

Senate Council Meeting
February 5, 2007

The Senate Council met at 3 pm on Monday, February 05, 2007 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

The meeting was called to order at 3:01 pm.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair asked if there were any changes to the minutes from January 8. There being none, the January 8, 2007 minutes were approved as distributed. There being no changes to the minutes from January 22, 2007, those minutes were also approved.

The Chair shared that Grabau had informed the Office of the Senate Council that he would be late. The Chair then turned to announcements.

There was a proposed change to HR 4.1.1.1 that, if adopted, would state that faculty in positions of dean or above would remain faculty members instead of staff, in the eyes of Human Resources. The Chair said that the item would be discussed at a future SC meeting.

A new chair of the Senate's Admissions Advisory Committee was needed due to Baxter's leave of absence. The Chair indicated that Richard Mitchell, a present committee member, was nominated by a few committee members and that he had agreed to serve if chosen. Finkel **moved** that the Senate Council approve Richard Mitchell to serve as chair of the Senate's Admissions Advisory Committee. Odoi **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion to approve Richard Mitchell serving as chair of the Senate's Admissions Advisory Committee **passed** unanimously.

The Chair shared that he waived *Senate Rule (SR) 5.1.8.5.A.2* for a student whose completed retroactive withdrawal application (RWA) was submitted to the Office of the Senate Council within the "two-year window." Unfortunately, the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Application Committee had already met for the month and was unable to meet again until after the window. He explained that the SC had previously waived the rule for students in similar situations; in addition, the student already had an appointment to meet with the committee. The Chair said that he announced the waiver at the recent special Senate meeting and was also reporting it to the SC.

Referring to a recent article in the Herald-Leader, the Chair said that there had been a new degree announced. He said that he had expressed concern to Provost Subbaswamy because the degree had not yet been approved by the Senate. He also met with Associate Vice President for External Affairs Tom

Harris. Shortly thereafter, a memo was written by Harris to the PR officials and later distributed to various individuals requesting that any announcement of new degree programs should be cleared by the Senate Council Chair. The Provost was sensitive to his concerns and the Chair opined that such a premature announcement was unlikely to happen again. In response to questions, the Chair said that the announcement was for an equine studies degree, but that no such proposal had been approved by the Senate. He added that a correction to the article on UK's website had been posted immediately.

(Harley arrived at this point.)

The Chair said that he would mention the remaining announcements after other business was conducted.

2. [New Department: Department of Neurosurgery](#)

The Chair invited those present to introduce themselves. He invited College of Medicine Dean Jay Perman to offer background information on the item.

Guest Dean Perman said that the organizational structure of the Department of Surgery was a bit of a throwback. He said that Division of Neurosurgery Chief Byron Young, a long-time faculty member, would be able to articulate the genesis of the Department of Surgery, if necessary. The current organization of the department was a result of the nature of surgery training in years past. Those medical students interested in surgery would specialize in general surgery, after which a student branched out. Over the years, the training programs in the discipline had become much more specific; the notion of general surgery as a foundation was withering. Nowadays disciplines had their own portfolios of research; it was the norm to have separate departments of orthopedics surgery, neurosurgery, etc.

Dean Perman said that while one could argue that the College of Medicine did not have to follow what others did, he said that the national competition for neurosurgery and academic neurosurgery faculty members was very tight. The same could be said for the Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, which separated from the Department of Surgery several years ago. Dean Perman said that he did not want UK or the College of Medicine to be in a position of being different from over 80% of schools with separate neurosurgery departments. He said that when the Division of Neurosurgery competed for new faculty members, those visiting had an expectation that neurosurgery should be a separate department. Apart from the arguments in the proposal, it was necessary and pragmatic to be organizationally equivalent to other medical schools.

Guest Young said that many years ago, the specialty surgery disciplines worked extensively with other surgical disciplines. The current alliances were with basic science neuroscience researchers, who were involved in the daily activities of the neurosurgeons. Young added that interactions would improve if neurosurgery

was a stand-alone department. He noted the activities of the Kentucky Neuroscience Institute (KNI) which was comprised of related centers and departments; the Division of Neurosurgery was the only component that was a division. He said that communication would be more efficient if all areas were at the same administrative level.

