

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE

---

---

Regular Session

May 5, 2003  
3:04 p.m.

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

Dr. Jeffrey Dembo, Chair

\*\*\*\*\*

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**

FREELANCE COURT REPORTERS & VIDEO SERVICES

STEPHANIE K. SCHLOEMER, PRESIDENT

10 NORTH UPPER STREET

P. O. BOX 85, LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40588

**(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197**

e-mail: [arsi@alltel.net](mailto:arsi@alltel.net)

\*\*\*\*\*

***JEFFREY DEMBO, CHAIR***

***GIFFORD BLYTON, PARLIAMENTARIAN***

***REBECCA SCOTT, SECRETARY TO SENATE***

***SUSAN WILLIAMS, SARGENT-AT-ARMS***

***STEPHANIE K. SCHLOEMER, COURT REPORTER***

---



UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 years as Chair, and your strong hand and sensible  
2 guiding force, Brad, has always been a help to the  
3 University Senate and a heartfelt thanks for all your  
4 good work.

5 (Applause)

6 MR. CANON: This is my last  
7 Senate meeting ever. I am retiring at the end of the  
8 year.

9 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Things are  
10 starting to spill over and we can't accomplish all of  
11 the agenda items, I think that's what we'll  
12 entertain... To try to keep that in mind as we discuss  
13 each item.

14 The first item on the agenda,  
15 Professor Waldhart.

16 MS. WALDHART: The first  
17 item on the agenda is a group of changes that have come  
18 from the governing regulations. There are many, many,  
19 many changes that have been offered and we thought they  
20 were very, very good. We've had a lot of discussion in  
21 the Senate Council. We offered some changes that has  
22 to do with that point in addition to the ones that had  
23 already been there, and I believe that many of you have  
24 offered yet more changes that will go into that. I  
25 would move for approval of these changes. And Linda is  
26 here to answer questions as we go through, to answer  
27 questions if you have questions about them.

1 I didn't put them all up because it's  
2 page after page after page; and you've read them and so  
3 you know how complex it is. But these seem to be  
4 reasonable changes.

5 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: To help put  
6 this in perspective, the governing regulations  
7 currently say this:

8 "...that the governing regulations  
9 may be amended..."

10 (Technical difficulties) Oops. Hang on a second.  
11 There we go --

12 "...may be amended by the Board of  
13 Trustees providing a certain amount  
14 of time has elapsed. The President  
15 or the Senate or SGA through the  
16 President may recommend amendments to  
17 the governing regulations."

18 So the Senate, therefore, does have the capability to  
19 propose these to the Board of Trustees. The Academic  
20 Planning and Priorities Committee was charged with  
21 taking a look at that, specifically with the idea of  
22 looking at the elucidation of shared governance, which  
23 turns out to be one of the core values of the new  
24 strategic plan for the University. The members of the  
25 Committee you've met with. Dr. Hahn has addressed the  
26 Senate before as a discussion item.

27 Linda, can you describe briefly how

1 that committee processed these or talked about them?

2 MS. WORLEY: Certainly. The  
3 Committee actually first met -- and we were going to  
4 put together some guidelines for the Provost search --  
5 but after that became moot, we moved to look at and  
6 define issues of: What is *joint governance*; what is  
7 *shared governance*?

8 Members of the Committee felt -- we  
9 started combing through the governing regs to find  
10 instances where work of the faculty, power to the  
11 faculty was referred to. We wanted to make sure that  
12 in certain sections of the government regs when the  
13 faculty actually have power to initiate or advise and  
14 to recommend to start things up, it didn't seem as  
15 though it was totally an advisory thing. I brought a  
16 couple of the things we did. You could break them into  
17 two parts.

18 One was what I like to call pure  
19 housekeeping. We went through and edited the governing  
20 regs so there would be an internal consistency. Very  
21 often we would find in one section definitions that  
22 were not carried through or were not in previous  
23 sections, even though they were meant to carry through.  
24 But sometimes when you read this and you would find an  
25 expansion of the same wording, you did it because you  
26 can't assume somebody will have read the whole thing.  
27 So part of that kind of housekeeping is to get the

1 consistency. Another part of housekeeping was to  
2 clarify and to get rid of inconsistencies where one  
3 part would say one thing, one was another. We also  
4 tried to keep parallel structures going so that  
5 internally the document made sense as well, simply as  
6 changing it to reflect the new Provost model. So those  
7 are the very simple, I think, editing kinds of things.

8                   The second is we did look at where  
9 instances of shared governance, when they were talked  
10 about, and we based our work -- we wanted to underscore  
11 those instances. We wanted to underscore the fact that  
12 through Kentucky law, the faculty and the Senate  
13 actually are the educational policy-making authorities  
14 going up through the Board of Trustees.

15                   Another thing we did, particularly  
16 through Davy Jones' immense work -- he took up these  
17 archives; he found all sorts of older documents, flow  
18 charts talking about how faculty could initiate things,  
19 Board of Trustee minutes that have never been rescinded  
20 and were actually on the books but nobody really knew  
21 about them. So we did those two things. Trying to do  
22 editing as well as taking instances where we do have  
23 shared power and making sure that came into it.

24                   CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So at this  
25 stage it's already on the floor for discussion.

26                   Are there any points you'd like to  
27 bring or questions to ask? (No response.)

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1                   So at this stage, if you were to vote  
2 on sending these forward, they would go to the Board of  
3 Trustees as recommendations for changing in the GRs.

4                   MR. JONES: It would go to  
5 the President.

6                   CHAIRMAN DEMBO: To the  
7 President as the Chair of the Senate--

8                   MR. JONES: Yes.

9                   CHAIRMAN DEMBO: --to  
10 deliver them to the Board of Trustees.

11                  MR. JONES: It's my  
12 understanding that there are some other things going on  
13 with the governing regs right now, too, like the  
14 cleanup bill that was passed relating to the community  
15 college system. And so there are some things like that  
16 are also being drafted that this would dovetail into.

17                  CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. So  
18 it's already on the floor. Any other discussion? (No  
19 response.)

20                  All in favor of submitting the GRs as  
21 listed, signify by saying "aye."

22 ("AYE" VOICE VOTE: ALL)

23                  CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Any  
24 opposed?

25 ("NAY" VOICE VOTE: NONE)

26                  CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. So  
27 that's unanimous. Thank you.

1                   Okay. The next item was a leftover  
2 from last meeting where the Senate voted to table the  
3 graduation contract pending the answering -- answering  
4 two items. One was the resources needed to implement  
5 and monitor the proposal and the second was where the  
6 decision-making authority should rest when a student is  
7 caught and needs to have some remedy, that is, waiving  
8 or substituting courses versus paying tuition.

9                   Enid, would you like to talk about  
10 it?

11 (PowerPoint presentation:)

12                   MS. WALDHART: As we looked  
13 at these, we decided that there were a couple of things  
14 that needed attention.

15                   We recommended that there be a  
16 meeting of four people: a department chair, somebody  
17 from the Dean's office, somebody from the Provost's  
18 office, and a student involved in considering anytime  
19 those kinds of changes should be made. The final  
20 decision would rest with the Dean of the College based  
21 on the information that is there.

22                   Prior to this meeting, as you see  
23 here, the student should have talked and the advisor  
24 should have looked at the kinds of things that would be  
25 available, particularly Item 7 in the contract, making  
26 sure that the course was simply not available to the  
27 student so that the student who didn't want to take a

1 course at eight o'clock or whatever would not get  
2 excused from it if that student had had the course  
3 available at the time. So this idea of having an  
4 appeals committee, we thought, was a very good idea.

5 We also thought that there needed to  
6 be staff support. And one of the questions that we had  
7 about resources, that we wanted to make sure that the  
8 Provost would provide support, had to do with providing  
9 a staff support person. We also had some additional  
10 questions about support, but this one was particularly  
11 important, a half-time position beginning next fall to  
12 deal with these kinds of issues. Now, as we looked at  
13 this, in addition to this, the Provost responded the  
14 staff member was not a problem, or at least it didn't  
15 seem to be, at least for the first two years. He  
16 thought that a four-person committee was too many. And  
17 I guess that's one of the things that we will talk  
18 about here, if you want to. Okay.

19 The Senate Council recommendation was  
20 actually not that we try to implement the whole thing  
21 now but rather that we start this with select  
22 departments or programs so that we could try it out and  
23 see if we would like to have the representation of  
24 programs across the University so that it wouldn't be  
25 just all in one College so that any peculiarities that  
26 might result would not be about the College but rather  
27 that departments or programs would volunteer to

1 participate in this in a trial period of three years.  
2 We had talked about four years, but they would go all  
3 the way through. But at the end of the third year, we  
4 would know whether it looked like people were on track  
5 to graduate. And then you could talk about other kinds  
6 of things to do that. Also, we would recommend that  
7 all departments and programs put together curricular  
8 maps and that those should be available by the fall of  
9 2003.

10                               So those were the Senate Council  
11 recommendations. Provost Neitzel may want to respond  
12 specifically to the comments he had made, but these are  
13 the recommendations that we offer about the graduation  
14 contract.

15                               CHAIRMAN DEMBO: I'll offer  
16 one thing and then I'll call on Tony Stoeppel, the Co-  
17 Chair of the Graduation Contract Committee.

18                               There was quite a bit of discussion  
19 at the Senate Council because I think -- and I don't  
20 like to speak for all Senate Council members; please  
21 speak up if I'm not. But that, intuitively, there's a  
22 lot of merit to looking at the contract. But there  
23 still were some sticking points, especially in terms of  
24 resources, what it would take, what could make sure  
25 that we can get a full start on it if we were to do it  
26 across the board, and that's why the pilot came to mind  
27 as one way to manage it.

1 Tony, what else could you add to  
2 that?

3 MR. STOEPPPEL: I think  
4 everyone would agree that the curricular map is a good  
5 idea and if all programs had those, that that's a great  
6 starting point and that's part of the recommendation.  
7 And then doing this pilot, I think that's a prudent way  
8 to get into this.

9 People that want to get into a  
10 graduation contract can then start getting into that.  
11 Programs that are a little skeptical, they can take a  
12 step back to see how this plays itself out. But I  
13 think that the part of the graduation contract, the  
14 curricular map, that's going to get done, and then any  
15 questions that might arise on how this is going to work  
16 out with the graduation contract, we can see that  
17 through the pilot.

18 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Questions?  
19 Professor Grossman?

20 MR. GROSSMAN: Bob  
21 Grossman, Chemistry.

22 Are you recommending that for the  
23 issue of who decides what to do when the University  
24 decided the contract was not upheld? Are you  
25 recommending that we institute Dr. Neitzel's  
26 suggestion? That wasn't clear to me at all. You had a  
27 proposal and then you said, here's Dr. Neitzel's

1 response, and I wasn't sure what you were recommending  
2 in the end.

3 MS. WALDHART: Do you want  
4 to go back? The recommendation from the Senate Council  
5 was that we'd still have the four-person committee. We  
6 felt that the committee was needed to explain and to  
7 provide enough diversity to consider all kinds of  
8 issues might be at stake in a particular case rather  
9 than just leaving it up to the individual Dean to do  
10 that. Not that we don't think Dean's could do so, but  
11 we were very concerned about inconsistencies that would  
12 occur and a four-person committee we thought would  
13 help.

14 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And  
15 how is this committee supposed to make a decision? I  
16 mean, is it a majority vote or the Provost gets to  
17 decide in the end, or the Dean gets to decide in the  
18 end or what? Does the student get a vote about what  
19 happens?

20 MS. WALDHART: The final  
21 decision -- no. The final decision--

22 MR. GROSSMAN: This is what  
23 you're recommending. I see. So does this also mean  
24 that the Dean gets to decide who gets to pay the  
25 tuition? If the Committee decides that the student  
26 needs to stay another semester, does the Dean decide  
27 who gets to pay the tuition?

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Your  
2 question is a good one. I think in the end--

3 MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you.  
4 (Laughter)

5 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Yeah. I  
6 think in the end, this is one of those things that  
7 would have to be worked out along the way because this  
8 is why at least having a committee -- Ultimately, the  
9 Dean and the Provost can decide to do whatever they  
10 want to do, because that's the case right now. Right  
11 now, Deans can waive or substitute requirements at  
12 their will because they represent the academic interest  
13 of the college.

14 In this situation, one would hope  
15 that this four-person committee, including the student,  
16 would have some say in the matter. The student may,  
17 him or herself, present a very convincing case as to  
18 why they can't possibly go another semester to school.  
19 They're being called into the military, who knows what.

20 MR. GROSSMAN: I just -- I  
21 can't imagine a situation where a Dean will say, okay,  
22 you can go another semester. I'll pay.

23 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Provost  
24 Neitzel would like to respond directly to that.

25 MR. NEITZEL: Well, I think  
26 this has always been the issue.

27 Bob is correct. I would recommend

1 that whoever -- that funding a decision about providing  
2 tuition needs to be in line with who makes that  
3 decision. Otherwise, I don't think it works. And I'm  
4 fine with this as long as the -- this would be a very  
5 reasonable way to go, but I think that the decision  
6 that the Dean makes does have to be one then that  
7 either the College or the unit covers in what I think  
8 will be very rare instances, the tuition obligation  
9 that might be associated with that extra course.

