

***University Senate Agendas, 2012-2013***

All meetings are from 3:00 - 5:00 pm in the Auditorium of W. T. Young Library  
unless otherwise noted.

## **Monday, September 10, 2012**

1. State of the University Address - University Senate Chair Eli Capilouto
2. Minutes and Announcements
  - a. Minutes from March 19, 2012 p. 2-5
  - b. Minutes from April 9, 2012 p. 6-9
  - c. Minutes from May 7, 2012 p. 10-25
3. Officer and Other Reports
  - a. Chair
  - b. Vice Chair
  - c. Parliamentarian
  - d. Trustee
4. UK August 2012 Degree List (second of two) (Separate handout)
5. Committee Reports
  - a. Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) - Davy Jones, Chair
    - i. Proposed Change to *Senate Rules 5.4.1* ("Residence Requirements") p. 26
  - b. Senate's Academic Facilities Committee - Alice Christ, Chair
    - i. 2011 - 2012 Annual Report p. 27-30
6. Proposed December 2012 Honorary Degree Recipients (three nominees) - Dean Blackwell, Chair,  
University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees
7. Report on Student Government Association - Stephen Bilas, SGA President

***Next Meeting: October 08, 2012***

## University Senate

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm in the Auditorium of W. T. Young Library on Monday, March 19, 2012. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Hollie I. Swanson called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:05 pm.

### 1. Minutes from February 13, 2012 and Announcements

The Chair noted that there were no changes received for the February minutes. D. Jones **moved** to approve the Senate minutes from February 13, 2012 and J. Blackwell **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair offered a variety of announcements.

- The Chair approved the inclusion to the December 2012 degree list of a student earning an MS in Rehabilitation Counseling.
- There are three web transmittals are currently posted – please review them:
  - March 14, 2012: Courses and Programs
  - March 12, 2012: Courses and Programs
  - March 9, 2012: Courses, Programs and Calendar
- Provost Kumble Subbaswamy has begun to look at the organizational structure of the Provost's office.

### 2. QEP Update (Multimodal Communication Across the Curriculum) – Diane Snow and Deanna Sellnow

Guest Diane Snow and Deanna Sellnow offered a presentation to update senators on the Quality Enhancement Plan. They explained that due to the length of the name of the chosen topic (“Multimodal Communication Across the Curriculum”), it underwent a name change to “Presentation U.”

After their presentation, Sellnow and Snow answered questions from senators. The Chair asked them to offer some information on what the expert reviewers reported. Sellnow said that the expert reviewers, and recent research, suggested against having just a student focus, or just on general education. If there is not broad-based faculty buy-in, or if it is required and not optional, it will be more difficult to implement. Discussions with UK faculty have gone well, which is important for faculty to feel that the QEP consultants hear what faculty members want. If SACS approves “Presentation U,” there will be a five-year pilot and implementation plan that will accommodate various levels and types of information dissemination.

### 3. Officer and Other Reports

#### President's Chief of Staff – Bill Swinford

The Chair invited Bill Swinford, the President's Chief of Staff, to offer a report to the Senate. Guest Swinford did so; he spoke to senators about the impending cut in funding from Frankfort and how President Capilouto envisions that the cuts will be communicated and distributed. Swinford answered questions on how federal support can be contingent upon state support; the use of coal severance funds for scholarships and the proposal to put the University of Pikeville into the Commonwealth's public system; and how the President will determine cuts for administrative and academic units.

#### b. Vice Chair's Report

Vice Chair Grossman reported that the response to the solicitation for nominees for the annual Outstanding Senator Award had not been great – he asked senators to email him with nominations. Last year's winner was Davy Jones and therefore ineligible to be nominated this year; current SC members are ineligible but past SC members are eligible.

#### c. Trustee Report

Trustee John Wilson (ME/Behavioral Science) thanked the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee for a smooth election process and also thanked the Senate as a whole for supporting the voting process. He offered a few comments to senators on how he intended to serve faculty as one of their trustees.

#### i. Background on Proposed Changes to Governing Regulations

Wilson explained that at the request of the Chair, he will give some brief background information on amending the *Governing Regulations*, specifically *GR I.C.3*. He showed senators a table that showed how the Core Values had changed since 2003. When the 2009 – 2014 Strategic Plan was approved, it included some changes to the Core Values, specifically the removal of two of the values (“personal and institutional accountability and responsibility” and “sense of community”). Unfortunately, the corresponding language in *GR I.C.3* was not also revised. He said that no one now could remember why those were removed and that the members of the Board of Trustees were not clearly informed that the values listed in the Strategic Plan omitted the two values (“personal and institutional accountability and responsibility” and “sense of community”) that still remained in *GR I.C.3*.

Wilson answered a variety of questions from senators.

#### a. Chair's Report

##### i. Proposed Changes to *Governing Regulations I.C.3*

The Chair explained that there had been a considerable amount of discussion among SC members, various Board of Trustees members and administrators to work through the issue of the change to the Core Values.

The Chair stated that the **motion** from the Senate Council was to recommend that the University Senate ask President Capilouto to forward to the Board of Trustees a request to amend *Governing Regulation I.C.3* (“Values”) to keep the Core Values of “Personal and institutional responsibility and accountability” and “A sense of community” and modify the 2009 – 2014 Strategic Plan accordingly.

After a few additional comments, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The Chair commented that efforts to draft a new strategic plan would likely begin around January.

##### ii. Proposed Changes to *Governing Regulations IV.C* (“University Senate Functions”)

The Chair asked Davy Jones, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), to explain the proposed changes. Jones did so, noting that the language was a result of a new policy at the Southern Association for Colleges and Schools (SACS). The proposed language was vetted and endorsed by the SREC.

The **motion** from the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee was that the Senate endorse the proposed new wording for *Governing Regulations IV.C.2 and IV.C.3* (“University Senate Functions”). After discussion by senators, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair gave Senate members an update on activities by the Faculty Committee on Review, Reward and Retention. She said that there will be open forums for all faculty (for all ranks and title series) on Thursday, March 22, from 2 – 4:30 pm (Medical Center, MN 263) and also on Friday, March 23, from 9 – 11 am (Center Theater, Student Center).

She also offered information on the proposed new process and questions for the evaluation of the president. It was undertaken by the Senate Council (SC), with Coyne and Wasilkowski leading the effort. There was an informational presentation given to the Senate in November 2011, with a request for input from senators (no comments received). Coyne explained how the survey was designed, as well as the rationale behind the different questions. He and the Chair answered a variety of questions from senators. Towards the end, the Chair added that she would speak with Board of Trustees Chair E. Britt Brockman, MD later in the week to discuss when the faculty's input would be included.

The Chair asked senators to comment on how the faculty's input would be incorporated into the presidential evaluation process. There were a variety of opinions offered.

#### 4. Committee Reports

##### a. Senate's Admission and Academic Standards Committee

###### i. Dual Credit / Proposed Change to Senate Rules 3.2.0 and Senate Rules 4.3.1.2.4

Raphael Finkel, chair of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAASC), explained the proposal to senators. There were a variety of questions. Jeannine Blackwell, dean of the Graduate School, and Mike Mullen, associate provost for undergraduate education, assisted in answering questions.

The Chair stated that the **motion** from the SAASC was that the Senate approve the proposal to allow Dual Credit, and the changes to *Senate Rules 3.2.0* and *Senate Rules 4.2.1.3.4*. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with two opposed and two abstaining.

##### b. Senate's Academic Programs Committee

###### i. Proposed New Undergraduate Certificate in Global Studies

Hippisley, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal for a new Undergraduate Certificate in Global Studies. The **motion** from the SAPC was that the Senate approve the proposed new Undergraduate Certificate in Global Studies, effective fall 2012. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

###### ii. Proposed New Minor in Information Studies

Hippisley explained the proposed new Minor in Information Studies. There were a few questions. The **motion** from the SAPC was that the Senate approve the proposed new Minor in Information Studies, effective fall 2012. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstaining.

###### iii. Proposed New BSEd in STEM Education

Hippisley explained the proposal for a new BSEd in STEM Education. D. Jones asked if the home department and college could be included in the motion, and Hippisley agreed. The **motion** from the SAPC was that the Senate approve the proposed new Bachelor of Science in Education in STEM Education (Mathematics and Physics content areas), within the Department of STEM Education, in the College of Education, effective fall 2012. There were no further questions from senators. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iv. Proposed New PhD in Gender and Women's Studies

Hippisley explained the proposal. Jones asked that the home department and college be included in the motion. There were a variety of questions from senators. It was made clear that the Master of Arts degree would not be a stand-alone degree, but rather would be awarded *en passant* as a student progresses toward the PhD. There were a few questions from senators.