Thelin asked about the memo from Dean Perman to Raleigh Jones which stated the need for institutional support for the remaining Department of Surgery. Thelin asked for additional information regarding the amount of institutional support and the length of time it would be needed. Dean Perman said that the current Department of Surgery and all other departments had institutional support. The term "institution" was ambiguous and could also include references to the medical school and the clinical enterprise. He said that the department was solvent and would continue to be solvent if the Division of Neurosurgery separated. Perman said it was difficult to put a hard dollar amount on it, but the Department of Surgery would be supported. In current negotiations with candidates for chair of the Department of Surgery, candidates had been told that they would be expected to let administrators know of the department's needs, which would be accommodated if at all possible. He said it would not create a financial exigency for the remaining divisions.

Dean Perman replied negatively when Thelin asked if any additional money from the Office of the Provost would be required. (At this point Grabau arrived.) Lesnaw referred to a memo from Dean Perman to the Health Care Colleges Council, in which Perman described having 11 faculty members, but in the report of the Committee to Evaluate the Neurosurgical Service at the University of Kentucky Medical Center, the composition of the division was listed at seven clinical faculty members and three research clinical faculty members. She asked for clarification with respect to the number of faculty in tenure track positions and what the anticipated enhancements would be for the numbers of tenure track faculty within a department of neurosurgery. Dean Perman replied that some of the data came from consultants and added that there could be terminology that was not used consistently throughout the proposal. Young confirmed that there were 11 faculty members.

Finkel said that it seemed that the two primary reasons for making the Division of Neurosurgery a stand-alone department were keeping pace with other medical schools and the associated need to attract qualified faculty, along with improving communication. Finkel said it was difficult to evaluate either of those considerations, but thought they could not be the sole reasons for requesting the change. He also asked about the stated loss of half of the income from the Department of Surgery, which could impoverish the remaining divisions. He asked for additional information on other benefits of the split and also the negative aspects. Dean Perman replied that there was documentation that the faculty wholeheartedly supported the split. A detailed analysis was conducted by administrators in general surgery and neurosurgery. Neurosurgery would

continue to offer some financial support for the Department of Surgery, which would not be impoverished. Regarding keeping pace with other medical schools, Perman said that the split was needed to compete nationally for faculty who would expect to be in a free-standing department of neurosurgery. Young added that the split would be beneficial for functional reasons, as well. There was no longer a close bond between surgical divisions as there once was. Neurosurgeons worked much more closely with basic neuroscientists in research and in teaching, and not with other surgical disciplines. Young said that collaboration was one rationale behind the creation of the KNI; splitting out neurosurgery would help to enhance working together.

(Dembo arrived at this point.)

Randall shared that he was chair of the faculty council in the College of Medicine, which unanimously approved the split. Randall **moved** to approve the proposal for a new Department of Neurosurgery. Lesnaw **seconded**.

Finkel asked about the likelihood of another division in surgery wanting to separate. Dean Perman said he was unsure of what the other divisions might want to do. He said that during the search for a chair of the Department of Surgery, none of the candidates had questioned the wisdom of the proposal; most were surprised that only one other surgical discipline, the Department of Orthopedic Surgery, was a stand-alone department. Perman said that in the summer of 2005, he imposed a moratorium on additional separations until summer 2008. He said he told surgery chair candidates that they would inherit the Department of Surgery as it was now (with perhaps the separation of neurosurgery) but made it clear any further changes would need to come from the chair and departmental faculty, after the period of three years was up.

Odoi asked how it would affect medical students. Young said that students would not be affected for awhile and would continue in the teaching program of the Department of Surgery. Eventually, though, medical students interested in neurosurgery would also interact with the KNI. In response to Odoi's question about an increase in numbers of students, Young said that he hoped the number of students studying neurosurgery would increase.

