University Senate Minutes
April 12, 2004

The University Senate met on Monday, April 12, 2004 at 3:00 pm in the Auditorium of the W.T. Young Library and took the following actions.

Absences: Anderman*, Anderson*, Bacon, Baldwin, Barnett, Bhavsar, Brothers, Brunn, Butler, Byars, Cibulka, Cohen, Davis, Deem, DeLuca, DeSimone, Duffy*, Durant, Feeney, Ferrier*, Fink III*, Flournoy, Garen, Gargola, Garkovich, Garrity, Gassenheimer*, Gentry, Gesund*, Hahn, Haist*, Hanson, Hardy, Harrison*, Hazard*, Hensley*, Hoch, Hoffman, Isaacs*, Jeng, Kaalund, Kerley, Kern*, King*, Kovarik, Lester, Lewin, Martin, Mazur, McCormick, Michael*, Mobley, Mohney, Nietzel*, Nokes*, Parker*, Perry, Purdue*, Ray* Roberts, Robinson, Schomaker, Sharpe, Shaw, Shay, Siemer, Smith, S., Smith, V., Storm, Sudharshan, Swetnam, Terrell, Todd, Tsang, Vestal, Walker, Watts, Weis, Whitescarver*, Williams, C., Williams, E., Wilson, Witt, Womack.

*Excused Absence

1. Approval of the Minutes
The Chair asked the Senate if there were any corrections. There being none, the minutes were approved as written.

2. Announcement
The Chair informed the Senate of four reinstatements and one grade change during the Spring 2004 semester. He announced that elections to fill the empty seat on the Board of Trustees will begin Wednesday and provided information on how to vote. The Chair acknowledged Jones for his service on the Board and thanked him "for his knowledge of and passion for the role faculty" in the governance process. He said the nominees to fill Jones seat on the Board are Roy Moore, Carol Steltenkamp and Dean White.

3. IRIS Update
Phyllis Nash presented an update on the Integrated Resource Information System. Nash explained the reasons for implementing a new system and outlined some of the things it will accomplish. Nash informed the Senate of the location of the IRIS office and explained its staffing. She said that recent contract negotiations with software vendors had gone well with SAP eventually being selected. Nash said the IRIS team hoped to identify issues "up front" rather than addressing potential problems during implementation. She also announced the University would begin moving away from using social security numbers as identifiers. Nash concluded by saying that the process of hiring consultants was underway and offered to return to the Senate to provide updates as often as possible.

Holmes asked if faculty involvement in the decision-making process would be sought. Nash replied that faculty involvement is crucial to the success of the project and cited the Chair's involvement on the steering committee as evidence of that commitment.

The Chair noted a recent request from a sub-group of the IRIS committee to have faculty input regarding an upcoming payroll system decision.

The Chair thanked Nash for her excellent work both as the former Chief of Staff and as IRIS project director. Nash departed.

<u>Announcement</u>
The Chair informed the Senate Council members that breakfast with the Provost the following morning was cancelled due to a death in the Provost's family. The Chair said the thoughts of the Senate were with the Provost during this difficult time.

<u>4. Degree Candidate List</u>
Blandford made a **motion** to approve the degree list. Yanarella **seconded** the motion. The motion **passed** without dissent.

<u>5. Proposal to create the College of Public Health</u>
The Chair complemented the thoroughness of the routing sheet which accompanied the proposal. He explained the various levels of approval the proposal had undergone. The Chair informed the Senate the proposal had been forwarded by the Senate Council with a positive recommendation with contingencies and was therefore on the floor for discussion. The Chair outlined the concerns expressed by the College of Medicine faculty council as presented in a letter from its Chair, Tom Kelly. The concerns pertained to the proposal's claim that no additional resources would be necessary to form the college, the status of salary support for the faculty involved and the impact on the University of a new college being formed at a time of low resources and low moral. Kelly concurred that the Chair's summation of the concerns was correct.

The Chair invited Tom Samuel to provide a brief overview of the proposal. Samuel explained that the status of health in the state was poor and the college would help address that problem. He noted that only colleges of Public Health could seek accreditation and added that only accredited colleges could apply for certain types of grant funding. Samuel said that 31 different groups had endorsed the proposal and asked the Senate to consider it favorably.

The Chair opened the floor to discussion. Govindarajulu expressed concern that the faculty of the Statistics department had not discussed the impact left on the department if the joint faculty lines in biostatistics were transferred to the new college. He also doubted the validity of the claim that the formation of the new college will be cost neutral. He said duplication among programs was another concern in that he perceived duplication among the proposed college and the Martin School and with the public health programs at other state schools. Govindarajulu said his main concern was about the creation of the biostatistics department in terms of how it would affect the Statistics Department.

Samuel replied the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Chair of Statistics had been consulted and noted that the four faculty lines of concern to Govindarajulu were funding

50% by the School of Public and 50% by the Statistics Department ever since the hiring of the faculty concerned with the understanding that the primary appointments would transfer to the school of public health. Samuel said the college did not intend to compete with other programs or department.

Tagavi asked if the department faculty had been consulted as well as the Chair. Samuel noted that a member of the faculty was involved in the discussion. Tagavi noted that one faculty member was not representative of the whole department. The Chair reminded Tagavi of a letter signed by Wood in the proposal packet which indicated her approval. He added that in her role as department Chair she represents the interests of the faculty.

Grossman spoke in favor of the proposal, noting the need to achieve college status in order to seek accreditation. Grossman added that some natural overlap would occur due to the interdisciplinary work undertaken by the new college and that such work represents the state of modern research. Grossman pointed out that a Memorandum of Agreement exists between the Martin School and the proposed college to help address some of the overlap concerns.

