

University Senate  
December 10, 2007

The University Senate met at 3 pm in the Auditorium of W. T. Young Library on Monday, December 10, 2007. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Kaveh A. Tagavi called the meeting to order at 3:06 pm.

1. Minutes from November 12 and Announcements

The Chair noted that the minutes from November 12 had not been sent out six days in advance of the meeting, as required by *Senate Rules*. Grossman **moved** to waive the six-day rule. Anderson **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

The Chair referred senators to two revisions to the minutes that had been received but not incorporated into the minutes in the handout. Under agenda item number seven, Hulse had offered an amendment, not a friendly amendment. Under agenda item number six, a comment mistakenly attributed to Hulse was corrected to be attributed to Houtz. There being no other corrections, the minutes from November 12 were approved as amended.

The Chair said that he had a number of announcements. He reminded senators that the annual Board and Senates' Holiday Reception was cancelled for 2007 due to a change in the meeting time of the Board of Trustees (BoT). He also showed senators the memo sent to the President and the President's response regarding guidelines on the use of university-owned lands.

With respect to the blood drive challenge in November with the Staff Senate, the Chair reported that the University Senate (Senate) had lost the challenge and that he would be presenting a trophy to the Staff Senate chair later in the week, on behalf of the senators. He jokingly threatened to make senators as a whole present the trophy next time if the Senate lost again.

The Chair reminded senators about the document "Seven Principles of General Education" proposed by the USP Reform Steering Committee and displayed the web site where comments could be submitted. He asked that senators talk to colleagues and encourage them to submit comments.

The results of the officer elections in the Senate Council (SC) were next announced. The Chair reported that David Randall was elected to serve as chair and Stephanie Aken was elected to serve as vice chair, both for a term of June 1, 2008 – May 31, 2009.

The Chair asked the departing SC members (Harley, Lesnaw and Thelin) to stand and be recognized for their excellent service. The Chair commented that

for three years they had dedicated their Monday afternoon to SC and Senate business. He thanked them for their hard work.

With regard to the nominations for senators to serve on the SC, the Chair reported that a very small number of senators had made nominations. He implored senators to vote in the SC election and asked for the nominees who were present to stand so senators could put names with faces.

The Chair said that there was one waiver he had to announce. The September 2007 list of Bluegrass Community and Technical College candidates for credentials was not placed before the Senate for approval due to an administrative oversight. He reported that he had approved the list on behalf of the elected faculty senators.

## 2. [Proposed Change in Method of Appointment to Graduate Faculty](#)

The Chair said that the SC had reviewed the proposal thoroughly during three separate meetings. He invited Dean Blackwell to offer comments on the proposal.

Dean Blackwell stated that the major changes were to clarify language and that the major change was to make full graduate faculty status automatic on reward of tenure in the regular title series. The revisions also clarified that graduate faculty status was typically only for UK faculty members, although there were times when it was appropriate for the Graduate School (GS) dean to make exceptions and allow faculty from sister institutions to serve on UK's graduate faculty for some specific committees. She said that it was current practice, but had not been codified. Dean Blackwell noted that the revisions would also clarify primary and secondary graduate faculty appointments.

Grossman stated that he had a few questions. He began with section A, "Qualifications for Membership." He asked why the first sentence outlined the eligibility qualifications, if the second sentence also outlined what the eligibility qualifications were. Dean Blackwell stated that the first sentence outlined the minimum qualifications, and the second sentence and corresponding three items offered additional requirements for qualification. Grossman then suggested changing the first sentence, as follows<sup>1</sup>: "~~Any~~ Only a faculty member whose assignment includes a research component, and who is in a faculty title series appointment, is eligible for consideration for membership on the Graduate Faculty." Dean Blackwell agreed that was her intent, so the changed wording was acceptable.

Grossman asked about the first bulleted item under "A" – he wondered what was meant by "equivalent in scholarly reputation." Dean Blackwell replied that a good example would be Wendell Berry, who had full faculty status yet no terminal

---

<sup>1</sup> Strikethrough formatting indicates deleted text, underline indicates the proposed new text, and double underline indicates text added during the meeting.

doctorate degree, but who had many accomplishments as an author. She noted that there would not be many such exceptions. In response to Grossman, she stated that the dean of the GS would make any such exception, upon recommendation of the program faculty.