The Chair noted that the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee had reviewed the proposal. Randall **amended his motion** so that the Senate Council would support the proposal for a Department of Neurosurgery and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation. Lesnaw **agreed** to the change. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously. The Chair thanked Dean Perman and Dr. Young for attending.

3. [Clinical Title Series Discussion](#) – Colleges of Health Science, Law, Public Health and Social Work

The Chair said that at the last SC meeting, other colleges utilizing clinical title series (CTS) faculty were in attendance. He noted that College of Law Dean Vestal and College of Health Sciences Dean Gonzalez could not attend. He offered apologies to the deans present, the College of Social Work Dean Kay Hoffman and College of Public Health Dean Stephen Wyatt, explaining that a mistake was made and a formal invitation was supposed to have been sent, but by mistake just an announcement of the meeting was emailed. He thanked both deans for attending.

Guest Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Heidi Anderson suggested that anyone with questions about the background review the January 22 SC meeting minutes, as they offered an excellent explanation of the background of pertinent CTS activities thus far. Anderson said that the discussion at the last meeting centered around the percentage cap on CTS faculty, governance within the Senate and issues of sabbatical. She said that the colleges were withdrawing suggestions to make CTS faculty eligible for sabbatical. The primary issues for discussion would be the cap and governance at the college and Senate levels.

Guest Dean Hoffman expressed her thanks for the invitation and said that CTS faculty were important to the College of Social Work (SW), which had utilized CTS faculty since 2000. She said SW CTS faculty were a little different from other colleges – SW CTS faculty were funded externally from grants and contracts. Seventy-five percent of a SW CTS faculty member's time was assigned through an agreement with the Kentucky State Cabinet for Health and Family Services (Cabinet) for outreach activities and off-campus outreach. She said they primarily served Cabinet employees returning for advanced degrees, but also did consulting work with the development of supervisory and leadership skills in the Cabinet. The other 25% of time was spent in teaching and other duties.

Guest Dean Wyatt said that there were about 10 CTS faculty in the College of Public Health (PH). PH CTS faculty were involved in preventative medicine and residencies and also staffed clinics at Lexmark and Toyota for occupational medicine venues. Dean Wyatt thought that about 7% of their faculty were CTS and that they were somewhat involved in faculty governance. Dean Hoffman said that SW CTS faculty did have a vote in college governance, but could not serve on committees, including tenure and promotion committees, and did not have a say in the curriculum. It was difficult for the college to reach the decision to offer voting rights, but there was a concern that a two-tiered governance system would negatively affect SW, since it was a small college. Hoffman said SW was in line with its benchmarks, although SW could be considered a little more restrictive than some places.

The Chair referred SC members to the handout that contained [Administrative Regulations \(AR\) II-1.0-1](#), which defined CTS faculty; he had highlighted the pertinent parts. Grabau asked how many faculty were in SW when CTS faculty

were added, as well as the number of ReTS and special title series (STS) faculty. Dean Hoffman said there were about 22 faculty members. Grabau asked if there had been any salary savings in the regular title series (RTS) to transform RTS to CTS. Hoffman replied that salary savings of 25% from the CTS faculty was earned from outreach programs in distance education, which encompassed the programs with the Cabinet. Grabau asked for confirmation that over time, SW was not converting RTS to CTS. Dean Hoffman agreed – there was no conversion taking place.

Wood asked for clarification about external funding and wondered if it came from tuition dollars. Hoffman said that 25% of funding was derived from distance learning tuition dollars. In response to a question from Randall, Dean Wyatt said that CTS faculty in PH made up about 7% of the total faculty; currently there were about two or three CTS faculty members. He confirmed for Randall that CTS faculty were definitely active in their faculty council. Dean Hoffman said that the faculty of SW as a whole served as the SW faculty council.

