Senate Council Meeting
April 30, 2007

The Senate Council met at 3 pm on Monday, April 30, 2007 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Kaveh A. Tagavi called the meeting to order at 3:02 pm. The Chair noted that the date of the next SC meeting was not yet determined – the date of May 7 was the special Senate meeting. With regard to attendance, the Chair said that Grabau and Yanarella would be late and Aken, Michael, Randall and Thelin would be absent. The Chair noted that the minimum number of Senate Council (SC) members for a quorum was present. The Chair noted that while he normally did not take part in voting, he would purposely abstain from all votes so that it was evident that a quorum was present.

The Chair said that the previous meeting's minutes were not yet ready due to increased workload. Those present introduced themselves.

3. New Graduate Certificate in Computational Fluid Dynamics
The Chair invited College of Engineering Professor Jim McDonough to offer background information on the proposal for a new Graduate Certificate in Computational Fluid Dynamics. Guest McDonough said that the field of computational fluid dynamics (CFD) emerged in the 1970s, but it could be traced back even further. Fluid motion is present in the actions of everyday life – e.g. the circulation of blood in veins and arteries and breathing. McDonough said that CFD was used to evaluate many things. Many of the well-known major projects with Toyota involved CFD. He said that undergraduate and graduate courses in CFD were occasionally taught, but there was no real program; the proposed graduate certificate in the College of Engineering (CoE) would rectify that.

In response to Finkel, McDonough said that successful completion of four courses was required to earn the graduate certificate (GCft). Finkel noted that the usual requirement was three courses – would there be a process by which a student could test out of a course? McDonough said that as far as he was concerned, the requirement of four courses was mandatory whether or not a student had taken a similar course elsewhere; in such situations, the four courses would be that much more edifying.

McDonough said that there was a requirement that a GCft required nine to 15 credit hours. Wood explained that it had to be less than half the hours required for a non-thesis master's degree program, which was 15 credit hours.

Wood asked for a clarification of the intended audience and prerequisites. McDonough said the intended audience was very broad and would particularly include students in the various departments in the CoE. Masters and PhD

students in mathematics and some physics students might also be interested. McDonough said he could envision future growth into the biological sciences and many other areas. With respect to the prerequisites, McDonough said the courses were mostly oriented toward math and engineering students; the average biological sciences student would not quite be ready for the certificate. In response to Wood, McDonough said that students in statistics would be able to get into mechanical engineering courses. The Chair noted that a student in a completely different field, like philosophy, would not be able to master the material in just four courses.

In response to Finkel, McDonough said that the CoE would have no trouble accommodating students from other colleges. In response to Piascik, he said the student who completed the GCft would have the knowledge garnered and a notation on the student's transcript. Many schools had CFD programs at the MS and PhD levels, so this was an opportunity for UK to have a CFD offering.

Lesnaw asked about CoE interest in the flow of air through woodwind instruments. There was a brief exchange of information.

The Chair invited the College of Engineering's Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies Eric Grulke to add his thoughts. Guest Grulke said that the CoE felt such a GCft would be very helpful for graduates and had the right balance of courses, including an emphasis in math, which was necessary for CFD work. The Chair added that McDonough also had a graduate degree in math and a joint appointment in the Department of Mathematics.

Finkel asked a series of questions. In response, McDonough explained that the decision maker for admissions requirements would be the GCft director. It would be hard to guess how many students would complete the GCft, since the numbers of students in the Department of Mechanical Engineering fluctuated around 20-30 students. After five years, the success of the GCft would be evaluated with respect to a current expectation that three or four should be awarded every year. Most, if not all, of the problems assigned in a CFD class could be solved on a desktop computer, so additional facilities would not be required.

Finkel **moved** to send with a positive recommendation to the Senate the proposal for a new Graduate Certificate in Computational Fluid Dynamics, with an effective date of fall 2007. Lesnaw **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion passed with five in favor and the Chair abstaining.

