health Administration, and I have -- my conscious has recently been raised. This is a program. This is a certificate.

The rules surrounding certificates are actually not very well articulated, or if they are they're not very well followed. But, in any case, this particular certificate is a program -- I'm sorry, it's not a program; it's a certificate, being created by the Martin School for student in the College of Nursing. It's for stu -- students in the College of Nursing who would like a credential that says that they have taken some courses in Health Administration.

There -- they need nine credits, which can be -- with two required courses and then one or two other courses to add up to nine -- to the nine credits, and if they take such nine credits and they graduate from the College of Nursing they will earn the certificate.

It is currently open only to students in the College of Nursing, and next

year -- early next year we will have a companion graduate certificate offered by Nursing that will be for students in the Martin School, but that is not on the floor right now because it came -- didn't come through in time.

The -- some of the questions that came up about this are why is it exclusive to nursing students? If another student from a different college decides that they -- takes these three courses, why shouldn't they get the graduate Certificate in Health Administration also. And the answer -- well, is -- let's see. I don't see the person whose name I've forgotten now who put this -- brought this proposal forward.

MS. BLACKWELL: Ed Jennings.

MR. GROSSMAN: Ed Jennings?

MS. BLACKWELL: Yes.

MR. GROSSMAN: Is Ed Jennings here?

(NO RESPONSE)

MR. GROSSMAN: No. Because he would probably be better able to express this than I. I guess he -- he said that they created this specifically in collaboration with Nursing, and that's why they are making it for nursing students. They are concerned about a flood of students from other departments that will -- or from other colleges who will come in and swamp their -- their courses, although they do have enrollment limits on their courses anyway.

They do have other reciprocal graduate certificate with other colleges. For example, they have one with Pharmacy. Apparently, according to Dean Blackwell, these restricted enrollment graduate certificates are actually quite common around the University, and so there's nothing unusual about it in this particular case.

But that was a concern that came up, and so I felt like I should express it. It came up both at the committee level and at the Senate Council level.

Other than that concern and some concern about some language in the proposal

program versus admis -- an admission and things like, which was all dealt with at the Senate Council level, the proposal was approved.

CHAIR: All right. Are there any questions you'd like to raise?

Yes?

MR. FORGUE: Ray Forgue, Family Studies.

This is clarification. Do these certificate designations go on a transcript?

MS. BLACKWELL: Yes, they do. They're approved in Graduate School, and we pass that on to the Registrar.

CHAIR: Any other questions?

Yes?

MS. HARRISON: Anne Harrison, Health Sciences.

Are these nine credits that are in addition to the degree that they would be getting in nursing or are they incorporated into the credits that they have to have?

MS. BLACKWELL: They're in addition to.

CHAIR: Okay. Other questions?

Phil Kraemer?

MR. KRAEMER: Phil Kraemer.

A question about if Martin School would decide to abandon this, would they need the agreement of the College of Nursing? Or who has ultimate control if there's going to a change in this in the future?

MS. BLACKWELL: If there's a change in the graduate certificate, it goes through the regular kind of proposal and approval procedure. It would go to Graduate Council if there are revisions, and it would be duly voted on and then reported, again, to the Senate through the Senate Council. So if there are any changes, it takes that normal route.

CHAIR: Other questions?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: If not, let's vote.

All those in favor of the motion to initiate a Graduate Certificate in Health Administration please indicate by raising your hands.

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: All those opposed?

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Any abstentions?

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: That motion carries, too.

MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Our final program is the -- it's a Doctorate in Physical Therapy; correct? No Doctor in Physical Therapy? Okay. A Doctor in Physical Therapy.

This is an upgrading of a current Master's Program in Physical Therapy. The -- it has gone through all the regular approval channels. It's been approved by everyone. There were some questions about why this propo -- why it was necessary to upgrade this program from a Master to a Doctorate, and basically it's to keep -- well, one reason, anyway, is to keep up with the Joneses. Everyone's doing it, and we need to also because otherwise people will stop coming here for Physical Therapy.

It involves adding additional courses and credits. There's also a compelling clinical reason to do this. These days people are often going straight to a physical therapist as their first line of -- as the first sort of the medical provider they will see and there is need, apparently, for additional training for physical therapists to recognize medical conditions that might need intervention by other specialists.

So there was some concern about essentially grade inflation of -- in the degree, but I think all tho -- those concerns were satisfied by Dr. Malone, at least to the satisfaction of most members of the committee, and Senate Council I think passed this unanimously also, and Dr. Malone can answer any of your questions.

