Senate Council Minutes
January 31, 2005

The Senate Council met on Monday, January 31, 2005 from 3:00 to 5:00 in room 103 Main Building and took the following actions.

1. Minutes from January 24, 2005
After asking the Senate Council members to introduce themselves to the guests, the Chair asked for any corrections or changes to the minutes. He noted that Tagavi and Jones had provided some suggestions prior to the start of the meeting. There being no additional corrections, the minutes were approved as amended.

2. Announcements
The Chair asked the Senate Council members to forward their nominees for membership on the Graduate School External Review Committee. He requested the nominations by the end of the week.

The Chair reminded the Senate Council members of the need to submit names for the Area Committees and other academic and administrative committees as soon as possible. Jones said that Peggy Way could allow some additional time, if need be, to allow for a more thorough vetting of the nominees through the Senate Council. The Chair noted that not many nominations had been received so far and expressed hope that additional nominations may be forthcoming from the Senate Council members.

Dembo and Grabau joined the meeting at this point.

Ms. Scott offered to circulate the list of current nominees so the Senate Council members could see the areas in which there was a lack of nominees.

In other business, the Chair noted that due to the resignation of Odoi a vacancy existed among the student membership.

Finally, he announced that Steve Kohler from Springfield, Missouri will be in Lexington on Wednesday to speak with various people about the Provost's candidacy for the presidency of Southwest Missouri State University.

3. Proposal to create a Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering
Grossman provided some background on the proposal and said that the Academic Programs Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval.

Kennedy asked if the Council on Postsecondary Education had reviewed the proposal. Ms. Scott reported having checked with the CPE earlier in the day and had discovered that the 45-day review period was over and the program was released for institutional action.

Jones asked if the proposal reviewed by the CPE was the same proposal that was before the Senate Council or if alterations had occurred. Singh replied that no changes had occurred since 2003 and, therefore, the two proposals under review were the same.

Grossman made a **motion** to approve the proposal. Cibull **seconded** the motion.

Bailey asked for an explanation of the differences between Computer Science, Electrical Engineering and Computer Engineering. Dietz replied that Computer Science deals primarily with the science aspects of computer systems and included things like concrete math, language theory and computability theory and involved math and high-level programs. He said Electrical Engineering is more involved in digital logic and circuitry, but that a large gap exists between the two. He suggested that Computer Engineering bridged that gap by including things like computer architecture, higher level system design and software design while also addressing the interface issues between hardware and software.

Tagavi asked what course prefix the proposed program planned to use. Donohue said they planned to use the courses that already existed. Dietz added that the prefix of CPE had been used during the planning phases of the proposal but that the current courses would be used as a compromise between the two departments.

Bailey asked if there was a possibility that students may misunderstand the nature of the departments and the courses. Donohue noted that confusion occurred with the current programs and that web advertising and advising helped students find the right program. Dietz added that the curriculum of the proposed program was designed to accommodate students who wished to transfer to either Computer Science or Electrical Engineering without losing the majority of their credits.

Grossman asked when the program would apply for accreditation. Donohue replied that the program was required to graduate its first students before applying for accreditation.

Seven Senate Council members voted in favor of the motion, which **passed** without dissent. The Chair thanked the faculty from Engineering and they departed.

4. Proposed name change of Geology to Earth and Environmental Sciences
Bailey provided some history of the item and discussed the deliberations of the Academic Organization and Structure committee. He noted that the word "environment" is often a lightning rod for discussion and potential conflict so the committee asked Geology for additional materials from other departments

regarding their thoughts and concerns about the proposed change. He noted that despite the note from Associate Dean Cox in the College of Agriculture, some of the faculty had not been consulted and the committee had been interested in hearing the perspective of that group. He noted that the former Department of Agronomy, now Plant and Soil Sciences, spoke very strongly against the name change. He concluded by saying that despite the concerns of various groups his committee felt that the name change would be advantageous to the department and would aid them in their efforts to recruit faculty and students.