2. New Institute in College of Engineering: Institute of Research for Technology Development

The Chair invited Grulke to explain the proposal. Grulke said that the impetus for the proposed Institute of Research for Technology Development (IR4TD) was the sheer success of College of Engineering (CoE) Professor Kozo Saito in industrial

scale research, his work in that field with graduate students and his ability to generate patentable ideas. Grulke said Professor Saito was bringing in a lot of funding while still graduating students; it would help the CoE grow if there was an institute with additional faculty members in the area of industrial scale research to expand current activities. There were already visiting international scholars in CoE – such an institute would create a structure in the university to enlarge and grow.

The name chosen for the institute had changed at least seven or eight times. The proposal began in the spring of 2004 and went through much iteration inside the CoE. Grulke noted that there was no need to request institutional resources – the IR4TD would be able to stand alone but due to some accounting rules at UK, some creativity was required. In response to Lesnaw, Grulke stated that part of the purpose of the IR4TD was to offer larger scale prototyping, which was not being done in the industry and was not feasible for suppliers. Grulke said that the IR4TD would be able to offer unique opportunities at the Coldstream Research Campus. If the IR4TD were located off-campus, the institute would not have to charge the full differential research rate. The IR4TD would be a hybrid – large-scale research facilities and would be located off-campus, where there would be sufficient space for something like an automobile paint booth, something that could not fit anywhere on campus but would still hold tremendous value for UK. He added that some of the research involved computational fluid dynamics. Guest Saito added that partnerships with Toyota Motor Manufacturing Kentucky (TMMK) had already been extremely successful.

Lesnaw noted that the title of the institute was very broad. She asked what other areas of research would be involved, as well as if there was any intent to pursue “green” research for the automobile industry. (Dembo arrived at this point.) Saito said that in spite of the seed money for IR4TD that came from TMMK, the resulting technology would help others in the auto industry. When research partnerships with TMMK began in 1993, the emphasis was on auto painting technologies, which went on for six or seven years. Currently, TMMK identified UK as a long-term partner in other areas. Other automotive companies were interested in how successful TMMK has been, in large part due to its partnership with UK. Other companies have begun to show interest in working with UK. Saito said he tied the technology development with student learning, which helped to draw international researchers to UK. Such interactions offered an opportunity for companies to improve their processes successfully and gave UK a unique niche.

Saito said that part of the proposal for the new institute was indeed about making the auto industry greener and more environmentally friendly, with ideas such as fuel efficiency. Saito said the name of the IR4TD was partially chosen to help keep an emphasis on curiosity and keeping research at the forefront of the enterprise. Research will be performed to develop products for industry and students will be involved, offering a global educational impact that will be relevant anywhere.

Saito said that when paint spray research began, approximately 50% of the paint was captured – the other half was left in the air. One of Saito's students created a mechanism by which almost all of the 50% overspray was captured with minimal energy usage and high capturing efficiency, which was very environmentally friendly. Subsequently, a question was raised about a plant that used coal for power – there was a problem with small particulate matter being released into the air. The application of the paint spray technology was then applied to the coal industry. Saito said that this was an excellent example of a green spin-off and how one aspect could grow larger.

Grulke said that 50% of the energy used and pollution produced in an auto plant was generated in the paint booth. By finding a solution for overspray, there were steps taken to get more paint onto the car. He said that Boeing would be interested in a practice by which X-rays could be used to put together planes and see inside joints. Currently such practices took about four days, but Grulke said with additional research, they might be able to decrease the wait time from days to just minutes. Their ability to solve problems would be improved with the breadth of research that could be conducted at the IR4TD.

Wood asked if it would be sponsored research that would be proprietary to the company commissioning it. Grulke replied in the negative – all income would arrive via a four-account and go through UK's Sponsored Projects Accounting offices. The IR4TD would not give up any publication rights; graduate students had already used similar research in dissertations and reported it in publications.

In response to Finkel, the Chair referred him to the letter of administrative feasibility included with the IR4TD proposal. Finkel then wondered how much the IR4TD would rely on Saito alone – if he left UK, would the IR4TD disappear? Grulke said that his concern was having someone who is successful in applied industrial research. Faculty would benefit from performing such research and the IR4TD could expand the numbers of faculty who could do it and collaboratively working with Saito would help spread his knowledge. The CoE review committee (of which Chair Tagavi was a member) saw the IR4TD as a real opportunity for those who wish to participate in such research.