Grossman asked about the words “by University” under section B.1, “Associate Members.” Dean Blackwell replied that those two words were not meant to be included and could be deleted.

Grossman moved to section B.2, specifically the phrase, “when appropriate.” He asked for clarification regarding when the GS dean would find it appropriate to consult with the Graduate Council (GC). Dean Blackwell replied that it was meant to be defined by the bulleted items that followed – if, for example, an assistant professor was proposed for full graduate faculty membership early, then the decision would automatically be taken to the GC. If the decision only required input by the dean, however, the dean could still go to the GC for advice.

Grossman suggested that the phrase, “when appropriate” be replaced with “under one of the following circumstances.” To further clarify, the sentence “The approval of the Graduate Council is required.” should be added to the end of subsection d. after the bullet points. It would clarify intent, and the dean could always consult with the GC, regardless of circumstances if the dean so desired.

Gesund stated that he had not yet had a chance to read the proposal and that making such detailed changes on the Senate floor was not appropriate. Gesund **moved to table** the proposal until the next Senate meeting. Sawaya asked how Dean Blackwell felt about tabling the proposal. She replied that motions of the Senate were within the Senate’s purview. The Chair said that he would allow a very brief discussion prior to getting a second to Gesund’s motion.

Hayes said that she had had plenty of time to review the proposal and that it should not be tabled. The Chair again asked for a second. The motion to table **died** due to lack of a second.

After a query from Barnes, the Chair explained that because Dean Blackwell accepted Grossman’s suggestions as what she had intended to say, there was no need to formally move a motion to amend and then take a vote.

In response to a concern from Barnes, Dean Blackwell replied that all faculty title series (regular, special, clinical, research, and extension) were included, not just those in the regular title series. She noted that lecturers were not included.

Calvert referred to the sentences under section A – he suggested dropping “Eligibility” since it was understood that eligibility was the subject of the section and was mentioned previously in the section.

Miller said that he was not clear about Grossman's suggestion about section B.2.d – Grossman replied that while the GS dean could consult with the GC on any matter at any time, the intent was to signify that the GS dean must consult with the GC for the exceptional circumstances addressed in B.2.d.

Effgen asked about associate members' terms. Dean Blackwell replied that eligible UK faculty in one of the title series were limited to two renewals, but that associate members from other institutions could be renewed indefinitely. Effgen asked if it was possible to make that language clearer, since as written it seemed to imply one renewal was the maximum. Dean Blackwell agreed to a change in the last sentence under section B.1: “Associate membership for those from other universities is limited to a renewable three-year terms.”

Viele asked if there were ways (other than outlined in section B.2 a-d) in which a faculty member could be appointed to full graduate faculty status. He wondered how an average citizen, like Wendell Berry, could be offered graduate faculty status. Dean Blackwell replied that an exception like Wendell Berry was appropriate since Berry held the position of professor. She said it was her job to review exceptions and that if something very odd occurred, she would consult with a variety of individuals, such as the Provost, department chair, director of graduate studies, college dean, etc. She said that in the position of GS dean, she appointed visiting distinguished faculty members, who were usually from other universities. She said she sometimes needed to appoint someone in a unique position to a specific assignment for a specific committee. While the rules of the graduate faculty were an operating document, there would always be exceptions.

In response to Eldred, the Dean replied that none of Grossman's suggestions would hinder ability to make decisions for unique or exceptional circumstances.

Dean Kirschling expressed concern that after the revisions to section A, many Nursing faculty would not be eligible for graduate faculty status since many had no research component on their DOE. While some special title series faculty had a research component, none of the clinical title series faculty did. Dean Blackwell replied that the situation in Nursing would be one of the special circumstances where an exception would be appropriate to allow continued activities in the clinical and translational areas. In response to Dean Kirschling, Dean Blackwell said that an exception statement was not currently in the proposal. She suggested that the following sentence be added at the end of section A: “Exceptional cases should be presented to the dean of the Graduate School for consideration.”