Ettensohn provided some additional background on the proposal, noting it originated in 1998 but was rejected by Chancellor Zinser. He said the primary reason to change the name was that the nature of the work being done by the department faculty had changed dramatically over time from a profit-oriented and somewhat exploitative field to being more concerned with the study of the earth as a system and the remediation of ills that resulted from geological cultural misuse. He said that a majority of the department's activities falls under the environmental rubric. Ettensohn added that he didn't feel that the name change would provide undue competition with Agriculture, especially since the program was so small that it could not accommodate many more students. He spoke of the program's collaborative philosophy, noting that due to its specialized equipment it is frequently called upon to work with a variety of departments and organizations.

Tagavi noted that he was surprised that the proposed name change did not require the approval of the Undergraduate Council since that body represents a variety of constituencies. Aside from that point, Tagavi suggested the department change its name to Earth and Geo-environmental Sciences. Ettensohn said that he could not approve that suggestion but would need to discuss it with his faculty. He said he liked the suggestion but could not comment for the whole department.

Grabau said he was surprised that the Associate Dean and Dean would say that Agriculture did not object to the proposal while opposition clearly existed. He said that he had clarified the Dean's comments earlier and understood that he was making an effort to not "mark out turf." Bailey said he had spoken with Cox who agreed she might have been hasty in her response.

Grabau said that there were a variety of initiatives coming forward in the College of Agriculture, including the potential formation of a School for Natural Resources or School of Environmental Sciences. He suggested both names included significant units across the college that may be moved to those schools as departments or parts of departments and added that external entities from outside the college which were interested in collaborating may be included as well. He noted that the Dean was very much in favor of creating this sort of school.

Grabau went on to say that another initiative that is forthcoming involves considerable discussion for the creation of an undergraduate major across colleges that would be called Environmental Sciences. He said that while such a major may involve Geology it will also involve a variety of other programs in an interdisciplinary effort. He noted significant objection in his department to this proposal.

Bailey said his concern with the proposal was what was meant by "environmental." He noted that several departments suffered under generic misnomers and said that if the proposal was denied because "environment" was a protected word then all proposals that contained that word would continually be denied. He said in the end that he believed that the approval of the proposal was better for the faculty and students.

The Chair asked if Grabau was in favor of Tagavi's suggestion. He explained why he understood the various perspectives presented and stated his own interest in preserving the multidisciplinary nature of the word "environment". Grabau replied that he thought Plant and Soil Sciences would view Tagavi's suggestion more favorably. Grossman asked if the newly-proposed name could be expedited if the Geology faculty were in favor of it. The Chair replied that a shorter route to the Senate Council could be arranged if the proposal was amended at this stage.

Bailey said that the Academic Organization and Structure committee recommended approval. Grossman made a **motion** to table the proposal pending discussion in Geology to determine if Earth and Geo-Environmental Sciences is an acceptable alternative. Cibull **seconded** the motion. Seven Senate Council members voted in favor of the motion to table, which **passed** without dissent. Tagavi did not vote.

Dembo asked if there was anything peculiar to the department or its mission that required it to reside in the College of Arts and Sciences. Ettensohn replied that in some other institutions Geology is housed in Engineering while in others it belongs to a College of Earth Systems. He said the issue of location within the institution had arisen before, adding that in order to move there would need to be a college that would be interested in absorbing Geology and Arts and Science would have to agree to the move. He said that while there were reasons to remain in Arts and Sciences there were also probably other reasons to belong to a different college.

The Chair thanked the various Senate Council members for their input and asked Ettensohn to discuss the newly-proposed name with his faculty. He said that while the Senate Council was sympathetic for the need for a name change it hesitated to send the current proposal forward with a positive recommendation to

the Senate under the circumstances that have been articulated. The Chair thanked Ettensohn and he departed.

5. Replacement nominees for Medical Center Clinical Sciences Area Committee
Jones noted a need to send at least two nominees forward but said the Senate Council could elect to forward all three names. He noted that Okeson was a member of the Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure and should therefore not serve on the Area Committee. While Ms. Scott checked the membership of the SACPT several members of the Senate Council noted that the other two nominees held administrative posts in their departments or divisions and were therefore ineligible to serve.