10                   The experience that I'm familiar with  
11 at other universities -- Tony knows this better,  
12 probably, than any of us. It's very, very seldom  
13 there's extra tuition paid because the decision is made  
14 either that some substitute will work or that there's  
15 another way to finesse the definition of the  
16 requirement. But if the programs define the curricular  
17 maps, if the programs are responsible for scheduling  
18 the courses, if the programs are responsible for  
19 advising the majors, it does seem to me we ought to  
20 keep all the decision and responsibility for it as low  
21 in the hierarchy as possible. So I think this would be  
22 very reasonable; but I think we ought to clarify, then,  
23 that the Dean makes the decision about whether it is at  
24 the college or a unit level that the tuition is  
25 assessed.

26                   CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Any other  
27 comments about this specific point or questions?

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1                   Okay. There were some other hands  
2 up. Is it about a separate facet of this? So where do  
3 you want to go with this? This is on the floor. Yes,  
4 sir?

5                                   MR. YATES: Steve Yates,  
6 Chemistry department.

7                   Last time we discussed this, I think  
8 people saw some merit in the proposal, particularly the  
9 curricular maps seemed like a very good idea.  
10 Information was presented from the University of Iowa  
11 and it was also mentioned that Indiana University had  
12 implemented such a thing. I happened to have dinner  
13 last week with two faculty members from Indiana  
14 University -- and I won't say that it spoiled our  
15 dinner, but we discussed Grad Pact, and it was,  
16 according to these faculty members, it was another  
17 failure.

18                                   At the end of this period when they  
19 instituted this program, it was told to the parents of  
20 students that if they came to Indiana University and  
21 followed the program, in four years their students  
22 would -- their children would be guaranteed a degree,  
23 which is basically what is being proposed here.

24                                   In the end, it didn't work. And this  
25 is not the picture that I got from Indiana -- from the  
26 anecdotal information about what happened at Indiana.  
27 We were told it was not renewed because of computer

1 problems and the costs involved, but apparently at the  
2 end of this experiment at Indiana, it wasn't favored by  
3 the faculty, it was certainly disliked by advisories,  
4 and the dean's students didn't even like it. And the  
5 estimate was that there was something like ten percent  
6 of the students that were really impacted by it, who  
7 were in the contract at the end. And I really, before  
8 I vote on it, I'd like to see some follow up on this to  
9 really get the straight scoop. Was it withdrawn by a  
10 vote of Indiana University or indeed what we heard the  
11 way things evolved?

12 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: I can  
13 answer that, Steve, for you.

14 I spoke with Bob Enod, who is my  
15 counterpart for the faculty Senate there. Because it  
16 was a President-mandated event without distinct  
17 generation from the students or the faculty, they  
18 didn't feel like they had a choice. So what he told me  
19 was, in the end, because of the computer-related  
20 problems, it served as a handy excuse, basically, to  
21 kill it.

22 MR. YATES: So it was a  
23 failure, then?

24 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So it was  
25 a failure because there was no buy-in from the faculty.  
26 So technically speaking, they did run into software  
27 problems. That is true that they would have to upgrade

1 their PeopleSoft product. From our point of view here,  
2 SIS, as I understand it from Jackie Hagar, already has  
3 the capability to do degree tracking; and then there's  
4 a new pilot program they're running as well. So I  
5 don't think we'd run into the same software problems.

6 We're talking really now about the  
7 essence of whether you, the faculty and students, think  
8 that this is a good thing for the University of  
9 Kentucky. Because the experience at Iowa was  
10 dramatically different.

11 MR. YATES: Well, I have to  
12 question that also, because what variables were  
13 retained in order to make sure that it was a valid  
14 experiment. Perhaps it was just that these curricular  
15 maps make the big difference in graduation rates there.  
16 I don't know.

17 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Phil, then  
18 Mike.

19 MR. KRAMER: I think maybe  
20 one way to deal with Steve's endurable concerns would  
21 be to run the three-year pilot project. I think  
22 comparing yourself to another institution is difficult.  
23 I think we get into that, we do that. So even if  
24 Indiana's was a huge success, there's no guarantee that  
25 ours would work. But I think this would be a very good  
26 compromise and a safe way to travel.

27 Perhaps defining how many programs we

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 want to get in, in three years I think we could afford  
2 to succeed or in three years we could afford it to  
3 fail.

4 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Mike?

5 MR. CIBULL: What he said.

6 (Laughter)

7 MR. STEINER: A question.

8 How are you going--

9 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Please  
10 announce your name. I'm sorry.

11 MR. STEINER: Shelly  
12 Steiner, Biology.

13 How are you going to evaluate the  
14 three-year rule? Has that been thought out as well? I  
15 mean, if we go for three years, is there some marks  
16 that are going to be made along the way? Is there some  
17 system to evaluate whether it worked or didn't work and  
18 what's going -- what is it going to mean that it worked  
19 or didn't worked? What are you hoping for? What's the  
20 projected positive outcome that you'd like to see? I  
21 mean...

22 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: One of the  
23 things we didn't have written on the screen here was  
24 that the Senate Council felt strongly that the hands of  
25 this program should rest with the Associate Provost for  
26 undergraduate studies. So one would think, then, that  
27 somebody in his position would help to monitor the

1 program.

2                                 While we didn't talk specifically  
3 about it, Shelley, it talks about we would have to take  
4 a look at the ease or difficulty in tracking students,  
5 the communication that would occur across departments  
6 and across colleges in terms of the course load or the  
7 expected course load, the mechanics of it. I guess --  
8 I know it's a very general answer to the question. We  
9 could even have an ongoing committee to monitor it as  
10 well, a Senate committee.

11                                 MR. STEINER: I think it's  
12 a good advising tool. I'm not sure about...

13                                 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Brad?

14                                 MR. CANON: Yeah. If  
15 you're going to measure against something, presumably  
16 you would measure against the situation now. And it's  
17 not clear to me that we have a problem now. Is there  
18 harder data on this? That is, are people being held  
19 over for another semester because courses are  
20 unavailable or are we just sort of doing something  
21 that, you know, we should -- not grounded in data?

22                                 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Tony, do  
23 you have a response to that?

24                                 MS. STATEN: I have an  
25 addition to that.

26                                 Ruth Staten, College of Nursing. As  
27 I've talked to people -- and I hear more. I think

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 somebody alluded to this at our last meeting, that  
2 maybe there's some difficulty with advising in some of  
3 the pre-areas and somebody said, *and then I have to*  
4 *undo what's done there.* So I'm wondering if we  
5 actually know what the problem is and if this is the  
6 solution to it if there is indeed a problem.

7 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: I don't  
8 have a slide with the exit survey that's given to  
9 senior students, but it was, I think -- Mike correct me  
10 if I'm wrong -- somewhere 30 to 40 percent of  
11 graduating seniors talked about unavailability of  
12 courses as one of the problems they encounter along the  
13 way for failing to graduate in a timely fashion. So it  
14 was there as measured by that survey instrument.

15 MS. LOCKHART: Dan  
16 Lockhart.

17 Does this include double majors and  
18 people who are pursuing minors? Are we guaranteeing  
19 folks who want to pursue a double major or a double  
20 degree that they can complete it in a given time frame?

21 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Professor  
22 Stoepple?

23 MR. STOEPPLE: You can  
24 sign the graduation contract and do your double major  
25 or whatever you had in mind; however, you're only  
26 guaranteed for one of those two. Therefore, for  
27 example, I can be a math major in mechanical

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 engineering but I can only sign the graduation contract  
2 for one of them. I'm only guaranteed to graduate one  
3 of those in a timely fashion. So I might have to put  
4 off the second major considerably to stay on track for  
5 the one. But it is possible.

6 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Any other  
7 thoughts that have not been brought to the floor yet?

8 MR. GOVINDARAJULU: The  
9 thing about who pays what is still not -- I'm not clear  
10 who pays for it. In lieu of the fact that a college  
11 like Arts and Sciences is very strapped for funds. So  
12 I wouldn't be interested in it. I wouldn't want any  
13 duty. I think we should make a recommendation that it  
14 should be initially paid by the Provost's office.

15 MR. NEITZEL: I second  
16 that.

17 (Laughter)

18 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Is there a  
19 response from the Provost's office?

20 MR. NEITZEL:  
21 Unsurprisingly, yes. I'd be happy to pay it, but then  
22 I think I need to make the decision on which of the  
23 outcomes should be implemented from this committee.  
24 You cannot have the consequences associated with this.  
25 Somehow, what's determined to be a University failure  
26 in terms of providing courses or the advising can only  
27 be occurring in a departmental level here. So I think

1 if you want this to work, you want the consequences to  
2 be borne at that level along with the decisions. If  
3 you don't want them to be borne there, and you want  
4 them borne up higher, then I think that person has the  
5 right to make a decision about which outcome we  
6 implement associated with the failure somehow for the  
7 University to live up to the contract. You can't  
8 disconnect those two in any way that's going to come  
9 out being beneficial to students.

10 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Any other  
11 points?

12 MS. WALDHART: This is a  
13 question, I think, addressed to the Provost just saying  
14 if we were to phrase this in such a way that there  
15 would be a committee proposed at the college level and  
16 then the Dean would be responsible for requesting money  
17 from the Provost to make a decision, would that be a  
18 way to address both points?

19 MR. NEITZEL: Say it again,  
20 Enid.

21 MS. WALDHART: Okay. We  
22 would still have the Dean deciding, based on the  
23 committee's suggestion, what should be done. But then  
24 the Dean wouldn't decide who to pay or whatever, if  
25 money were involved with it. That the Dean would send  
26 that request forward to the Provost to make the final  
27 decision about funds being available.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 MR. NEITZEL: So the Dean  
2 would be sending a request forward to my office--

3 MS. WALDHART: Yes.

4 MR. NEITZEL: --for funds?

5 MS. WALDHART: Correct.

6 MR. NEITZEL: Which then I  
7 would either say yes or no to?

8 MS. WALDHART: Right.

9 MR. NEITZEL: Sure.

10 (Laughter)

11 MS. WALDHART: If that  
12 makes sense. It seems to me that instead of the  
13 automatic "no," that if there were a compelling case  
14 that it would be up to the college to make the case not  
15 to provide the funds.

16  
17 MR. NEITZEL: But I think, seriously here,  
18 what we're after is trying to shape behavior by  
19 advisories and departments and their interaction with  
20 the students so that if we put together a curricular  
21 map, we will provide these courses. If you visit your  
22 advisor on the prescribed basis and you sign up for  
23 these courses, you can graduate in four years. If  
24 there's a problem in that, it would have had to occur  
25 at the departmental level and we don't want those foul-  
26 ups to continue, obviously. So somehow having the  
27 consequence occur at that unit level, as well as the

1 decision, this is fundamentally an academic decision  
2 about what the best outcome should be for that  
3 particular student. But I really think that's much  
4 better than taking this to the Provost level, and I  
5 think that's how you change behavior in a way that's  
6 going to be helpful to students in the long haul.

7 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: What  
8 brings this to mind, I think, is one of the possible  
9 arguments that can come up.

10 Let's say that one of Scott Smith's  
11 students in Agriculture has had a problem, and it was a  
12 documented problem, that he couldn't get Com 181. And  
13 then Scott says, well, why should my college have to  
14 pay this tuition when it's not my college's fault. And  
15 then Dean Johnson says, well, we never have enough  
16 money anyway so there's no doubt you didn't have enough  
17 Com 181 sections.

18 So that's why there's some sense to  
19 having the Provost being the final arbiter, I think, in  
20 my opinion.

21 But Bob was first, then Steve.

22 MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah.  
23 There's a -- I understand your argument, Mike, but  
24 there's also a counter-argument here, which is that if  
25 you have the person who makes the decision also be the  
26 person who's responsible for dividing the money, it's  
27 going to be a very easy erosion to academic standards.

1 Just say, well, we'll just waive this requirement  
2 because I don't want to have to pay tuition.

3 The other issue is that the problem  
4 with students getting their classes is not always that  
5 the department didn't schedule them properly. For  
6 example, we don't know how we're going to cover organic  
7 sections next year because we haven't been able to hire  
8 enough organic chemists over the last five years and  
9 does that mean -- You know, who's responsible for that?  
10 Is it the Provost, is it the Dean, is it the  
11 department?

12 MR. NEITZEL: We'll know  
13 that the very first semester it happens to a student.  
14 And there will be a variety of ways that we can respond  
15 to that particular student between the first semester,  
16 the second semester and the fourth year to have that  
17 student's problem taken care of. So I don't think it  
18 requires that we get to the fourth year to remedy that  
19 particular problem, and it doesn't involve one of  
20 waiving a requirement or having to provide extra  
21 tuition to the student. It does mean you somehow have  
22 to find a way for that student to get the section that  
23 he or she needs, but we've got time to do that.

24 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Steve,  
25 then Shelley.

26 MR. YATES: I just differ  
27 with you a little bit, Mike, because, as you know, Arts

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 and Sciences, as it is now, we don't see our majors  
2 until the third year. So to say that the department  
3 should be responsible for advising--

4 MR. NEITZEL: Well, who's  
5 advising them in the first two years? The college.

6 MR. YATES: That's right.

7 MR. NEITZEL: And, again, I  
8 would say at the college level, that's where your  
9 responsibility has to somehow be taken the most  
10 seriously and enforced.

11 MR. YATES: I would also  
12 say that I've been advising students for 20-something  
13 years now, and I've made my share of blunders, and I  
14 think everybody has the opportunity to do that. I  
15 think the curricular maps could minimize that.

