

# **University Senate Agenda**

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

---

**Monday, November 8, 2010**

1. Minutes and Announcements

Minutes from October 11, 2010 pg. 2-11

2. Memorial Resolution for College of Pharmacy Professor Thomas Scott Foster (presented by Professor Daniel Wermeling) pg. 12-13

3. Officer Reports

- Chair
- Parliamentarian

4. Committee Reports

- Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee 2009-2010 Annual Report pg. 14
- Update on Presidential Search Committee - Committee Member Shelly Steiner

5. UK's December 2010 Degree List

6. Proposed Changes to *Administrative Regulations 1:2* ("Requests to Address the Board of Trustees")

- Flow Chart pg. 15
- Tracked Changes Language pg 16-19

7. Approval of New General Education Curriculum (first reading) pg.20-24

8. Trustee Report

*Addition to agenda: 9. SACS Accreditation - Quality Enhancement Program (QEP) Update*

***Next Meeting: December 13, 2010***

University Senate  
October 11, 2010

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, October 11, 2010 in the Auditorium of the 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. She established with Sergeant-at-Arms Michelle Sohner that quorum had been met. The Chair asked senators to be respectful of others and guests. If discussion becomes bogged down or circular, senators were reminded that any member may “call the question” if discussion is repetitive.

1. Minutes from September 13, 2010 and Announcements

There was brief discussion between Nadel and Grossman regarding Grossman’s comments during the September 13, 2010 Senate meeting. Grossman **moved** to approve the minutes from September 13, 2010 as distributed, and Nadel **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair offered a variety of announcements.

- The 2010 Stakes Reception will take place on the following day, Tuesday. Senators are welcome to attend regardless of RSVP.
- The Office of the Senate Council is using a listserv to communicate with members. Senators should have received a couple of emails sent out the previous week, one with a list of information on coming events, and another with names and email addresses of senators by college. Senators were asked to contact Mrs. Brothers if those emails were not received.
- On Friday, November 19, 2010, the 5th Annual KY Engagement Conference will host “Institutionalizing Community Engagement” at the Galt House in Louisville, from 8:30 am - 4:30 pm. The University of Louisville is hosting the event, and UK is one of the sponsors. If any senator is interested, please contact Mrs. Brothers; Provost Subbaswamy will pay the registration fee.
- Suggestions are needed for faculty to serve on the Social Sciences Area Committee, specifically faculty from the Martin School for Public Policy and Diplomacy, the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce or the College of Social Work. The Chair emphasized how important it is that the faculty senators be diligent in supplying suggestions of faculty who are qualified for service on the Area Committees. Senators were asked to send names to Mrs. Brothers.

- College of Business and Economics Dean Devanathan Sudharshan has resigned, and an email will be sent out soon to solicit faculty names to serve on the upcoming dean search committee.
- The Senate Council (SC) was not asked to offer names of faculty nominees to serve on the College of Medicine Dean Search Committee. The Chair met with the chair of the faculty council in the College of Medicine (ME), and asked if that body was satisfied with the composition of that search committee, and if all title series were well represented. The response was that the faculty council thought the search committee was fine, that it was currently working and in the process of finishing.

## 2. Officer Reports

2a. Chair: The Chair noted that she had attended the New Student Induction Ceremony, in which approximately 5,000 freshmen and parents attended. She said that attendees left with a sense of community and a reason for being at UK. She said that the Office of Student Affairs was very interested in increasing faculty participation. The Chair asked senators to respond to the email sent next August from deans to college faculty about attending the ceremony.

Work is progressing on a couple of initiatives with the Staff Senate. The first such is a listening forum with Provost Subbaswamy, Friday, November 12, from 11 – 1 pm, in 230 & 231 Student Center. The Chair reminded senators about having shared information about cost efficiencies and revenue-generating ideas. She said that the SC put forward some ideas. The Provost is encouraging faculty to continue the war on attrition. In addition, UK is preparing for the coming reaffirmation of accreditation by the Southern Association for Colleges and Schools (SACS). The Chair added that she was a member of the leadership team, and encouraged senators to contact her with comments and/or suggestions.

The Chair said that the SC was looking at how to vet proposed changes to *Governing Regulations VII (GR VII)*. She said that the section defines UK's organizational structure. There are two major changes proposed: faculty within the tenure-ineligible title series can hold primary appointments in institutes and centers; and centers and Institutes can offer courses and graduate certificates. She said that discussions on *GR VII* in the SC will begin on November 1. The SC is going to divide into three groups to investigate specific sections of *GR VII*, as well as solicit input from department chairs and center directors. The three groups will review sections in detail and report back to SC as a whole. A report will be offered to the Senate in December.

2b. Vice Chair: There was no report from the vice chair.

2c. Parliamentarian: Parliamentarian Catherine Seago shared information on agendas with senators. According to Robert's Rules of Order, agendas should include the information below.

- Reading & Approval of Minutes

- Reports from Officers, Boards, Standing Committees
- Reports from Special or Ad Hoc Committees
- Unfinished Business
- New Business

Seago went on to explain how new business is placed on a Senate agenda. According to *University Senate Rules 1.2.3* ("Meetings"), the SC sets the agenda for the Senate. Anyone can present a written recommendation to the SC. If the SC opts not to bring an item to the Senate the language below applies.

In this situation, the recommendation may be introduced on the Senate floor if its initiator obtains either the signature of ten (10) Senators, or a petition approved by a corresponding percentage of the members of the University Faculty in the case of matters for which the elected University Faculty Senators are responsible.