In response to Finkel's question about the number of companies who might be involved, Grulke said that when the IR4TD went to TMMK, TMMK said they wanted to participate in the IR4TD but also wanted other companies involved, such as paint suppliers and other auto companies, which was a surprise to folks involved in the IR4TD proposal. TMMK has already begun the process of communicating with other companies to enlarge the collaboration.

Finkel noted that of the seven prototyping facilities outlined, four dealt with coatings. He asked about expansion of research. Saito said that when the proposal was drafted, the research at hand relating to paint was what was

referenced. Smart paint, however, had applications in many areas, such as coating lenses, ship building and structure inspection; paint was a very generic name. Auto coating capabilities had many other applications, such as in the treatment of cancer – how to kill the bad part without affecting the good part. Coating abilities could identify contagious diseases and small temperature increases.

After additional comments, Piascik **moved** to send the proposal for a new Institute of Research for Technology Development (IR4TD) to the Senate with a positive recommendation, to be effective immediately. Harley **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

4. Change to *Senate Rules 5.1.8.5* ("Retroactive Withdrawal")
The Chair invited the chair of the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee (SRWAC), Katherine McCormick, to explain the proposal.

Guest McCormick said that her return to the SC was due to a desire on the part of the SRWAC to make the language about processing a retroactive withdrawal application (RWA) more clear to everyone involved in the process. She said that there were colleges who operated in different ways, specifically with regard to the proposed Instructor Feedback Form (IFF). The SRWAC also wanted colleges to be more uniform in the processing of RWAs regarding stops.

The IFF would allow instructors' feedback – in some colleges, it was utilized to gather comments by instructors and offered information about the veracity or credibility of a student's claim. In addition, the act of a dean informing instructors about the IFF would increase the general understanding of the RWA process. If there were a legitimate reason why an IFF could not be filled out (instructor gone, hardship on student, instructor refuses to fill out, etc.) then the IFF could be waived by the dean. (Grabau arrived during discussion.)

In response to Finkel, McCormick explained that the IFF was not recently generated – it was currently in use, but not used consistently across colleges. The purpose of the SRWAC request regarding the IFF was to approve its inclusion in the RW application, not necessarily to approve the content of the IFF.

After additional brief comments, Wood **moved** to send the proposal to change the wording of *Senate Rules 5.1.8.5* (regarding the Instructor Feedback Form and stops) to the Senate with a positive recommendation, to be effective in fall 2007. Lesnaw **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously with five in favor and the Chair abstaining.

With unanimous consent from SC members, the Chair rearranged the agenda to ensure as many items as possible were reviewed.

6. Continued Discussion on Tenure Clock Delay

The Chair invited Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Heidi Anderson to begin the discussion on the proposed change to *Governing Regulation X (GR X)* to allow a delay in a faculty member's probationary period.

Guest Anderson said that a SC member suggested adding language about guardianship for elderly parents, as well as a definition of guardianship. Anderson said she looked at some benchmarks to see what language they used and referred SC members to her handout, which included sample language from a couple universities. She said that depending on which regulation one looked at, "family" was defined differently for purposes of family medical leave and for nepotism. Since there were already two different definitions, she thought a third would be acceptable for the purposes of tenure clock delay. She added that there was one sentence in the middle of the main paragraph ("A faculty member…to the dean and Provost….") that needed to be moved to the end of that paragraph.

Finkel wondered how a department chair was supposed to know that a faculty member experienced a qualifying event for the tenure clock delay. Anderson replied that it would be addressed in the implementation phase – neither she nor Marcy Deaton (Office of Legal Counsel) wanted to have implementation information included in the *AR*, unless it were included in an appendix. Greissman noted that Anderson had developed a very nice faculty affairs website where such information could be housed.

Lesnaw asked if Anderson wanted SC members to deliberate on which definition of "family" should be used. She also wondered how the issue of domestic partners would be handled. Anderson replied that she was open to all suggestions. In response to Lesnaw, the Chair confirmed that at UK, the term "domestic partner" referred to both same- and opposite-sex partners. Dembo noted that some consideration should be given to permit colleges to modify the chain of command, since some areas had division directors, etc. Greissman suggested using the phrase "educational unit" and "educational unit administrator."