16 MR. STEINER: One other  
17 point from many years of experience, oftentimes there's  
18 a debate, a student is in trouble, they didn't take  
19 the course or they did take the course and they say you  
20 advised them not to take the course or you forgot to  
21 advise them. That's not uncommon at all. What do you  
22 do under those circumstances where, you know, as far as  
23 you know, you've advised the correct way? You have  
24 your sheets and you have your maps and all that jazz  
25 and they come in and you tell them and they stand there  
26 and they say, well you never told me; in fact, you said  
27 I could skip this or skip that. It's not unheard of in

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 this kind of situation. What do you do in those  
2 circumstances?

3 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Don?

4 MR. GROSS: Yeah. Don  
5 Gross, Political Science.

6 There's also a problem even at the  
7 department level, because if you take a faculty size  
8 that's fixed and as you increase the number of your  
9 majors and you start getting overloaded on faculty,  
10 they are more likely to be making mistakes. But I  
11 think in some sense we can keep talking about who's  
12 responsible for mistakes, who's responsible for paying  
13 money, and I guess rather than talk the rest of the  
14 day, you know, I guess my preference is just to go  
15 ahead and try this. And no department has to do it if  
16 they don't want to. Let's try it and let people sort  
17 of think about, you know, how we're going to evaluate  
18 it as we start implementing it.

19 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So that  
20 came as a suggestion from the Senate Council. Do you  
21 want to make that a MOTION?

22 MR. CIBULL: It is a motion.

23 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Well, I  
24 guess it is. It's on the floor. Okay. So you're  
25 speaking in favor of the motion, then.

26 Are there any other opposing points  
27 of view? I'm sorry?

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Call the  
2 question.

3 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. So  
4 stop debate. It takes a two-thirds vote. All in favor  
5 of stopping debate, please raise your hands.

6 ("AYE" HAND-COUNT VOTE: MAJORITY)

7 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: All  
8 opposed?

9 ("NAY" HAND-COUNT VOTE: ONE)

10 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: One person  
11 has raised their hand opposed. Okay. So the MOTION on  
12 the floor then is a pilot for the graduation contract  
13 with, hopefully, a representative cross-section of  
14 voluntary colleges, programs and departments and to  
15 evaluate the pilot in three years.

16 Should we -- Does anybody want to  
17 amend this motion to decide how this should be  
18 evaluated, who should have a hand in it?

19 MR. CIBULL: You already  
20 called the question, isn't that correct, to get the  
21 vote on this?

22 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: I guess we  
23 have.

24 MR. CIBULL: Is that  
25 correct?

26 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Yeah.  
27 Okay. So all in favor, please raise your hands.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 Gifford, do you want to take a look?

2 MR. BLYTON: Yeah.

3 ("AYE" HAND-COUNT VOTE: MAJORITY)

4 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. All  
5 opposed?

6 MR. BLYTON: It's clear.

7 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So, seven  
8 opposed.

9 SARGENT-AT-ARMS: Eight.

10 ("NAY HAND-COUNT VOTE: 8)

11 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Eight.  
12 Okay.

13 MS. WALDHART: Would it be  
14 possible at this point to ask the Provost, Associate  
15 Provost for Undergraduate Studies, to take on that  
16 responsibility or to simply assume that this will be a  
17 Senate Council thing that would decide how we go on?  
18 Because we had talked in Senate Council about this  
19 falling under the--

20 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: The  
21 Associate's authority.

22 MS. WALDHART: The  
23 authority of the Associate Provost for Undergraduate  
24 Studies; and that coming out of that office, whether  
25 it's a Senate committee or something, it seems to me  
26 there needs to be a clear place for it to be housed.

27 MR. KRAEMER: I'd be happy

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 to volunteer to do it. I could do it in consultation  
2 with a committee, advisor, whatever you want.  
3 Certainly something I think would be a good match that  
4 we have to do that.

5 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So could  
6 we recommend continued input from the elected faculty  
7 and students of the Senate in terms of the evaluation  
8 and ongoing management of it then?

9 MR. KRAEMER: Sure.

10 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay.  
11 Kavi?

12 MR. TAGAVI: That wasn't  
13 quite the sense of the motion. It was that this would  
14 be handled by the Senate Council or Undergraduate  
15 Council under the leadership of the Provost.

16 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So the  
17 Undergraduate Council--

18 MR. TAGAVI: What was said  
19 was that it should remain a Senate function and,  
20 naturally, the Associate Provost is the head of that  
21 COUNCIL.

22 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Would you  
23 agree to that, Phil?

24 MR. KRAEMER: I would be  
25 happy to consult and manage and lead or stay out of the  
26 way.

27 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Also as

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 your being the Chair of the Undergraduate Council,  
2 which is a Council of the Senate.

3 MR. KRAEMER: Exactly.

4 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay.

5 Professor Waldhart, next agenda item?

6 MS. WALDHART: Okay. I'm  
7 almost scared to conduct this. We have two wins and  
8 maybe this one won't work.

9 The College of Communications and  
10 Information Studies is proposing approval of a grade-  
11 point-average connection with its selective admission  
12 requirements. In the college there are four  
13 undergraduate programs, and because each of the pre-  
14 majors includes different courses and different kinds  
15 of things, this needs to be done in four sets rather  
16 than one standard across the college.

17 So you may remember as we talked  
18 about selective admissions standards for colleges, we  
19 wanted them to be program specific rather than  
20 necessarily across the college. So what each of the  
21 majors is proposing is some kind of grade point average  
22 along with the pre-major courses that are in place.  
23 And so, as you look at this, there were a couple of  
24 changes in wording from the original to the ones that  
25 the Council saw. The pre-major courses themselves are  
26 all approved as is.

27 What we are voting on at this point

1 is the GPA that is with it. So that with a  
2 communication major, there's a minimum cumulative GPA  
3 of 3.0. You don't need the "or greater" in these  
4 courses. So there are five courses there.

5 In journalism, there are three  
6 courses; but one of them becomes double because it is  
7 the best predictor of success in the journalism  
8 program. In integrated strategic communication,  
9 completion of the four courses, five courses and,  
10 again, a 3.0 GPA as a minimum in those courses and in  
11 telecommunications, again, a minimum cumulative GPA of  
12 3.0 in those courses.

13 So what the Senate is to vote on at  
14 this point is whether that number 3.0 can stand as a  
15 selective admission requirement.

16 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Professor  
17 Kraemer?

18 MR. KRAEMER: I appreciate  
19 Enid's clarifying these.

20 The Council did approve the courses  
21 but without the 3.0 GPA, and I'm going to argue against  
22 that because in a sense this is just an alternative  
23 selective admissions criteria. And I think the general  
24 issue, as we all know, is there is a challenge of some  
25 colleges with resources being able to accommodate the  
26 number of majors. And the last business the Senate  
27 engaged in at the prior meeting, I think that's still

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 the key issue, that we need to have some principles and  
2 guidelines that make this not moot, but to give us a  
3 context within which we can deal with this process. I  
4 don't really see this one as being any better than the  
5 overall GPA in terms of who gets in and who doesn't.  
6 In some cases, if you take a student, the student may  
7 have an excellent overall GPA but may have tripped with  
8 one course with a C. I'm not sure, again, that that's  
9 the kind of student-friendly university we want to be.  
10 But I do appreciate you clarifying that the Council did  
11 not approve the 3.0 GPA.

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: Response from  
13 the college?

14 Dean Johnson?

15 MR. JOHNSON: I just wanted  
16 to respond to the one of the points that the Associate  
17 Provost or Assistant Provost Kraemer made and that is  
18 that the committee, the Senate Committee, whose  
19 recommendations the Senate voted on at the last Senate  
20 meeting, specifically said that this approach was the  
21 best approach to follow. And we've been closely  
22 following the work of that committee in developing our  
23 proposals and we've been trying to structure our  
24 proposals to accommodate the role of the Senate. So  
25 what we've done here exactly reflects what the Senate  
26 committee did the last time.

27 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Professor

1 Grossman?

2 MR. GROSSMAN: This  
3 proposal disturbs me greatly because the rationale for  
4 it that's put forth in the document to the Senate was  
5 we have too many students. We need to limit enrollment  
6 somehow and so to make these academic standards just  
7 because there are too many students we have to enroll,  
8 to limit enrollment somehow seems to me to be  
9 absolutely the wrong approach.

10 If they don't have enough resources  
11 and they can't get more resources, then let's be  
12 honest, the problem is the number of slots. The  
13 problem isn't the quality of the students going through  
14 the program. Let's just say, this is how many students  
15 we can educate and we'll have a lottery to let that  
16 many students in. If the problem is one of that the  
17 students aren't sufficiently prepared, I have no  
18 problem with the specific courses that are involved,  
19 although I do have a problem with 3.0, which is awfully  
20 high. I would love it if I only got superb students in  
21 organic chemistry. Okay? But we all know that doesn't  
22 happen and it won't happen. We're at a big university  
23 and for one college to say that it's standard is so  
24 high and then say that anyone who falls below those  
25 standards, presumably they'll have to go off to other  
26 colleges that have not yet passed such standards, guess  
27 who that's going to be. It seems to me that it would

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 be absolutely the wrong approach.

2 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Dean  
3 Johnson first, then Cindy.

4 MR. JOHNSON: Again, you  
5 know, this is something that our college has  
6 contemplated for a long period of time and has tossed  
7 about a number of different alternatives.

8 The University is a selective  
9 admissions university. We don't propose that students  
10 can enroll to UK on the basis of a lottery system.  
11 This is an enrollment management proposal. We are not  
12 proposing that we're going to decrease the enrollment  
13 in our college. In fact, the proposal we had before  
14 the Senate last year that we passed, we would only  
15 decrease if the enrollment were up by 40 students,  
16 which would at that we had probably grown by 100  
17 additional students. Since I've been Dean over the  
18 last five years, our college has almost doubled in size  
19 in terms of undergraduate enrollment. We've added the  
20 equivalent of five colleges at UK just in terms of our  
21 growth. We haven't come anywhere close to that in  
22 terms of adding additional resources to our college.

23 Another interesting little statistic  
24 is that this commencement, we're going to graduate ten  
25 percent of the undergraduates at UK. Our college only  
26 has 37 faculty people and only 28 of those faculty  
27 members are devoted to undergraduate education. We are

1 not talking here about diminishing the number of  
2 students we have, but rather what we're trying to do is  
3 decrease the growth and enrollment within our college.  
4 We get a lot of those students, and the reason we have  
5 ten percent of the undergraduate student body at UK is  
6 because we're a net importer of students to our  
7 colleges rather than an exporter our students out of  
8 our colleges.

9 MS. RUDER: I guess to  
10 follow up on that, what one college's enrollment  
11 solution is is another college's enrollment nightmare.  
12 And I think for Arts and Sciences, as Bob eluded to  
13 before, what ends up happening is that if you  
14 consistently make every other college in the university  
15 selective, what happens is that Arts and Sciences  
16 becomes the dumping ground for all students. And I  
17 apologize for the term, but that's essentially what it  
18 is. That all the students who can't "make it" in the  
19 other colleges end up in Arts and Sciences. And what  
20 happens with the proposals is that someone looks,  
21 rightly so, at their own college and at the enrollment  
22 management issues, but the other colleges don't have a  
23 chance to reflect on how that enrollment management  
24 solution is going to affect the enrollment management  
25 in that other college. I think that's not a good way  
26 of following these things or promulgating these  
27 programs, number one.



UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 mistake by saying why they are doing this. Because if  
2 we deny College of Education of this today, when are we  
3 going to deny the College of Communication? When are  
4 we going to deny Engineering? Tomorrow.

5 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: And if I  
6 can interject, the Senate Council discussed this and  
7 also discussed the fact that these criteria were also  
8 labeled as predictors of success.

9 MR. TAGAVI: And to their  
10 credit, look the number C. No GPA. C or D. B does  
11 not have a GPA so I think it's the same--

12 MS. WALDHART: No. B does  
13 have a GPA.

14 MR. TAGAVI: Enid. Which  
15 one does not have a GPA?

16 MS. WALDHART: They all  
17 have GPAs. The way they're calculated is different.

18 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: ISC, Kavi,  
19 came as a separate proposal. Somehow it was  
20 disconnected from this one.

21 MR. TAGAVI: Yes. One of  
22 them did not have a GPA. Would you like to add,  
23 "before every completion," "successful"? Because  
24 legally speaking when you get an E, you have completed  
25 that course and it's possible to have four As and an E  
26 and end up with a GPA of 3.0. I don't think that's  
27 what Communications wants. So you want to add

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 "successful completion" before every one of those.

2 MS. WALDHART: If you get  
3 an E in a course, you have not completed it in terms of  
4 meeting the requirements.

5 MR. TAGAVI: When somebody  
6 who says is my grade incomplete and you have to say  
7 "no," and therefore you have accomplished the course.

8 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay.

9 MS. WALDHART: An E grade  
10 means you haven't met the course requirement. I don't  
11 think it would be--

12 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Professor  
13 Steiner?

14 MR. STEINER: Shelley  
15 Steiner, Biology.

16 Why not have enrollment management by  
17 setting realistic limits and exceptions where, if you  
18 think you can teach reasonably for your discipline, so  
19 30 in this section and that's it? When the section  
20 closes that's sends the pressure upstairs. If they  
21 want more sections, let them roll. And basically that  
22 would be a way to have enrollment management. Set the  
23 number of sections that you can set with the number of  
24 faculty you have and that's it.

25 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Are there  
26 any points of view so far that we haven't heard? Jim?

