

Senate Council Minutes
December 1, 2003

The Senate Council met on Monday, December 1, 2003 at 3:00 pm in the Gallery of the W.T. Young Library and took the following actions:

1. Approval of the Minutes

Editorial changes were submitted by Tagavi and Jones prior to the meeting. The minutes were **approved** as amended.

2. Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering – Paducah

The Chair thanked G. T. Lineberry and Eric Grulke for attending the meeting. Lineberry provided history on the item and specified the department's intent to offer an existing Masters Plan B program via a distance learning mechanism. Grulke provided more background regarding the existing faculty at the Paducah location and asked the Senate Council members if they had any questions.

Jones requested changing the term "Graduate Center" in the document since there is no graduate center in Paduch. Grulke agreed. Cibull asked if the off-site students took the same tests as the on-site students and if the tests were graded at the same time. Grulke replied "yes".. Lineberry said the same learning outcomes are expected and added he reports that information about the courses offered annually to the appropriate UK offices.

Debski asked if all courses were transmitted to the off-site location or was some on-site instruction used as well. Grulke replied they use a combination of the two.. Lineberry added that more courses get transmitted from Paducah to Lexington than from Lexington to Paducah, since UK main campus students take the ITV courses as well. Debski inquired as to the qualifications of the off-site special title series faculty and whether or not they were hired to teach graduate level courses. Lineberry said the Paducah faculty were hired to complement the faculty on main campus to prevent duplication of specialization among the faculty.

Discussion ensued regarding the definition of Distance Learning and revisited some of the issues it discussed over the past summer months regarding Distance Learning, including concern regarding whether or not the Distance Learning courses in question had or had not been properly channeled through the Councils of the Senate. The Council expressed concern that the undergraduate and graduate courses offered in Paducah had not gone through the approval process described by the various Senate Council members.

Jones questioned whether the courses in question existed before the 1999 creation of the SR pertaining to Distance Learning, and might therefore be protected a grandfather clause. Saunier suggested asking the respective Council chairs how they'd like to proceed. Grulke expressed concern over having to go through the entire approval process for each undergraduate and graduate course offered. Cibull suggested acting on the program proposal which was before the Senate Council instead of considering undergraduate courses which were already being offered. Jones noted the Graduate Council's implicit approval of the Distance Learning portion of this proposal. The Chair suggested the Senate Council could include approval of the courses in the program for

Distance Learning delivery when it approves the program, since the courses are already part of the existing program. Debski and Yanarella objected, and Yanarella cautioned against preempting the authority of the Graduate Council to be the first entity to consider graduate-level courses. Grulke agreed to consult the Graduate Council to determine the best course of action for the courses in question.

Saunier made a **motion** to approve the request of the Department of Mechanical Engineering to offer the Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering, Plan B, in Paducah via the proposed Distance Learning mechanism. Cibull **seconded** the motion. The motion passed in voice vote. Debski and Edgerton abstained. Saunier asked the Chair to contact the chairs of the appropriate Councils of the Senate, communicate the nature of the above discussion to them, and ask them to rectify the situation and the Chair agreed.

3. Conversation with Associate Provost David Watt

The Chair introduced Watt and invited him to talk about the status of a proposal to create a College of Public Health.

Watt apologized for not having met with the Senate Council earlier in the process. He provided the history of the issue -- the proposal should be finished within the next two weeks, having been working on it since last July, looking at the detailed financial picture involved. There were two assumptions made out the outset -- the Department of Preventive Medicine and Environmental Health and the Department of Health Service Management would transfer into the new college. He analyzed the faculty and staff lines and resources available, and determined there were sufficient funds to create the 25 lines and 5 separate divisions necessary to seek accreditation. No additional recurring money would be necessary in addition to what the former Chancellor of the Medical Center and the former Director of the School of Public Health had already assembled. Watt expressed his intent to send through one comprehensive picture of what the college will look like. He said he will look at the impact on units from which the departments that will comprise the college will be taken, the impact on other colleges and schools, and the University's mission as a public land-grant institution. Watt also noted the importance of keeping a commitment made to the 150 students who have already been admitted to the college with the promise that they would receive a degree from an accredited College of Public Health.