CHAIR: Ray Forgue.

MR. FORGUE: Ray Forgue, Family Studies.

How does this relate to licensure, then, for a physical therapist?

MR. MALONE: At the present time the key is to be a graduate under an accredited program, so it has no impact on that specifically.

CHAIR: Other questions?  
(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Okay. Let's vote on favor of the motion relating to the Doctor in Physical Therapy.  
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: You've anticipated me. Thank you.  
All those opposed?  
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Any abstentions?  
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: The motion carries.  
We now have a number of curricular items. These, too, have all been forwarded with a positive recommendation from the Senate Council.

The first deals with the program change for the Bachelor of Health Science in Health Administration or Clinical -- help me out someone.  
(MEMBERS RESPOND)

CHAIR: Now all together: One, two, three.  
Okay. We also have two -- two accompanying course changes, CLM 405 and CLM 444, which we'll take up in just a moment -- and 445.  
Sorry.

Could we consider first the -- the program change itself? Is there anyone here who would want to speak to this change?  
Yes?

MS. GONZALEZ: Lori Gonzalez, College of Health Sciences.

This is a program that was a Bachelor's Degree Program in our college, and the faculty that taught in this program were moved to the College of Public Health when it was formed and we had asked that we retain the Bachelor's Degree at that time.

We since have formed an Advisory Committee that involves health care providers and HR providers from hospitals and community college representatives.

This degree is now designed -- instead of being designed for someone who comes through -- straight through four years and wants to be a middle manager in a

hospital situation, we are designing this program to be a career ladder for individuals who have some sort of Associate Clinical degree. They may be a respiratory tech or a reg tech, and they have to have had worked in a clinic for one year. They come into this program and get their Bachelor's degree so that they learn about finance, quality assurance, human resources and all the things that you might expect someone would need to know if they were managing a lab or a rehab clinic.

CHAIR: Thank you, Lori.  
All right. Are there others questions?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Okay. Let us vote just on the -- on the program change itself, and then take up the -- the three courses.

All those in favor of the motion to -- to approve the program change for BHS and Health Administration, please indicate by raising your hands.

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Any opposed?  
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Any abstentions?  
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Okay. That motion carries.  
Let's turn then to the three course proposals. Let me indicate that all three of these proposals have been brought to the Senate with a Senate Council recommendation. The one minor change that we did introduce in our discussion and received assent from -- from Lori and others relates to CLM 405. We took note of the fact that CLM 405 had an identical course description as CSC 605, and what we did was to adjust that description to include a statement at the end of the first sentence that said: As appropriate for an upper division undergraduate course. This, in our mind, then did sufficiently distinguish one from the other so that there would not be confusion on the part of students.

I would like to take all three of these proposals as a single package.

Are there any questions that you have? Is there anything else, Lori, that you would like to add to this?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: There being none, let's vote.

All those in favor of these three course proposals that part of the program change in BHS and Health Administration, please indicate by raising your hands.

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: All those opposed?

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Any abstentions?

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: These three carry.

We have three last course -- course proposals. Course proposal one is CPH 920, Advanced Environmental Health. This course was reviewed by the Senate Council. It comes to you with a positive recommendation. If you have any questions relating to it, you may see the documentation on pages 202 to 211.

This is a new course proposal for CPH 920, Advanced Health -- Advanced Environmental Health with a course description that says: This professional seminar in environmental health is designed to provide comprehensive coverage of the principles upon which the environmental health field relies.

There were -- there were no issues or controversies in the Senate Council relating to this.

Tom?

MR. GARRITY: Tom Garrity, Medicine.

Just a point of information: I've not -- I can't remember ever seeing a 900-level course. Where does that come into play? Is that a...

CHAIR: As I understand it, 800 and 900-level courses are those that predominately populate professional -- professional programs.



MR. GARRITY: Okay. I've seen the 800 frequently, but not 900. So...

MS. SCOTT: And I would just like to add that these three courses are courses that we would normally circulate via the Web site, but they came through after the deadlines so that's why we're hearing them at last Senate meeting, so they don't have to wait until Fall, that's the idea.

CHAIR: Davey Jones?

MR. JONES: Can I just to follow-up, just for my own edification too, when people are proposing these how did they decide whether to propose it as not 820 but as 920? What's the difference within the professional courses of the 800 versus the 900?

MS. SCOTT: That is outlined in the Senate Rules. That's one of the things that they refer to.

CHAIR: Davey, you should have the Senate Rules. That you should ask, makes me quake, to be honest.