27 MR. ALBISETTI: Jim

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 Albisetti, Arts and Sciences.

2 Does this proposal allow for the  
3 exercise of repeat options in order to have to get this  
4 3.0 GPA or is this something we apply to make people  
5 retake courses they've already passed in order to try  
6 to qualify for their majors?

7 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Dean  
8 Johnson, do you have a response for that?

9 MR. JOHNSON: I think that  
10 the key to that response is completion, and obviously a  
11 repeat option provides for continuation.

12 MR. GOVINDARAJULU:  
13 Especially you mentioned courses 200 and 291. I  
14 consider all those courses (unintelligible). People  
15 just walk in and they're learning a new language. So  
16 essentially you're forcing these students to make a B.  
17 So this in turn they come to us and say I want to drop  
18 out. My GPA is going to drop if it is going to be a B.  
19 So, I unfortunately drop them. The cumulative GPA is  
20 something less.

21 MR. LABUNSKI: My name is  
22 Richard Labunski. I'm a faculty senator from the  
23 College of Communications and Information Studies and I  
24 wanted to talk for a few moments about this.

25 This proposal is because we want to  
26 provide the best educational experience for our major  
27 that we can and part of that is to make sure that they

1 have appropriate preparation so that the limited time  
2 we have with them to help prepare them for careers in  
3 intensely competitive fields is really as worthwhile  
4 for the students as we can possibly make it.

5                   So after much discussion in the  
6 Department of Communications and the School of  
7 Journalism and Telecommunications and at the college  
8 level, we have decided that students need to know  
9 something about politics and government and budgets and  
10 public affairs before they go into the journalism  
11 field, and you will see how other courses make perfect  
12 sense. Psychology before you go into advertising,  
13 public relations, direct marketing, et cetera. Once  
14 you have made a decision, and I think everybody in this  
15 room would agree that appropriate preparation makes the  
16 major experience much more successful, then why does it  
17 not make sense to say we are going to require that you  
18 take certain courses to be the best prepared that you  
19 can. We also want you to do well in those courses, to  
20 show us that you have attained some competency in those  
21 fields, and the only way we really can judge it is to  
22 see what your grades were in those courses.

23                   And I don't think it's unreasonable  
24 at all, especially with grade inflation having taken  
25 over so many universities over the years when so many  
26 people, so many students get As and Bs consistently. I  
27 don't think it's inappropriate at all to say we want

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 you to take course A, B, and C and we want you to do  
2 fairly well among all of them. We're not saying that  
3 you have to get a B or a better to get the grade and  
4 every single one of those prerequisite courses.

5                   What we're saying is, overall you'll  
6 have to show some commitment to learning the material.  
7 And I would also remind the Senate that this does not  
8 change the overall grade point average that this  
9 organization would not allow us to change a year and a  
10 half ago. It's still a 2.6 for the overall GPA for  
11 admission to the college. What we're saying is, as  
12 students prepare for our majors, we want to make sure  
13 they learn something and not simply take those courses.

14

15                   And I would just add one editorial  
16 comment -- out of great deference to Drs. Grossman and  
17 -- I'm so tired I can't remember the Associate  
18 Provost's name all of a sudden -- Phil Kraemer.  
19 Anxiety that I approach this.

20                   I must tell you that I taught at the  
21 University of Washington for 11 years. I taught at  
22 Penn State. I taught at University of California,  
23 Santa Barbara. I served on the University Senate at  
24 the University of Washington for three years. I must  
25 tell you, I'm always surprised by the idea that to say  
26 to a department or a college like ours, we're not going  
27 to let you do what you think you need to improve the

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 educational experience of your students because we're  
2 so afraid one of your students who doesn't quite make  
3 it is going to end up as a political science major or  
4 something else, and we just can't let that happen  
5 because we're all so overburdened, that in order to  
6 keep us from having to deal with any of your overload -  
7 - and I reject the suggestion that our rejects are  
8 somehow worse students or unmotivated or just going to  
9 be a drain on your resources -- but the idea that, you  
10 know, Department A can't make changes that Department A  
11 really believes will improve the educational experience  
12 of the students because Department B is terrified with  
13 the idea there's going to be another student in a large  
14 lecture class and instead of 212 there are going to 213  
15 students when we're teaching students in small labs,  
16 computer facilities and other kinds of limited  
17 classroom experiences and can only have 12 or 14 or 18  
18 students in any of our classes, it's really beyond me.  
19 And I just thought we would all be kind of pulling in  
20 the same direction instead of being quite so  
21 territorial and sort of resentful of anybody else who's  
22 trying to make changes.

23 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Thank you,  
24 Richard.

25 Is there another point of view that  
26 has not been brought to the floor?

27 Dean Salle?

1

2

MR. SALLE: Leon Salle from Dentistry.

3

4

Even our professional schools have  
GPA expectations, but we don't have GPA requirements.

5

And I'm curious as to why you select requirement.

6

7

Doesn't that prevent you from selecting students for  
your programs that would be exceptional in other ways,

8

that perhaps showed exceptional talent in other ways

9

that would be excellent additions to the college? And

10

lastly, doesn't it affect your ability to attract a

11

diverse student body, especially those that are coming

12

to us from the community college system or from other

13

systems?

14

So I just was curious, David, if you

15

have thought about that. Instead of saying

16

"requirement," you could say it's "expected that,"

17

which is the language that we use.

18

CHAIRMAN DEMBO: A

19

response? We're going to have to tie this up in the

20

next couple of minutes. David?

21

MR. JOHNSON: In terms of

22

diversity, I think the recent series in the ***Kernel***

23

demonstrated that our college is one of the more

24

diverse on the campus. We have probably the most

25

diverse in terms of its undergraduate student body, and

26

this is something, quite frankly, that the faculty

27

struggled with for two years before we brought a

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 proposal forward to the Senate.

2 I think there's also the fundamental  
3 issue of fairness here in addition to some of the other  
4 ones we've just talked about. There are over a score  
5 of units on this campus that have enrollment management  
6 policies and it seems like -- and I've been in this  
7 body when two have been considered; one from Social  
8 Work and one from Business and Economics -- the only  
9 time we have an elaborate discussion is when my college  
10 puts a proposal forward.

11 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Do you  
12 have a response to Dean Salle?

13 MR. TAGAVI: You are the  
14 Dean of Dentistry. In your case, when students meet  
15 the minimum requirement, they are not guaranteed  
16 admission. At least I know medical school is not like  
17 that.

18 MR. SALLE: That's true.

19 MR. TAGAVI: It's not true  
20 for Communications. Communication is before that  
21 saying whoever meets the minimum requirement is  
22 guaranteed admission. So the comparison that you just  
23 made was apples and oranges.

24 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Mike?

25 MR. CIBULL: I guess that I  
26 wouldn't -- I mean, I'm not in the undergraduate  
27 college. But I would certainly encourage any college

1 that has the ability to take excellent students to take  
2 excellent students. Isn't that what we're all supposed  
3 to be aiming for? Isn't that how the college increases  
4 their academic standing, by taking excellent students  
5 and making them more excellent in that college?

6 So if the College of Communications  
7 can do that, more power to them. And, hopefully at  
8 some point, the College of Liberal Arts can do that as  
9 well. But I wouldn't wait until every, you know -- I  
10 wouldn't aim for the lowest common denominator. This  
11 may be a state school but it doesn't have to act like a  
12 state school.

13 MR. KRAEMER: We have  
14 selective admissions and we are getting very excellent  
15 students coming into the University. But the challenge  
16 is whether we're going to have some colleges having  
17 additional hurdles; and, quite honestly, and I respect  
18 all of the arguments in favor of this, but we wouldn't  
19 be considering this 3. GPA and the predictive nature of  
20 those data if it weren't for the fact that many  
21 students are trying to get into these majors.

22 If it weren't that we needed these  
23 courses to succeed in the majors, that would be a  
24 separate argument. This is really a way to manage a  
25 very difficult problem that in essence is a resource  
26 issue, and the problem is what happens to the students  
27 that don't make it into these majors, and are the

1 criteria such that we're completely confident in their  
2 validity?

3 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. In  
4 the next one minute, anybody who has not spoken will be  
5 given the floor.

6 MS. GARVEY: Beth Garvey,  
7 Medicine.

8 I'd like to know what proportion of  
9 this year's class that was admitted into Communications  
10 and Information Studies would have met these  
11 requirements. In other words, how big of an impact is  
12 this really going to have?

13 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Is there a  
14 response to that?

15 MR. JOHNSON: At the last  
16 Senate meeting we heard of the problem that Pharmacy  
17 was facing and we also had the standard admissions  
18 criteria where they have 100 slots, essentially, and  
19 they have 500 applicants. In our college, with all of  
20 our selective admissions proposals, we essentially let  
21 in 90 percent of the students that come to our body.

22 I will predict that this is going to  
23 decrease the growth in our students by 40 and we we'll  
24 still have enrolled probably 50 to 100 students next  
25 year.

26 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Dan?

27 MR. LOCKHART: One last

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 question. If you don't get this, does this affect your  
2 accreditation in any way?

3 MR. JOHNSON: I didn't--

4 MR. LOCKHART: If you don't  
5 get this, are you going to be in jeopardy of losing  
6 your accreditation in any way?

7 MR. JOHNSON: In fact, this  
8 was brought up during our AC and C accreditation and  
9 they were very impressed that we were working on this  
10 proposal, and that considerably helped us. But if this  
11 proposal isn't passed, it's going to have a dire effect  
12 on our accreditation in that system.

13 COURT REPORTER: Can I have  
14 your name, please?

15 MR. LOCKHART: Dan  
16 Lockhart.

17 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: If there's  
18 no objection, I'd like for us to go ahead and vote on  
19 this now because I don't think we've heard any new  
20 arguments coming to the front here.

21 So the MOTION on the floor now is to  
22 accept these suggested admissions requirements, minimum  
23 3.0. There should be no questions about the motion.

24 So all in favor of -- And I'm going  
25 to lump all of these together because I haven't seen  
26 there's much of a difference between them, so all four  
27 programs with these admission requirements.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 All in favor, please raise your hand.

2 ("AYE" HAND-COUNT VOTE: MAJORITY)

3 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. All  
4 opposed? Let's take a hand count on that, Susan.  
5 Okay. Hands down.

6 All those in favor of the motion?

7 ("AYE" HAND-COUNT VOTE: 36)

8 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: 36. Okay.  
9 All those opposed.

10 ("NAY" HAND-COUNT VOTE: 22)

11 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: The motion  
12 passes 36 to 22.

13 Okay, the next agenda item, proposed  
14 changes in the B&E Suspension and Probation Policies.

15 MS. WALDHART: As you will  
16 see, the concern here is about students who are  
17 suspended, students who are put on probation. And so  
18 as we're looking at this, the gist of this has to do  
19 with the less than 2.0 and how long students have had  
20 that less than 2.0 GPA. I don't think I need to read  
21 those all the way through.

22 The key is the number at which no  
23 probationary notice needs to be given. So that's  
24 something that's different from some of the other  
25 problems. Being placed on probation any time they're  
26 less than 2.0 is a fairly standard position; and the  
27 final one, students who are dropped twice from the

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 college will not be readmitted, and that is something  
2 that is not necessarily a part of the other  
3 requirements.

4 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So these  
5 parallel word for word the College of Engineering  
6 Suspension and Probation Requirement policies; and  
7 because they are a Senate rule, they also are published  
8 in the bulletin. So to date, Engineering has this.  
9 B&E does not.

10 Dan, would anyone like to speak any  
11 further to this? Any other details?

12 MR. LOCKHART: The main  
13 reason we wanted to do this--

14 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Dan,  
15 please introduce yourself so that everybody knows who  
16 you are.

17 MR. LOCKHART: Dan Lockhart  
18 from the Gatton College of Business and Economics.

19 The main reason we were interested in  
20 trying to do something like this is not so much in our  
21 own management issue as it is a student retention  
22 issue. We have selective admissions requirements there  
23 at a level, which there is a significant difference  
24 between being on probation and suspension and what it  
25 takes to being admitted to the upper division status.  
26 We have a lot of students who are down around the 2.0,  
27 1.9, 1.8 level, and the way it is now we have no real

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 good way of capturing them and getting them into the  
2 program so that they could do something about the fact  
3 that they're probably not going to be admitted to upper  
4 division status.

5 We want to try to be able to get a  
6 hold of students a little bit sooner than what we  
7 currently can now and to advise them about what they  
8 can do to change their study habits, their lifestyle  
9 habits, their funding habits, so that they can make the  
10 grade point average and be admitted into upper division  
11 status. And if they simply are running out of gas and  
12 are unable to do that, we want to work with them, not  
13 to throw them back out to the university or back into  
14 central advising so that they can figure what to do on  
15 their own. We want to be able to work with them so  
16 that they can, hopefully, find another college or  
17 another program in the university that enables them to  
18 graduate and leave UK with a completed degree.

19 To our college it is important that  
20 anybody who comes there, we do everything we can to get  
21 them out of the university. Hopefully, it's through  
22 the College of Business. But if it's not through the  
23 College of Business, it's somewhere else. And we want  
24 to be able to work with them, to advise them, to show  
25 them other career options that are -- or program  
26 options that are available for them at the University.  
27 And as it is now, a student who's less than 2.0, he or

1 she can bounce around the first year and it's not  
2 really until sometimes their freshman, first semester,  
3 their sophomore year, that they ever get themselves  
4 into any kind of trouble where they would have to be  
5 suspended. At that point in time, at a 2.0 or a 1.9 or  
6 1.8 or 1.7, there's just no way in heaven's name  
7 they're going to make the requirements to be admitted  
8 to upper division status.