Watt told the Council it would see how the necessary finances will come together through a variety of sources, including grants, contracts, endowments and state funds. He said the College of Medicine will lose a department that generated approximately \$1.5 million annually in extramural funding, which would be detrimental to that college. He cited the addition of the Center for Drug and Alcohol Research to the College of Medicine as an offset to that loss since the CDAR generates approximately \$7 million annually in extramural funding. Watt said that a review team in 2001 for the CDAR recommended the unit be moved back into the College of Medicine. He hoped buffering the College of Medicine with the CDAR will help stop the fiscal arguments against the various proposed moves.

Watt explained the complex nature of the issue involving Preventive Medicine and Environmental Health, including the affiliation of the physicians within that department to Kentucky Medical Services Foundation. Watt said they negotiated with KMSF and created

a document describing how the separation would work, though the committee involved did not necessarily endorse the removal of the department from the College of Medicine.

Watt said discussions with the Graduate Center of Toxicology were underway to determine the possibility of relocating center within the proposed college, with no decision reached yet.

Watt then addressed the issue of the College of Health Sciences, which would lose two components. The Department of Health Services Management would move into a new department or division within the proposed college and said the faculty supported the move. He could not find record of a recorded vote on this matter, so in a vote held one week ago, the department faculty voted unanimously in support of the move. The Center for Health Services Management and Research would also be removed from the College of Health Sciences. Watt said this Center is no longer needed and plans to abolish it and cited faculty support for that decision. He noted the importance of adding something to the College of Health Sciences since two items were being removed. Discussions are underway regarding establishment of a center for voice research that may include clinical centers with educational, research and patient care missions.

Jones asked how such a center would function with the existing Speech Therapy program. Watt said it would rebut that program but would not replace it.

Watt then discussed the Martin School, noting concern for how the proposed college would affect the Masters in Public Health program. The programs offered would serve two different audiences, but some overlapping and cross-listing of courses would occur. Watt hoped an accord could be reached and noted the increased need for funding to hire a new Director of the Martin School since Genia Toma expressed interest in stepping down from that role.

Regarding Gerontology, Watt expressed concern that no primary faculty appointments exist in that department, causing desire to leave Gerontology for other departments, in turn causing funding problems since NIH grant money is frequently associated with these professors. He also said Gerontology has expressed interest by a letter in being part of the proposed college. Gerontology would not necessary for accreditation of the proposed college, but the addition of Gerontology would add a half a million dollars annually to the college, and suggested the college could provide some recurring funds to the program to initiate some outreach functions.

Jones asked how many faculty lines might be created in Gerontology. Watt did not know offhand but seemed to recall there were approximately five.

Cibull asked what would become of the Sanders Brown Center on Aging. Watt said the Center desired a separation from Gerontology and suggested some overlap may occur. Cibull asked about a clinical program in Gerontology and Watt replied that no clinical program exists. Cibull relied that an interest in establishing a clinical program exists and noted the presence of a Gerontologist on staff. Watt agreed there was one Gerontologist and noted Internal Medicine is currently interviewing a candidate who built a successful program in Geriatrics in South Carolina. Watt said Marksberry says he has built a

successful research enterprise and would require a clinical enterprise to meet the same standards. Watt said Gerontology wants to join the proposed college and that the documentation in support of the move exists. He add that if the move does not occur then Gerontology will remain part of the Graduate School.

Bailey asked if Gerontology would become a department if it moved -- Watt thought it would.. Bailey asked if the faculty would be moved from their current locations and be housed in the new college -- Watt said yes. Cibull asked if there were any physicians in Gerontology, to which Watt replied in the negative. Tagavi said that if he hears the name "graduate center" he assumes the entity is part of the Graduate School. Since that assumption would no longer be correct he wondered if the name would be changed. Watt replied it would be up to the faculty to decide what to be called. Watt said there were other centers to be considered, including the Kentucky Injury Prevention Center, that were considering moving into the proposed college.

The proposal will show the rationale, budget and the various pieces concerned with the new college. The proposal will be routed through the College of Medicine for approval by its faculty, the Academic Council of the Medical Center, the Graduate Council and the Senate Council. He asked the Senate Council members to provide him with guidance on the timing of the proposal and send he would send copies to all entities at once and suggested all comments on the proposal be sent directly to the Senate Council. The Chair suggested Watt utilize the recent routing sheet completed by the College of Pharmacy as an example of how the process involved should be shown since the issue will eventually be sent to the Academic Organization and Structure Committee. Watt said a checklist at the beginning of the document showed the levels of approval it had undergone. Bailey suggested the use of the routing sheet because it showed the various deliberations which had occurred throughout the process.