Finkel **moved** to send the proposed changes to *Governing Regulations X.B.1*, specifically the addition of subsection "c" ("Automatic Delay of Probationary Periods") with a positive recommendation for endorsement, to be implemented July 1, 2007. Piascik **seconded**. Finkel noted that it might be necessary to add language to accommodate the children of a domestic partner or the relatives of a spouse. Anderson replied that *GR X.A.1* already defined "relative," but Finkel pointed out that there was no reference at that spot to domestic partners.

Wood expressed concern with a possible legalistic interpretation of "guardian," which implied a formal legal process. In her experience with her elderly parents, she was not identified as a guardian, but rather the individual with power of attorney. Becoming a guardian stripped another individual of their rights, and she was concerned that many individuals were not technically a guardian but were

still heavily involved in the care of a relative. She suggested using “care for a dependent” or something similar. Piascik agreed – she said that as it was currently worded, she could not take time off to care for her husband, since she was not his guardian. Lesnaw added her support to Wood and Piascik’s concerns.

After additional discussion on terminologies, Finkel suggested that the language be changed to “principle caregiver for the relative.” Wood wondered about using the language from the University of Wisconsin to refer to one who assumed significant responsibilities with respect to family and/or dependent care obligations of a relative.

There was more discussion on how to include domestic partners in the definition of “relative.” Finkel suggested that the language include a reference to *GR X.A.1* as well as including “or domestic partner” but not as a parenthetical reference.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to send the proposed changes to *Governing Regulations X.B.1*, specifically the addition of subsection “c” (“Automatic Delay of Probationary Periods”) and the suggestions for wording (changing “guardianship” and adding the inclusion of domestic partners) with a positive recommendation for endorsement, to be implemented July 1, 2007. The motion **passed** with five in favor and the Chair abstaining.

6. Continuing Discussion on Clinical Title Series Faculty

The Chair noted that he had sent out an email to SC members over the weekend about the clinical title series (CTS). Because some SC members did not receive the email, he offered a synopsis.

A discussion followed regarding CTS faculty and what the next step(s) should be. A variety of issues involved were touched upon. Grabau left during the discussion.

After the discussion ended, Wood expressed concern over what she perceived to be a misperception by the Provost that the SC had taken overlong to review the issue. While discussion on various aspects of CTS faculty began in January 2007, the actual language of revisions to the *Administrative Regulations* (*AR*) was not distributed until the previous Thursday. Wood also expressed deep concern that a quick review without full consideration of the complex issue and the necessary time for reflection would falsely reflect a true process of faculty deliberation.

Dembo added that because the Senate and SC were sometimes viewed as impediments, it would be very important to underscore that the issue was extremely complex and affected the future of the university in many ways. The time was too short now to permit researching the details.

Lesnaw **moved** to send the issue of the clinical title series (CTS) to the University Senate for discussion in order to provide the input requested by Provost Subbaswamy. As a result of a friendly amendment by Lesnaw and Yanarella, the motion was modified to read, "to send the issue of the clinical title series (CTS) to the University Senate for discussion in order to provide the input requested by Provost Subbaswamy, but with the understanding that the Senate Council would continue discussing the issue at the July retreat and in pre-September meetings to be able to return to the Senate at the September 2007 meeting with a final recommendation." Finkel **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with five in favor and the Chair abstaining.

7. Tentative Senate Agenda for May 7

The SC approved the tentative, unordered Senate agenda for May 7, with the addition of two agenda items: Discussion on the Clinical Title Series and Revisiting a Change to Fall Break.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:09 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh Tagavi,
Senate Council Chair

Senate Council members present: Dembo, Finkel, Grabau, Harley, Lesnaw, Piascik, Tagavi, Wood and Yanarella.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman

Non-SC members present: Heidi Anderson, Eric Grulke, Jim McDonough, Katherine McCormick and Kozo Saito.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on May 11, 2007.