9 We just don't want to throw them out,  
10 and we feel like we're doing them a disservice as it is  
11 right now. We feel like we're setting them up to not  
12 succeed, and we want to use this program here and we  
13 want to use the requirements that Engineering has to  
14 get their attention, to get their parents' attention  
15 more quickly so that we can make sure that they make  
16 whatever financial arrangements, work less, get more  
17 money from Mom and Dad, so that they can spend more  
18 time on their studies. We want to try to improve their  
19 probability of getting admitted into upper division  
20 status. If that doesn't work, we want to help them,  
21 work with them to find a program somewhere else in the  
22 University so they can graduate.

23 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Questions  
24 or comments?

25 Provost Kraemer.

26 MR. KRAEMER: Once again, I  
27 just want to clarify that the Undergraduate Council did

1 not approve this. You want to give the council much  
2 too much credit for some of these actions.

3 I understand Dan's rationale; he and  
4 I have talked about that. But the difficulty is that  
5 this would be moving toward selective retention and not  
6 the virtue of selective admissions. If a student is on  
7 probation, the best point to intervene and help them  
8 would be within the college in which they were  
9 originally admitted. So it would be nice to think that  
10 there are some interventionary programs, that the  
11 colleges would take on the task of working with their  
12 probationary students. The Engineering program is not  
13 a model of excellence and if we turn the clocks back--  
14 (Laughter)

15 Perhaps I may have mentioned, or  
16 already mentioned it is a model of excellence, but we  
17 have the problem every spring in January seeing a huge  
18 exodus from the college and those students do end up  
19 working simply with advisors who are wonderful, but the  
20 difficulty is it's not like being in college. And I  
21 think this would simply compound that problem by  
22 extended it to another college. I think the answer,  
23 again, motivation is a lot of it. To work with them  
24 and to be honest with them because some of these  
25 students are going to have achieved low enough GPAs  
26 that's it's going to be very difficult for them to get  
27 into the selective admissions. But I think the best

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 point to begin to intervene and work with them would be  
2 in the college. If they fall below 2.0, then  
3 suspension takes over. But transporting more of them  
4 to undergraduate studies I don't think is necessarily  
5 in the University's best interest or the students'.

6 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: This  
7 common theme I'm hearing is sort of the like the bumper  
8 sticker that used to say "Growth is Good."

9 Professor Gross?

10 MR. GROSS: Yeah. On the  
11 fourth one there, if the student does poorly and then  
12 goes through the academic bankruptcy procedures, when  
13 they come back does that mean they only have one time,  
14 or is the academic bankruptcy going to give them two  
15 times a year?

16 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: I'm  
17 probably not the most qualified person to answer that,  
18 but bankruptcy affects simply the GPA that the person  
19 has but doesn't affect the fact that they have been in  
20 fact dropped twice. So it wouldn't take out one of  
21 those drops, in other words, or the suspensions. Is  
22 that what your question was?

23 MR. GROSS: Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Other  
25 comments or questions about this proposal?

26 MR. LOCKHART: It is not  
27 the purpose of the proposal to just turn people out on

1 the street if they get -- capable of being on probation  
2 or capable of being on suspension. It doesn't  
3 necessarily mean that we would say, well, you are  
4 eligible for suspension; therefore, we are going to  
5 suspend. We can keep them on in the College of  
6 Business if we feel like there's some kind of promise  
7 for them. I know that there are other schools that may  
8 say, look, it's the end of the first semester, you  
9 didn't make it, out you go. Sorry. You know, here's  
10 the door. That's the direction you have to go. That  
11 is not our purpose and our intent.

12                   And the number of students that this  
13 involves is only about eight-tenths of all the --  
14 eight-tenths and one percent of all the students who  
15 are freshmen and sophomores in the University. It's a  
16 very small number of students. We're not going to turn  
17 out a large number of people in the first place. And  
18 even though we would have the capability of turning out  
19 a larger given number of students, we probably wouldn't  
20 do that to all of them. We want to just get their  
21 attention, to try to do something to be able to hit  
22 them, as well as their parents, over the head early on  
23 and say, your son or your daughter is in trouble either  
24 because they're working too much or they're in a  
25 program that isn't in their best interest right now.  
26 We want to work with you to help you to get focused on  
27 what's important and that's getting a degree from the

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 University. They will stay. A bunch of these people  
2 will stay in the College of Business.

3 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Provost  
4 Neitzel?

5 MR. NEITZEL: Given that,  
6 why wouldn't you give them probationary notice?

7 MR. LOCKHART: Because we  
8 were just trying to be consistent with what Engineering  
9 was doing because we wanted to follow that and put  
10 together a model that was--

11 MR. NEITZEL: If  
12 Engineering gave probationary notice, then you would do  
13 it?

14 MR. LOCKHART: Probably.  
15 We were just following the--

16 MR. NEITZEL: I mean, it  
17 seems to me that the rationale you're giving that  
18 notice would be something you'd want to give to  
19 students in terms of alerting them as early as possible  
20 that there are implications that their academic scores--  
21 -

22 MR. LOCKHART: We most  
23 likely would. It doesn't say that we couldn't give  
24 notice there. Our purpose is a retention thing. The  
25 only reason we have the wording like it is is because  
26 we wanted to try to be as consistent with a policy  
27 that's already on the books.



UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 MR. LOCKHART: In the  
2 student information system, the way Engineering --  
3 please help me out with this. It's possible for a  
4 student to be dropped from the College of Engineering  
5 and still be in good standing or be able to take  
6 classes from other colleges in the University; is that  
7 correct? And how is it coded or how do you guys say  
8 that?

9 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Very good  
10 question.

11 MR. BAXTER: They're  
12 suspended from the college.

13 MR. LOCKHART: If they're  
14 suspended from the college, the letter would read  
15 something to the effect that they're suspended from the  
16 college but not necessarily from the University.  
17 They're suspended only from the College of Business.  
18 They're suspended only from the College of Engineering.

19 MS. MACNAMARA: It goes on  
20 to say they are on probation (inaudible).

21 MR. LOCKHART: You'd have  
22 to use two -- Really , you're using two sets of  
23 criteria. You're using the ones that address the  
24 bulletin, the absolute probation and suspension from  
25 all the programs in the University; and then this is  
26 just one tier above that, these are the probation  
27 suspension requirements in the College of Business.

1 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Kavi, was  
2 there one additional point?

3 MR. TAGAVI: What is a  
4 probationary notice? Either you are on probation or  
5 suspended or you are not. What is a notice to be on  
6 probation? I think the best solution is just drop that  
7 part. Don't say anything about probationary notice.  
8 There is no such thing as probationary notice.  
9 Students who are not going to make a 2.0, are we not  
10 afraid that they're going to drop out and go to College  
11 of Medicine or Pharmacy?

12 MS. WALDHART: And  
13 Communication.  
14 (Laughter)

15 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Kavi, so  
16 there's been a -- There was a friendly amendment that  
17 was accepted to change it to probationary notice. Do  
18 you want to make a new motion to amend this again?

19 MR. TAGAVI: No. I won't  
20 presume--

21 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay.

22 MR. TAGAVI: Just one  
23 suggestion. That I think just dropping that sentence  
24 is better than changing the rules.

25 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. We  
26 need to wrap this up. One more response. Brad?

27 MR. CANON: Yeah. I have a

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 question.

2 As Chair of the Rules Committee and  
3 the person who is actually going to have to do this, I  
4 see a contradiction here. That is, if a probationary  
5 notice is given, it seems to me that you have to  
6 actually wait a semester before dropping someone. Is  
7 this the intent of changing something?

8 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Tony, do  
9 you speak to that?

10 MR. BAXTER: I believe what  
11 happens in the College of Engineering is that if a  
12 student drops below 2.0, he's placed on probation by  
13 the University, and I believe under the University  
14 rules, that places the student on probation. The  
15 College of Engineering drops them from the College of  
16 Engineering. They are suspended from the college and  
17 they are on probation under the normal University  
18 rules. That's my interpretation.

19 MR. CANON: So in other  
20 words, it doesn't make any difference whether we say  
21 probationary notice would be given.

22 MR. BAXTER: I believe it  
23 does not make any difference because the University is  
24 going to give probationary notice should that occur.

25 MR. CANON: A person  
26 getting less than a 2.0 cumulative would be out of the  
27 College of B&E. Correct?

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 MR. BAXTER: But then the  
2 University normal probation rule would apply.

3 MR. CANON: Then I would  
4 agree with Kavi. There's no point in mentioning that  
5 they're on probation.

6 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. If  
7 you can trust the rule--

8 MR. MURALIDHAR: Take it  
9 out.

10 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay.  
11 Kris, is there a new point to bring up?

12 MR. MURALIDHAR: No.

13 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Jim, is  
14 there a new point? Okay.

15 Jim, go ahead.

16 MR. ALBISETTI: Jim  
17 Albisetti, Arts and Sciences.

18 Does being dropped from a college  
19 prevent a student from again using a repeat option to  
20 raise the grade in the college? If you're dropped from  
21 the college, can you not take courses in the college?  
22 I mean, you can't be a major.

23 MR. LOCKHART: Most of the  
24 courses that would be -- you would run into with this  
25 are really in their University studies programs. These  
26 are freshmen and sophomores. There would be very few  
27 classes and, in fact, there would be virtually none --

1 there wouldn't be any that this would affect in the  
2 upper division criteria so they could be eligible to  
3 take it -- to use a repeat option if they got a D, to  
4 maybe get that up to a B, or if they got an E, to get  
5 it up to a C. They could do something like that.

6                   The only thing they can't do is  
7 there's a University rule somewhere that says you can't  
8 take a B and get an A, and it counts for improving  
9 grade point. That's the only thing they couldn't do.  
10 But all the other strategies that are available to  
11 students or all other activities would be available.

12                   CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. We  
13 need to push ahead now because we have another major  
14 item, so I'm going to call it quits for discussion here  
15 and take the privilege of the Chair.

16                   The MOTION on the floor is to adopt  
17 these suspension and probation policies and include it  
18 as a Senate Rule and in the bulletin with the change  
19 taking out anything about probationary notice.

20                   All in favor, please raise your  
21 hands.

22 (No count taken.)

23                   CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. All  
24 opposed? So let's do a hand count again, please.

25                   All those in favor?

26                   I'm going to make an announcement  
27 while you have your hands up. Steve Reed, the Chair of

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 the Board of Trustees has written to me as Senate  
2 Council Chair asking for input regarding the  
3 President's performance so they can do a performance  
4 evaluation review. You'll be getting an e-mail from me  
5 -- what's the number,  
6 Susan?

7 SARGENT-AT-ARMS: Thirty-  
8 eight.

9 ("AYE" HAND-COUNT VOTE: 38)

10 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Thirty-  
11 eight. All those opposed?

12 You'll be getting an e-mail from me  
13 directing you how you can provide input which will be  
14 discussed by the Senate Council and forwarded from the  
15 Senate Council directly to Steve Reed upon his request.

16

17 SARGENT-AT-ARMS: Thirteen.

18 ("NAY" HAND-COUNT VOTE: 13)

19 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Thirteen.

20 The motion passes. Thank you.

21 I want to take the privilege of the  
22 Chair to change the agenda in terms of its order.  
23 While the 400-, 500-level courses are probably not  
24 controversial, anytime after 5:00 if we conclude our  
25 discussion about HES, we will use that time to cover  
26 that. But I think it's really important to allow the  
27 guests in the audience who are here specifically to

1 hear about HES reorganization.

2 MS. WALDHART: As you look  
3 at the HES reorganization, did everyone pick up the  
4 letter? This comes to you with no recommendation at  
5 all from the Senate Council in terms of which of these  
6 options should be adopted.

7 There are two proposals, one which  
8 would include all of the units of the current HES going  
9 into the College of Agriculture and one that would have  
10 one unit going into the College of Education.

11 If you will turn to the last two  
12 pages of the handout, on the second to the last page is  
13 a proposal which is called "Proposal One," which has  
14 the Department of Family Studies not going into the  
15 College of Agriculture. This is just the description  
16 of the diagram of the proposal on the second to the  
17 last page. The last page is the Proposal Number Two  
18 for having all the units in the College of Agriculture.  
19 Is there someone here to speak on this?

20 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: What I'd  
21 like to do first is to call on Scott Smith very briefly  
22 to describe what he did, and then Provost Neitzel to  
23 describe how it came to you, and then to call on Kay  
24 Chard, Chair of the Senate Committee on Academic  
25 Organization and Structure.

26 Scott?

27 MR. SMITH: Scott Smith,

1 acting Dean of Human Environmental Sciences and Dean of  
2 Agriculture.

3                   This is a very long story and I'm  
4 sure that you don't want to hear all of it. We have  
5 been working in the College of Human Environmental  
6 Sciences, at least until August of last year when I was  
7 appointed acting Dean, to resolve the future  
8 organizational structure of the college. The current  
9 episode was initiated largely in response to the  
10 recommendation of the Site Task Force that the college  
11 be restructured and the recommendation and the support  
12 of the University administration. Since August, the  
13 faculty, the staff and alumni of the college have been  
14 working very diligently to resolve the issue.