Grossman objected to the sentence, saying that the situation sounded like a regular circumstance, which should not be dealt with under an “exceptional” clause. He stated that the current topic of discussion was why he specifically asked if substituting “only” for “any” in the first sentence under section A was acceptable to Dean Blackwell. He opined that the whole section needed to be

rephrased if there was an entire group of faculty who were not included in the current draft but needed to be accounted for.

Barnes supported Dean Kirschling's concerns, saying that about one-third of faculty in Agriculture had DOEs with 100% dedicated to extension activities, even though it was essentially applied research. He said that as written, he would have to be removed from the graduate faculty. Swanson stated that Medicine would have similar problems, especially with an effort to increase clinical translational relationships – it would prevent clinical colleagues from being on doctoral committees.

Dean Kirschling suggested that removing the phrase “whose assignment includes a research component” would effectively accommodate Agriculture and Nursing. McKnight noted that unless the language was changed, it would negatively affect Public Health.

Yates stated that due to the complications and the various changes, the proposal should be tabled. Yates **moved to table** the proposal until the issues involved in the meeting discussion were thought out thoroughly. Grossman **seconded**.

Cammers opined that more specific rules for various colleges would be more appropriate than one, overarching set of regulations that might or might not apply to everyone.

In response to a question from the Chair, Canon (Parliamentarian) replied that a simple majority was required to pass the motion, but that a date at which the item would return was needed. Yates and Grossman agreed that it could come back in February 2008. The Chair noted that if the planned discussion on USP reform took place as scheduled in February, then the proposal would be on the March Senate agenda.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to table the proposal to change the method of appointment to the graduate faculty until the February 2008 Senate meeting. The motion **passed** with a clear majority in favor, one opposed and two abstaining.

### [3. Western Kentucky Community and Technical College Permanent Grade Waiver](#)

The Chair explained that the proposal could be better characterized as a UK GPA rule exception for students enrolled in the College of Engineering's extended campus cooperative Bachelor of Science program in mechanical and chemical engineering. He explained that when a student came to UK from any other university, while some courses might fulfill some degree requirements, the grades received at the other institution for those courses would not count in the UK GPA. The Chair said that the proposal asked for an exception for a narrow group of students – those enrolled in the extended campus cooperative program.

The Chair stated that there was a cooperative program among UK, Western Kentucky Community and Technical College (WKCTC) and Murray State University (MSU), although the involvement of MSU was minimal. Students completing the program received a UK degree. Until the community colleges separated from UK, grades received at the community colleges (CC) did factor into the UK GPA. After the separation of the CC from UK, students transferring from the CC also did not have their CC grades factor into the UK GPA. This caused hardship for students in the cooperative program, in areas such as honor designations, financial aid, scholarships, etc.

In May 2007, the Senate approved a one-year extension of the previous GPA rule for the cooperative program so there would be time for the College of Engineering (CoE) to develop a proposal for a permanent exception. The Chair asked G. T. Lineberry, CoE associate dean for Commonwealth and international programs, if he had any additional information to offer.

Guest Lineberry said that the rationale was included in the handout. He said that the time since the Senate's approval of the GPA rule extension had worked satisfactorily and to the service of the students, such that a permanent continuation had been requested. The Chair added that approving the request from CoE would not allow MSU grades to factor into the UK GPA; only the WKCTC grades would factor into the UK GPA.

In response to Cammers, Lineberry explained that only students enrolled in the cooperative program would be affected. If a student in the cooperative program moved to UK's main (Lexington) campus, or transferred to another institution and then to UK, the student would be treated as any other transfer student – appropriate credits, but no grades, would transfer. In other words, the GPA would drop to zero upon coming to main campus. The Chair noted that the Office of the Registrar had indicated that the proposal was feasible to administer.

Lineberry further clarified that if a student was at WKCTC and then transferred to UK, the GPA would begin from a zero level. In response to the Chair, he said that about 110 students had graduated from the program since its inception, and there were about 90 students currently in the program.