Any other questions?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: All right. All those in favor of CPH 920 as a new course, please indicate by raising your hands.

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: All opposed like sign?

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Any abstentions?

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: The motion carries.

Okay. The last two are EDS 651 and 652. These are Distance Education Programs. Once again, you may find the appropriate material for them on pages 212 to 252.

The course description for 651 and 652 are both fairly lengthy so I won't -- I won't read them. They emanate from the College of Education, and the specific department or division of Special Education and Rehabilitation Counseling. These are being added to their graduate program.

Is there any discussion or questions you'd like to raise relating to

them?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: If there are none let's turn then to a vote. All in favor of -- of these two new course proposals, please indicate by raising your hands.

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: All opposed.

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Any abstentions.

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: The two proposals, then, are carried.

MS. WILLOUGHBY: Ernie, if I may?

CHAIR: Yes.

MS. WILLOUGHBY: Jeanmarie Willoughby.

CHAIR: Yes.

MS. WILLOUGHBY: We have on (inaudible) notification about a new Russian course that had been passed through but it wasn't on the agenda or on the list. Is there a reason for that?

MS. SCOTT: What was the course?

MS. WILLOUGHBY: RUS 275.

MS. SCOTT: All the RUS courses and MCL courses were pending the approval of the MATWL program today.

MS. WILLOUGHBY: Okay. That makes sense.

CHAIR: Okay. Just by way of conclusion: First a reminder again, those of you who are neither cycling in nor cycling out of this program may wish to go to the tool design workshop on bicycle planning in the Student Center 231 today and it will continue past Senate adjournment.

MR. GROSSMAN: Six o'clock.

CHAIR: Until six --

MR. GROSSMAN: Until six o'clock.

CHAIR: Until six o'clock. Thank you.

Secondly, I want to issue my special thanks to both Rebecca Scott and to Megan Cormney -- Megan is sitting in front here -- for their invaluable assistance with both the Senate Council and the Senate work this year.

We thought about visiting upon -- upon them the need to put together this

entire packet, and I decided to be kind at the end of the academic year. But I do -- would like to thank them profusely for their -- their staunch assistance.

Second, deep gratitude again to Gifford Blyton for another year as Parliamentarian. He's getting so old that even I can't count how many years been involved with the -- with this University and with the -- with the Senate. We -- we certainly applaud you, and I think quite literally, Gifford, for another -- another year as our Parliamentarian.

(MEMBERS APPLAUD)

CHAIR: Special acknowledge, too, to departing Senate Council members: Michael Kennedys -- Kennedy, Braphus Kaalund and Ernie Bailey for their stellar service and unique gifts over this past year and, indeed, over their entire tenure on the Senate Council. We certainly are going to miss their -- their advice and their -- their counsel.

I'd also like to issue my thanks to the committee chairs and committee members. They're the very life blood of the University Senate operations. Certainly, Ernie and -- Ernie Bailey and many others who have -- have done their service as committee chair have -- have made my work and have made the Senate work much easier for their efforts.

Finally, gratitude to those Senators whose terms are expiring. I'm going to take note of this list and then quickly retract the omnibus expression of gratitude because some people who are -- whose terms are expiring have been re-elected, and others will continue on by virtue of their being on the Senate. Thanks to Jim Albisetti, Lynley Anderman, Anthony Baxter, Ruth Beattie, Suketu Bhavsar, George Blanford, Michael Braun, Patricia Burkhart, Jody Deem, Phil DeSimone, Mary Duke, Matt Gabel, Tom Garrity, Don Gross, Bob Grossman, Mark Hanson, Samuel Jasper, Chester Jennings, Judith Lesnaw, Katherine McCormick, Doug Michael, Don

Perrier, Jeanmarie Rouhier-Willoughby, Tate  
Tsang, Henry Vanconez, forget me, Steven --  
Steve Yates and Aaron Yelowitz.

Again, some of you will be back  
again this year in various roles. I  
certainly want to thank you for your  
steadfast service and we look forward to a  
busy and I hope productive and rewarding year  
next year.

Thank you so much.  
(MEMBERS APPLAUD)

CHAIR: Meeting adjourned.

\* \* \* \* \*

THEREUPON THE MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY OF  
KENTUCKY SENATE COUNCIL WAS ADJOURNED AT

4:20

P.M.

\* \* \* \* \*

STATE OF KENTUCKY )  
COUNTY OF CAMPBELL )

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

My commission expires: January 23, 2007.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 25th day of May, 2005.

---

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