15                   At the beginning, we were faced with  
16 essentially a tie with regard to the two proposals.  
17 The family studies as a department by and large were  
18 favoring an affiliation with the College of Education.  
19 And the remainder of the faculty by a very large  
20 majority favoring, principally favoring the continuing  
21 unification of the three departments as a school or as  
22 a unit within the College of Agriculture.

23                   After extended debate, analysis,  
24 efforts to develop different alternatives, we remained  
25 deadlocked in essentially the same pattern as recently  
26 as a few weeks ago. The process that we went through  
27 led to an understanding that if there were multiple

1 proposals and no consensus developed within a  
2 reasonable period of time that we would forward those  
3 multiple proposals, be they two, three, four or 17, to  
4 the Provost with a request that he seek consultation  
5 from the Senate, from the Board of Trustees and from  
6 other leaders at the University with regard to which of  
7 those would be most appropriate for the future of the  
8 college.

9                   The letter that I forwarded, which I  
10 believe the Senate has, indicates that we are, at least  
11 I am, convinced that further debate and mediation or  
12 therapy would not resolve this ... (laughter). And so  
13 we have asked the Provost to help us seek a resolution.

14

15                   I think that it has been clear among  
16 the faculty and staff of the College of Human  
17 Environmental Sciences for some time that if we were  
18 unable to reach a consensus, then in a sense we were  
19 forfeiting some of our responsibilities to the  
20 University administration, and that's the point that  
21 we're at at the time.

22                   What we finally did, as Dean of the  
23 College of Agriculture, that we are -- our college  
24 supported either proposal and will attempt to make it  
25 work. And I will also conclude by saying that I  
26 believe that either proposal offers many advantages for  
27 enhancement of the program's support of the faculty.



1 probably being three, since there would be some  
2 participation by Interior Design which is now in the  
3 College of Design, and Family Studies, as it were, in  
4 Proposal One in Education.

5                   The second reason was that the  
6 staffing needs would be better addressed if we could  
7 keep staff within one college rather than splitting  
8 them across two or attempting to add staff, which  
9 frankly would be from a budgetary point of view not  
10 possible to do at this point. So I felt we could  
11 address student support, development and faculty  
12 support needs better with the staff concentrated in one  
13 college.

14                   And the third was an overwhelming, if  
15 in fact I believe very close to unanimous, expression  
16 of opinion from friends and alumni, supporters and  
17 constituents of these units that they thought the  
18 mission of the units would be better maintained within  
19 the context of the College of Agriculture. This was a  
20 close opinion, frankly, and those folks -- and I'm sure  
21 you've gotten copies of some of those letters; I know  
22 they have been sent to a broad array of recipients.  
23 That opinion was forcefully delivered in terms of the  
24 alumni and supporters of the college indicating a  
25 variety of reasons why they felt maintaining the three  
26 units within Ag would be the best outcome.

27                   So it was with that I asked if we

1 could have the Senate input on this to me. I did ask  
2 the -- at that meeting on the 10th that I thought that  
3 this had now gone on for a year and that it was time  
4 for us to pull behind one of these proposals and make  
5 it work. I had greater confidence that we could do  
6 that with Proposal Two.

7 I asked everyone at that meeting of  
8 the three units to communicate to me after that if they  
9 had any thoughts about it. A few people have. But for  
10 the most part I have not heard anything subsequent to  
11 that meeting. My advice would be to make Proposal Two  
12 work with the college and I think we have a better  
13 chance of doing that than with Proposal One, although I  
14 don't want to be critical of the first proposal. I  
15 think it had high academic standards and good  
16 motivation behind it as well.

17 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So what  
18 happens is that the Board of Trustees relies upon the  
19 advice of the Senate for changes in organizational  
20 structure. Ordinarily, the Senate will draw its advice  
21 from two other bodies. One is the Senate Council and  
22 the other is the Senate Committee on Academic  
23 Organization and Structure.

24 In this case, because of the timing,  
25 both of those bodies have not had a chance to review  
26 this and form an opinion. However, Kate, since you've  
27 had experience with other matters like this, do you

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 have any comments to help guide the Senate?

2 MS. CHARD: Just a couple  
3 of things. We have been watching this pretty strongly  
4 since the beginning of, I guess, the academic year when  
5 HES first went through the dissolution of Interior  
6 Design moving out. And fortunately, because they did  
7 hear what Interior Design had to go through, a lot of  
8 the work that has been done over the course of the year  
9 has been because of the request of this committee that  
10 things follow proper routing procedures, that faculty  
11 guidance does play a large role in this, so we are  
12 unfortunately to blame, I think, for the length of time  
13 it's took as a committee. But also, unfortunately,  
14 because of the large time it took, we have not been  
15 able to meet on this. And that is one of our goals of  
16 the committee is to listen to a proposal and decide  
17 whether it does have proper faculty input or not and we  
18 have not done that.

19 There were two proposals that were  
20 submitted originally to the Provost, and we do know  
21 about those as a committee. But our job is not to  
22 evaluate the quality of the two proposals, either. And  
23 so at this point we would be more than happy, and  
24 committee don't shoot me now, if they do or at their  
25 leisure, you would like us to review the current  
26 proposal that the Provost is putting forward, we could  
27 probably call a quick ad hoc meeting here at the end of

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 the year and to go ahead and meet and review that or at  
2 your leisure, we could go ahead and try to meet on that  
3 here today.

4 So we really don't have an opinion  
5 for you other than our job would be to review this  
6 proposal, see if it does have merit, see if the faculty  
7 do support it, and then perhaps provide you with some  
8 suggestions for how to do better implementation if this  
9 indeed this one is the one that seems to do that. And  
10 I'm here as a resource person if you have any  
11 questions.

12 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So before  
13 I open the floor up for discussion, we're weighing not  
14 only two proposals but we're also weighing whether we  
15 should make a decision considering what we know now  
16 without the usual deliberative process; or should we  
17 put it off, then risking lots of faculty, staff and  
18 students who still don't know what college they're  
19 going to be in when they come back in the fall?

20 The floor is open for discussion.  
21 There was a hand up. Ray, just behind you.

22 Okay. Ray?

23 MR. FORBES: I'm Ray Forbes  
24 with Family Studies.

25 I'm not a member of the Senate. I  
26 don't have a voting role here, but a couple of points.  
27 In terms of process, the committee of the faculty that

1 developed proposals for this particular change,  
2 developed the first proposal. That was a broad based  
3 committee from the college. It was a relatively narrow  
4 vote on whether to go that way; but once that vote  
5 went, the committee then was established and put forth  
6 the proposal.

7                   The second proposal came in from  
8 another group written by folks who, we are not sure but  
9 we believe were the department Chairs of the three  
10 departments in the college. The second proposal then  
11 went forward as well.

12                   The first proposal had a lot more  
13 groundwork laid for it. Deliberations with the College  
14 of Education, how we would work this, combining  
15 programs responsibly we would continue to have. The  
16 second proposal has less of that and some of that was  
17 continued and needed to be worked out as the first one.

18                   The second point has to do with  
19 timing. The feeling among the faculty, I believe, in  
20 Family Studies is that a decision is imminent and needs  
21 to be imminent and that very soon we should be able to  
22 say, probably by July 1st at the Provost's suggestion,  
23 that we have an implementation of something. The  
24 feeling among the department is it looks like it's  
25 going to be we're going to Agriculture but we're not  
26 sure very clearly about how that would weigh out.

27                   We have had a meeting with Dr. Smith,

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 Dean Smith, and that was very fruitful to do that kind  
2 of a thing. So it's kind of hard for me to stand up  
3 here because I was kind of the person that spearheaded  
4 Proposal One, the Department of Family Studies portion,  
5 to say, you know, something that would appear to be we  
6 give up. (Laughter) But I don't think that's it at all  
7 because there's a following point and that's this, the  
8 Provost has in good faith asked the Senate to give  
9 advice and recommendations.

10                   The Senate has seen this proposal for  
11 five days and I think there is considerable benefit  
12 from having some additional input from the Senate to  
13 resolve the fact that you have a department that wants  
14 to go a certain way and a college that is largely from  
15 the other two departments wants to go the other way.  
16 And so a unit -- and it depends on the unit analysis  
17 here. If the unit analysis is the college, then it is  
18 a very evenly split. The staff seems to want to go to  
19 Agriculture. The alumni seem to want that to happen,  
20 but the faculty are relatively split. If the unit  
21 analysis is departmental, you have some pretty good  
22 indicators that it would go the other way.

23                   That being said, we think that it's  
24 important to have some type of process that the Senate  
25 goes through to provide some information and maybe  
26 recommendations and some help to resolve this situation  
27 because which is going to be a bit sticky for a year or

1 two regarding how we're going to make this work in  
2 Agriculture.

3 So not being a member of the Senate,  
4 and I'm making a recommendation to the Senate but I'm  
5 not a member of the Senate, and this is the interest of  
6 timeliness, but my recommendation would be this: To  
7 allow Dr. Chard's committee to have a chance to look at  
8 this and get that information to the Senate Council and  
9 have the Senate defer to the Senate Council to provide  
10 not necessarily a yes or no on which way to go, but  
11 some input to the Provost so that there may be some  
12 things that can be added to the implementation of  
13 Proposal Two so that it can be more smoothly  
14 implemented over time.

15 All of this could take place in the  
16 next, maybe, two or three weeks. That would mean that  
17 it wouldn't come back to the full Senate but the Senate  
18 would be deferring to the committee and the Senate  
19 Council could take on that task and provide that input.  
20 That's just, you know, what I might suggest; but,  
21 obviously, there might be some other ideas. So I'd be  
22 happy to answer any questions you may have.

23 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Thank you,  
24 Ray.

25 MS. McCORMICK: Katherine  
26 McCormick, College of Ed.

27 I need some clarity in terms of,

1 would both proposals be sent to the committee or only  
2 one?

3 MS. CHARD: There has only  
4 been one proposal put forward from the Provost to the  
5 Senate Council, so only that proposal should then be  
6 ordered to the committee. Proposal Two. In the  
7 letter, he's suggesting that he would like us to review  
8 number two. Correct?

9 MR. NEITZEL: I don't think  
10 that's quite correct.

11 I indicated what my preference was  
12 based on what I had heard and the letter to Jeff  
13 actually requests an expedited process or Senate advice  
14 to me on the matter so the letter of recommendation for  
15 reorganization can be placed on the agenda. I didn't  
16 want to try to do it at the June meeting so that this  
17 could be effective for July. So I hadn't necessarily  
18 tried to suggest that there was only one proposal  
19 before you to evaluate. I wanted to indicate what on  
20 the basis of what I had seen up to this point I thought  
21 was going to be preferable.

22 MS. CHARD: Well, we can  
23 review both. We can take both and do a committee, a  
24 quick meeting.

25 MR. NEITZEL: I took Ray's  
26 recommendation to be one that was more implement --  
27 what can be done with two to make it work better. But

1 again, in that we had some discussion about the  
2 likelihood that that would be the direction we would  
3 go. And that's fine, as well.

4 I just didn't want to -- I wasn't  
5 foreclosing input from you on the other one put  
6 forward. It was just having a process that would  
7 preclude that.

8 MS. CHARD: Well, we'll  
9 take it whichever way you go.

10 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Dean Smith?

11 MR. SMITH: Can I ask for  
12 clarification of the role of the committee. I thought  
13 I heard initially that the role would be to review the  
14 process rather than to evaluate the proposals.

15 MS. CHARD: Well, we do  
16 make recommendations based on whether we see that  
17 processes do take place or not and if there was a sway  
18 -- I mean if the faculty in a proposal did not support  
19 the proposal, we would recommend to vote down the  
20 proposal. So we can evaluate two proposals at the same  
21 time.

22 MR. SMITH: But the process  
23 was essentially the issue that you would make a  
24 recommendation on.

25 MS. CHARD: It's not just  
26 the process. It's, like I said, the process could be  
27 followed perfectly and still if the faculty and

1 students involved in a proposal do not support the  
2 proposal, it is within our ability to vote down that  
3 proposal.

4 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Both  
5 process and merit?

6 MS. CHARD: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Although  
8 the typical hangups have been typically in process, I  
9 think.

10 Ray?

11 MR. FORBES: If I could  
12 clarify a minute, though, what I'm thinking is that  
13 move back to the fact that there are two proposals, but  
14 one of them -- well, the one is much more clearly  
15 flushed out in terms of the relationship between the  
16 departments if they were to be in separate units. What  
17 separates colleges, what is somewhat lacking in the  
18 second proposal, is some of that specificity as to how  
19 the units would then operate within the school because  
20 they have a history of operating within a college.

21 So what -- The best scenario for me,  
22 in a sense, or maybe for Family Studies, in a sense, if  
23 I can speak for them, is to have this -- the  
24 implication is that there's some ideas for  
25 clarification that might be in the first proposal that  
26 would be helpful in having the second proposal be  
27 smoothly implemented and the wisdom of the Senate, in

1 other words, would be brought into that process to help  
2 in the implementation of this.

3 In other words, the Provost has asked  
4 for Senate guidance. The Senate can take the  
5 information it has and provide that guidance even if it  
6 was Proposal Two that ended up getting recommended. So  
7 when I'm talking in terms of this committee, then,  
8 necessarily saying, oh, no, oh, no, we're going with  
9 Proposal One. But what could we say to the Provost to  
10 help him make his recommendation regarding this future  
11 process?

12 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Let me  
13 make sure there's no misunderstanding, though, because  
14 in the end the Senate is direct advisory to the Board  
15 of Trustees so that, in the end, if there is something  
16 that comes out from the Provost and the various  
17 departments on the Senate Council that is cohesive, the  
18 Senate still has to make that recommendation to the  
19 Board. I just want to make sure it's clear.