Lesnaw posed a question for both deans – do all of the funds (including support and benefits) for CTS faculty come from external sources, generated by the CTS faculty members? Dean Hoffman replied that SW did not break down the funding by faculty member, all the funds were generated from either grants or contracts and from the tuition dollars received from the distance education program. Dean Wyatt said that any salary for PH CTS faculty came from clinical practice dollars. Hoffman clarified that the distance learning tuition dollars were not paid by students, but came from the federal government in a pass-through program to develop child welfare programs. It was very similar to a grant but was not; in addition, the arrangement was somewhat odd – the tuition was paid by Eastern Kentucky University, which collected the tuition money from the federal government. Hoffman confirmed for Aken that UK matched the money.

In response to a question from Thelin, Hoffman said that there was no clinic in which CTS faculty practiced, but rather that they served organizations, not specific, individual clients. Dean Hoffman confirmed that they provided professional education and consulting services to the Cabinet in the area of abuse and neglect of children. In response to Thelin's question about the appropriateness of the SW CTS faculty being out of synch with the model of clinical practice, Hoffman said it was the closest they could get, and had been officially approved. She said SW CTS faculty served a workforce of individuals who needed professional development. Thelin pointed out that if the College of Law offered continuing education to attorneys, there would be no argument that those Law professors offering continuing education could be categorized as CTS faculty.

Provost's Liaison Greissman thought that SW CTS faculty were in a client-provided service in which someone was paying for the service. He said it was different than faculty who taught students in class, even though one could argue

that students were clients paying for an education. In the case of SW CTS faculty, they would not be there were it not for the monies received for services provided. Greissman opined that what differentiated CTS faculty from other faculty was that CTS faculty were engaged in a clinical service (either academic or medical) that resulted in a fee for the service provided. He said educational outreach was the clinical service. Thelin replied that if the definition of clinical service was made more generic to encompass the education of future professionals, it would drastically transform the CTS. Greissman pointed out that those being serviced were current professionals, not future ones.

Wood said that there were statistical fee-for-consulting services provided by the Department of Statistics, but that no CTS faculty were involved. She said that one pervasive fear or concern was that CTS faculty were being assigned duties without the benefits (or disadvantages) of tenure, etc. She asked for clarification regarding what differentiated the assigned duties of RTS and CTS, as it applied to the Distribution of Effort (DOE). Dean Hoffman replied that there was no research component assigned – 75% of the DOE for SW CTS faculty was service and the remaining 25%, at least in part, was for teaching or additional service. She said the service was really outreach through clinical activities in agencies other settings and that no SW CTS faculty was in a field other than public child welfare.

Piasek asked if there would be another option for hiring if CTS was not available. Hoffman replied that it was the best the college could do, except for the possibility of extension title series (ETS), which would have included the possibility of tenure. Dean Hoffman confirmed for Piasek that hiring in staff employees to do the work would have been a far worse option. (Wood left the meeting at this point.)

Grabau asked for information about the logical boundary for faculty involved with fees received for services. Dean Hoffman agreed with Grabau that SW had pushed the boundary for CTS faculty. Grabau wondered if that pushed boundary should be acknowledged as appropriate and extended to other colleges. Grabau also said that he has a letter from Dean Hoffman to then-Chancellor Zinser from June 2001 in which Hoffman referred to three incoming faculty. Two of the faculty would be funded from sources in the Cabinet along with salary savings from SW. Grabau wondered if the salary savings could be from a designated tenure track faculty member. He underlined his concern about the number of SW tenure track faculty now and in 2001. He requested that Dean Hoffman provide the Chair with the numbers of tenure track and CTS faculty currently. (Yanarella arrived at the meeting at this time.)

Lesnaw opined that the CTS faculty in SW and PH were in line with the definition of CTS faculty in *AR II-1.0-1*. She said that as long as the money to support such positions (and associated benefits) did not come from within UK, it was time to

move on and begin discussing the percentage cap and the issue of college- and Senate-level governance.

Aken asked a hypothetical question of Dean Hoffman: if there were four SW CTS faculty and some funding was lost and the number of CTS faculty had to be reduced, who would decide which CTS faculty member would be let go? Hoffman replied that it would require looking at the funding involved and who it supported. She said it would be a difficult decision and presumed it would be her decision to make, in conjunction with a consultation with the faculty bodies involved in appointment, promotion and tenure. She added that since the contracts for CTS faculty were fairly specific, it would likely be clear which faculty member would need to go.