Debski asked if Watt had worked with a feasibility committee, since this would be a major reorganization that could benefit from committee input . Watt replied he and Tom Samuel had constructed the proposal and didn't think a committee would serve a useful purpose at this time. Jones asked if Watt had visited the people involved to discuss the issue throughout the process of creating the proposal -- Watt replied he had. Debski wondered aloud about each item being removed from one location would be replaced by something else and asked if there would eventually be a hole left somewhere. Watt gave an example, noting the Dean of the Graduate School convened the Graduate Council and the Council approved the move of Gerontology. He said he had a handle on each of the various part of the proposal, the net effect of which was a "piece of art coming out of his office."

Debski any of the faculty from A&S who were affiliated with any of the centers discussed had been consulted, or how the moves would affect their research programs since the moves represented major change for them. Watt relied the change was not negative since the dollars have all been replaced. He said the unit in question is whole and functioning, but just reports now to a different place. He added he didn't know how much consultation had been done with the faculty in Psychology prior to the move.

Tagavi inquired of Watt if he heard him correctly to say that if it is proposed that department A moves from college B to college C, that the consent of department A is necessary before such a move is made. Watt reaffirmed that if the faculty of department A rejects a proposal to be moved to another college, that transfer would not take place.

Cibull found many problems with the proposal. He asked why a college should be created from a school. Watt gave two compelling reasons, the first being the University's land-grant mission and the existence of public health problems in the state. The second was 150 students who were admitted and promised a degree from an accredited College of Public Health. Cibull asked if the accrediting body was currently involved in a lawsuit with Ohio State University, which had recently changed its school into a college. Watt replied he did not know if that suit was continuing.

Cibull's next concern was that removing the School of Public Health from the COM sends the message that public health is not the concern of physicians but of some other entity. He said public health is part of the fabric of the College of Medicine, adding that physicians have a profound appreciation and concern for public health. Watt said the accrediting body will not accredit the public health program unless it has status equal to other health colleges. Cibull thought the only rationale provided so far was students who were promised a certain type of degree. Watt said receiving a degree from an accredited college would affect the students' ability to obtain certain types of fellowships and grants and would affect their future careers.

Cibull was also very concerned about the Gerontology issue, noting that there is a growing problem of how to care for an aging population. He felt moving Gerontology to a separate college would make it impossible for the unit to develop clinical programs since such a move would separate it administratively from productive research. Watt said Gerontology was only intended to be a PhD training program.

The Chair noted the purpose of the discussion was to learn the essence of the future proposal, not to debate its finer points.

Jones asked if subsequent to July 1 students were made the same promise as after that date. Watt said he was not sure but suspected the students were all made the same promise. Kaalund what the reason was for the promise. Watt said students want a degree from an accredited school for scholarship purposes and add accreditation lends validity to the degree obtained.

Jones asked if the whole proposal would fail if any of the components were not approved or if the proposal had sufficient flexibility to change. Watt responded that metamorphosis was likely since some units were still considering transfer and since the budgetary issues would need to be reconsidered with each new change. He noted the complexity of the proposal and said many items were yet to be determined.

Yanarella asked if there was any anticipated fallout for the existing degree programs resulting from this proposal. Watt said no, noting there was enough teaching manpower to continue offering all the programs in question. Yanarella asked who currently oversees

the programs, Watt answered the current Director of the School of Public Health is Tom Samuel.

The Chair said his concern was the ability of a college comprised of so many different parts to develop the sort of college identity and alumni base of support necessary to propel it to Top 20 status.

Debski asked if the futures committee had recommended creation of this college or not. Watt replied he could not remember but thought they had said this proposal needed additional careful study. Debski asked Watt to verify that he, himself, had been skeptical about this proposal last summer, then thought it could be done, and now he feels there is support. Watt confirmed that this was a fair assessment.

The Chair thanked Watt for his time and said he will provide Watt with a sample routing sheet and would be happy to help guide the process and answer any questions that might come up.