20 MR. NEITZEL: Just a point.  
21 Doesn't the GR say that it's advisory to the Provost?

22 MR. SMITH: I believe  
23 that's correct on matters of administrative  
24 organization.

25 MR. JONES: In one place --  
26 What's posted in one place says that. When you  
27 actually go to the December 2001 Board meeting when

1 that was supposedly adopted, that section of the GR  
2 actually was not placed before the Board. In a  
3 separate section of the GRs, it says the Senate advises  
4 the Board on academic reorganization. It's actually  
5 talked about in two places. One clearly says what he's  
6 saying. The other has (inaudible) what was before the  
7 Board or not before the Board.

8 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay.  
9 Other thoughts to bring to the table about to handle  
10 this matter?

11 MR. BAILEY: Ernie Bailey.  
12 Veterinary Science.

13 It sounds like Ray is suggesting that  
14 Proposal Two will be the one that would be adopted; but  
15 what he would like would be for there to be additional  
16 time, two weeks, three weeks, for the faculty group to  
17 look over it to make specific recommendations.

18 Do you have something in mind?

19 MR. FORBES: I don't know  
20 that I necessarily have something in mind. I'm also  
21 concerned about the Senate being able to do what it  
22 should do in that respect in matters of governance.  
23 And if it chooses to make a decision today based on  
24 five days, that concerns me. So I'm thinking there's a  
25 possibility here of finding a way to get this to happen  
26 while at the same time maintaining the Senate's ability  
27 to have some input in the process as a matter of its

1 obligation to do just that.

2 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Ray, if I  
3 can clarify it. If that's the sense of Family Studies,  
4 is that reflected anywhere in any of the paperwork  
5 that's come forward or has this sentiment just sort of  
6 come to the front as of recently?

7 MR. FORBES: Well, it  
8 wouldn't have been in any of the paperwork because the  
9 paperwork was telling you what Family Studies wanted.  
10 That's Proposal One. But since that time, Family  
11 Studies has gotten together. One of the problems we  
12 have in this is that -- I have to be careful how I say  
13 this, I guess. But there isn't any leadership in the  
14 department if you put Proposal One, in terms of the  
15 leadership in the department. So this is the faculty  
16 acting independently.

17 Since the Provost met with us, the  
18 sense has been in the department, well, okay, that's  
19 what's going to happen. How is that going to work?  
20 And I think the Senate has a role to play in providing  
21 some of that input, some assistance in this process so  
22 that when this is implemented, there may be, you know,  
23 there's wisdom in this group and that's what the  
24 Provost is asking for. The information's all about  
25 wisdom. We don't want it to go on past July 1st.

26 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Liz?

27 MS. DEBSKI: Liz Debski,

1 Biology.

2 Just a question. Are you saying that  
3 Family Studies, that you don't feel Family Studies has  
4 had the chance to add any input into Proposal Two? I  
5 mean, you seem to be--

6 MR. FORBES: What we had  
7 was we had our own -- that Proposal One was developed  
8 by the faculty of the college. What it came to, you  
9 know, that has some type of a hold because it was more  
10 than just the faculty staff, it was the stake holders.  
11 When that point came, there were two proposals. This  
12 second proposal came from another process. And when  
13 the faculty voted on that, it was a one-vote majority  
14 across the college in favor of Proposal One. However,  
15 that's, you know, the staff, as the Provost has  
16 mentioned, the alumni and a lot of other folks liked  
17 Proposal Two. So if you broke the vote down by  
18 departmental, clearly the majority of Family Studies  
19 wanted Proposal One and the majority of the rest liked  
20 Proposal Two. I guess we have gotten to the point, how  
21 are we going to work with this Proposal Two and--

22 MS. DEBSKI: Yeah. I  
23 understand what he said.

24 My question really had to do with,  
25 before you had said something about Kate's committee  
26 flushing out Proposal Two in terms of who reports to  
27 whom and you said that Family Studies did that with

1 Proposal One and that the Senate would do those things.  
2 And what I'm really asking you is, has Family Studies  
3 had any chance to put suggestions like that of itself?

4 MR. FORBES: Well, in one  
5 sense we did because we met Friday with Dean Smith and  
6 we talked about some of the issues that we were  
7 concerned with. All I'm talking about is having the  
8 Senate have a chance to review this to establish the  
9 processes and take a look at this, provide any wisdom  
10 it might have, provide that information to the Senate  
11 Council and Kate's committee, and let that go to the  
12 Provost. And then the Provost can make the  
13 recommendation to the Board and we can get this thing  
14 taken care of.

15 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Scott,  
16 then Pat.

17 MR. SMITH: To answer that  
18 somewhat more fully. Both proposals were circulated to  
19 all personnel in the college. There was an opportunity  
20 for the everybody to comment on either or both  
21 proposals. There was an opportunity to modify the  
22 proposals based on the comment we see. The reality,  
23 however, was that one group of people were working  
24 exclusively on one proposal and another group was  
25 working exclusively on another proposal and they  
26 weren't coming together.

27 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Professor

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 Burkhart.

2 MS. BURKHART: I was just  
3 going to make a MOTION that, in fairness, and for open  
4 deliberations from the Senate, that we send this  
5 forward to the committee to review it and bring down a  
6 recommendation.

7 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Can you be  
8 more specific? Bring it back to whom and when?

9 MS. BURKHART: Bring it  
10 back to the Senate.

11 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. So  
12 that would imply either calling a special meeting over  
13 the summer or waiting until the first fall meeting. I  
14 just want to make sure that it's clear.

15 So is that the MOTION?

16 MS. BURKHART: Well, is  
17 there a sense of urgency or do we have to have this  
18 done by July 1st?

19 (Audience chatter unintelligible.)

20 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So, hang  
21 on. We're trying to phrase a motion on the floor first  
22 and see if it's seconded.

23 MS. BURKHART: Can the  
24 Senate Council somehow poll the Senators or, you know,  
25 based on the recommendation of the committee, can we  
26 see that?

27 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Anything's

1 possible. So--

2 MS. BURKHART: That would  
3 be my recommendation. That would be what I would  
4 propose.

5 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: I see.  
6 Okay.

7 MS. CHARD: To put it back  
8 to the Senate Council alone and not go back to the full  
9 Senate to make it even faster, you could put your hands  
10 with the Senate Council.

11 MS. BURKHART: My  
12 recommendation would be that it would come back to the  
13 Senate.

14 MR. CIBULL: You could do  
15 that electronically with the Senate Council, but I  
16 think that's not a realistic -- you either are going to  
17 vote on it or you're going to revert back to the  
18 committee and it's going to take however long it takes.  
19 That's the reality of what's going to happen.

20 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So,  
21 anyway, let's be fair. So the MOTION on the floor is  
22 to send it to the committee and then eventually to have  
23 it come back to the Senate, either through a meeting or  
24 electronic or otherwise. Is there a second to that  
25 motion?

26 MR. GOVINDARAJULU: SECOND.

27 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: It's

1 seconded.

2 Okay, further discussion now?

3 MR. SMITH: I can assure  
4 you of one issue on which there is a consensus, and  
5 that is the duration of this uncertainty has been  
6 incredibly destructive, that we enter another academic  
7 year in a state of uncertainty, that the level of  
8 destruction will be great. I suspect that maybe with a  
9 very small number of exceptions, all of the faculty  
10 would support the resolution before the beginning of  
11 next April. And there are others from HES here who may  
12 wish to speak to this.

13 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Is there  
14 anyone who wants to speak to that issue?

15 Yes. Please introduce yourself.

16 MS. FORSYTHE: Hazel  
17 Forsythe--

18 COURT REPORTER: Your name  
19 again, please?

20 MS. FORSYTHE: Hazel  
21 Forsythe. Excuse my allergy.

22 I totally agree with Dr. Smith.  
23 We've done all the discussion we could do. In the  
24 second proposal, we had representatives from each of  
25 the departments. And there were some persons who  
26 worked exclusively on Proposal One, others worked on  
27 Proposal Two. And so we had a number of discussions

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 across the groups and determined that Proposal Two had  
2 the approval of our constituents outside of the college  
3 or donors or scholarship proposals or alumni or an  
4 advisory board and so was the consensus that this has  
5 gone on too long for everyone. So we totally agree  
6 that the faster we can get this settled by July 1 would  
7 be better for us.

8 As Ray said earlier, he thinks that  
9 Proposal Two wasn't flushed out as much as Proposal  
10 One. But if you consider all that Proposal Two says is  
11 that we stay together as a unit, we have been  
12 interactive, we have been working together for years,  
13 so there's nothing that changes to great extent -- who  
14 gets to sign the paperwork outside of the college and  
15 that doesn't need as much deliberation as does the  
16 (inaudible). How does the faculty get invited? How  
17 we're staffed?

18 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay.  
19 Now, make sure you're talking to the motion on the  
20 floor to send it to the committee back to the Senate  
21 for review.

22 Is this to the motion?

23 UNIDENTIFIED: Have we  
24 voted on that?

25 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: We didn't  
26 vote on it yet.

27 UNIDENTIFIED: You called

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 the question.

2 MR. KRAMER: Call the  
3 question.

4 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. So  
5 call the question on the motion made.

6 All in favor of stopping debate,  
7 please raise your hand.

8 ("AYE" HAND-COUNT VOTE: MAJORITY)

9 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. All  
10 those opposed.

11 ("NAY" HAND-COUNT VOTE: 7)

12 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay, so  
13 six, seven opposed.

14 So we're voting now on the MOTION  
15 made by Pat Burkhart to send it to the committee back  
16 through to the Senate for electronic vote. Is that  
17 clear?

18 MR. GOVINDARAJULU: One  
19 clarification.

20 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Yes.

21 MR. GOVINDARAJULU: This  
22 would be next year when we send it back to the Senate,  
23 correct?

24 MS. WALDHART: There's no  
25 way to do it prior to July 1.

26 MS. STATEN: We can't have  
27 an emergency meeting or...?

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 MR. TAGAVI: Make that part  
2 of the motion.

3 MR. CIBULL: There is no  
4 more debate on that motion.

5 MS. BURKHART: Well, it  
6 came back to the Senate. We could have it come back  
7 and we could have an emergency meeting if it needed to  
8 come back to the Senate.

9 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So the  
10 essence of the MOTION, then, is that it would not be  
11 discussed further at this meeting, it would be  
12 discussed or talked about at a later time?

13 MS. BURKHART: Right.

14 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay.  
15 Let's--

16 MR. TAGAVI: May I ask that  
17 the Chairman would rule whether the Senate could have a  
18 meeting even during summer because I think there is  
19 some reason -- and this is not fair to the Senators who  
20 are not employed, who are not going to be here, to have  
21 a meeting. They're going to be deprived of their work and  
22 of their opinion. Is it even possible to call an  
23 emergency meeting to during summer? I'm asking for a  
24 ruling on that.

25 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Yes. The  
26 terms of the Senate goes until August 15th.  
27 Practically speaking, I don't think it's happened

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 frequently. Let's take a straw vote. How many could  
2 attend an emergency meeting of the Senate sometime at  
3 the end of May or beginning of June?

4 (SENATORS RAISE HANDS)

5 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So a straw  
6 vote, maybe three-quarters to seven-eighths of the  
7 attendees present.

8 MR. TAGAVI: Would that be  
9 a quorum?

10 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Forty-five  
11 people would be a quorum.

12 MR. TAGAVI: Can I ask we  
13 contemplate this?

14 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So I think  
15 I'd rather go ahead and vote on the motion right now.  
16 We've got a sense of the Senate, okay?

17 So, all in favor of the motion,  
18 please raise your hands.

19 ("AYE" HAND-COUNT VOTE: 8 or 9)

20 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Eight or  
21 nine. All those opposed.

22 ("NAY" HAND-COUNT VOTE: MAJORITY)

23 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay, the  
24 majority. So the motion fails.

25 Mike?

26 MR. NEITZEL: Let me offer  
27 a suggestion for how we might proceed in line with what

1 Ray has recommended. His committee would like to take  
2 particularly Proposal Two -- And I agree with Hazel  
3 that probably some of the difference in detail is that  
4 you inherit quite a bit of the specifics when three  
5 units who have always been together stay together,  
6 particularly with respect to curriculum. You do have  
7 to have additional details when you pull them into a  
8 separate organization. But if Kate's committee would  
9 like to look at Proposal Two and identify in  
10 consultation with Family Studies some of the areas of  
11 implementation that raise concern and about which there  
12 would be some suggestions, I would be happy to meet  
13 with them after that. And perhaps, Scott, you would be  
14 willing to do that, as well, to find out what those  
15 recommendations are and try to get some assurances to  
16 the department that we will address those.

17 I don't think we can probably lay out  
18 every specific matter that you will come to identify as  
19 you govern yourself in the future, but if there are  
20 some big ones out there that are a concern that we need  
21 some details on, it seems to me we could let Kate's  
22 committee take a look at it, meet with her after that,  
23 or with the entire committee, and give some feedback  
24 back to Family Studies or all the units in HES about  
25 those recommendations and then report.

26 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: We have  
27 two HES Senators in the audience. I would like to call

1 on either of you to comment on that.