Harley asked if Dean Hoffman anticipated seeing a growth in a certain area that would require additional CTS faculty and also if those would be externally funded. Hoffman replied in the affirmative – she said there was a huge crisis in the state; in KY there were only 339 social workers with an MS in the field, illustrating a drastically undereducated social work workforce. She said that SW was currently in negotiations with the Cabinet about additional trainings. She urged the SC to think about removing the percentage cap.

Thehin asked about Dean Hoffman's statements that SW CTS faculty DOEs were typically at 75% for service and 25% teaching. Hoffman said that the 25% was "not service" and there was some leeway with regard to what made up the 25%. She said one SW CTS faculty member taught a class that was not part of outreach and also worked on a service grant for adoption for the state. Thehin asked about what would be included in the 75% of service for a DOE. Dean Hoffman replied that SW CTS faculty were responsible for team-teaching in outreach programs for employees in the Cabinet for post-baccalaureate credit. She added that recipients of such credit could transfer six credits to either the University of Louisville or UK's MS in Social Work programs. Hoffman said SW CTS faculty could use the 75% to apply to work with learning development teams to deal with the supervision of social workers, a crisis in KY. She added that some also were working with learning development teams with program directors in regional offices.

Thehin wondered why teaching courses for UK credit would not be listed as "teaching." Dean Hoffman explained that the teaching was done in tandem with the state. The courses were big, lasted several weeks and incorporated training with the educational component. SW CTS faculty were responsible for the educational component and aided in the training in specific, topical areas. She acknowledged that it was not a perfect description of duties, but rather a hybrid.

In response to a question from Finkel about the situation that would result if SW CTS faculty were prohibited from teaching any courses, Dean Hoffman said it would be catastrophic; she said there were already so many part-time SW faculty

that she did not know how to deal with them. She said that SW's CTS faculty were very good for the college and for the small amount of teaching they did perform. Finkel expressed concern that using the services of CTS faculty without offering benefits could be an abuse of their good services; they taught classes that were desperately needed yet were in an untenurable line. In response to Finkel, Dean Hoffman said that no SW CTS faculty had ever been fired.

Lesnaw reiterated that the activities of SW CTS faculty were within the *AR* definition and that they played a vital role in the academic mission of UK. Dean Hoffman added that they also were vital to the professional advising mission.

The Chair asked if Dean Wyatt wanted to add anything. Dean Wyatt replied that PH would like to add a few CTS faculty as occupational medicine residency dictated, but doubted it would add up to more than four or five additions. He said the cap was not particularly problematic and that PH CTS faculty were critical; they often served as preceptors for MS students in environmental health, who needed to understand implications at corporations such as Toyota.

Dean Hoffman apologized for feeling under the weather; she said she should have mentioned that SW had an extensive for-credit internship program that was a huge part of the undergraduate and MS programs. She said it helped students to relate to others in agencies and helped students to deal with common issues that arose and how to practice skills. Dean Hoffman said she wished CTS was tenurable and added that SW could use more of them.

There being no further comments, Anderson thanked Dean Hoffman and Dean Wyatt for attending on such short notice. She asked SC members to ask if they needed further information from her. Lesnaw said that the *AR* conditions of employment for CTS faculty (no voting privileges for matters relating to RTS or STS faculty appointments, retention, promotion, or tenure and the prohibition against being elected to the Senate) helped clarify the issues remaining. The issue of sabbatical for CTS was removed and there were assurances by deans that CTS faculty numbers would not draw away internal funding. Therefore, if CTS faculty continued to be removed from Senate-level governance (by not counting CTS faculty in a college toward the number of seats) and were not allowed to serve on the Senate, the cap was the only remaining issue to address. Lesnaw opined that the cap should be removed. Anderson agreed and said that any college-level governance issues should be addressed individually by colleges.

Piascik said that at the last meeting, some of the deans indicated they wanted their CTS faculty to have benefits similar to RTS faculty, such as election to the Senate. Lesnaw agreed that it had been an issue, but said it boiled down to having a two-tiered system. The Chair thanked Dean Hoffman and Dean Wyatt for attending and answering questions. He indicated to Anderson that the SC

would have a follow-up discussion at a subsequent meeting. The deans and Anderson departed.

4. Honorary Degree Nominations

The Chair noted that while Graduate School Dean Jeannine Blackwell was presenting the names of three candidates for honorary degrees to the SC, the role of the SC was merely to place the item on a Senate agenda; the SC had no approval authority over honorary degree nominations.

Guest Blackwell shared the names and a little background on the three nominees with SC members. There being no questions, Dean Blackwell departed after her presentation.

The Chair noted that he had skipped some announcements in order to move more quickly into the CTS discussion. He said that he had received a request from the Office of the Provost for nominees to serve on the College of Law external program review committee. He asked for suggestions on how to solicit nominees. It was decided he would ask Law senators specifically, as well as all other senators. The final decision on which nominees to send to the Provost would be made over the SC listserv.

The Chair asked for an update from either faculty trustee regarding the recent Board of Trustees (BoT) meeting on February 10, 2007. Trustee Yanarella shared that there was a controversy between Green Thumb and the Administration with regard to a referendum that was successfully passed last year by students, which requested a \$6 fee be added to the 2006 – 2007 tuition and fees to increase environmentally friendly endeavors on campus. At the level of the BoT, an agreement was worked out in which President Todd would presidentially appoint a committee that would enlarge and supersede the current UK Sustainability Task Force and that Vice President for Facilities Management Bob Wiseman would return to the BoT with a report on UK's sustainability activities. The concern of President Todd with the proposed \$6 increase was that there was not enough leeway in the fee structure to keep increases no higher than the 9% mandated by the Council on Postsecondary Education. The President's other concern was the end product that would be accomplished by an increase in fees; the President also thought that efficiencies and economies were the responsibility of the university proper. Yanarella added that a sustainability coordinator would be hired into Wiseman's area to assist with sustainability activities by the new committee.

In response to Odoi, Yanarella said that the presumption was that the university would fund energy and environmental efficiencies.

5. Post Mortem on Special Meeting and Discussion on SC Input to Provost RE: LEAP

It was decided that the input provided by the SC would consist of a categorization of comments made at both the SC and Senate meetings. The Chair said he would submit a draft document to the listserv for input.

SC members suggested the input be sent to USP Reform Steering Committee Chair Phil Kraemer and carbon copy Provost Subbaswamy.

7. [Tentative Senate Agenda for February 12 Senate Meeting](#)

Lesnaw **moved** to approve the tentative Senate agenda as an unordered list. Harley **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

The Chair asked if there were any additional topics for discussion before adjourning. Dembo suggested that a memorial resolution be read at a Senate meeting for an individual who passed away. The Chair agreed to communicate such a request to the faculty member mentioned by Yanarella as a good person to read the memorial.

6. Academic Area Advisory Committees

The Chair noted he had already let the Office of the President know that the February 15 deadline for submission of academic area advisory committee nominations would not be met, although he hoped it would be no more than a week late. The Chair said he had written to all senators, every department chair and every faculty council member to request nominations. He implored SC members to come up with additional nominations, since there were far more slots needing to be filled than there were nominations. He requested that SC members review the spreadsheet in the handout with names of full professors and use it to help make suggestions.

There being no further business to attend to, the meeting was adjourned at 5:02 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh Tagavi,
Senate Council Chair

Senate Council members present: Aken, Dembo, Finkel, Harley, Lesnaw, Odoi, Piascik, Randall, Tagavi, Thelin, Wood, Yanarella.

Provost's Liaison: Greissman.

Non-Senate Council members present: Heidi Anderson, Jeannine Blackwell, Jay Perman, Byron Young.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, February 14, 2007.