Cibull suggested Doug Damm or Jeff Dembo from Dentistry should serve on the committee until the usual new round of appointments can be made in August. Tagavi made a **motion** to submit those two names as nominees. Jones **seconded** the motion, which passed without dissent. Ms. Scott will thank Dentistry for the submission of nominees and will explain why different names are going forward to Administration for consideration.

6. Proposed Authorship Guidelines
The Chair welcomed EVPR Baldwin. He reviewed the history of the proposal for the benefit of the new members and reiterated some of the concerns expressed by the Senate Council during its previous meeting on this issue. He noted, in particular, that he was uncertain as to the origin of the proposal and asked Baldwin to provide some background and thanked her for meeting to discuss the guidelines.

Baldwin said that it was important to understand the context in which the document came forward. She said that while the University is required by federal law to have a management plan for research misconduct it was not required to have a policy regarding authorship disputes. She noted that when such disputes arise the Office of Research Integrity receives inquiries and is left without an answer for callers. Baldwin said there was a need to provide guidance during such disputes. She said her office had reviewed the existing policies of journals, associations and other Universities and had distilled those policies into a list of common points to consider. She reiterated that the document just provided points to consider and was not being proposed as a new policy. Baldwin then provided an amended version of the circulated version, which the Senate Council members took a moment to review.

Grabau returned to the meeting at this point, having previously departed the room with Ettensohn.

Baldwin noted that the revised version was less elaborate regarding disputes and added that the document was intentionally flexible since not every single type of authorship dispute could be imagined. Bailey expressed concern about the

language suggesting cases would be forwarded to a particular office for final decision and said he was glad to see that language removed. He asked, though, why Baldwin was interested in being involved in the conflict resolution process. Baldwin said she wasn't necessarily interested in having conflicts end up in her office but noted that since she was proposing some points to consider it seemed likely that issues would settle in her office. She asked Bailey what he proposed. Bailey suggested removing the whole sentence about "if disputes arise and fail to be resolved." He spoke against having the Administration involved in the resolution process and suggested the document should simply be provided as a service to those who might be experiencing an authorship conflict.

Tagavi suggested that perhaps the department chair could appoint an arbiter who would be agreed-upon by all co-authors and who would be a member of the faculty. Baldwin said she preferred to keep the language flexible since such a wide variety of cases could arise. Thelin asked what would happen if the authors are from different institutions. Baldwin replied that a case like that had arisen just recently and she had served in a mediation role to resolve the dispute.

Grossman agreed that the conflict resolution shouldn't be codified into legal process, noting that journals frequently have their own criteria to resolve disputes.

Tagavi asked that the comments he circulated earlier be added to the minutes. He also noted that the first hotlink in the document is inactive and that there is a newer version of the document mentioned in the second link. He also questioned the appropriateness of using the word "primary" and suggested removing it from the first sentence.

Jones suggested that if some other group besides the authors themselves became involved in resolving the dispute then perhaps they could seek the services of some local faculty group, like the Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure, since such disputes could involve issues regarding privilege.

Cibull asked what action was expected of the Senate Council since the proposed policy had been amended to be points to be considered. He asked if the question was merely regarding who should be included if the conflicts were unresolved. The Chair replied that the crux of the question did revolve around that point. Cibull suggested that an arbitration committee appointed by the Provost could hear those cases. He thought it would be more useful to have the arbitration in the hands of the peers of the authors rather than be adjudicated from above.

The Chair suggested that "adjudication" might be too strong a word and suggested that the relevant Dean, faculty group or EVPR could play a mediating role. Cibull reiterated the point that faculty should be put in the position of

serving as mediator or arbiter rather than having Administration serve in that capacity. Baldwin noted that the document said her office would be consulted, not that it would necessarily make a decision. She added that she liked the flexibility in that language since it allowed for a wide range of possible outcomes.

Jones suggested including the Provost in the wording regarding consultation. Baldwin said she would ask the Provost if he would agree to that suggestion. She added that she would like it if the points to consider were broadly accepted across campus, but that her primary goal was to ensure that her office and the people who were in Research knew how to direct callers who experience authorship conflicts.