The **motion** from the SAPC was that the Senate approve the proposed new PhD in Gender and Women's Studies, in the College of Arts and Sciences, within the Department of Gender and Women's Studies, effective fall 2012. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with one opposed and one abstaining.

Proposed New MA in Gender and Women's Studies

Although students will not be directly admitted into the MA, it was opined that as a distinct degree, the Senate should explicitly approve it.

The **motion** from the SAPC was that the Senate approve the proposed new (en passant) Master of Arts in Gender and Women's Studies, in the College of Arts and Sciences, within the Department of Gender and Women's Studies, effective fall 2012. Senators discussed the proposal, as well as whether or not "en passant" was necessary. Grossman **proposed an amendment** to remove "en passant" from the motion. Friar **seconded** the amendment. A **vote** was taken on the amendment and the amendment **failed** with five in favor and a vast majority opposed.

A **vote** was taken on the **motion** that the Senate approve the proposed new (en passant) Master of Arts in Gender and Women's Studies, in the College of Arts and Sciences, within the Department of Gender and Women's Studies, effective fall 2012. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. State of Undergraduate Education

Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mike Mullen offered a presentation to senators.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:23 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Robert Grossman,  
University Senate Secretary

Absences: Adams; Anderson; Anstead; Baker; Ballard; Birdwhistell; Brennen; Butler; Campbell; Capilouto; de Beer; Deep; DeWall; D'Orazio; Eckman; Effgen; Ettensohn; Feist-Price; Fielden; Geddes; Hackbart; Harris; Heller; Hong-McAtee; Jackson; Jasper; Jones, D.; Kelly; Kilgore; Kirk; Kirschling; Kornbluh; Kovash; Larson; Lee; Lester; Martin; Mazur; McCormick; Mountford; Newman; O'Hair, D.; O'Hair, MJ; Peek; Peffer; Richey; Rieske-Kinney; Sarge; Schein; Scutchfield; Sekulic; Shannon; Smith; Speaks; Steiner; Subbaswamy; Tick; Tracy, J.; Tracy, T.; Turner; Voro; Wasilkowski; Wells; Wimberly; Wiseman; Witt; Wyatt; Yelowitz.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on 7/12/12.

## University Senate

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, April 9, 2012 in the Auditorium of W. T. Young Library. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Hollie I. Swanson called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:03 pm.

### 1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair noted that there were no minutes ready for approval.

There were a few announcements.

- The SC recently received a request from the Martin School of Public Policy and Administration regarding an alternate calendar and waiver of *Senate Rules 5.2.2* (course load) for the Master's in Public Administration. SC members approved a one-time waiver to allow the MPA program to teach two 3-credit hour courses in a four-week period, with the course calendar reverting to a six-week term in future years.
- Congratulations to the following winners of the Provost's Award for Outstanding Teaching
  - Faculty:
    - Kimberly W. Anderson, Chemical & Materials Engineering
    - James F. Fox, Civil Engineering,
    - Sue E. Nokes, Biosystems & Agricultural Engineering
    - William J. Silvia, Animal & Food Science
    - Irene Chico Wyatt, Hispanic Studies
  - Teaching Assistants:
    - Mahan Ellison, Hispanic Studies
    - Joshua T. Guerin, Computer Science
    - Pauline S. Stratman, Chemistry
    - Nesa Wasarhaley, Psychology
  - Provost's Distinguished Service Professors:
    - Francie R. Chassen-Lopez, Department of History
    - Mark Dignan, Department of Internal Medicine
    - Laurie M. Lawrence, Department of Animal and Food Sciences
    - Joseph Straley, Department of Physics and Astronomy
  - Provost's Public Scholars:
    - Paul Eakin - Mathematics
  - Faculty Research Professors (2012-2013):
    - Doug Andres, Molecular and Cellular Biochemistry
    - Mark Dignan, Internal Medicine
    - Mark Fillmore from Psychology
    - Chris Pool, Anthropology
- The Sarah Bennett Holmes Award is granted annually to women working at UK who promote the growth and well-being of other women at UK and across the Commonwealth. There were 60 nominees for the award this year. Congratulations to the 2012 winners:
  - Faculty: Gail Kennedy, Libraries

- Staff: Ann Bassoni, Work+Life

## 2. Officer and Other Reports

### a. Chair's Report

The Chair gave senators an update on the Faculty Committee on Review, Reward and Retention (FCR3). She asked senators to send input, and to encourage colleagues to send input, to either the Chair or other members of FCR3. She said FCR3 was currently setting up interviews with faculty council chairs, deans and department chairs.

The Chair said that it was with regret that Board of Trustees Chair E. Britt Brockman was called away for surgery and was unable to attend the day's meeting. In lieu of his attendance, the Chair asked Bill Swinford, chief of staff to President Eli Capilouto, to give an update.

Guest Swinford offered information to senators on the current budget situation with Frankfort and the impending cut in state funding; how the cuts will specifically affect administrative and educational units; the transition from Provost Kumble Subbaswamy to an interim provost; the search process to identify someone to fill the position of executive vice president for finance and administration; and the recent excitement due to wins by the basketball team. Swinford answered questions from senators.

### b. Vice Chair's Report

Vice Chair Grossman reminded senators that during his report in March, he asked senators to send in nominations for the Outstanding Senator Award. He has since received nominations; the period for nominating will end on Friday.

### c. Trustee Report

Faculty Trustee John Wilson noted that he was sending information to faculty via email – just contact him about unsubscribing, if need be. Wilson reported to the Senate on the final version of UK's Core Values, but spent the majority of his time discussing the process to evaluate the president. He answered a variety of questions from senators.

## 3. Committee Reports

### a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee

#### i. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in School Technology Leadership

Andrew Hippisley, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal for a new Graduate Certificate in School Technology Leadership. The **motion** from the SAPC was that the Senate approve the proposed new Graduate Certificate in School Technology Leadership, in the Department of Educational Leadership Studies, within the College of Education, effective fall 2012. There was a question whether or not the Graduate Council had approved the proposal – it had. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### ii. Proposed New BS in Human Health Sciences

Hippisley explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAPC was that the Senate approve the proposed new BS in Human Health Sciences, in the Division of Health Sciences Education and Research, in the Department of Clinical Sciences, within the College of Health Sciences, effective fall 2012. There were a variety of questions from senators. Interim Dean Sharon Stewart (College of Health Sciences) explained that the proposed new program was going to be advertised as just one route available for students interested in a professional program.

A **vote** was taken on the **motion** and the motion **passed** two opposed and one abstaining.

iii. Proposed New Master of Arts in Arts Administration

Hippisley explained the proposal and said that the **motion** from the SAPC was that the Senate approve the proposed new Master of Arts in Arts Administration, in the Department of Theatre, within the College of Fine Arts, effective fall 2012.

A question arose as to the home academic unit for the proposed new degree. The proposal listed the Department of Theater, but Christ said that the BA in Arts Administration was homed in the College of Fine Arts as a whole. Guest Michael Braun (FA/Theatre) said he had no objection to changing the home academic unit to the College as a whole. Wood asked who would comprise the graduate faculty if the home academic unit were changed. Dean Tick explained that the Council on Postsecondary Education approved the undergraduate program as a free-standing division within the College; it is not interdisciplinary, but rather its own academic discipline.

Some senators expressed concern about changing the home academic unit on the floor of the Senate, without due consideration for possible ramifications. D. Anderson **moved** to remove “Department of Theater” from the motion. Fiedler **seconded**. There was additional discussion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 31 in favor, seven opposed and 10 abstaining. Thus, the motion changed to, “motion from the SAPC was that the Senate approve the proposed new Master of Arts in Arts Administration, within the College of Fine Arts, effective fall 2012.”

Grossman **moved** to send the proposal back to the SAPC. Brion **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with two opposed.

b. Senate’s Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC)

i. Proposed Move of Appalachian Center from Vice President for Research to College of Arts and Sciences

Herman Farrell, chair of the SAOSC, explained the proposal and said that the **motion** (approved unanimously) from the SAOSC was that the Senate approve the move of the Appalachian Center, a multidisciplinary research center, from the Vice President for Research to the College of Arts and Sciences, effective upon approval by the Board of Trustees.