### 3. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 1.2.2.1.D* ("Elected Faculty Membership," "Vacancy")

The Chair explained that the proposed change would allow faculty to fill vacancies in the Senate through three ways: 1. Leave the seat vacant either until the faculty elect a replacement in the next regularly scheduled election or until the originally elected representative is eligible to serve again, whichever is sooner; 2. Appoint an eligible faculty member until the faculty elect a replacement in the next regularly scheduled election; or 3. Hold a special election to fill the vacancy. The Chair allowed Grossman, who proposed the revision, to explain it to senators.

Grossman said that currently, according to the *Senate Rules (SR)*, in the event of a vacancy in the Senate a college must look back to the previous election, and use the person who received the next highest number of votes but was not elected. If there was no such faculty member, then the college is required to hold an election within 30 days. That requirement was very inefficient in large colleges, although it might be more manageable in smaller ones. Grossman said that the College of Arts and Sciences (AS) ran out of faculty to fill vacancies, as senators went on sabbatical, took administrative positions, etc. He said that the current rules would have required AS to hold a special election, and would likely result in holding special elections monthly. Grossman said he proposed the changes so that it would be easier to allow an appointment until the next general election, although it doesn't preclude a special election – it merely offers additional options.

Wasilkowski asked about who would appoint a faculty member to a Senate seat. Grossman replied that it would be the faculty as a whole, or the faculty elections committee entrusted with that responsibility by the college faculty as a whole. In response to Arthur, Grossman replied that an election was different from being appointed by the college because an election required an actual election with secret ballots. If there is a faculty committee making the appointment, then it is not an election by the entire college

faculty. If it occurred in a small college, the identification of a replacement may be the equivalent of holding an election. In response to D. Jones, Grossman said that the changes will be effective fall 2010, from the beginning of the semester.

D. Anderson **moved** that the Senate approve the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 1.2.2.1.D*, effective immediately (Fall 2010). Nadel **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with one opposed.

The Chair reminded senators to turn off cell phones and beepers, etc.

#### 4. Committee Reports

4a. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee 2009 – 2010 Annual Report: Ederington, a member of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) gave the report. In summary, the SAOSC reviewed four proposals, of which three were supported and subsequently acted upon by the Senate. One proposal (that of the Quantitative Institute for the Social Sciences) was set aside until additional information was received.

Ederington said that the SAOSC had discussions about their charge, especially with judging academic merit, and not getting into the issue of funding. There was some ambiguity in the SAOSC's charter, which talks about setting priorities, but since proposals come to the SAOSC singularly and sequentially, it is hard to order things. One item for discussion for the current year is exactly what the SAOSC ought to discuss.

The Chair said that many senators should have already and some will soon receive emails about setting up Senate committees and meetings. She said that some of the issues brought up in the SAOSC report would be clarified.

4b. Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure 2009 – 2010 Annual Report: The Chair explained that the past chair of the Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure (SACPT), Sue Straley, was not in attendance and so the Chair would give the report. The Chair said that the SACPT had one case last year, and said that she would focus on the recommendations. The first issue pertained to that of inaccurate position descriptions. If a faculty member's Distribution of Effort (DOE) is 20% research, but that does not match the expectation of the department chair, there will be a problem, which occurred in the case the SACPT reviewed. The Chair read from the SACPT's report.

SACPT recommends that for review purposes the Chair should, in such a situation, describe the position reflected in the DOE in the cover letter and not use the formal position description. Alternatively, when position descriptions drift significantly from the original one used to advertise the position, the Chair should officially create a new description that matches the DOE negotiated with the faculty candidate.

The Chair reminded senators that the issue of DOEs comes up frequently, and if often falls to the faculty member who is signing the DOE to ensure the DOE actually reflects what the faculty member does.

Moving to the next recommendation, the Chair noted that there is no sub-discipline-specific document for large departments. She read language from the report:

SACPT has noted with concern that there is no sub-discipline-specific document provided during the review process to guide colleagues outside of the candidate's sub-discipline on expectations for excellence within the sub-discipline or on typical strategies for structuring a research program in the sub-discipline. The case that SACPT considered this past year was a good example of one where such a document would have been of benefit. The candidate's department contained sub-disciplines that vastly differed in pace of data gathering and in strategy for structuring an individual program. The outside letters did not comment negatively on the structure of the candidate's research program. However, it was striking how wide the range of opinions was within the University on whether the candidate had a focused program and whether the program structure was a positive or a negative factor.

The Chair noted that it was a problem in very large departments, where some faculty may not appreciate the differences within a sub-discipline.

Nadel commented that he recalled that in some cases recommendations were made by the SACPT, but not followed. The Chair said that she was a past chair of the SACPT, as was Senator Blonder, and when both were on the SACPT together there was an issue pertaining to seven-year reviews, and wide disparities between colleges. That problem has since been rectified. Nadel said that he thought there were specific instances where recommendations were not heeded. The Chair said that did occur, and that a faculty member could appeal, writing a letter and making a specific case, but must be done in accordance with University processes. The SACPT will make a decision and forward it to the President, and the President responds positively or negatively. Nadel wondered how often the response from the President was in accordance with the SACPT's recommendation. The Chair replied that when she chaired the SACPT, all the recommendations were followed. Blonder added that about half of the recommendations of the SACPT were followed when she was chair. Wasilkowski said that he was on the SACPT during the past year, and reviewed the case. The President was initially against the recommendation, but then agreed to it. The faculty member, however, had already resigned at that point.

Debski said that she wanted to discuss the first issue more closely. She said that one incorrect comment was magnified and then documented by the area committee, and then went on up through the process. She said she found that aspect most disturbing. She asked what would be done about that. The Chair was unsure, but said that if she had to decide, it would be that the area committee should look at the facts. Debski said that a recommendation like that would be a bare minimum, but did not even hear that in the SACPT's report. She added that there was also a concern about a lack of timeliness on the parts of

the Provost Subbaswamy and President Todd, but the inaccuracies seemed most remarkable. Wasilkowski said that within the confines of the committee actions, they were very detailed, but of course he could not be that open during the Senate meeting about confidential matters. He said that they thought the Provost did not agree with their comments on the area committee's job, but that it was just two different opinions.

Debski stated that she wanted clarification. As she read the SACPT's report, there were inaccuracies that were perpetuated, but it was not re-reviewed only because the problem was not procedural. Wasilkowski noted that the SACPT was charged only to address procedural issues. Regarding an additional question from Debski, Wasilkowski said that the inaccuracies were pointed out to the Provost and President. The Chair commented that this was part of the reason that senators were asked to provide nominees for area committees with due diligence, as the area committees are comprised of fellow faculty.

Nadel opined that an error of fact was committed so nothing could be done, since it was not a procedural error. When things are factually wrong, a faculty member is at the mercy of the administration. Grossman objected, saying that the process involved human beings, who do make mistakes. In this particular case, the Provost did agree to re-review the case after speaking with the faculty member, but the faculty member had already left UK. That was the issue of timeliness. There was going to be a re-review due to the error of fact. Finally, the original decision by the Provost was that yes, an error was made, but it was not enough to affect the outcome, and overall did not affect the case. One can disagree with that opinion, but is it the Provost's decision alone to decide if a person gets tenure or not. Grossman thought that mistakes had been made before the ultimate decision was made, and were brought to light, but the final decision was never made. The situation was rendered moot by the faculty member leaving. Steiner agreed that the Provost agreed to reopen the case, after the faculty member spoke to the Provost.

Nadel reiterated that structurally, there is no recourse for a factual error. The Chair said that suggestions on how to improve the review process were welcomed. Nadel suggested that a document be formulated to outline the problems. He agreed that faculty do not control the problems, but could create a document and ask a committee to work on a structural change to protect faculty against errors in fact. Brion suggested that the Senate could suggest defining factual errors as procedural errors.

Wasilkowski said that he remembered the decision as having been made by the President. He asked D. Jones to correct him if needed, and went on to say that he thought there were two different channels to appeal an unsuccessful tenure decision. One is based on procedural error, and the other is based on merit, and it is up to the faculty member to decide which it is. He opined that it would be nice to consider factual errors as procedural errors, but that it was not true that faculty did not have any other avenues.

D. Jones added that there were two routes of appeal. One takes an administrative route, through the dean, Provost and President, in which any issue can be entertained, whether there was a procedural

error, or a dean made a bad decision, etc. As far as the Senate apparatus is involved, the SACPT can only hear procedural issues. Since the University President is the University Senate Chair, the SACPT recommends directly to the President at the top of the process, where the President makes a final decision.

The Chair asked if there were any additional comments, and there were none.

4c. Senate's Rules and Elections Committee 2009 – 2010 Annual Report: D. Jones, chair, offered information about current and upcoming events. He referred to the election recently concluded by the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) for three faculty members to serve on the Presidential Search Committee. The Senate was the starting body for that exercise, in which the body comprised of the elected faculty senators nominated from themselves candidates to be on the committee. The six finalists were placed on a university-wide ballot for a vote by the eligible University Faculty on the final three. He said he was pleased with the participation of the elected faculty senators, as 86% voted. The university-wide voting ended the past Friday, and 840 people voted, about 40% of eligible University Faculty.

D. Jones then announced that the three candidates voted to be the three members of the President Search Committee (and associated votes) were: Sheldon Steiner – 199; Hollie Swanson – 172; and Lee Meyer – 158. The votes received by the remaining three candidates were: Greg Wasilkowski – 132; Connie Wood – 108; and Dwight Denison – 71. Any vacancy on the committee would be filled in the order given for the fourth through sixth candidates. He thanked the six individuals who volunteered for something that is an incredible amount of time, spent on the faculty's behalf, and he said he really appreciated it. Those six individuals were honored with a round of applause.

Noting the ca. 1880 picture of the original University Faculty in the PowerPoint presentation, D. Jones said that there would be several more elections during the year. The President Search Committee is over, but in mid- to late November the elected faculty senators will elect three faculty senators to serve on the Senate Council. A Faculty Trustee election will be held in the spring, and Senate elections for about one-third new members will also be held then. Senators should expect to see a lot of communications this academic year from the SREC.

Turning to other matters, D. Jones said that the SREC had been contacted several times this academic year about things brewing in relation to budget constraints and how they will affect programs, departments, proposals, etc. There is also some concern among some faculty about whether the appropriate faculty vetting will occur as it should. He said he would then share with senators the information that has been and will be sent to colleges and deans.

D. Jones then offered an explanation of a flow chart about shared governance, in particular faculty governance control over educational policy-making. He explained that the Board of Trustee's *Governing Regulations* delegate to the faculties of departments, the faculties of colleges and to the University Senate decisional control over the University's educational policies, while the chairs, deans and



Provost/President are delegated decisional control over managerial policies. He further noted that the *Governing Regulations* expect the faculty bodies and administrators to each consult the other for advice prior to making their respective decisions.

Moving specifically to the subject of new departments and new programs, Jones explained that the final decision on departmental infrastructure is made by the administration, with input from faculty. The features of an academic program within an administrative structure are decided finally by faculty. He referred to a specific example: a question was raised about whether or not the motion for a vote by the faculty on the dean's budget proposal is the same as a vote on an academic program. D. Jones stated that faculty make an advisory vote to a dean or chair on infrastructural aspects (such as budget), but the vote by the department faculty or college faculty on academic features is a decisional vote that establishes the academic policy or position of the respective unit. This issue is what the SREC has been attempting to clarify for various units across campus. He said that senators may be seeing this year some of these proposals and that this is the context in which decisions are being made at department and college levels.

Some faculty were anxious because someone raised the question of whether or not the tenure of program faculty was secure if the program (but not the department) was terminated but that tenure was not secure if a department were eliminated. D. Jones said that he asked the question of the Provost, and the Provost offered a written reply, shown below.

I regret that discussions about efficiency, innovation, and cost-cutting are being conflated with the status of tenure. From my perspective, the governing principle in faculty personnel matters related to the status of tenure is derived from GR X (page 7) on "Termination of Appointment."

The language in that section of GR X reads:

"Except in cases of financial emergency, the termination of a tenured appointment or the dismissal of a person prior to the expiration of a non-tenured appointment shall be, in accordance with KRS 164.230, only for reasons of incompetence, neglect of or refusal to perform duties, or for immoral conduct."

Furthermore, any declaration of "financial emergency" has to pass national scrutiny in order to hold true to AAUP principles and maintain credibility among our peers.

Thus, in my opinion, a departmental reorganization for reasons of efficiency, innovation, and cost-cutting (for reprioritization) does not constitute sufficient basis for dismissal of a tenured appointment, nor the dismissal of a person prior to the expiration of a non-tenured appointment. And finally, any decision-making about reorganization will follow

established University policies and rules, including those policies and practices on shared governance.

Provost Kumble Subbaswamy

D. Jones said that the last sentence meant that all proposals concerning reorganization of infrastructure will be processed up through decision-making routes. He said he thought it was very important for faculty to know this, and that the mere recombining or reorganization of departments in a college has nothing to do with security of tenure. It is only a declaration of financial emergency that must pass national scrutiny that brings security of tenure into play. Steiner asked if reorganization of departments would be categorized as an administrative change of structure and D. Jones said that it could, but would still need the input of the faculty. Steiner noted that the faculty's input was only advisory, and D. Jones replied that even if the Senate and administration do not see eye to eye, because the President is the Chair of the University Senate, the Senate body can force the University Senate Chair to pass the Senate's opinion on to the Board of Trustees. The Board will be made to know of the various opinions on the abolitions of departments with which the Senate does not agree.

The Chair asked for additional questions or comments, but there were none.

#### 5. Recognition of 2009-2010 Recipients of Provost's Awards for Outstanding Teaching

The Chair called the names of the recipients of the Provost's Award for Outstanding Teaching:

- William Rayens (AS/Statistics)
- Jeff Rogers (AS/Modern and Classical Languages, Literature and Cultures-German)
- Bryan Hains (AG/Community & Leadership Development)
- Tracy Kitchel (AG/Community & Leadership Development)
- Jennifer Cowley (NU)
- Bruce Holle (AS/History)

Those present stood and were honored with a round of applause. The Chair then recognized the outstanding teaching assistants, who were also recognized with a round of applause.

- Andrew Battista (AS/English)
- T. Garrett Graddy (AS/Geography)
- Jeffrey Gross (AS/English)
- Justin Taylor (AS/Mathematics)

#### 6. Recent Changes to Provost's Awards for Outstanding Teaching

The Chair explained that Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Heidi Anderson had intended to present the changes, but was home ill. The Chair said that there were new criteria for the Provost's Awards for Outstanding Teaching, and shared them with senators. Grossman commented that he had not seen the updated criteria the last time he was on the site, and suggested that the information be posted there.

The Chair also shared information about guidelines and deadlines for submitting nominees for the Outstanding Teacher Awards.

#### 7. KCTCS September 2010 Candidates for Credentials

D. Jones **moved** that the elected University faculty senators approve the September 2010 KCTCS list of candidates for credentials, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Grossman **seconded**. D. Jones commented that other than a few omissions that might come to the Senate later, this list would likely be one of the last received comprised of students from the Bluegrass Community and Technical College (formerly Lexington Community College, or LCC), for their receiving a diploma with the UK name on it. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

There being no further business to attend to, Steiner **moved** to adjourn, and Nadel **seconded**. There was no dissent and the meeting was adjourned at 4:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Debra Anderson,  
University Senate Secretary

Absences: Absences: Adams; H. Anderson; Arents; Arrington; Back; Badger; Birdwhistell; Brennen; Cheever; Conners; Costich; Culver; DeWall\*; Dyer; Ederington; Ettensohn; Gonzalez\*; Hall; Hardin-Pierce\*; Harris; Hazard\*; Hippisley; Jackson; Januzzi; Jensen; Kelly; Kidwell; Kington; Kirk; Kirschling\*; Kornbluh; Kwon; Lester; Maglinger; Martin; McCormick\*; McCorvey; McMahan; Mendiondo; Mobley; Mock; Mountford; Parker; Patsalides; Peek; Perry; Prats; Ray\*; Rickey; Ritchie; Robinson; Rohr\*; Rouse; Sellnow; Shannon; R. Smith; W. Smith\*; Snow; Starr-LeBeau; Stombaugh; Subbaswamy; Sudharshan; Thacker; Thelin; Tick; Todd; J. Tracy; T. Tracy; Travis; Troske; Turner; Viele; Wells; Wermeling\*; Williams; Wilson; Wiseman; Witt; Wyatt\*; Zentall; Zhang.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on November 3, 2010.

---

\* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.

Memorial Resolution  
Presented to University Senate  
November 8, 2010

Professor Tom Foster  
College of Pharmacy

Thomas Scott Foster departed this life on October 14, 2010 following a brief illness. He is survived by his wife Marijo, a daughter Megan (David) Sullivan of the Isle of Guernsey, UK, and a son Scott (Courtney) of Ocean City, NJ, three grand children in Guernsey and three grandchildren in Ocean City.

Tom was a 1970 graduate of the State University of New York at Buffalo School of Pharmacy with a B.S.Pharm. degree and the University of Kentucky College of Pharmacy with the Doctor of Pharmacy degree in 1973. He also completed a pharmacy practice residency at UK in the same year. He then embarked on a highly successful career as a clinical practitioner and academician at the University of Kentucky. Joining the faculty of the UK College of Pharmacy as an Assistant Professor, he quickly rose through the professorial ranks to be Professor of Pharmacy. He continued to be active in teaching, research and service roles at UK until shortly before his passing.

He also held joint faculty appointments as Professor in the UK College of Medicine, Department of Anesthesiology, and the UK College of Public Health, Department of Health Services Management.

He served the College of Pharmacy at UK in administrative roles as a Division Director. He also served UK as Executive Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board for over twenty years.

His teaching focused on pharmacotherapeutics, pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics and computer applications in health care delivery. An animated and engaging lecturer, he had a unique ability to motivate students to achieve more than they thought they could. He was an early leader in developing educational initiatives in clinical pharmacy in internal medicine and critical care medicine.

He led programs of multidisciplinary clinical pharmacology research involving investigational drugs and drug administration systems. Those efforts facilitated the development of numerous human pharmaceutical and biopharmaceutical products to improve the health of Americans and others around the world.

His service to professional organizations was highly noteworthy. He served as Chair of the Section of Teachers of Clinical Pharmacy of the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy. He was the founding Vice Chair of the Board of Pharmaceutical Specialties of the American Pharmacists Association, the credentialing board for specialists in pharmacy practice. The Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education regularly enlisted him to serve as a member of accreditation site visit committees. He contributed to

composing national licensure examinations for pharmacists. He enjoyed many roles with the United States Pharmacopeial Convention, the national body that establishes standards for medications distributed within the U.S. This year he received the Beal Award for Distinguished Volunteer Service to the U.S.P., the highest award of that important non-governmental standards agency.

He was a pioneer in using his pharmacy knowledge to address drug product selection issues for the benefit of the public in Kentucky, ultimately chairing Kentucky's Drug Formulary Council and Drug Management Review Board. He was appointed to the Kentucky Board of Pharmacy, the licensure agency for pharmacists, and chaired the group. He served as a consultant to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration as well as to the Office of Human Research Protection of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

His achievements were recognized by his peers through election to fellowship in the American Pharmacists Association, American College of Clinical Pharmacy, and American College of Clinical Pharmacology.

Tom was a man of many talents, a man of many friends. His number of friends was almost matched by his number of bowties, his sartorial signature.

An avid sailor, he was happiest when with his grandchildren sailing on Seneca Lake in New York's Finger Lakes Region where his family had a summer home. Two Airedales, Commander and Chief, were his constant companions.

I move that this resolution be made a part of the minutes of the University Senate and that a copy be sent to Dr. Foster's family.

University of Kentucky  
 College of Agriculture  
 Department of Landscape Architecture

Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee

**Year End Report Fall 2009 - Spring 2010**

1. David Williams, Plant and Soil Science, began Fall 2009 as chair of the RWA.
2. March 2010, Thomas Nieman, Landscape Architecture, assumed the chair position upon the resignation of Dr. Williams.
3. The break down of cases is as follows:
 

October	14
November	5 (with an additional case tabled)
December	11
January	10
February	12
March	10
April	7
May	23
Total	93 (cases heard and decisions rendered)
4. The decisions relative to the cases can be found in the forms filled out for each case as filed with the Faculty Senate Office
5. A concern of the RWA is that a fair number of cases are being passed on, from the colleges, that could have or should have been handled within the college impacted. These include: late withdrawal from courses, mid term illnesses, improper withdrawal from courses, advice to go ahead and try to salvage a bad semester with the idea that if things don't work out one can always do a RWA, poor decisions on the part of students because of alleged advice from advisors, attempts to raise GPA, pre-existing medical conditions, etc. Some of these cases are, in our opinion, an abuse of the system, for example, we should not be expected to hear cases where the issue could have been resolved by using a "Repeat Option" or where someone wants a "W" removed from their record.

The RWA recognizes that each case is unique and each has its own issues, however, there is concern that the work load of the committee is gradually becoming larger and threatens to overwhelm the system.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas J. Nieman, Chair

START HERE  
Petitioner Submits Completed Form

President's Ofc Forwards Petition  
to Board Chair

May Consult with  
President

Board Chair Reviews Petition

NO

YES

TO CMTE

Board Chair DENIES Petition  
& Petitioner is Notified.  
(STOP!)

Board Chair APPROVES &  
Petitioner Informed of Time,  
Date & Location of Board Mtg  
(GO TO BOARD MEETING!)

Board Chair REFERS to Cmte -  
Petitioner Informed of Time,  
Date & Location of Cmte Mtg  
& Receives Explanation of  
Remainder of Process  
(GO TO CMTE MEETING!)

Petitioner Attends Committee Meeting

NO

OTHER

Committee DENIES Petition  
to Address the Board  
(STOP!)

Committee Takes Other  
Action It Deems  
Appropriate

YES

Committee INVITES Petitioner to  
Speak to Committee.  
(SPEAK AT CMTE MEETING!)

YES

Petitioner Speaks at Committee Meeting

NO

OTHER

Committee DENIES Request  
to Address the Board  
(STOP!)

Committee Takes Other  
Action It Deems  
Appropriate

YES

Committee APPROVES  
Petitioner to Address the Board  
(GO TO BOARD MEETING!)

Petitioner Addresses the Board



UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY <b>DRAFT</b>	IDENTIFICATION AR 1:2		PAGE 1
ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS	DATE EFFECTIVE / /	SUPERSEDES REGULATION DATED 9/15/70	

~~POLICY RELATIVE TO REQUESTS/PETITIONS TO ADDRESS FOR APPEARANCES  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
(APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES)~~

I. Introduction

The purpose of this regulation is to provide a standard process for members of the University community and the general public to address the Board of Trustees (Board) on matters relevant to the University. This process provides for reasonable access to the Board, while also preserving the Board's orderly business operations.

The procedures established by this regulation do not supersede *Governing Regulations* or *Administrative Regulations* that specifically permit appeal to, or appearances before, the Board or a Board Committee. The Board agenda shall be released to the general public at least three (3) full business days prior to the board Meeting. "Business Day" means Monday through Friday, excluding Saturday and Sunday and official University holidays.

II. Procedure

~~Anyone desiring to be heard by the Board of Trustees will first submit in writing the subject matter and the reason for desiring a hearing before the Board of Trustees to the President.~~

A. Anyone desiring to address the Board shall submit a written petition to the Chair of the Board (Board Chair) through the Office of the President at least two (2) full business days prior to a scheduled meeting of the full Board. The petition shall describe the subject matter and the rationale for addressing the Board, and shall be submitted electronically on the form (Petition to Address the Board of Trustees) attached as Appendix I to this regulation. ([www.\\_\\_\\_\\_\\_](#)) In order to be considered, any petition to address the Board shall be submitted in accordance with this regulation and shall contain all required information. The Office of the President is responsible for forwarding all petitions submitted in accordance with this regulation to the Board Chair.

~~The President shall determine if the subject matter is relevant and material to the University of Kentucky.~~

~~If the President determines the matter is relevant and material to the University of Kentucky, the President shall refer the matter to a Committee appointed by the Chairperson of the Board.~~

B. The Board Chair, who may consult with the President, shall determine if the subject matter of the petition is relevant to a pending or future agenda item, or deemed essential information necessary for the Board to fulfill its statutory responsibilities. If the Chair determines that the subject is relevant or the information is essential, the Chair shall:



1. approve the petition to address the Board and ask that the petitioner be so informed; or
2. refer the petition to the appropriate committee of the Board (see GR II) and ask that the petitioner be informed of the Committee's meeting time and location.

If the Chair determines that the subject is not relevant or the information is not essential, the Chair may deny the petition and ask that the petitioner be so informed.

If the Board Chair denies the petition to address the Board, the petitioner may request a written rationale for the denial from the Board Chair. The request for a rationale must be received in the Office of the President ([www.uky.edu/board](http://www.uky.edu/board)) within seven (7) business days of the Board meeting for which the petition to address the Board was made. The Board Chair shall ensure that the written rationale is sent to the petitioner within 30 calendar days of the Board meeting.

~~Said Committee will fix a time, place, and conditions for the petitioner or petitioners to appear before the Committee.~~

- C. The Committee to which a petition is referred shall review the merits of the petition to address the Board and shall:
1. inform the petitioner that the petitioner will be invited to address the Committee;
  2. deny the request to address the Committee; or
  3. take such other actions as it deems appropriate.

Prior to acting on an agenda item or essential issue, the committee shall hear petitioners who are present and approved to address the committee.

If the Committee allows the petitioner to address the Committee, the Committee shall:

1. approve the request to address the full Board;
2. deny the request to address the full Board; or
3. take such other actions as it deems appropriate.

If the Committee denies the petition to address the Board, the Committee Chair shall provide a brief oral rationale during the Committee meeting. If the Committee Chair denies the petition to appear before the Board, the petitioner may request a written rationale from the Board Chair. The request for a rationale must be received in the Office of the President (address above) within seven (7) business days of the Board meeting for which the petition to address the Board was made. The Board Chair shall ensure that the written rationale is sent to the petitioner within 30 calendar days of the Board meeting.

D. The list of petitioners requesting to address the Board with the disposition of each petition shall be made available immediately prior to each Board meeting at the meeting location.

E. The Board Chair shall provide a report during the full Board meeting on the number of petitions to address the Board at the beginning of the meeting, as well as the disposition of said petitions.

~~Said Committee shall report its findings of fact and conclusions to the full Board.~~

F. The Chair of each committee to which a petition to address the Board is referred shall provide at the beginning of the Committee report a summary of the number and nature of the petitions received, as well as the Committee's decisions regarding said petitions.

~~The full Board will act on the Committee's report or may determine that the full Board will hear the petitioner at such time and place as the full Board may determine.~~

G. Prior to acting on an item or issue, the full Board shall hear approved petitioners who are present and prepared to address the Board when called to appear.

H. A record shall be kept indicating the petitioner's name, the subject matter, and action taken on each petition to address the Board.

### III. Limitations

#### A. At the Full Board:

1. The Board Chair, in consultation with the chair of any Committee approving a petition to appear before the Board, shall determine how many petitioners may address the Board on the same topic; typically no more than two (2) petitioners may address the Board on the same topic.
2. Each petitioner approved to address the Board shall be allocated five (5) minutes unless the Board Chair grants additional time.
3. Typically no more than eight (8) petitioners shall be heard in any single Board meeting regardless of the topic(s).

#### B. At a Committee:

1. The Committee shall determine the number of petitioners who will address the Committee on the same topic.
2. The Committee shall determine the appropriate amount of time allocated to each petitioner to address the Committee.

**Petition to Address the Board of Trustees  
University of Kentucky**

Petitions to address the Board may be made by completing and submitting this form to the Office of the President no later than two (2) business days before the start of the meeting (e.g., for a Tuesday, 1:00 p.m. meeting, petitions must be received by Friday at 1:00 p.m.). To ensure the proper recognition of speakers, no change in the original presenter may be made, except possibly as determined by the Board Chair or a Board Committee. Note: individual presentations on topics that are germane to the action items on the Board's agenda are limited to five (5) minutes. For a complete list of guidelines, see AR 1:2, *Requests to Address the Board of Trustees*, <http://www.uky.edu/Regs/files/ar/ar1-2.pdf>.

**REQUIRED INFORMATION**  
(Please type or print.)

**Contact Information (All fields must be completed)\***

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone Number: \_\_\_\_\_  
E-Mail: \_\_\_\_\_ Mailing Address: \_\_\_\_\_

**\*YOU MUST PROVIDE A TELEPHONE NUMBER AND EMAIL ADDRESS IN ORDER FOR YOUR REQUEST TO BE CONSIDERED.**

**University Relationship**

Relationship to the University (please check the most appropriate category):  
 Student  Faculty  Staff  Alum \_\_\_\_\_ Other (Please specify)

Name of Group (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_

**Topic**

Topic on which you wish to speak: \_\_\_\_\_

Please indicate if you will speak  pro  con or  neutrally on this topic.

Briefly summarize your proposed address to the board: (maximum 1000 characters)

Have you contacted any University units about this topic previously?

Yes No

If yes, list the units and the action taken by each office: (maximum 300 characters)

*The University of Kentucky is committed to providing equal opportunity for participation in all programs, services, and activities. Accommodations for persons with disabilities may be requested by contacting the Office of the President within 24 hours of the meeting. Requests received after this date will be honored whenever possible.*

Office of the President  
100 Main Building  
Lexington, KY 40506  
Phone: (xxx) xxx-xxxx Fax: (xxx) xxx-xxx E-mail: xxxxx@uky.edu

## General Education Program Information for University Senate November 3, 2010

### ***Introduction***

The University of Kentucky has been engaged in a lengthy and thoughtful conversation about its core curriculum, beginning with the 2004 review of the University Studies Program. After approving a set of Design Principles for a revised curriculum, in March 2008, the University Senate and the Provost jointly established a General Education Reform Steering Committee, whose recommended Learning Outcomes and Curricular Framework were approved by the University Senate at its December 8, 2008 meeting.

The learning outcomes adopted by the University Senate articulate the major components of a curricular framework for general education and the distribution of course work within each segment of that framework. And, general education in its new conception is to be integrated throughout the four years of study. The core courses are meant to create the foundation. Members of ten curricular faculty teams were appointed, each of which is associated with one of the ten courses within the adopted curricular framework. Each of the ten teams was composed both of specialists and non-specialists in the corresponding discipline, in order to ensure balance between rigorous disciplinary content and the central learning outcomes of the general education curriculum.

At the April 13, 2009 meeting of the University Senate, Provost Subbaswamy shared his estimate of the instructional cost differential associated with a move from the current University Studies Program to the proposed General Education program. The rationale for increased expense was to move to a model with smaller classes or large classes with break-out sessions, such as recitations, labs, etc. The agenda for that meeting also involved a First Reading of the curricular teams' recommended Course Templates, which established both the detailed learning outcomes and the assessment framework for each of the ten courses.

At the May 4, 2009 meeting, the final reading of the course templates occurred. Chair Randall indicated that

1. The Senate must be satisfied that all necessary resources, etc. are available for a new gen ed, with attention paid to a tentative implementation date of fall 2011.
2. The SC expects that the process for forming a group to vet proposed gen ed courses will be approved by the Senate.

After discussion, a vote was taken on the motion that the Senate approve the 10 course templates with an intended implementation date of fall 2011, subject to final confirmation by the University Senate of: 1) the implementation date; and 2) the process of vetting Gen Ed courses for inclusion during fall 2010. The motion passed in a show of hands with none opposed and one abstaining (Minutes of the May 4, 2009 Senate Meeting).

This document pulls together information to show that we are, indeed, ready to implement the new Gen Ed for Fall 2011. Following are discussions of: 1) financial considerations; 2) projected courses and seats; 3) course approval process; and 4) an overview of assessment processes.

## 1. Financial Considerations

At the April 13, 2009 Senate meeting, Provost Subbaswamy shared preliminary estimates of the cost of a new general education program built on the design principles and learning outcomes for this program as put forth by Senate. The estimate at that time was \$4.4 million. That estimate was based on the costs to hire tenure track faculty in strategic areas, to hire new lecturer lines to provide terminal degree faculty for general education teaching, and to add additional Teaching Assistant lines. The premise for these moves was to provide what our students deserve, a high quality educational experience with faculty and strategically placed Teaching Assistants and to reduce our dependence on courses taught by part-time instructors and too many TAs. We know now, that the cost to do this is higher than originally estimated. Provost Subbaswamy has set aside the required funds to do this though. The distribution of funding across the ten areas of General Education is shown in the table below.

Area of General Education	Total \$ Allocated
Inquiry in Arts and Creativity	\$958,050
Inquiry in Humanities	\$143,863
Inquiry in Natural Sciences	\$575,644
Inquiry in Social Sciences	\$540,094
Composition and Communications	
Comp and Com I and II	\$1,721,320
Quantitative Reasoning	
Quantitative Foundations	\$209,485
Statistical Inferential Reasoning	\$264,718
Citizenship	
Community, Culture and Citizenship in USA	\$895,280
Global Dynamics	
<b>Total Funding Allocated</b>	<b>\$5,308,455</b>

## **2. Projected Seats for General Education**

During the past year, colleges have been working to develop new courses, or to revise existing courses, to meet the new Gen Ed program. The table below shows the approximate number of seats expected to be available for Fall 2011. One can see that seats in Arts and Creativity and Global Dynamics are lower than the other areas. Over time, we anticipate growth in these areas as more faculty members determine how their courses can fit into each area.

### **Projected General Education Seats by Area**

Area	Seats
Inquiry in Arts and Creativity	3900
Inquiry in Humanities	7080
Inquiry in Natural Sciences	9000
Inquiry in Social Sciences	7330
Composition and Communications I	4400
Composition and Communications II	4400
Quantitative Foundations	5900
Statistical Inferential Reasoning	4800
Community, Culture and Citizenship in USA	4500
Global Dynamics	3960

These numbers include seats in classes that have been approved and will be submitted for approval. For a summary of courses that have been approved, see the Gen Ed website at <http://www.uky.edu/GenEd>.

## **3. Course Approval Process:**

Recall that at the May 2009 Senate meeting it was voted that prior to approval of the fall 2011 implementation, Senate wanted to be assured of “the process of vetting Gen Ed courses for inclusion during fall 2010.”

At the September 14, 2009 Senate Meeting, the development of a series of vetting teams for the 2009-10 academic year was proposed in order to vet courses developed during the summer of 2009. The Vetting teams were appointed based on faculty elections and SC appointments. Senate then gave approval at the December 14, 2009 meeting for piloting courses in the spring based on the activities of the vetting teams. The teams remained active through May 2010 and made considerable progress in vetting and approving the Gen Ed content of the courses that had been submitted during that time.

The vetting teams were not intended to be permanent. To that end, the development of an oversight committee was necessary. Senate Council and the Office of Undergraduate Education worked collaboratively to develop the concept of the current Interim General Education Oversight Committee (IGEOC – more commonly referred to as simply GEOC).

On May 3, 2010, the University Senate authorized the appointment of the Interim General Education Oversight Committee (IGEOC). Senate Council Chair David Randall officially appointed this committee on May 11. The core of the committee is comprised of ten faculty members who represent, broadly, each of the 10 course template areas in the new Gen Ed. These 10 faculty members serve as a sub-committee of the Undergraduate Council (UGC) that

adheres to all academic approval processes of the faculty. The committee charge includes:

- Providing input and recommendations on issues that may arise as implementation of the new curriculum takes place.
- Reviewing proposed general education courses to ensure conformity with Senate-approved course templates for each of the 10 course areas. Final approval of courses will reside with the University Senate.
- Working collaboratively with the offices of Undergraduate Education and Assessment to ensure that assessment of the general education program meets the needs of program review and the needs and diverse activities of faculty teaching general education courses.
- Developing recommendations for the long-term oversight of the program, including periodic course review and program assessment to ensure that the program remains true to the learning outcomes.
- Providing regular updates on General Education to the University Senate and the campus community.

GEOC will operate for a period of two years, from May 17, 2010 until May 15, 2012.

The committee is chaired by Dr. William Rayens (Professor, Department of Statistics) who is serving a two-year appointment as Assistant Provost of General Education in the Office of Undergraduate Education.

Operationally, each GEOC member works with faculty referees who are chosen to review courses in each area. When the area expert, based on the input of the referees, recommends that a course be approved, the larger GEOC must approve it as well. GEOC also makes sure that syllabi meet Senate Guidelines and that course approval forms are in proper form. Once approved by GEOC, the proposals are then sent to the UGC. One member of GEOC, Dr. Ruth Beattie from Biology, is also appointed to UGC and has a long history of outstanding service to the Council. Dr. Beattie represents the Gen Ed courses to UGC for final approval prior to moving to Senate. The table below provides data on the number of courses that have already been submitted and vetted during the past 18 months. For an overview of the activities of GEOC, please see the Gen Ed website, <http://www.uky.edu/GenEd>.

#### **Number of courses currently approved or in the approval process.**

Area	2009/10 Vetting Cycle*	2010 GEOC Vetting Cycle	
	Courses Approved	Courses Submitted**	Courses Reviewed
Inquiry Humanities	8	19	4
Inquiry Arts and Creativity	5	12	8
Inquiry Social Sciences	6	3	3
Inquiry Natl/Math/Phys Sciences	8	11	2
Comp and Comm I	1	0	0
Comp and Comm II	0	1	1
Quantitative Foundations	1	3	3
Statistical Inferential Reasoning	1	1	1
Citizenship/Diversity	10	8	0
Global Dynamics	11	15	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>24</b>

\*Not all 60 courses submitted in summer 2009 were vetted by the original committees and are being vetted by GEOC.

\*\*31 of these were submitted on or after October 1<sup>st</sup>

#### **4. Assessment:**

Design Principle Seven states: “The curriculum will specify learning outcomes and the processes for both the systematic assessment of those learning outcomes and ongoing curricular improvement.”

In order to assess the General Education Program, the Office of Assessment has developed an assessment plan that includes the following components:

1. Developing Student Learning Outcomes (SLO). The UK faculty has articulated four Senate approved SLO for our Gen Ed Program, under which the ten areas fit.
2. A mapping of courses in the program that address one or more SLO. As previously discussed, this is happening, as faculty submit courses for one of the ten areas of Gen Ed.
3. Identification of “authentic artifacts” from each course that can be used for assessment of the SLO. An “authentic artifact” for purposes of Gen Ed should be an assignment that is part of the course that will be administered and graded. Graded assignments help to ensure that students are serious about completing the work. These “artifacts” are collected from the course each semester, prior to grading, and stored in a database. The documents are stripped of class and student identifiers and are coded to reflect which SLO they relate to.
4. A random, stratified sample is chosen from the larger pool, packaged into groups of 10, and distributed to evaluators. Each packet of 10 will be evaluated at least twice.
5. “Artifacts” will be evaluated by holistic scoring using AAC&U VALUE rubrics.
6. After data analysis, results will be provided to a number of stakeholders, including GEOC. The data are used to evaluate the efficacy of the Gen Ed program, and to allow for improvement planning over time.

Assessment of Gen Ed, done well, and done consistently, will strengthen the program and prevent slippage away from our SLO. It is important that the process is one that is supported by faculty and is a strong collaboration between faculty governance and academic administration. Faculty, through GEOC and other avenues, will have input on evaluating the process, the rubrics used and improvement plans that impact Gen Ed curricula.