Grossman suggested that the three points regarding the definition of authorship should be "or" statements rather than "and" statements. Jones suggested that graduate students, for example, might participate in items one, three and four but not necessarily two. Grossman said that anybody who does items one and two should qualify as authors and should therefore be allowed to do items three and four. Baldwin disagreed, stating that if those items change then the document would contain points she would not wish to promote. She added that authors should participate in all four items. Lesnaw and Cibull agreed.

The Chair noted that the revised draft had just been received and asked if the Senate Council members preferred to continue the conversation on the listserv or if they were ready to vote for or against endorsement of the points to consider. Jones asked where the document would go next, if approved. Baldwin said she would post it to the Research web site and would certainly invite others to provide links to it on their sites as well. She reiterated that the document was intended merely to provide points to consider and was a document about principle.

Bailey spoke in favor of endorsing the document, noting that it will serve a useful purpose without being overly legalistic. Jones asked Baldwin how she'd like the Senate Council to proceed. Baldwin replied that she hoped to be able to say that the document had been reviewed and endorsed by the Senate Council.

Bailey made a **motion** to endorse the EVPR to provide a service of arbitration on authorship for various parties that are based on this document. Tagavi **seconded** the motion. Lesnaw suggested the friendly **amendment** "endorse this document as amended." Bailey expressed concern that such an amendment would preclude Baldwin from amending the document in the future and did not accept the amendment as friendly. Cibull suggested the friendly **amendment** to "endorse the EVPR's creation of points to consider to address authorship disputes." Bailey accepted Cibull's amendment and Tagavi's second stood. The motion **passed** without dissent. Baldwin thanked the Senate Council members and encouraged them to e-mail her with other suggestions or concerns.

<u>Other Business</u>
The Chair reminded the Senate Council members that the chairpersonship of the Institutional Finance and Resource Allocation committee remained undecided. He asked them to please forward nominees to him as soon as possible.

Kennedy asked if the membership of the Ad Hoc Committee on Calendar Revision had been decided. Kaalund reported that Kyle Burns will serve as the other student member. The Chair asked if two Senate Council members would be willing to serve. Grabau and Yanarella will serve as the two Senate Council members and Kennedy and Roy were already appointed to the committee by virtue of the motion to create the committee.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:12.

<div align="right">
Respectfully submitted by
Ernie Yanarella, Chair
</div>

Members present: Bailey, Cibull, Dembo, Grabau, Grossman, Jones, Kaalund, Kennedy, Tagavi, Thelin, Yanarella.

Liaisons present: Greissman, Saunier.

Guests present: Baldin, Dietz, Donohue, Ettensohn, Singh.

University of Kentucky Authorship Policy

Authorship identifies those individuals who deserve primary ["Primary" means first. There is only one first/primary. From the second ref: "An 'author' is generally considered to be someone who has made substantive intellectual contributions to a published study." I like theirs better.] credit and hold principal responsibility for a published work. Research and other scholarly publications provide an important medium to disseminate findings, thoughts, and analysis to the scientific, academic, and lay communities. Because scholarly activity as evidenced by publication of original work is a major area in which faculty, staff, and students are evaluated for appointment, promotion, tenure, and research funding, the criteria used to determine authorship are of significant concern. This policy is intended to apply to all types of scholarly writing including articles, abstracts, presentations at professional meetings, grant applications, authorship of theoretical and experimental papers, review papers, case histories, book chapters, and books [It is always dangerous to name a few. Perhaps we need an "others" or "etc." here.].

The purpose of the following principles is to help faculty, staff and students navigate authorship issues by expressly defining University of Kentucky's policy on authorship.

Although criteria for authorship vary [From what, between what?], authorship qualifications should be based on meeting the following criteria:

1) substantially contribute to conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and   interpretation of data;

2) draft the article or revise it critically for important intellectual content; and

3) final approval by all authors [If not by whom?] of the version to be published.

4) agreement to be named as an author.

[(1) and (2) are similar – there are criteria for authorship. (3) and (4) are similar but different from (q) and (2). Mixing them is a bit confusing.]

It should be noted that:

- Acquisition of funding, collection of data [This conflicts with (1) above. What is the difference between acquisition and collection?], or general supervision of the research group, in the absence of any of the above, does not justify authorship.
- All persons designated as authors should qualify for authorship, and all those who qualify should be listed.

- Each author should have participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for appropriate portions of the content.

The order of authorship on the byline should be a joint decision of the co-authors. Authors should be prepared to explain the order in which authors are listed.

This policy does not deal with disputes regarding the order of authorship. It is unfeasible for the University to define the order of authorship. It would not be appropriate to develop any guidelines that should be used in agreeing upon this. Only the coauthors can make informed judgments regarding authorship. If authorship disputes arise and fail to be resolved, the chair(s) and/or center director(s) of the units where faculty have primary [Why primary? Why not the chair of the area of the research? What one of the authors is the chair?] appointments should be consulted in an effort to resolve the dispute. The chairs and center directors will attempt to arbitrate a solution but failing that will refer the matter to respective dean(s) whose decision will be final. [Or else what? What if the author(s) do not follow the dean's decision?] In the event more than one dean is involved and an agreement cannot be reached, the matter will be referred to the Executive Vice President for Research for a final decision. [Is this decision final too?] [From the second ref below: "The order of authorship on the byline should be a joint decision of the co-authors. Authors should be prepared to explain the order in which authors are listed." What if the Deans decision is rejected by all but one co-author? By accepting the Dean's decision, we are violating the rule mentioned in the second reference.]

Authorship disputes do not, by themselves, constitute research misconduct and, as such, are not governed by the University of Kentucky's Research Misconduct Policy.

The University of Kentucky's requirements are [Or "derived from" or "in part derived from"?] excerpted from [is this accurate? Everything here is from these two?]):

Authorship Task Force (2000): Is it time to update the tradition of authorship in scientific publications? Council of Science Editors (formerly Council of Biology Editors)
http://www.councilscienceeditors.org/services_ATF.shtml DOES NOT WORK

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) **"Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals"**. The current document (updated October 2001) on line at http://www.icmje.org/index.html. [There is an Oct 2004 version.]

****

Here are some issues that have not been addressed:

From: http://gradfile.fgsro.ualberta.ca/current/guideauthor.html

For manuscripts derived from thesis work, the student normally would be the first or senior author (if there were multiple individuals contributing to the work).

From the same source:

Over the years, various standards or criteria for authorship have been proposed and defined. Many journals and journal editors now accept the basic criteria defined by Ed Huth (1986 Ann Int Med 104:269-274): 1) All authors should have made a substantial contribution to the conception, design, analysis, or interpretation of data; 2) they should have been involved in writing and revising the manuscript for intellectual content; and 3) they should have approved the final draft and be able to defend the published paper. Those who have made other contributions to the work (such as data collection without interpretation) or only parts of the above criteria should be credited in the acknowledgements, but not receive authorship.

It seems the references used here took their idea from this 1986 publication. Should we not give the correct credit, especially in a policy governing authorships? :-)

Also I found this wonderful source: from Harvard University:

http://www.hms.harvard.edu/integrity/authorship.html

Here are some good excerpts:

2. Everyone who has made substantial intellectual contributions to the work should be an author. Everyone who has made other substantial contributions should be acknowledged.

5. One author should take primary responsibility for the work as a whole even if he or she does not have an in-depth understanding of every part of the work.

[I think the above is very important and missing from our policy.]

6. This primary author should assure that all authors meet basic standards for authorship and should prepare a concise, written description of their contributions to the work, which has been approved by all authors. This record should remain with the sponsoring department.

[Some more…]

1. The authors should decide the order of authorship together.

[I was surprised to see this…so perhaps it is not that bad. :-)]

2. Authors should specify in their manuscript a description of the contributions of each author and how they have assigned the order in which they are listed so that readers can interpret their roles correctly.

3. The primary author should prepare a concise, written description of how order of authorship was decided.

[And finally:]

Disputes over authorship are best settled at the local level by the authors themselves or the laboratory chief. If local efforts fail, the Faculty of Medicine can assist in resolving grievances through its Ombuds Office.

[I like this way better than what is proposed here.]