4. Retiree Health Benefits issue

The Chair attended one of the forums being provided by Human Resources and reported the presentation was very similar to those given to the University Senate and Staff Senate. Sheila Brothers, Chair of the Staff Senate, agreed but noted the addition of a few slides to the presentation. Brothers reported the ad hoc committee formed by the Staff Senate to develop rationale for their motion to not endorse the report had completed its work. Copies of the rationale were distributed by Ann Livingstone, task force chair. The rationale has not yet been approved by the Staff Senate and maybe amended during the meeting.

Livingstone reported on the work of her committee and discussed the documents distributed, including the rationale and the set of recommendations. She noted the recommendations from her committee were more extensive and explicit than the recommendations drafted by the Senate Council, but the rationales were similar. Livingstone added there had been a great deal of debate over the wording "binding legal agreement" in the recommendations drafted by her committee, but she felt the words needed to be there to help stop something like this from happening again. The ad hoc committee also recommended creating a cover letter from the two Chairs of the Senates to accompany the rationales and recommendations to the Employee Benefits Committee to help tie the two Senates together

Jones noted the Staff Senate recommendations were narrower in scope than those of the Senate Council because they only addressed the issue of Retiree Health Benefits while the Senate Council recommended a review of rising health care costs. Jones noted the President stated this was the overriding question at a previous Senate Council meeting, Cibull agreed, saying addressing the larger issue of rising health care costs, which might help this sort of problem from recurring in the future. Livingstone stated her personal preference to include the issue of salary, but doubted the Administration could be would be inclined to examine the larger problem.

Yanarella informed Livingstone of the existence of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Salaries , with its final report being delivered this Friday. One of the committee's recommendations is to examine the overall problem of salaries at the University. Livingstone said the Institutional Finance and Resource Allocation Committee is also examining the issue of salaries. Cibull noted Yanarella's committee was charged in response to a request from Chair Reed of the Board of Trustees, and suggested combining that report with the recommendations of the Staff Senate's ad hoc committee would not be useful at this point.

The Chair said both sets of rationales and recommendations will be forward to the Employee Benefits Committee and added it might be useful to have a co-signed letter. He asked the Senate Council members if they would rather have a co-signed letter or if they'd prefer to present total unanimity to the EBC. After discussion Bailey **moved** that the two Senate Chairs draft a letter that extracts points from both documents and identifies the commonality between the two Senates. Yanarella **seconded** the motion, which **passed** without dissent.

5. Senate Council Officer Elections

The Chair reminded the Council of last week's nomination process and said Yanarella had agreed to serve. Written ballots were cast with Ms. Scott reporting ten affirmative votes for Yanarella, who will serve as the new Chair.

Discussion ensued regarding who was eligible to serve as vice-chair. Cibull **nominated** Debski, who declined. Bailey **nominated** Saunier, with a **second** from Tagavi. Saunier expressed concern regarding her eligibility to serve in the future since LCC may separate from UK. Saunier declined her nomination, but upon further urging from the Senate Council members she revoked that statement and agreed to serve.

Debski **nominated** Bailey, who declined. Bailey said he would consider serving as vice-chair in the event that LCC separated from UK and Saunier became ineligible. He voiced his support for his nomination of Saunier. Bailey then **moved** to close nominations, with a **second** from Watts. Ms. Scott tabulated the votes. There were eight affirmative votes for Saunier, who will serve as the new vice-chair.

Kaalund **moved** to allow students to serve as vice-chair. Kennedy **seconded** the motion. Cibull **moved** to table the motion until the next Senate Council meeting. Kennedy **seconded** the motion to table, which was upheld by a majority vote. The Chair said the item will be on the December 15, 2003 Senate Council agenda.

Tagavi announced the Senate Council election results. He reported Kate Chard, Davy Jones and Larry Grabau have all agreed to serve as Senate Council members, and noted their term will begin January 1, 2004.

The meeting adjourned at 5:02 pm.

Respectfully submitted by
Jeff Dembo, Chair

Members present: Ernie Bailey, Mike Cibull, Liz Debski, Jeff Dembo, Lee Edgerton, Davy Jones, Braphus Kaalund, Michael Kennedy, Peggy Saunier, Kaveh Tagavi, Rachel Watts, Ernie Yanarella.

Guests present: Sheila Brothers, Kyle Dupree, Eric Grulke, Cindy Jefferson, G.T. Lineberry, Ann Livingstone, David Watt.

Prepared by Rebecca Scott on December 3, 2003.