Grossman **moved** to change the word “approve” to “endorse” and D. Jones **seconded**. After brief discussion regarding the amendment, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair asked if there were any comments for or against the amended motion. There being no comments, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to endorse the move of the Appalachian Center, a multidisciplinary research center, from the Vice President for Research to the College of Arts and Sciences, effective upon approval by the Board of Trustees. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

iii. Proposed Change to Name of the College of Communications and Information Studies

Farrell explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAOSC was that the Senate endorse the proposed name change of the College of Communications and Information Studies to the College of Communication and Information, effective upon approval by the Board of Trustees. There were some comments from senators. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstaining.



c. Senate's Rules & Elections Committee (SREC)

i. Proposed Revisions to Senate Rules 3.3.2 ("Procedures Governing Creation, Consolidation, Transfer, Discontinuation, or Significant Reduction of an Academic Program or Educational Unit")

Davy Jones, chair of the SREC, explained the proposed changes to the Senate Rules in detail. He explained that the **motion** from the SREC was that the Senate approve the proposed revisions to *Senate Rules 3.3.2*, effective immediately. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed

4. State of Student Affairs

The Chair invited Vice President for Student Affairs Robert Mock to offer his presentation, which he did.

5. University Appeals Board (2010-2011) Report

Joe Fink (PH/Pharmacy Practice and Science), chair of the University Appeals Board, gave senators a report on the activities of the UAB from 2010 – 2011. He answered a variety of questions from senators. The Chair thanked him for attending.

The Chair commented that she knew the Senate was interested in the work by the budget committee chaired by College of Pharmacy Dean Tim Tracy. He met for two hours with SC, but she thought that since the agenda was already full, it might just be frustrating for everyone to insert a 10-minute presentation into the April agenda. She said there would be open forums coming soon with more information to come.

Brion **moved** to adjourn and Friar **seconded**. The motion **passed** due to lack of objection. The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Robert Grossman,  
University Senate Secretary

Absences: Adams; Allison; Anderson, H.; Anstead; Atwood; Badger; Baker; Ballard; Birdwhistell; Blackwell\*; Brennen; Brion; Brown-Wright; Butler; Campbell; Capilouto; Conners\*; Davis; de Beer; Deep; DeWall\*; Durham; Eckman; Etensohn; Feddock; Feist-Price; Mullen; Fielden; Hackbart; Hardin-Pierce; Harris; Hazard\*; Heller; Jackson; Kelly; Kirk; Kirschling\*; Lee\*; Lester; Martin; Mazur; Michelman; Morris\*; Mountford; Murthy; O'Hair, D.; O'Hair, MJ; Osborn; Peek; Porter; Ranseen; Richey; Scutchfield; Shannon; Smith; Speaks; Steiner; Subbaswamy; Sutphen; Tracy, J.; Tracy, T.; Voro; Wasilkowski; Wells; Williams; Wimberly; Wiseman; Witt; Wyatt

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on 7/12/12.

---

\* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.

University Senate  
May 7, 2012

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, May 7, 2012 in the Lexmark Public Room, 209 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Hollie I. Swanson called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 2:03. The meeting began early due to the number of agenda items. The Chair said that due to the number of agenda items, only senators and proposal contact persons will be allowed the privilege of the floor.

The Chair explained that someone needed to move a **motion to waive *Senate Rules 1.2.3*** to allow the Senate to consider the agenda, etc. because some supporting documentation was not sent out six days in advance. Brion **moved** thusly and Charnigo **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with one opposed.

### 1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair said that there were no minutes ready for approval. She offered some announcements.

- Congratulations to the following winners of a variety of awards:
  - Professor Steven Yates (AS/Chemistry), SEC 2012 Faculty Achievement Award
  - Professor Carl Lee (AS/Mathematics), Kentucky Mathematical Association of America Award
  - Professor Daehyun Kim (AS/Geography), J. Warren Nystrom Award from the Association of American Geographers

The Chair commented on the announcement that Provost Kumble Subbaswamy had accepted the chancellor position at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. She said that the Senate Council (SC) recommended the following:

That the University Senate thank Provost Kumble Subbaswamy for his University service and formally wish him well. If he returns to Kentucky, he should not go to Louisville.

Geddes **moved** and Duncan **seconded** such a motion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair asked the Senate's representative on the Work-Life Advisory Council (WLAC), Armando Prats, to give an update on recent WLAC activities. Prats outlined the content of the memo from the WLAC sent in response to the results from the 2010 Work-Life Survey.

The Chair asked those senators whose term ended in August 2012 to stand up and be recognized for their service. Senators gave them a round of applause.

### 3. Officer and Other Reports

#### a. Chair

The Chair reported on the recent activities of the Faculty Committee on Review, Reward and Retention (FCR3). A mass email will go out later in the week to solicit more faculty input to go out later this week. Each member serves as a liaison to a specific college – please visit the FCR3 website for more

information. There is also an anonymous "Contact Us" box on the page where faculty can submit comments. FCR3 is on track to submit a preliminary draft to President Eli Capilouto June 1.

Moving to other topics, the Chair reminded senators of the joint faculty and staff committee to investigate an employment ombud. The report (in favor) was sent to the President a few weeks ago; he has since offered a response:

Because the reduction in state appropriations has created a very difficult budget environment, the President has decided not to move forward with the creation of the Ombud Office at this time. He understands and appreciates the very real concerns that motivate the proposal and wants to continue to talk with the Ombud Committee and others about addressing them within the current administrative structure. He is deeply committed to strengthening the culture of trust and respect at the University.

The Chair commented that many of the Senate's committees had been very active. In particular she wanted to thank the members and the chairs of the following committees:

- Senate's Academic Programs Committee – Andrew Hippisley
- Senate's Academic Organization & Structure Committee – Herman Farrell
- Senate's Admissions & Academic Standards Committee – Raphael Finkel
- Senate's Rules and Elections Committee – Davy Jones

#### b. Vice-Chair's Report

Vice-Chair Robert Grossman announced that three individuals received nominations. Shelly Steiner (AS/Biology) won the second Annual Outstanding Senator Award. Steiner received a plaque from Grossman and a round of applause from senators. Grossman added that the other nominees, Herman Farrell and Raphael Finkel, would have been highly deserving recipients, as well.

Grossman ceded the floor to Davy Jones, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee. Jones explained that the Senate needed to express its appreciation to another individual. Jacquie Hager has contributed immeasurably to the Senate in its activities in broad policy context and in the individual cases of so many students. Hager will retire as of June 30. Jones said that he could not imagine the University without Hager. She has also been an invaluable member of the SREC with regard to context and best practices. Jones handed Hager a plaque honoring her years of service and she received a round of applause.

Grossman then yielded the floor to chair-elect Lee X. Blonder. Blonder noted that the May meeting is the Chair's last Senate meeting. She said she was thrilled with how well the Chair has done over the last two years. She has done all kinds of things to elevate the visibility of the Senate and had done an outstanding job. She presented the Chair with a plaque in honor of the Chair's service and the Chair received a round of applause.

The Chair thanked those present and said serving as the Senate's representative had been a thrill. She said that even SC chairs needed mentors, and she thanked Steiner for his help.

#### c. Trustee's Report

Wilson thanked senators (and many other faculty members) for responding to his survey on budget cuts. He said the results were sent to each Board of Trustees (Board) member. He said several trustees

thanked him for sharing the information. He offered a few additional comments – there were no questions from senators.

#### 4. UK May 2012 Degree List

The Chair reported that a handful of students were added to and deleted from the May degree list. She thanked senators for checking back with home departments to ensure a correct list. D. Jones **moved** that the elected faculty senators approve UK's May 2012 degree list, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. D. Anderson **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 5. UK August 2012 Degree List (early list)

No changes were received for the early August 2012 degree list. Wasilkowski **moved** that the elected faculty senators approve UK's (early) August 2012 degree list, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Grossman **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 6. Proposed Changes to Governing Regulations II ("Governance of the University of Kentucky")

The Chair reported that UK's accrediting body has changed its name from SACS (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools) to SACSCOC (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges).

SACSCOC requires language about removal of Board members in University governing documents. In Kentucky, the authority to remove members of UK's Board is vested in the governor. The change to *Governing Regulations II* will refer to the Kentucky Revised Statutes language regarding removal of trustees, as per SACSCOC requirements. There were also a few grammatical/title changes.

Wasilkowski **moved** that the Senate endorse the proposed changes to *Governing Regulations II* as outlined in the handout. Brion **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair reminded senators that there were some upcoming deadlines for the SACSCOC accreditation exercise:

- Complete report due September 10, 2012.
- Off-site review from November 6 – 9, 2012.
- QEP Report due in January 2013.
- Onsite review from April 9 – 11, 2013.
- Review by SACSCOC Commissions board December 7 – 10, 2012.