There being no further comments, a **vote** was taken on the motion (from the SC) to approve the UK GPA rule exception for students enrolled in the College of Engineering's extended campus cooperative Bachelor of Science program in mechanical and chemical engineering so that the grades received at WKCTC would factor into their UK GPA. The motion **passed** unanimously.

#### 4. Academic Calendars

The Chair noted that the Senate approved the calendars for the university on an annual basis. He emphasized the responsibility and authority of the Senate as it pertained to the academic calendar of the university.

The Chair and Viele had a brief discussion about courses that do not start and end at the customary start and end dates. There being no further comments, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** from the SC to approve the following calendars: [2008 - 2009 calendar](#); [2010 - 2011 tentative calendar](#); [2008 - 2009 dentistry calendar](#); [2010 - 2011 tentative dentistry calendar](#); [2008 - 2009 law calendar](#); [2010 - 2011 tentative law calendar](#); [2008 - 2009 medicine calendar](#); and [2010 - 2011 tentative medicine calendar](#). The motion **passed** with a vast majority in favor and one abstaining.

##### 5. [Discussion on Third Bachelor's Degrees](#)

The Chair explained that the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) had been asked to determine if the *Senate Rules (SR)* allowed a student to earn a third bachelor's degree. The SREC determined that since third bachelor's degrees are not mentioned in the *SR*, then there was nothing to interpret. The SC then voted to send the matter to an appropriate committee. The Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SA&ASC) then requested a Senate discussion to offer guidance as to how the SA&ASC should proceed. The Chair opened up the floor for comments.

A variety of senators took place during the friendly and philosophical discussion. Senators' comments included:

- An overall approval of allowing students to earn as many bachelor's degrees as desired, particularly for life-long learners.
- There were a few concerns raised, such as how much double-dipping would be or should be allowed.
- Is it appropriate to allow students to continue earning undergraduate degrees? If there is a desire to advance one's knowledge, perhaps a graduate degree would be better after a first or second bachelor's degree.
- Should the *SR* language on degrees subsequent to the second bachelor's degree include the number of hours required for additional degrees, or should the number vary by college and program?
- How will the general education component of a degree be satisfied, particularly if a student returned years after earning a second bachelor's degree? It is likely the general education component will have changed over the years, so does the returning student need to satisfy the then-current requirements?
- Could a student petition an appropriate administrator to waive general education requirements? That would allow a case-by-case review, instead of trying to create a one-size-fits-all rule.
- Would it be appropriate for a student seeking a third bachelor's degree to utilize a portfolio of accomplishments to demonstrate proficiency to avoid having to take lower-level courses?

There being no further comments, the Chair thanked senators for a lively discussion. The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted by David Randall,  
University Senate Secretary

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on December 18, 2007.

Absences: Absences: Adams, Anyaegbunam, Arnold, Atwood, Barbee, Bartilow, Bernard, Bhatt\*, Bhavsar, Biagi\*, Blades, Bollinger\*, Brown, Bush\*, Butler, Campbell, Case\*, Chappell, Cheng, Cibull, Clarke\*, Crofford, Deem, Dembo, DeSimone, Desormeaux\*, Diedrichs\*, English\*, Evans, Finkel\*, Fox, Frost, Garrity, Goldsby\*, Gonzalez, Gottlob, Hallman\*, Hardesty\*, Hazard\*, Heller, Hoch\*, Hoffman, Houtz, Jackson, Johnson, Karpf, Y. Kim, Lee\*, Lester, Lillich, Lorch\*, Luhan\*, Martin\*, Mattingly, McCormick, McNeill\*, Mehra, Michael\*, Mobley, Moliterno\*, Newman\*, Nieman\*, Palmer\*, Parrish, Parrot, Patwardhan, Perman, Phelps, Piascik, Rauf\*, Ray\*, Rieske-Kinney\*, Roberts\*, Santhanam\*, Scaife, Shay, Smart, Smith, Steiner\*, Stenhoff\*, Storm, Subbaswamy, Sudharshan, Telling\*, Terrell, Todd, Tracy\*, Turner, Vasconez, Vestal, Webb, D. Williams\*, G. Williams, Wiseman, Witt, Wood\*, Wyatt, Yanarella.

---

\* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting