

## MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, October 14, 2002

The University Senate met in regular session at 3.00 p.m., October 14, 2002 in the Auditorium of the W.T. Young Library.

Members absent were: Leon Assael\*, Thomas Barker, Rolando Berger, Suketu Bhavsar\*, Jack Blanton, James Boling\*, Beth B. Brady\*, Laretta Byars\*, Ben Carr, Craig Chasen, James Cibulka, Taylor Coots, Jody Deem, Patrick Deluca\*, Mary Duke\*, David Durant, Greg Feeny, Walter Ferrier\*, Joseph Fink\*, William Fortune, Daniel Frank, Ben Franzini, Michelle Freed\*, Richard Furst, Lori Garkovich\*, Rebecca Glasscock, Z. Govindarajulu, Larry Grabau, Louise Graham, Bob Grossman\*, Howard Grotch, James Holsinger, Kyle Jewell, David J. Johnson, James Kerley, Judith Lesnaw\*, Thomas Lester, Bruce Lucas, Mary Marchant, Joan Mazur, Leola McClure, Katherine McCormick, William McKinney, John McKnight, Ralph Miller, Mary Molinaro\*, Krishnamurty Muralidhar\*, Sue Nokes, David Randall, Connie Ray, Kenneth Roberts, Thomas Robinson, Tim Robinson, Susan Scollay, Robert Shay, Bill Smith, Scott Smith, Patricia Terrell, Kelly Tian\*, Salvatore Turco, Henry Vasconez\*, Allen Vestal, Brian Wade\*, Retia Walker\*, Kelly Wiggins, Carolyn Williams, Eugene Williams, Emery Wilson, Liz Wilson, Deborah Witham\*, Don Witt\*, Kelly Wright.

---

\*Excused Absence

Chairperson Jeff Dembo called the meeting to order.

The Chair indicated that the minutes of the regular meeting of 9 September and the special meeting of 30 September were not available.

Chairperson Dembo then called on Professor Jim Hougland, Sociology, to present a memorial resolution honoring Professor Willis Sutton. Following the reading of the resolution, the Chair called for a moment of silence. A copy of the resolution is appended.

Chairperson Dembo read a letter from former Senate Council Chair Bill Fortune, responding to the resolution of recognition presented at the 9 September 2002 Senate meeting. It reads as follows:

Thank you for the Senate resolution. I enjoyed for the most part my two years as Council Chair.

Being active in the greater University brought me into contact with folks in every college, took me to places I never would have gone, and confirmed what I've always known: that UK faculty and staff are for the most part trying to do the best job possible to make UK a great University.

Sincerely, Bill

The Chair welcomed new Senators to the meeting and apologized for the oversight at the first meeting of the academic year.

The Chair introduced three new Senate Committee Chairs: Professors O.J. Hahn, Planning and Priorities; Mark Hanson, Admissions and Academic Standards; and Bret Ripley, Retroactive Withdrawal Committee.

The Chair noted that in the next week, a broadcast email will come out from him about several issues asking for input; he also noted that he would solicit issues for future deliberation.

The Chair called for a report from the Rules & Elections Committee Chair Brad Canon. Canon announced that there were seven nominations for the faculty Board seat being vacated by Claire Pomeroy. The candidates were named as follows: Glenn Collins, Agriculture; Frederick DeBeer, Medicine; Boyd Haley, Chemistry; Davy Jones, Toxicology; Roy Moore, Journalism and Telecommunications; John Piccoro, Pharmacy; and Ernie Yanarella, Political Science. Canon explained the voting process. Brief discussion followed on the election rules.

The Chair announced recent rule waivers and noted that a calendar change had been requested by the College of Dentistry, to change the date of graduation to parallel the University-wide date. Dembo noted that the change would stand approved unless objections were raised by three Senators.

The Chair then called on and made welcome Professor Susan Scollay, University Academic Ombud, for her report. Scollay noted that she did not have a specific report. She will emphasize Academic Integrity, Senate Rules - various Sections, and UCOA - guiding principles. Her objectives for the first year include the need to raise the profile of the Academic Ombud as a voice for Academic Integrity; to upgrade the office brochure and to develop a website. She noted that the website is "up" now, but the site address is not included yet in their literature.

The Chair thanked Professor Scollay and the membership accorded her a warm round of applause.

The Chair noted that later in the agenda, Joe Anthony, LCC Academic Ombud, would give his report.

The Chair then called for a waiver of the Senate's ten-day Rule in order to consider the action items. On motion by Senator Hans Gesund, Engineering, and second by Senator Brad Canon, Political Science, and a voice vote of the Senate, the Rules were waived.

**ACTION ITEMS:**

**ACTION ITEM A** - University Senate Meeting, Monday, October 14, 2002. Proposal to amend University Senate Rules to adopt the definition of a "major" was introduced by Senator Enid Waldhart, Communications.

The Chair invited discussion on the proposal, and after discussion it was put to a vote. The proposal passed in a voice vote. The proposal is attached.

**ACTION ITEM B** - University Senate Meeting, Monday, October 14, 2002. Proposal to amend the University Senate Rules, Section V - 5.2.1.1, International Baccalaureate (IB) credit, was introduced by Senator Enid Waldhart, Communications.

The Chair invited discussion on the proposal, noting that Cindy Iten was present to respond to questions. Following discussion, the proposal passed in a voice vote. The proposal with background and rationale is attached.

**ACTION ITEM C** - Proposal to establish a College of Design and to establish a School of Architecture within that College was introduced by Senator Waldhart. A Department of Historic Preservation within the School was noted in the proposal and as a result of discussion on the floor, added to the Senate action.

The Chair added several points following Waldhart's introduction. Discussion was invited.

Following extensive discussion, Senator Dwyer, Veterinary Science, called for the question. On a voice vote the question was called and debate ceased. The main motion passed on a voice vote. The proposal, appended to these Minutes, will be forwarded to the Provost for Board action.

**DISCUSSION ITEM** - University Senate Meeting, Monday, October 14, 2002. For Discussion Only: the proposed Maloney Report (Student Evaluations), Professor William Maloney, Chair

The Chair made brief introductory comments and invited Professor Maloney to speak. Maloney spoke to each issue presented in the report. Considerable discussion followed. No action was taken. The report will be scheduled for action at a subsequent meeting of the Senate.

A copy of the report is available on the Senate website.

**REPORT** - University Senate Meeting, Monday, October 14, 2002. Work/Life Task Force Presentation: Phyllis Nash, co-Chair

The Chair introduced and welcomed Dr. Nash. Nash gave a brief report on the issues surrounding balancing employment with personal and family priorities. She noted the

areas addressed by a work-life program, the benefits of a work-life program, and the charge, vision, mission and goals. The short-term report recommendations will be made to President Todd on November 15; the long term findings will be presented to Todd on February 15, 2003. Nash put up the Work-Life Task force Web Site ([www.uky.edu/Worklife](http://www.uky.edu/Worklife)) and encouraged the members to visit and comment.

**REPORT** - University Senate Meeting, Monday, October 14, 2002. Academic Ombud Report, Senator Joe Anthony, Lexington Community College.

The Chair then called on and made welcome Senator Joe Anthony, Lexington Community College Academic Ombud, for his report.

Anthony thanked all those he had worked with in past years. He reported that grade disputes were the most common problem brought to his office. In many instances, the disputes arise from the lack of clarity of the evaluation criteria. Anthony said that grades coming from a holistic arena are judgments, and urged faculty to make those judgments as concrete as possible. He also noted the problem with faculty record keeping - being particularly problematic when faculty have left the University. Anthony reported having very few dangerous situations to deal with, but noted there have been a few that were "awful." A lot of time is spent dealing with problems due to a lack of communication. Disrespect and core incompetencies are tough to handle. He spoke to using plagiarism and cheating cases as teaching tools to deal with panic and/or ignorance. There being no questions, the Chair thanked Anthony and he was accorded a warm round of applause.

**REPORT** - University Senate Meeting, Monday, October 14, 2002. Provost Search - Advisory Task Force Report, Senator Lee Edgerton

The Chair made welcome Senator Edgerton and invited comments. Edgerton said that the Task Force was continuing to accept applications. They are seeking a firm to do background checks. Details are available on the UK Homepage, under the listing "Provost Search." The Task Force next meets on Thursday 17 October at 7:30 a.m.

The Chair thanked Senator Edgerton for his report.

The Chair noted that the Health Literacy Initiative Presentation listed on the agenda had been cancelled because Tim Buckingham was out of town

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Enid Waldhart  
Secretary, University Senate

Item A

Proposal:

In response to recommendation #5 of the SACs Reaffirmation/Substantive Change Committee Report (April 15-18, 2002) reiterated below, the Senate Council proposes the following definition of Major be added to The Glossary, Section IX, University Senate Rules: (USR)

SACs Reaffirmation/Substantive Change Reference:

Section IV: Education Program  
4.2.2 - Undergraduate Completion Requirements

**Recommendation 5:** The Committee recommends that the institution establish a definition of a major or area of concentration and publish such definition in appropriate bulletins or catalogs (page 21).

Major:

A major is a primary area of study defined by a set of course and/or credit hour requirements within specified disciplines. Within degree programs, majors may be further defined by requirements in an area of emphasis (also known as an "option").

Background:

Recommendation 5, SACs Report: The Committee recommends that the institution establish a definition of a major or area of concentration and publish such definition in appropriate bulletins or catalogs (page 21).

Reaffirmation Committee Concerns: Academic regulations are published in the University Bulletin and on the web in the University Senate Rules. Members of the Committee were unsuccessful in locating the institutional definition of the major or area of concentration in either location. During the interview process, the appropriate administrators were unable to provide a definition of these terms.

Action Taken: The Office of the Registrar conducted a review of definitions of *major* as presented in the bulletins of the University's benchmark institutions. Using the benchmark examples, the Registrar developed a definition of major which was amended by the Senate Council and is recommended to the Senate for adoption.

Implementation: Immediate

\*\*\*\*\*

Item B

Proposal to amend University Senate Rules, Section V - 5.2.1.1

Amend as follows: [Delete strikeouts; add underlined, bolded wording]

**Accelerated Programs** the College Board Level Examination Program Subject and General Examinations, the College Board Advanced Placement Examinations, the American College Testing Program Proficiency Examination Program Subject Examinations, and courses evaluated by the American Council on Education for which credit recommendations are made under the Program on Noncollegiate Sponsored Instruction and courses in the International Baccalaureate Program (~~Higher Level~~) are recognized as appropriate credit for meeting degree requirements. Colleges and/or departments representing the discipline, as designated by the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, ~~in consultation with the Admissions and Registrar's Office~~ shall determine and publish appropriate cut-off scores for the CLEP, AP, PEP, and IB examinations and report them to the Office of Admissions and Registrar. (US:9/12/82) ~~Students with superior results from their International Baccalaureate High Level may be awarded up to six credits by the corresponding department of the University. Scores of 5, 6, and 7 normally are requisite.~~ No AP, CLEP, or IB credit hours shall be letter graded. Rather, all such earned credit hours will be shown on the student's academic record as course credit (CR) (See also V-5.1.4, Rules Committee Interpretation, 1/15/93) (US: 4/25/88; US:3/9/98)

\*Departments may make decisions about allowing or not allowing credit for the examinations mentioned in this rule and about scores necessary for credit, subject to the approval of the dean of the college.  
(RC: 4/28/98)

Background:

The University of Kentucky has awarded credit through the International Baccalaureate Program for a number of years. The IB program is a two year, intensive academic program that culminates with either Standard Level or Higher Level exams (much like AP exams) scored in a range of 1-7.

Historically, Atherton High School in Louisville and Holmes High School in Covington have been the only Kentucky high schools to offer the IB program. Sacred Heart Academy in Louisville, however, just graduated their first class and Apollo High School in Owensboro will begin the program next year. Others are expected to follow. With this new participation in IB from Kentucky students, the UK Office of Undergraduate Admissions is now receiving many more questions from students and parents as well as requests from schools for a more standard approach to awarding credit from this program, similar to the way Advanced Placement credit is awarded.