2 MS. GAETKE: Lisa Gaetke.

3 I would say that that's a good idea.  
4 I do think it's fair to at least let Kate Chard's  
5 committee see this because there's been such a time  
6 crunch. But I also have to agree that something needs  
7 to be done as soon as possible because it has really  
8 torn apart the college.

9 MS. DANDEO: I would concur  
10 with Lisa Gaetke.

11 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: That's  
12 Lisa Dandeo.

13 Professor Grossman?

14 MR. GROSSMAN: I would like  
15 to make a MOTION that we send this to Kate's committee  
16 and that the Senate will concur with whatever  
17 recommendations her committee makes.

18 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: As a point  
19 of clarification, do you want to include the Senate  
20 Council at all or have the Senate Committee on Academic  
21 Organization and Structure be the final arbiter?

22 MR. GROSSMAN: I am  
23 comfortable with having the Senate Committee be the  
24 final arbiter; but if my motion fails, someone else can  
25 propose another motion to the Council.

26 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. Is  
27 there a second to that?

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 MS. STATON: SECOND. Ruth  
2 Staton.

3 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay.  
4 Discussion?

5 MR. TAGAVI: I'd like to  
6 amend that to include the Senate Council. The Senate  
7 Council also meets regularly during summer and it's the  
8 Senate Council who presents to Senate, not the Senate  
9 Committee, and I don't think even maybe according to  
10 the rule for the Senate to delegate their authority to  
11 a committee, we can delegate our authority to the  
12 Senate Council.

13 MR. GROSSMAN: I will  
14 accept Kavi's amendment.

15 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So what  
16 would your motion now read?

17 MR. GROSSMAN: (MOTION)  
18 That it go to Kate's committee and that as soon as  
19 possible it would be forwarded to the Senate Council  
20 for a vote and then the Senate will accept whatever  
21 recommendations the Senate Council makes based on what  
22 Kate's committee recommends.

23 MR. TAGAVI: I'd like to  
24 just clarify what "it" is because it seems to me that  
25 right now there are two proposals in front of us, but  
26 little by little we are explicitly becoming one  
27 proposal, the other one being overwhelmingly supported

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 by the faculty.

2 I feel a little bit uneasy to even  
3 implicitly drop that proposal. I think whatever is in  
4 front of the Senate right now should go in front of  
5 Kate's committee and then come to the Senate Council.

6 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: In other  
7 words, both proposals?

8 MR. TAGAVI: Well, what  
9 "it" means. "It" means both proposals.

10 MR. GROSSMAN: That was  
11 inherent in what I said, that what is in this packet  
12 that we were presented goes to Kate's committee, make a  
13 decision, make a recommendation to the Senate Council.  
14 They make a decision and make recommendations to the  
15 Provost.

16 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Professor  
17 Cibull?

18 MR. CIBULL: I sit on the  
19 Senate Council and have questions about the Senate  
20 Council's ability to add much to this process except  
21 for a lot more argument. I think that the Senate would  
22 be abrogating its responsibility in doing that. I  
23 think that if the Provost is willing to consult with  
24 Professor Chard's committee, I think that would be an  
25 appropriate way to handle this because we need as  
26 little more heat generated as possible. I think that  
27 doing it, having the Senate Council do it just would

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 continue this debate, prolong the debate unnecessarily.  
2 So I'm against the motion.

3 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Other  
4 comments on the motion?

5 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let me  
6 just say I'm probably going to abstain on this motion  
7 and probably all subsequent votes with this simply  
8 because I think this comes to the Senate in five days  
9 and all of a sudden there's this massive crunch because  
10 previously there was an attempt to make a consensus and  
11 they really couldn't move forward. That's not really  
12 the Senate's fault, but I get the impression that the  
13 Senate's sort of being asked to make a decision without  
14 going through all our normal procedures of having our  
15 appropriate committees go through it; and, personally,  
16 I'm not sure I feel strongly on one proposal one way or  
17 the other. I suspect there's some hidden stories here  
18 that's not coming out on the floor, and that could only  
19 happen with the Senate being put in the position of  
20 being asked to answer this simply because it's a last-  
21 minute rush.

22 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Mike, do  
23 you want to respond to that?

24 MR. NEITZEL: Well, I just  
25 wanted to point out that I think you invited me to  
26 bring this letter forward as soon as I could, Jeff, so  
27 that we did have an opportunity to discuss it at this

1 particular meeting. So I was responding to your  
2 request as I understood it from the Senate Council to  
3 try to get this on the agenda at this point in time.

4 This reflected the fact that every  
5 faculty member I think in HES believed that this needed  
6 to be brought to a conclusion for the benefit of all  
7 three units.

8 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Well ...  
9 And honestly, this being the last Senate meeting and  
10 having heard nothing up to that point, we kind of got  
11 concerned that it would never make it here and that  
12 there might be a decision made over the summer that we  
13 were all surprised by.

14 MS. GARVEY: Beth Garvey,  
15 Medicine.

16 I've not heard anybody actually speak  
17 against Proposal Two from the departments. Does  
18 anybody really feel strongly that the second proposal  
19 is not appropriate and they can't live with it?

20 MS. STATON: I have a  
21 question about that. We keep saying that these  
22 departments have been together; but Interior Design,  
23 wasn't it part of it and they went another way? Am I  
24 missing something in there, for Family Studies who seem  
25 to feel like they might never belong someplace else?

26 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: It seems  
27 to me that there was little question that all the

1 players in Interior Design were in favor of that,  
2 including, I think, the remaining colleagues in HES.

3 Am I correct, Ray? So that was  
4 basically not disputed. So we're still speaking to the  
5 motion, now, to send it to the Senate Committee and  
6 then to the Senate Council.

7 MR. GOVINDARAJULU: Let me  
8 ask a question. What are you shooting for? Is the  
9 student administrator of your flow chart structure? I  
10 have many concerns but I'm really concerned that they  
11 should come back to the Senate. Otherwise, I'm okay.

12  
13 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So to  
14 clarify your question, that is, is this merely just a  
15 reshuffling of names and faces or is there some  
16 academic merit to this?

17 MR. GOVINDARAJULU:  
18 Absolutely.

19 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Ray, do  
20 you want to respond to that?

21 MR. FORBES: I don't know  
22 about the last part, about the academic merit part, but  
23 as of now there is no program change part of this  
24 proposal. However, in Proposal One there were some  
25 suggestions about how program changes might transpire  
26 and it may be that there are some aspects there that  
27 would come about, but that would be next year and that

1 would come back to the Senate under the normal  
2 processes.

3 So the answer to the question is, I  
4 don't think so. It's more of a structure issue. It's  
5 a structure question.

6 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Anybody  
7 else want to speak to this motion?

8 MS. CHARD: I did not  
9 understand the question.

10 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: The  
11 question was whether this has academic substance to it  
12 in terms of what college these departments are housed  
13 in or is it just more of a reorganization that will not  
14 have major impact on the programs, the education,  
15 teaching, research and service missions?

16 Did I state that correctly?

17 MR. GOVINDARAJULU: Yes.

18 MS. MCCORMICK: I don't  
19 know if we can answer the question set forth in the  
20 proposal. Certainly it reaches the education programs,  
21 including in the Department of Family Studies. The  
22 accreditation is still there. I don't know in terms of  
23 administratively saying that the liaison and  
24 collaboration with Northern Kentucky, the accreditation  
25 is in place now.

26 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: The motion  
27 is on the floor. Any other questions or comments?

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1                   The MOTION is to send it to the  
2 Senate Committee followed by the Senate Council making  
3 its recommendations.

4                   All in favor raise your hands.

5                   Count, please.

6                                   SARGENT-AT-ARMS: Thirty-  
7 three.

8 ("AYE" HAND-COUNT VOTE: 33)

9                                   CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Thirty-  
10 three. All opposed?

11                                   SARGENT-AT-ARMS: Ten.

12 ("NAY" HAND-COUNT VOTE: 10)

13                                   CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Any  
14 conscientious objections. (Laughter)

15                   Okay. So that's what we're going to  
16 do with it now.

17                   Could I beg your indulgence for one  
18 quickie that was on the agenda? This should be an easy  
19 one. It's left over from the SACS accreditation. It  
20 should be fairly straight forward. This was regarding  
21 the 400G- and 500-level courses.

22                   Enid?

23                                   MS. WALDHART: Very  
24 quickly, what the SACS accrediting folks were concerned  
25 about was that there were courses that had combinations  
26 of graduate and undergraduate students in them but no  
27 clear delineation of what the graduate students did to

1 get graduate credit or the undergraduates did to get  
2 undergraduate education. And so they asked that they  
3 do some clarification about what would count which way.

4 And so the proposal is that, as  
5 you're looking at this, that they must be structured to  
6 allow something for undergraduates and something for  
7 graduate students and that that would be included in  
8 the syllabus as the courses were being offered.

9 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So this is  
10 through the Graduate Council. It was approved and sent  
11 to the Senate Committee on Admissions and Academic  
12 Standards and received approval.

13 Are there any questions about the  
14 rationale here? Professor Grossman?

15 MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah. This  
16 is a quixotic question, but who is it at SACS who was  
17 entrusted with the authority for making this decision  
18 and who entrusted them without authority?

19 I think this is incredibly stupid,  
20 but we are forced to do it.

21 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Does the  
22 Provost have any insight on the people behind this?

23 MR. NEITZEL: No.

24 (Laughter)

25 MR. NEITZEL: Actually, we  
26 are SACS. We are members of SACS just like anybody  
27 else that is subject to its accreditation, so we've met

1 the enemy on this one and it is us.

2                                 These are standards that the  
3 participating universities and colleges contribute to.  
4 These will be changed under the new SACS criteria by  
5 the time that we, hopefully, are subject to re-  
6 accreditation. But for now, this is one that SACS has  
7 actually been very stringent on enforcing at some  
8 universities when they have not been convinced that  
9 there is some kind of differentiation in the  
10 expectation of courses.

11                                 MR. TAGAVI: When you said  
12 this is not controversial, you didn't check with me  
13 before that.

14 (Laughter)

15                                 I think that this is my  
16 understanding. When you teach 500-level courses to  
17 undergraduates and grads, I always drop the limit of  
18 the undergrad to the grad; and I thought that when a  
19 student mentioned to their family and their friends,  
20 I'm taking a graduate course, they would say wow.  
21 After this, it will not be. It will be another  
22 undergraduate course. In fact, this says -- I am  
23 uneasy that this we are not being requested -- in fact,  
24 forced. Professors were treating undergrads on the  
25 level of grads and bring them back up to a level of  
26 undergrads. One, what is then the difference between a  
27 400- and 500-level course for undergrads anymore?

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 None. Think about it for five, ten, 15 seconds. If we  
2 adopt this, there is absolutely no difference between a  
3 400-level course and a 500-level course for an  
4 undergrad. At this point it will also encourage a lot  
5 more departments to put 300 level courses and 500-level  
6 courses together under one 500-level course but then  
7 keep their old criteria of 300 level, lower criteria  
8 for undergrad.

9 I'm really uneasy about this. I know  
10 SACS is asking it. I read that one sentence. I don't  
11 think SACS is exactly asking for this, but I am not  
12 going to dispute that.

13 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Other  
14 comments?

15 MR. GROSSMAN: I did not  
16 realize, Kavi, that I was not the only person so I'll  
17 allow myself to be a little bit more measured this  
18 time. The idea that undergraduates -- or that the  
19 graduate students are at so much higher a level than  
20 the undergraduates is ludicrous. Our good  
21 undergraduates, the ones who are taking 500-level  
22 courses here, are as good as graduate students anywhere  
23 in the country and to treat them somehow differently  
24 just because they have one-year difference in education  
25 I think is just absolutely ludicrous.

26 And I don't know who it is at SACS  
27 who made this decision. You said "the enemy is us." I

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 know we're members of SACS and accreditation is  
2 required for state funding and all that; but, again, I  
3 don't know who is it at SACS who makes these academic  
4 decisions. And I know that there are political  
5 pressures to make this decision, but I think it's very  
6 ludicrous.

7 MS. STATEN: Call the  
8 question.

9 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay.  
10 Should anybody count?

11 All those in favor of stopping  
12 debate, raise your hands.

13 (SENATORS RAISE HANDS.)

14 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: A clear  
15 majority would you say, Professor Blyton?

16 MR. BLYTON: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. The  
18 MOTION is to accept the recommendations here.

19 All in favor please raise your hands.

20 Let's take a count Susan, please.

21 Thanks.

22 SARGENT-AT-ARMS: Twenty-  
23 five.

24 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: All  
25 opposed.

26 SARGENT-AT-ARMS: Excuse  
27 me, 26.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MAY 5, 2003

1 ("AYE" HAND-COUNT VOTE: 26)

2 SARGENT-AT-ARMS: It's 12.

3 ("NAY" HAND-COUNT VOTE: 12)

4 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Twelve.

5 Okay. So the motion passes.

6 While there were two other agenda

7 items, you have been remarkably patient.

8 Is there a question, David?

9 MR. RANDALL: There should  
10 not have been a quorum then.

11 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: How's  
12 that? With the total?

13 COURT REPORTER: I didn't  
14 hear his question.

15 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: The  
16 comment was that there was not a quorum.

17 MR. RANDALL: Were we at 45  
18 people?

19 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: What was  
20 the total numbers on that?

21 SARGENT-AT-ARMS: Twenty-six  
22 and 12.

23 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Twenty-six  
24 and 12. So that's 37, 38. Were there any abstentions  
25 from that? One, two, three, four.

26 Do I hear just a few more?

27 (Laughter)