The Chair noted that she would continue to the Senate's representative on the SACS Executive Leadership Team.

#### 7. Committee Reports

##### a. Senate's Rules & Elections Committee (SREC)

##### i. Proposed changes to Senate Rules 3.2 ("Procedures for Processing Academic Programs and Changes")

Davy Jones, chair of the SREC, explained that senators were being asked to approve changes to the normal processes for proposing new programs or changes to existing programs. The revisions were not

offered in track changes because a lot of text was rearranged as well as changed. Jones explained the proposed changes to Section 3.2.

The Chair explained that the **motion** from the SREC was that the Senate approve the proposed revisions to *Senate Rules 3.2*, effective immediately. There were no questions from senators, so a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed changes to *Senate Rules 3.3* (“Procedures for Creating Courses, Change Courses and Deleting Courses”)

Jones explained the proposed changes to Section 3.3. The Chair said that the **motion** from the SREC was that the Senate approve the proposed revisions to *Senate Rules 3.3*, effective immediately.

Christ commented that the revised language directed that courses proposed for inclusion into UK Core were to go to the Undergraduate Council first, and then to the UK Core Committee, which is the opposite of how the process currently works. The Chair said that issue had been brought up in Senate Council (SC) and that the SC would discuss the matter more fully during the summer at its retreat.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iii. Proposed New Standing Committee

Jones explained that the Interim General Education Oversight Committee has chronically been an interim committee and the SC wanted to formalize it into a standing committee of the Senate. The new standing committee will continue under its existing charge and scope and the relationship between it and the Undergraduate Council will be identified over the summer. Grossman added that IGEOC was only authorized to function by Senate through May 2012.

The **motion** from the SC was that the University Senate establish a standing committee of the Senate, known as the UK Core Committee, which will continue the same charge and procedures as the Interim General Education Oversight Committee. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with one opposed.

b. Senate’s Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC)

i. (Nursing) Proposal to Change *Senate Rules 4.2.1.2*

Raphael Finkel, chair of the SAASC, explained the proposal. He said that the *Senate Rules* currently limit the number of transfer credits that a student can bring into a program at UK. The recommendation is to change the limit from 67 hours. Students coming into the RN-BSN program, which is a program for registered nurses to receive their BSN, already have state licensure and may have already earned an associate’s degree. The purpose is to allow these students to continue their studies at UK and transfer in up to 90 credit hours. Finkel explained the other aspects of the proposed changes.

There was some confusion about whether the 67-hour limit change to 90 credit hours would apply to all students or not. Jones clarified that if/after the Senate approves the proposed change, the SREC will codify language after the general policies in Section 4 about RN-BSN students in the subsequent section on exceptions.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** from the SAASC that the Senate approve the proposed change to *Senate Rule 4.2.1.2*, effective fall 2012. The motion **passed** with three opposed and one abstaining.

### ii. Proposed Changes to BHS Medical Laboratory Science

Finkel explained the proposed changes. The proposal included a change to the existing admission requirements for the BHS Medical Laboratory Science, a change to *Senate Rules 5.3.2.2.1* ("Clinical Laboratory Sciences Professional Program") and proposed revisions to *Senate Rules 4.2.2.2.E*.

There being no questions or comments from senators, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** from the SAASC that the Senate approve the revisions to *SR 5.3.2.2.1* and *SR 4.2.2* (as outlined in the memo), as well as the admissions requirement changes, effective fall 2012. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

### iii. "What is a Credit Hour?" for Different Meeting Patterns

Finkel explained the proposed definitions for various course meeting patterns. He added that the grid was not intended to be a rule, but rather take the form of a Senate-approved guideline for new courses presented to the Senate. The Chair added that she discussed the proposed definitions with UK's SACS liaison, Associate Provost for Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness, who said that the proposed language would be satisfactory to SACS. Also, SACS will likely accept grandfathering in existing courses.

Grossman commented that while the SAASC viewed the definitions as guidelines, the SC took a stronger stance; these will not just be guidelines, but rather will be formalized policy for which exceptions will be made occasionally and reviewed regularly by the Senate.

Wood **offered an amendment** to the motion so that it includes that existing courses are grandfathered in. Brion **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the amendment to the motion **passed** with none opposed.

College of Arts and Sciences Dean Mark Kornbluh expressed concern that the proposed definitions were too limiting. The Chair reminded senators that the proposed definitions were sent to deans several weeks ago, with limited input received. The intent was to make the definitions as flexible as possible. D. Jones added that there was nothing in the definitions to prevent a proposal for an exception based on academic merit and pedagogical reason. Finkel noted that while there was no intent to prevent innovation, an exception to the definitions should include a justification.

A **vote** was taken on the **motion** that a new Senate Rule be established to state that course proposals shall use the Senate-approved policy [insert link] for determining meeting times and number of credit hours for each course. Exceptions, based on academic merit, may be made by the Senate upon the recommendation of the appropriate council. Equivalencies on the grid will be reviewed annually by the Senate. Existing courses are grandfathered. The motion **passed** with two opposed.

## 1. State of the University Address

University Senate Chair (and President) Eli Capilouto offered senators a brief presentation on tuition and fees, within the context of the entire budget. Before he began, he took a moment of personal privilege and thanked Provost Kumble Subbaswamy for his leadership and service to UK. The President said that the Provost and Senate had accomplished a lot together.

After President Capilouto's presentation, he asked Angie Martin (Vice President of Financial Operations and Treasurer) to offer senators a presentation on the proposed tuition and fees schedule, as well as an overview of UK's budget in general. Afterwards, Guest Martin answered questions from senators.

Grossman asked President Capilouto to elaborate on what the President sees as the academic core and how it would be protected. The President referred to the higher cut that administrative units will take, noting that administrative costs are a significant amount of the budget, compared to academic units. Also, there will be opportunities for units that produce income for the University with that income being directed in the future to the originating unit, although such actions will come after additional, honest conversations about improving UK's budgeting process.

In response to Brion, President Capilouto clarified that raises for faculty [and staff] will occur in the 2013-2014 fiscal year. Martin said that the faculty fighting fund will be in place for five years, with \$500,000 to be budgeted annually. Brion commented that an excellent faculty member just left, but not because of salaries; one of the primary reasons for the departure had to do with the faculty member's opinion that things were not getting better overall. Brion said that while she understood that salaries were falling below the benchmarks, eventually even a fighting fund will not retain the best faculty. President Capilouto replied that he wants to make things better and thinks it is doable. UK has hard choices to make, though – there are extensive physical plant needs even while UK has an outstanding faculty who can attract better and better students who will, in turn, improve UK's graduation rates. He opined that students cannot be adequately retained without improvements to facilities. State funding will not improve any time soon and by working together, UK can improve its revenue numbers. UK also needs to sharpen how financial aid is awarded. He said he hated to hear any stories about anyone leaving.

Mountford questioned the categorization of Libraries as being an administrative unit. She said that many faculty consider Libraries to be part of UK's academic core. President Capilouto said that discussions will occur about the second year-percentage of the cut to Libraries over the coming year. The challenge for libraries across the country is the monopolistic behavior by publishers – the price increases for journals is outside of any normal operating increase. There are several universities that have chosen not to pay any more for journals. President Capilouto said that even while Libraries is treated as an administrative unit, he and his staff will work with them to try to protect Libraries, since it is a valuable resource.

In response to a question about protecting undergraduates, possibly at the expense of graduate education and graduate missions, the President responded that the vitality of undergraduate education supports a robust undergraduate education.

D. Anderson said that private universities look at need-based scholarships over merit-based scholarships – she wondered if UK was looking into that. President Capilouto replied that some very good students who do not qualify for a need-based scholarship simply will not attend UK without the merit-based scholarship for which they do qualify. Also, many merit-scholarship students are also financially needy. UK has made a very recent significant investment in the William C. Parker Scholarship Program, which offers assistance to the need-based segment of students. The President added that 10 years ago, 15% of the student population was Pell Grant recipients. Now, Pell Grant recipients make up about 26% of the student population. He said he welcomed suggestions about how to improve the process of awarding scholarships.

Yost asked the President to elaborate on how funding decisions will be made in the future, particularly how student tuition hours will be calculated. President Capilouto responded that while he did not yet know how it would look, he wanted it to be open, enduring and predictable. The current budget process, compressing all decisions into a two-month period of planning, year after year, made it difficult

to be strategic and take a long-term view for enterprise-wide planning. Interim Provost Tim Tracy, who has been leading the committee to review UK's budgeting process, will speak to as many people as possible on how to improve UK's budget process.