The College of Arts and Sciences coordinated an informational meeting in January between the University and representatives from their high schools. A presentation involved a

completed overview of the program as well as specific details on student assessment, instruction in the areas of History of the Americas and English, and other program course materials. Faculty representatives from the A&S departments who would conduct the course reviews, members of the staff of the office of Admissions and Registrar and members of the A&S administration were present. The Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education was also present.

Accordingly, the proposed changes in the Senate Rules are recommended. They have been approved by the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee and by the Senate Council and are recommended to the Senate for approval.

Rationale for various changes:

1. Remove the (Higher Level) designation from International Baccalaureate (IB).

Rationale:

The Standard Level is appropriate for credit in some areas and the departments awarding the credit should be allowed that flexibility. Standard Level IB courses are 1-year courses and require the same number of class hours as AP.

2. Award credit for IB under the same rules as CLEP, AP, and PEP.

Rationale:

For consistency among pre-college programs, departments/colleges should be permitted the same discretion for IB credit as permitted for CLEP, AP, and PEP.

3. Clarify that the college or department representing the discipline has sole decision-making authority as designated by the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education

Rationale:

Make clear the intent.

4. Add International Baccalaureate Program credit to the Rules Committee interpretation(\*)

Rationale:

For example, in looking at the AP credit awarded by biology and Spanish, it is clear that the departmental faculty have taken different approaches in the amount of credit awarded, the level of coursework for which credit was awarded, and the required exam score. Those faculty should also be allowed to make similar decisions with IB.

Conversation with Dr. Brad Canon, chair of the Rules Committee, confirms that IB is not included in the interpretation of 4/28/98 but did not know why it was excluded.

Implementation: Effective for students entering as freshmen for Fall, 2002

Note: If approved, the proposal will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification

\*\*\*\*\*

University of Kentucky International Baccalaureate Program

Credit Awarded Based on Standard Level (SL) or Higher Level (HL) Exam Scores of 5, 6, and 7

**Subject Level Credit Awarded Credit Notes**

**Biology** SL BIO 102, 103; HL BIO 150, 151, 152, 153

**Chemistry** SL CHE 104 Credit will also be awarded for CHE 106 if curriculum options *A, C* or *H* are completed; documentation from school is required; HL CHE 105, 107 Students qualify to take CHE 115 bypass examination

**English** SL/HL ENG 161 Placement in ENG 105

**French** SL FR 203, 204 (Scores of 5 or 6) FR 304, 305 (Score of 7); HL FR 304, 305

**Geography** SL GEO 172 (Score of 5) GEO 130, 172 (Scores of 6 or 7); HL GEO 130, 172

**German** SL GER 201, 202; HL GER 205, 206, 307, 308

**History** SL 6 hours credit Specific courses determined after review of individual syllabus;  
HL 12 hours credit Specific courses determined after review of individual syllabus  
*Note: For history majors, the premajor requirement is met with either SL or HL*

**Mathematics** SL Math Studies MA 123; SL Math Methods MA 110; HL Mathematics MA 113

**Physics** SL/HL PHY 211, 213

**Psychology** SL PY 110; HL PSY 100

**Spanish** SL SPA 210, 211; HL SPA 312, 314



\*\*\*\*\*

Item C

Proposal to create a College of Design  
at the University of Kentucky

Submitted by the School of Interior Design and  
the College of Architecture  
August 28, 2002

Summary:

The School of Interior Design and the College of Architecture propose the creation of a College of Design. This new college would consolidate a number of the professional design disciplines into one academic unit: Interior Design, Architecture, and Historic Preservation. The new college will support an increased design presence on campus and in Kentucky. It should also facilitate enhanced interaction with other disciplines connected with design: Engineering, Landscape Architecture, and Geography. This consolidation reflects an increasing interaction among the varied professional design disciplines in their practices; for at least a generation, architects, interior designers, and other design professionals have affiliated their activities to a much larger degree than was previously the norm.

Discussions regarding establishment of a College of Design have occurred on campus for over two years, encouraged by Chancellor Zinser and acting Provost Nietzel. The faculties from the affected programs have reviewed the issue thoroughly, both within their own units as well as together. Professional organizations and visiting committees for these programs have encouraged the movement towards a College of Design. The Futures Committee recommended establishment of a design college; furthermore, an external review committee composed of eminent design professionals and scholars convened by acting Provost Nietzel concurred on this course of action.

Programmatic Considerations:

The establishment of a College of Design furthers strategic goals across the university. It will enhance professional education for the programs within it, and provide a more realistic model for the students' professional careers. The proposal also complies with the Futures Committee, which recommended the creation of a College of Design. It will enhance potential for increasing public awareness of design issues in a manner consistent with the university's service mission. A College of Design will stimulate opportunities between faculty,

students for the enhancement of research and creative scholarship. Further, the college will provide additional opportunities for collaboration with other disciplines on campus.

Professional accreditation in architecture and interior design takes place for the particular degree program, not the encompassing academic unit; thus establishment of a College of Design will not change existing accreditation processes. However, there are intangible benefits: during Interior Design's most recent accreditation visit, there was a clear sense from the visiting team that establishment of a design college would benefit the program.

Many universities organize their professional design programs under a single academic unit; it is the predominant model across the country. It affords opportunities for collaboration among a larger number of faculty with similar interests, and opportunities for consolidation of resources particular to design (e.g. workshop, computer-aided-design workshop, and library). The one significant disadvantage concerns facilities: both the College of Architecture and the School of Interior Design have significant limitations in their present facilities, and consolidating the programs into a new college makes resolution of proper shared facilities for professional programs even more urgent. That, by far, is the largest financial issue facing the proposed college. And it may also be the only financial issue: it is not anticipated the new unit will entail other significant costs.

In terms of administrative structure, the College of Design will consist of two schools and one department. They are the School of Interior Design (presently in Human Environmental Sciences) and a new School of Architecture (as a new school to replace the College of Architecture, this will need to be approved as a part of this proposal). The professional programs in each of these schools will not be changed as a result of this proposal. The Master of Historic Preservation program, presently in the College of Architecture, will become a department in the College of Design.

There will be one dean, and directors for each of the two schools and a chair for the preservation program. An overall administrative structure has been defined over the past three months and reviewed by the provost. It was presented to faculty from Architecture, Interior Design, and Historic Preservation at a faculty meeting last month, and received wide support at that time. A copy of this proposed structure is attached.

#### Individual Considerations:

Students will benefit from greater interaction with and exposure to another allied design discipline. Opportunities for increased intellectual discourse whether in formally arranged settings such as classes and seminars or the informal sharing

of ideas that can arise naturally as a result of association will strengthen the creative environment and lead to an enhanced design culture for all. There will also be substantial intangible benefits from affecting this transition without any degradation to the professional programs. Accreditation requirements within each program ensure that each will maintain its own identity; thus it is not reasonable to think that the programs themselves will be consolidated in a manner that does not honor commitments to students presently enrolled in them. Class size will remain the same. Degrees and curricula for all programs in the new college will not be changing as a result of this proposal.

The proposed college should substantially enhance the interests of faculty in each of the affected programs. There will be a larger number of faculty with shared interests in design. Thus the overall intellectual climate will broaden, and opportunities for collaboration will increase. In many respects, faculty responsibilities should fit much better than in present circumstances, which will enhance professional opportunities for all faculty. Untenured faculty, in particular, should benefit from the proposed college structure. A larger and broader array of design faculty should provide additional guidance about expectations, which will be valuable for the promotion process.

The opportunities for more structured curricular interactions are just now beginning to be explored. There has been a meaningful degree of informal joint teaching between Interior Design and Architecture for the past four years, and this should increase. In particular, as Architecture moves to implement a new Master of Architecture degree curriculum (approved by the University Senate in the spring of 2002, and planned to be implemented in the 2003-2004 academic year), the potential for shared teaching should increase.

Research and service activities for faculty should be enhanced as well. Interior Design will have access to Architecture's two community design centers (in Lexington and Louisville); the COPC grant (Community Outreach Partnership Center), which was awarded last year, serves as a model for more research collaboration; and discussions among faculty regarding additional shared research initiatives have been underway for a year. It is not anticipated that the proposed college will entail teaching reassignments that would be detrimental to research and service activities on the part of the faculty.

Allocation of staff and financial resources has been studied extensively this summer by a committee chaired by Roger Huston, Chief Budget Officer. The committee has forwarded their recommendation for equitable assignment of staff and finances to the acting Provost. It is anticipated that Interior Design will maintain its existing staff, and that they will join staff presently in the College of Architecture. There will be some redefinition of roles as this transition takes place, largely to remove redundancies in assignments, and to take advantage of

new opportunities for disseminating information about the new college and its programs.\*

Conclusion:

Programs in Architecture and Interior Design have as their primary purpose the preparation of future professionals for these design disciplines. This proposal to establish a new College of Design reflects substantial changes towards collaboration in these design disciplines; indeed, it is not too much to say that the professions are well ahead of the university. It is time for the university to catch up, and the creation of a College of Design is a very large step in this regard. Documents attached corroborate that this transition has been studied and contemplated for a substantial period of time. Representatives of all programs as well as staff from each unit have had opportunities to make comments in a number of different forums; they will also be given the opportunity to comment in writing, and that correspondence, will also be enclosed with this proposal.

Attachments:

-Proposed organizational chart for the College of Design [see Senate Council office for a copy of this attachment]

The proposal was approved by the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure and forwarded to the Senate Council. The Senate Council agreed to place the proposal on the Senate agenda if timely informed that a written, confidential vote was taken by the faculty of the Interior Design School and the faculty of the College of Architecture on the 28 August 2002 proposal.

Note: If approved the proposal will be forwarded to the Acting Provost for appropriate administrative action.

\*\*\*\*\*

Note: The Maloney Report is available on line at <http://www.uky.edu/USC/agenda/>

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Willis A. Sutton, Jr.  
(1917-2002)

Willis A. Sutton, Jr., Professor Emeritus of Sociology at the University of Kentucky, passed away at the age of 85 on September 18, 2002. He was a faculty member at the University of Kentucky from 1952 until his retirement in 1982. He remained an active part of the intellectual life of the department and the civic life of Lexington, KY until only a few months prior to his death. Willis received his degrees from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and devoted his career to research, teaching, and service related to his specialization in sociology of the community. He served as Executive Director of the Bureau of Community Service from 1955 to 1965. He helped found and became the president in 1964 of the Kentucky Council for Community and Area Development. He directed a number of interdisciplinary training programs for development workers from India, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Indonesia. He was an instructor in the University's training program for Peace Corps volunteers. In 1959-60, under the auspices of the Ford Foundation, he lived in India and conducted research concerning that country's community development program. The research led to the publication of *Village Level Workers and their Work*, published by the Indian Government in 1962. In the last several years before his official retirement (1976-1982), he served as Chair of the Department of Sociology. As Chair, he successfully encouraged open communication within a diverse department, worked for the effective integration of undergraduate education into a research-oriented university, and introduced many procedures that continue to be used by the department.

Willis had the personal characteristics that make for a wonderful colleague and a highly successful faculty member and department Chair. He had a lively sense of intellectual curiosity, a profound interest in local and global affairs, a disciplined and superbly organized approach to his work, and an unflinching commitment to the welfare of his colleagues. Those of us who were junior colleagues during his time as Chair found him to be a wonderful and consistently supportive mentor who willingly took the time to help us understand the vagaries of academia and the mysterious workings of the University's administration.

Willis Sutton is survived by his wife of sixty years, Dorothy Drake Sutton, three children, six grandchildren, and one great grandson. He was an elder of Second Presbyterian Church and active in several civic organizations. His passing represents a loss for the University of Kentucky, Lexington, and the discipline of Sociology.

James Hougland  
Department of Sociology

US Webminutes: 10.14.02