Thyne commented on the University of Louisville's ability to give bonuses to employees made possible, at least in part, through a transfer from their athletics' budget. He asked about the short-term and long-term advantages of balancing athletic and academic concerns. President Capilouto said that he spoke with Athletics Director Mitch Barnhart about better ways to support the academic enterprise. When the President called 50 top-notch, high-scholastic caliber students being recruited by UK, they all knew about their individual academic programs, but when asked about what they liked about UK, the community spirit of Athletics came up over and over – a successful Athletics program is important to the University's overall success and helps in recruitment. UK students pay the least amount in student fees in the Southeastern Conference in support of the Athletics program, approximately \$700,000 annually. The University of Louisville charges its students approximately \$4 million annually in student fees for Athletics. While there are pushes and pulls, he said he will look at all types of funding opportunities. Athletics supports \$14 – 15 million in scholarships for student athletes and the graduation rate for African-American student athletes is double the rate for the rest of campus. They also contributed \$3-4 million for the IRIS project.

President Capilouto said he appreciated the opportunity to speak to senators and was continuing to work for more transparency. Provost Tracy said that he will share with colleges their allocations and the allocations for other colleges. The President said that the only way to get to a better place is through direct conversation. He asked senators to send suggestions to him, Martin, or Provost Tracy.

The Chair thanked President Capilouto for attending. She suggested a short break and the meeting reconvened about 15 minutes later.

## 7. Committee Reports

### c. Senate's Academic Programs Committee

#### i. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Risk Sciences

Andrew Hippisley, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal to senators. The Chair stated that the **motion** from the SAPC was that the Senate approve the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Risk Sciences, in the Division of Risk Sciences, within the College of Communications and Information Studies, effective fall 2012.

Finkel asked for more information on direct contact with students in synchronous fashion. Hippisley and Guest Shari Veil (Health Sciences/Risk Sciences) said that the new courses are hybrids with weekend seminar seat courses. She said the courses would be both synchronous and asynchronous.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### ii. Proposed New Minor in Visual Studies

Hippisley explained the proposal. The Chair said that the **motion** from the SAPC was that the Senate approve the proposed new Minor in Visual Studies, in the Department of Art within the College of Fine Arts, effective fall 2012. The Chair asked if there were any comments in favor or against, but there were not. A **vote** was taken on the motion and the motion **passed** with none opposed.



iii. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Stream and Watershed Science

Hippisley explained the proposal. The Chair stated that the **motion** from the SAPC was that the Senate approve the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Stream and Watershed Science, in the graduate program of Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering within the College of Agriculture, effective fall 2012. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstaining.

iv. Proposed New Minor in Neuroscience

Hippisley explained the proposal. The Chair stated that the **motion** from the SAPC was that the Senate approve the proposed new Minor in Neuroscience, in the Department of Biology within the College of Arts and Sciences, effective fall 2012. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

v. Proposed New Undergraduate Certificate in Global Scholars

Hippisley explained the proposal. The Chair stated that the **motion** from the SAPC was that the Senate approve the proposed new Undergraduate Certificate in Global Scholars, within the Gattton College of Business and Economics, effective fall 2012. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

vi. Proposed New Postgraduate Certificate in Rehabilitation Counseling

Hippisley explained the proposal. The Chair stated that the **motion** from the SAPC was that the Senate approve the proposed new Postgraduate Certificate in Rehabilitation Counseling (to be reported to the CPE as a postbaccalaureate certificate), in the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation Counseling, within the College of Education effective fall 2012.

Finkel asked for more information on the type of synchronous contact with professors. Guest Ralph Crystal (Education/Special Education and Rehabilitation Counseling) explained that there will be established times when faculty communicate with students and have office hours online along with chat rooms and discussions for students. Finkel said that he would have to speak against it, as it set a bad precedent to accept any program or certificate where all the contact is non-synchronous. It was explained that there already such programs in existence. Duncan, member of the SAPC, said that that issue had come up in SAPC discussions, specifically how much online instruction is appropriate. She said that the SAPC wanted to revisit the issue, discuss it further and perhaps bring it to the Senate. This proposal was one of the best examples the SAPC could think of to have completely online. The students enrolled are already working but have to receive advanced training to retain their jobs. Students across the state can take the classes and communicate and share their experiences with a variety of other students. Duncan opined that there would perhaps be a broader experience than in-seat instruction. She thought it was an important point, but one that should be discussed separately from the proposal on the table for discussion.

There was a question about using the terms “postgraduate” and “graduate” and “postbaccalaureate” was necessary and if not, the wording of the motion needed to be changed. Duncan **moved** to change the wording of the motion to “Postbaccalaureate Graduate Certificate in.” Wasilkowski **seconded**.

Wood stated that according to the University Senate, the only nomenclature that fits the proposal is “Graduate Certificate.” She added that the motion included a clause that the certificate would be reported to the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) in such a way as to meet CPE reporting requirements. After additional discussion, Duncan **withdrew** her motion.

Grossman **moved to amend the motion** to change “postgraduate” to “graduate” and Wood **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstaining.

Finkel asked whether the proposal needed to include information about the necessary enrollment status (postbaccalaureate or postgraduate) of prospective students. Crystal explained that the students will all have master’s degrees in fields related to rehabilitation counseling. The certification board also requires having a master’s degree in a related area. For reporting purposes, the students are characterized as postbaccalaureate. Yost said he agreed with Finkel’s earlier concerns about the amount of asynchronous instruction; he asked if there were any other programs that were offered in asynchronous format. Guest Belva Collins said both an asynchronous graduate certificate and an asynchronous Master’s in Rehabilitation Counseling already exist.

There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** that the Senate approve the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Rehabilitation Counseling (to be reported to the CPE as a postbaccalaureate certificate), in the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation Counseling, within the College of Education effective fall 2012. The motion **passed** with three opposed and one abstaining.

vii. Proposed New MA in Linguistic Theory and Typology

Because Hippisley was the contact person for the proposal, SAPC member Duncan presented the proposal.

Duncan explained the proposal. The Chair stated that the **motion** from the SAPC was that the Senate approve the proposed New Master of Arts in Linguistic Theory and Typology, in the Department of English, within the College of Arts & Sciences, effective fall 2012. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

d. Senate’s Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC)

Farrell, chair of the Senate’s Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC), said he wanted to thank committee members for their hard work during the year. He added that the Chair [Swanson] served as an example of a great leader.

i. Proposal to Change the Name of the Department of Nutrition and Food Science

Farrell explained the proposal. He added that he asked committee member Geddes to check with departments having similar names and there were no objections.

The Chair stated that the **motion** from the SAOSC was that the Senate endorse changing the name of the Dept. of Nutrition and Food Science to the Department of Dietetics and Human Nutrition, effective upon approval by the Board of Trustees. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposal to Change the Name of the Department of Art

Farrell explained the proposal. There was brief discussion on how a school differs from a department. The Chair stated that the **motion** from the SAPC was that the Senate endorse changing the name of the Department of Art to the School of Art and Visual Studies, effective upon approval by the Board of Trustees. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstaining.

iii. Proposal to Change the Name of the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation Counseling  
Farrell explained the proposal. The Chair stated that the **motion** from the SAOSC was that the Senate endorse changing the name of the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation Counseling to the Department of Early Childhood, Special Education, and Rehabilitation Counseling, effective upon approval by the Board of Trustees. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

8. Proposed Restructuring of the School of Management in the Gatton College of Business and Economics and Transfer of Ownership of Eight Bachelor of Business Administration Degrees

The Chair asked Herman Farrell, chair of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC), to explain the SAOSC's review of the proposal to restructure of the School of Management, within the Gatton College of Business and Economics (Gatton College).

Farrell explained that the Gatton College's structure was comprised of the School of Management (SOM), the School of Accountancy and the Department of Economics. The proposal is to change the SOM (which includes four areas: Decision Science and Information Systems, or DSIS<sup>1</sup>; Finance; Marketing; and Management) to three departments, the Department of Finance and Quantitative Methods, the Department of Management and the Department of Marketing and Supply Chain. Farrell explained the timeline of the SAOSC's review of the proposal and commented that one of the votes for the restructuring passed by virtue of a plurality, not a majority of SOM faculty members. The SAOSC asked for information on the views expressed by the dissenting voters, but was told that there was no way to speculate on the rationale of voters. The SAOSC subsequently found out that there was documentation available within the Gatton College administration on why people voted against the proposal.

Part of the rationale for the proposal to restructure was a report from an outside consulting group, Pappas Consulting Group Inc. ("Pappas report"). The proposal stated that the restructuring was based upon recommendations from the Pappas report. However, Farrell explained that when the SAOSC asked for and received a copy of the Pappas report, the SAOSC saw that the Pappas report called for a reorganization of the entire Gatton College, including DSIS, and actually suggested the creation of a Department of DSIS.

The SAOSC also asked for the stated rationale for those who voted against the suspension of admissions into the Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA) in Analytics. The proposed suspension of admissions was included in the original request from Gatton College for the SOM reorganization. The SAOSC, however, was told by Gatton College that it was not a matter for discussion since the suspension of admissions had already been approved by the SC.

As a result of these issues and other discrepancies that arose, the Chair and Chair-elect Blonder suggested that the SAOSC consult with Gatton College senators and its faculty council since the SAOSC was having issues with forthrightness of Gatton administration. The SAOSC met with faculty colleagues about a week later (during March 2012) and a couple of documents materialized that the SAOSC had been told did not exist. The SAOSC ultimately did receive information about the specific numbers of

---

<sup>1</sup> The Decision Science and Information Systems area within the School of Management, and the use of "Analytics" to describe the same faculty, are used interchangeably throughout. "DSIS" is the name of the area in the School of Management and "Analytics" is the name of the BBA that was offered through the DSIS area.

votes in favor and against. In addition, the SAOSC received the rationales for dissenting votes made during the April 2011 vote by the SOM – the dissenters were primarily concerned with the elimination of DSIS. At least two faculty members were not happy with the new departments to which they were assigned. The SAOSC received information regarding their follow-up questions and subsequently realized that the SAOSC needed to hold an open hearing about the proposed restructuring. The open meeting was held on March 30, 2012 in the Main Building. At the beginning of the open hearing, Senior Interim Associate Dean Ken Troske said that the restructuring would not have any impact on programs and students.

Farrell commented that there were actually two memos received by the SAOSC that indicated a clear relationship between the SOM educational unit and its academic programs, most notably the change to the DSIS concentration for the PhD in Business Administration. During discussion at the March 30 open hearing, the SAOSC learned that the BBA in Analytics was also under review, although a change to the structure of the program was approved by the Senate within the past two years. (The DSIS faculty proposed the changes in response to concerns about the low number of DSIS majors.) The DSIS faculty were subsequently told that the major was suspended. There were other issues with respect to the faculty overseeing the program being dispersed into the new three-department structure. About five DSIS faculty came to the open hearing on March 30 – after consultation with other individuals, Farrell determined that anonymous comments would not be helpful and asked concerned faculty to come forward to speak at the hearing. There was concern among some of those concerned faculty present during the hearing about retaliation, as well as a sense that the “train had already left the station” when it came to the proposed SOM restructuring.

Farrell went on to explain that after the open hearing on March 30, the SAOSC met on the following Monday, April 2, to deliberate on the restructuring and prepare a formal recommendation to present to the SC during the SC meeting later that day. Farrell commented that Gatton College leadership had urged him and the SAOSC repeatedly to complete the review of the proposal quickly so the SC could review it on April 2. The SAOSC used the review procedures for elimination/restructuring of an academic unit outlined in the *Senate Rules* as the guideline for their deliberations and decision making.

During the April 2 meeting, the SAOSC voted not to approve the proposed restructuring of the School of Management (which included four areas: Decision Science and Information Systems, or DSIS; Finance; Marketing; and Management) to three departments, the Department of Finance and Quantitative Methods, the Department of Management and the Department of Marketing and Supply Chain. The SAOSC noted that the only evidence presented by the Gatton College on the restructuring was comparison of benchmark institutions and their respective DSIS areas. The list of benchmarks was comprehensive but did not address the suggestion that the DSIS area should be eliminated. Some evidence was heard that the DSIS field was considered to be a failure, but no evidence was provided.

Farrell said he had pointedly asked if there had been eliminations of similar educational units at benchmark institutions in the past couple of years. One of the professors from the former DSIS area said that one unit was terminated a couple of years ago, likely due to the tech bubble. No evidence was presented regarding any elimination of DSIS areas at benchmark institutions. A member of the former DSIS area said that the DSIS option of the PhD in Business Administration was a top-18 recognized program, which is one of UK's Top 20 goals. The SAOSC heard descriptions of the prestigious careers of graduates of the program, as well as of the numerous citations and merit of the faculty. The SAOSC vote to not approve the proposed restructuring (based on its academic merits) passed with five in favor and one opposed.

Regarding non-academic merit, Farrell explained that the SAOSC had issues with Gatton College governance and how the votes of the Gatton faculty in April 2011 were characterized. He acknowledged that the vote on the restructuring of the SOM was subsequently ratified by the entire Gatton College faculty, which included SOM faculty. The SAOSC asked about the financial resources involved in the restructuring and was told that it was revenue-neutral. Farrell said it was hard to understand how going from four unpaid area directors to three compensated department chairs would be revenue neutral. The SAOSC voted not to approve the proposed restructuring of the SOM (based on its non-academic merits), with six in favor and none opposed.

The Chair then described the reaction of the SC to the SAOSC's review. On April 2<sup>nd</sup>, Farrell presented the SAOSC's findings to the SC. After considerable deliberations, the SC voted (four in favor and three opposed) to table the motion from the SAOSC. This was to allow the Gatton College to address the concerns raised by the SAOSC, specifically, that the Gatton College revisit the voting process to ensure it is fair and allows for a fully informed vote by all Gatton College faculty members.

Dean D. Blackwell held a special meeting of the SOM on April 19, which the Chair attended. There, he presented the background of the proposed changes and reported on the concerns raised by the SAOSC. These concerns and the criteria used by the SAOSC, which included an evaluation of the academic merits of the proposed changes, were discussed. Dean Blackwell outlined the voting process that would be undertaken in the next few days and encouraged all to participate. Thirty of the 43 SOM faculty members were in attendance at the meeting. The minutes of this meeting were taken by Professor Bob Ramsey, who also supervised and coordinated the voting process. An electronic ballot was then circulated to the faculty that clearly described the proposed organizational changes. Forty of the 43 SOM faculty voted. Twenty-seven voted in favor of the three departments, eight voted in favor of four departments, and five in favor of retaining the current SOM structure.

The faculty members of the Gatton College were then asked to either endorse or not endorse the recommendation of the SOM to organize into three academic units. Of 85 Gatton College faculty members, 72 participated in the voting. Sixty-three voted to endorse while nine voted to not endorse the proposal.

The Chair asked Farrell to explain the actions of the SAOSC subsequent to the SC meeting on April 2. Farrell said that Gatton College Dean David Blackwell sent an email about the concerns of the SAOSC as well as a subsequent email about holding new votes. The language in that email did not address all of the SAOSC's concerns; governance was touched on but not the core academic issues. Farrell said he did not see Dean D. Blackwell's email until April 18, the night prior to the Gatton College special meeting. He immediately emailed the Chair about considering the academic merits and forwarded reams of information gleaned by the SAOSC. Farrell said that as he understood it, the issue of academic merit was combined into the discussion on structure. Faculty were told that their discussion about the proposed restructuring of the SOM was to be limited to how they arrived at the structure, but the academic merit of the proposal was not up for discussion.

The SAOSC held votes again after the Gatton College vote and the results of the SAOSC's second vote (to not endorse on academic merit and not endorse on non-academic merit) did not change.

The Chair then explained how the transfer of ownership of the eight degree programs from the SOM structure to the three new departments was reviewed. The transfer of the majors was considered by the

Undergraduate Council (UC). The UC voted in favor (nine approved, two abstained) of transferring the Bachelor's in Business Administration degrees from the SOM to the three new departments in the Gatton College.

The recommendations of the SAOSC and the UC, as well as the response from the Gatton College, were considered by the SC on April 30. The SC recommended the Senate endorse the proposed new structure and the transfer of ownership.

The Chair said that the **motion** on the floor from the SC was for the Senate endorse the proposed restructuring of the School of Management (and the four Areas of Analytics, Finance, Management and Marketing) to three departments (Department of Finance and Quantitative Methods, Department of Management and Department of Marketing and Supply Chain), effective upon approval by the Board of Trustees. The Chair asked if anyone wanted to speak in favor of or against the motion.

D. Anderson asked if the Senate was voting on the academic merits. The Chair asked Jones, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, to respond. Jones replied that the consideration of academic impact or infrastructural soundness can go into the Senate's consideration. Both are matters of endorsement or declining to endorse; the Senate does not control the approval of a structural change like it does an academic degree. The Chair asked if academic merit was rolled into the motion and Jones said that academic merit can be one of the lenses to be used when considering the issue. Farrell said that when the SAOSC voted on the proposal, the committee was told to review the proposal and vote in two different ways. If the SAOSC were to vote on a single motion, Farrell believed that it would still be a vote against the proposal to restructure.

In response to a question from Debski, the Chair said that the SC's vote on the proposed restructuring was three in favor, two against and two abstaining. Kellum said that he did not see the motivation for the non-academic merits of the organizational change. The Chair invited Dean David Blackwell of the Gatton College to reply. Dean D. Blackwell said that there were really only academic merits to the proposal. It was motivated by the movement among SOM faculty to ask for departmentalization instead of one broad school. The restructuring was discussed with the previous dean, prior to the Pappas report. There was a sense that the faculty in the SOM did not have a disciplinary identity. The governance structure had a difficult time allocating resources among the different areas, which were largely unrelated. The proposed restructuring was precipitated by academic merits.

DuPont-Versteegden asked if the Gatton College would go back to four areas if the Senate did not approve the motion. Dean D. Blackwell said that there were not four academic units – there was just one to be eliminated, the SOM. There were four areas of faculty interest but no real structure. He said it was a collection of faculty from many different areas. He will attempt to coordinate something as much as possible.

Grossman said that Dean D. Blackwell's response surprised him – the Senate can endorse or not endorse the proposal but the vote does inform the Board of Trustees (Board). The Senate cannot stop the proposal. Dean D. Blackwell replied that assuming the proposal goes to the Board, the Gatton College will keep the current new departmental structure, whether the Senate endorsed it or not. Grossman asked if Dean D. Blackwell was going to take the proposal to the Board. Dean Blackwell replied that President Capilouto will weigh the information and decide whether to present it to the Board.

D. Anderson asked about the financial impact. She did not understand how the addition of three department chairs would have no financial impact. Dean D. Blackwell replied that he wanted to preface by saying a lot of meetings and discussions occurred before he arrived. There will be some increasing administrative overhead as a result of the restructuring. He said that he and the faculty viewed that as a reasonable trade off. Brion asked him if he would like to amend the proposal going forward to the Board to include his statement that there will be additional administrative costs. Dean D. Blackwell said he was willing to be perfectly transparent to the Board.

Brion said that from the very beginning it seemed as though there should have been two votes – one for academic impact and one for organizational impact, since the two are inextricably intertwined. She said she would have understood the proposal better if there had been one proposal on restructuring and one on the academic impact, to make it clear that one area is being cut out. Dean Blackwell did not agree that an area was being cut. Brion asked if the Gatton College had suspended admission into the DSIS area of the PhD in Business Administration. Dean D. Blackwell replied that was the case and that similar action happened in other Areas in the SOM in the past. Suspension of admissions in other Areas of SOM was done in the past due to the timing of a particular cohort. The doctoral program and the number of assistantships are very small. Due to limited resources, admissions for a particular emphasis are periodically suspended for a year or two, to get one cohort of students graduated and the next cohort admitted. Brion asked if admissions to the DSIS area of the PhD would be opened again. Dean D. Blackwell said that there were no plans to keep them suspended in the future.

Provost's Liaison to the SC Richard Greissman asked to have the vote of the SOM faculty restated, which the Chair did. Forty of the 43 School of Management Faculty voted: 27 voted in favor of the three departments, eight voted in favor of four departments and five voted in favor of retaining the current structure. Guest Greissman explained that about three years ago, faculty in SOM petitioned the dean to deal with academic, educational and administrative matters along division lines – they had given up working as a whole. The Provost's area agreed and after a vote two years ago, the SOM ceased functioning as a school because the faculty chose to work along divisional lines. He said that faculty did not want to keep the status quo. The faculty made it clear, as evidenced by a vote of only five faculty out of 43 voting to keep the SOM structure as it is. Greissman said that the issue at play is whether there should be three or four departments. It would be more expensive to have four chairs rather than three. He respectfully suggested that the administrative cost is not about three or four departments or if the school structure should remain. The faculty in the SOM and Gatton College held a vote. Greissman reported that he and Jones discussed that there cannot be a vote on academic impact when it is not an academic matter. No one said that faculty cannot take academic impact into account when voting on an academic matter. Greissman said that it was insulting to the Gatton College faculty to think they did not take academic impact into consideration when they voted.

Ferrier said that he was a member of the Gatton College faculty council. The faculty council provides opinions on academic impact of various matters. He thanked Greissman for being blunt and Ferrier echoed Greissman's comments. He said he and his colleagues were charged with monitoring the process of voting. An overwhelming majority of faculty voted in favor of a three-department option. The faculty council found they were not in any violation of the rules and were satisfied that affected faculty have had ample opportunity to speak out. Shared governance ensures autonomy and self-determination.

Farrell said that no insult was intended toward anyone; the SAOSC considers the votes of every educational unit that comes before it and looks at the dissenting votes as well as those in favor. The dissent to the vote caused the SAOSC to look into the matter more fully. Farrell said the members of the

SAOSC felt as though their intelligence had been insulted throughout the process – the committee was given “facts” that were later proven to be false. Farrell said that Dean D. Blackwell stated there was no impact on the academic unit, but the DSIS faculty who were a cohesive unit were now separated into different departments. The SAOSC would not have wasted their time if they had not thought there was a valid concern. Regarding academic merit, the SAOSC was well within their purview to consider the academic and non-academic merits of the proposal, as per the review procedures outlined in *Senate Rules 3.3.2.1*. The SAOSC went back and forth regarding statements from the Gatton College that were rhetorical and not truthful. The SAOSC believed the governance issues in the Gatton College were the overriding issue. Tenure dilution and merit issues were taken into consideration. He said that the SAOSC perceived some severe process-related issues and he apologized for having to be blunt.

Farrell said that there would be a huge impact going forward and the SAOSC wondered about targeted cuts and what would happen to some former DSIS faculty in the next two years. There is the matter of majority will, but the SAOSC thought all the votes needed to be looked at. He said that the SAOSC was concerned with the issues of governance and academic merit; the SAOSC remains concerned that the academic merits were not fully discussed within the Gatton College. The SAOSC was glad the vote had been retaken in the SOM and Gatton College. If Farrell or the SAOSC had been asked to participate in the Gatton College’s revote, they would have suggested a meeting about the academic impact of the proposed restructuring. Ferrier assured Farrell that, to a person in Gatton College, the academic and non-academic merits were simultaneously considered. DSIS is not a coherent area of study – it was cobbled together about 20 years ago. Ferrier reported that the SOM had not functioned well and had been as fragmented as it could possibly be.

Wood **called the question**. The Chair asked Parliamentarian J. S. Butler for guidance – he explained that unanimous consent was necessary if no vote was taken; otherwise the motion required two-thirds in favor to pass. Tannock **seconded** the motion. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the **motion** to call the question **passed** with a vast majority in favor, three opposed and two abstaining. Butler explained that the Senate must move immediately to the main motion.

The Chair repeated the first **motion** from the SC was that the Senate endorse the proposed restructuring of the School of Management (and the four Areas of Analytics, Finance, Management and Marketing) to three departments (Department of Finance and Quantitative Methods, Department of Management and Department of Marketing and Supply Chain), effective upon approval by the Board of Trustees. A **vote** was taken and the motion **failed** with 16 in favor, 22 opposed and eight abstaining.

Grossman asked if it was necessary to hold a vote on the changes in ownership of the degrees, since the Senate just voted to not endorse the proposed restructuring. After brief discussion, the Senate opted to hold the vote.

The Chair said the second **motion** from the SC was that the Senate endorse the following transfers in ownership: 1. BBA in pre-Finance and Finance to the Department of Finance and Quantitative Methods; 2. the BBA in pre-Analytics and Analytics to the Department of Finance and Quantitative Methods; 3. the BBA in pre-Management and Management to the Department of Management; and 4. the BBA in pre-Marketing and Marketing to the Department of Marketing and Supply Chain, effective upon approval by the Board of Trustees. A **vote** was taken and the motion **failed** with 14 in favor, 19 opposed and seven abstaining.



The Chair said that the last item of business was the passing of the gavel. She invited Chair-Elect Lee X. Blonder to the podium and presented her with the official gavel. Blonder thanked the Chair.

The Chair then took a moment of personal privilege and presented Farrell with an action figure of the Ironman, saying he had earned it after all the SAOSC deliberations.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:37 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Robert Grossman,  
University Senate Secretary

Invited guests present: Belva Collins, Ralph Crystal, Richard Greissman, Angie Martin and Shari Veil.

Absences: Adams; Allison; Anderson; Anstead; Badger; Ballard; Bathon; Birdwhistell; Brennen; Campbell; Davis; de Beer; Deep\*; DeWall; Durham\*; Eckman; Ettensohn; Feddock; Feist-Price; Fielden; Hackbart; Heller; Hong-McAtee; Jackson; Jasper\*; Kelly; Kirk; Kirschling; Lederer\*; Lester; Martin; Mazur; McCormick; Mullen; Murthy; Nag el\*; Newman; O'Hair, D; O'Hair, MJ; Osborn; Payne\*; Peek; Richey; Schein; Scutchfield; Shannon; Smith; Speaks; Steiner; Stewart; Stombaugh\*; Subbaswamy; Tick; Tracy, J; Tracy, T; Turner; Voro; Wells; Williams; Wimberly; Wiseman; Witt;

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, July 18, 2012.

---

\* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.

University Senate  
September 10, 2012

**Background: There is a SACS requirement that:**

“At least 25 percent of the credit hours required for the degree are earned through instruction offered by the institution awarding the degree.” (3.5.2)

**Currently, the University Senate Rules do not expressly state this policy. In addition, SACS does permit waivers of this residence credit hour requirement in special circumstances as long as it is the University faculty that has responsibility for the waivers. While the current Senate Rule delegates to the college dean to authority to waive residence credit hour requirements, no parameters are provided on the extent to which the requirements can be waived by a dean, nor are reports being provided to the University Senate of the frequency and extent of such waivers. Hence, new language is also included that provides for annual reporting to the University Senate Council, by college, on the number and extent of waivers of residence credit requirements for undergraduate degrees.**

**Recommendation: the Senate Rules and Elections Committee recommends that the University Senate approve the proposed changes to Senate Rules 5.4.1.**

**5.4.1 RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS**

For an undergraduate degree,

- (1) at least 25% of the credits presented for a degree,
- (2) not less than 30 credit hours, and
- (3) a minimum of thirty (30) of the last thirty-six (36) credits

presented for the degree must be taken from the University.

Any request for waiver by veterans of any of the above requirements, or a request by other students for a waiver of requirement (2) or (3), must be presented for approval to the dean of the student's college. Students who wish to satisfy the above requirement with credit earned through such methods as independent study by correspondence, special examination, CLEP, and other methods which limit the opportunity for active exchange between students and instructors must have the prior approval of their department chair and college dean. At the end of each academic year the dean of each college shall report to the Senate Council, through the University Registrar, the number of waivers granted in the categories of (1), (2) and (3) above, and for each waiver granted the extent of departure that was approved from the given credit hour requirement in (1), (2) or (3).



## MEMORANDUM

TO: Professor Hollie Swanson, Chair  
University Senate Council

FROM: Alice Christ, Chair  
Senate Academic Facilities Committee

RE: 2012 Report of the Senate Academic Facilities Committee

**Charges:** The Senate Academic Facilities Committee received the following charges from the Senate Council for 2011-2012.

1. Examine the procedures by which PPD provides cost estimates and charges to units under the Provost's purview.
2. Investigate current procedures for setting building priorities and recommend, if necessary, new procedures to increase transparency and faculty representation in setting those priorities.

The committee addressed the second charge first because it is a direct continuation of work begun the previous year.

## 2. Recommendations on Building Priorities

The committee divided the charge into separate components.

### **A. Identify useful indices of the academic "value" of a facilities project and, if possible, metrics that may quantify that index.**

In response to the difficulties the first committee had in determining academic merit based on the variable quality and quantity of information provided in project proposals from different units and offices, sometimes evidently descending from previous versions more than 10 years old, the committee developed a checklist of academic criteria:

**Criteria of Academic Merit in Capital Projects Planning** (submitted by Chair John Rawls in January 2012 and attached below). The intention of the checklist is

- a. to encourage including explicit information about academic impacts of a proposal in its rationale
- b. to make clear and public the criteria the SAFC will use to rank its recommendations on academic merit of proposals.

Because the next planning/review cycle will likely commence during the summer of 2012, proposals will be created/revised over the next several months and the SAFC wishes to ensure that academic impact be adequately addressed in those proposals. To that end, we recommend the Senate accept and post the **Criteria of Academic Merit**

**in Capital Projects Planning** as a Senate document. We hope the Provost will include it in the Call for Proposals, summer 2012.

**B. Determine how to enhance faculty awareness of campus facilities planning and to promote the role of SAFC in the planning process.**

The committee determined that to serve effectively the functions in our charter (quoted below), SAFC needs a regular role in the 2-year capital planning cycle. There are 2 points during the planning process when the SAFC should make substantive contributions.

One is late in the process: evaluation of academic merit in proposals to the Provost or President, as detailed above, when proposals have been submitted. We recommend the Senate Council and SAFC consult further with the President and Provost on how to incorporate this in the regular capital construction calendar.

The other point is early in the process, as needs are being identified and proposals are beginning to be developed within separate units. Because of the complicated routes by which proposals are initiated and promoted, we have not identified a workable process for earlier engagement of SAFC in fostering academic facilities proposals from the units. It is unclear whether pursuing this, for example by consultations with Deans or other unit heads, or by making SAFC a resource for proposal writers, can be fruitful.

(Committee Charter: A. Serve the administration as a source of faculty information and opinion about the need, design, and priority and construction or renovation projects. B. Inform the Senate at least annually about problems relating to the alteration, construction, or allocation of academic facilities and about future plans and priorities for them. Whenever necessary, the SAFC may initiate action by preparing a recommendation to the administration, which should be routed through the Senate Council for Senate approval. D. Study the use, renovation, and need for space (including classrooms) and equipment relevant to academic programs and functions. [US: 3/12/84])

**1. Recommendations on PPD Procedures**

At our December meeting, the committee heard an explanation of procedures from PPD Director for the Lexington campus, Kevin Kreide, P.E. and Dawn Barkley, Manager of Planning, Design and Construction. We are grateful for their information and clarifications. From the thicket of UK, Lexington, state and federal regulations governing different scopes of project, we identified the following issues for report to the senate as possible concerns. These are informational points.

1. Different formats and levels of detail in estimates and billing statements for projects of various kinds have led to perceptions of opacity in the costs to units. SAFC might help communicate the fact that Budget Officers presently are entitled to access to the complete itemized accounting information through SAP.

2. Renovation costing \$100,000.00 or more must be pre-funded by the unit transferring funds into A Plant Fund Account through General Accounting. Although all projects can only be billed for actual costs (State law), money in a Plant Fund might not be returned to the unit. It reverts to the Provost. This potentially means 1 unit's money could be applied to a project for a different unit.

3. UK internal labor rates are lower than market; salaries for architects, engineers, managers and skilled trades are not competitive, causing more use of outside contractors and Unit Price Contracts with long-term accepted contractors for established types of job (if over \$40,000).

2011-2012 Roster

Chair: John Rawls, '13, retired December 2011; Alice Christ, S 2012

David Hulse, '12  
 Gary Shannon, '12  
 Tim Stombaugh, '13  
 Rebecca Kellum, '13  
 Rick Durham, '14  
 Alice Christ, '14  
 Alyssa Eckman, '14  
 Rich Schein, '14  
 Hubie Ballard, '14  
 Debra Anderson, '14  
 Ned Crankshaw, ex officio  
 Michael Speaks, ex officio

### **Criteria of Academic Merit in Capital Projects Planning**

Project Description/Justification\* should address benefit of the proposed project to the academic missions of the University. Criteria of academic merit should be addressed as quantitatively as possible, using the most current information as well as projections. Descriptions of the inadequacies of current facilities as well as benchmark comparisons are useful. Relevant information from recent programmatic reviews should be cited. The following are examples of information that is especially helpful:

1. Impact on instructional missions
  - a. Courses and enrollments
  - b. Degree program(s) affected (numbers of majors; degrees awarded annually)
  - c. Trans-University impact (contribution to University Core Studies and other majors)
  - d. Tuition revenue generated
  - e. Relative requirements for lecture, laboratory and other instructional space
  
2. Impact on research missions
  - a. Rankings in relevant national comparisons
  - b. Research grant revenues (including indirect costs)
  - c. Impact on graduate and undergraduate programs
  - d. Extramural economic impact

3. Impact on service/outreach missions
  - a. Role in land-grant mission of the University
  - b. Contribution to the economic, environmental and health well-being
  - c. Public education and enlightenment

\*Section of Form SYP-P2 or other proposal format.