Samuel added that the proposed college had no intention of competing with the Martin School and noted some differences in academic missions between the two. Samuel outlined a few ways in which the current School of Public Health is involved in interdisciplinary cooperation. Regina Washington, an SPH student, spoke in favor of the proposal and said she had participated in a student focus group to help develop the proposal. Yates expressed concern about the size of the college, believing that smaller colleges tend to be less efficient.

The Chair called for a vote. The proposal **passed** with one opposed and no abstentions.

6. Proposal to Create the Center for Visualization and Virtual Environments
The Chair presented the item and said it was forwarded from the Senate council with a positive recommendation. Staben asked what was meant by indirect cost savings by virtue of the center being established off-site. Waldcott said the proposal would work with the traditional indirect model and would hopefully one day allow some of the indirect costs to be returned to the center. The Chair called for a vote. The proposal was **approved** without dissent.

7. Items from the Rules and Elections Committee

SR 5.2.4.2: Definition of Family. Royse introduced the item and provided some history. Tagavi said his committee made an interpretation of the rule regarding excused absences and then suggested a change to the rule as well to include grandparents and other family and household members as well. The Chair noted a recent discussion with Greg Moore from Student Health Services in which it was decided to reaffirm and begin enforcing the Senate Rule stating Student Health will not give excuses to students. The

Chair said the proposed Rule change was presented from the Senate Council with a positive recommendation and was on the floor for discussion.

Grossman asked who would define the terms "significant" and "serious" in the Rule. The Chair said the intent was to bring trust and communication back to the relationship between students and faculty to work this out among themselves. Pfeffer asked how this rule would apply to fraternity and sorority houses and how faculty could deny excuses under the proposed policy. Tagavi noted that some of the items of concern so far pertained to the parts of the rule that already existed. Pfeffer wondered how faculty should respond if presented with an excuse from a student that they were absent from class because a fellow fraternity member in a fraternity house was seriously ill. Royse agreed with Pfeffer that he would be hard pressed to deny the excuse under the proposed rule. Chard noted that since Student Health will no longer give excused absences the student would have to get a note from the fraternity member's doctor in order for the excuse to be valid, which would require the sick fraternity member to authorize the release of the medical information to his fraternity brother. Govindarajulu said that as a committee member he took a broad philosophical approach to the issue. "Why test a student who's heart is somewhere else even if his body is in the classroom?"

Grossman proposed an **amendment** to say the instructor shall have final right of interpretation of the rule. The amendment **failed** for lack of a second. The original proposal to change SR 5.2.4.2 **passed** with 15 opposed and one abstention.

SR 1.3.2.2: Graduate Council Composition. Tagavi introduced the item and explained the committee's rationale. Blackwell noted the composition may change again next year if the College of Public Health receives Board approval. The proposal **passed** without dissent.

SR 1.2.3: Ten Day Rule. The Chair introduced the item and provided some background. He said the proposed rule change would allow items approved by the Senate Council one week to be on the following week's Senate agenda. Yates asked if the intention was to allow six working days or calendar days. Tagavi accepted Yates friendly amendment to allow six calendar days. The proposal, as amended, **passed** with one Senator opposed.

SR 6.2.3: Ombud Search. The Chair introduced the item and explained the function of the current rule and how it would change if the proposal was approved. Marchant asked how long the Ombud's term ran. The Chair replied the Ombud served a one-year term. Tagavi said his committee suggested a third term should not be served, but added that the Chair suggested discussion of that issue on a campus-wide basis. The proposal **passed** without dissent.

8. Items from Admissions and Academic Standards Committee
The Chair suggested bundling the four items together for a vote, all of them having received a positive recommendation of the Senate Council. Tagavi noted the word

"dismissal" should be removed from the proposal. Ms. Scott will correct the error. The four items were **approved** without dissent. They were:

College of Pharmacy Progress Guidelines
Medicine Graduation Requirements
Nursing MSN Requirements
Communications changes for Masters and Doctoral programs.

9. USP Oral Communication Requirement
The Chair provided some background pertaining to the evolution of the proposal. He said the original Senate Council recommendation was to forward the proposal to the Senate with no recommendation, but that after Bailey suggested the suspension idea the recommendation was changed to positive. He noted the Senate Council suggested the USP Committee and the Senate evaluate the requirement again after three years and that the suspension applied to incoming freshman and transfer students for Fall 2004, 2005 and 2006.

Harrington made a brief presentation to the Senate, outlining the evolution of USP requirements since their inception in 1988. She noted the existence of alternate paths to fulfilling the Oral Communications requirement, other than taking a Communications course, but added that fulfilling the requirement presented many students with a significant barrier to timely graduation. Harrington cited increases in enrollment and shrinking budgets as two of the reasons the requirement should be suspended. Harrington suggested that the back-log of students waiting to fulfill the requirement could be addressed if the requirement was suspended for incoming students.

Yates asked what outcomes might be expected after the three year suspension. Harrington replied that variables such as enrollment might be more understood after three years of study, and that three years would allow Communications to examine potential curricular options. The Chair suggested that perhaps many of the USP requirements might need to be reconsidered. Kraemer agreed.

Cavagnero asked if students could test out of the requirement. Harrington replied that not many students took that option. Lesnaw asked how UK's benchmarks addressed the issue. Harrington said that of the 17 benchmarks that responded only 3 schools had an oral communication requirement for the whole student body. Staten asked if Harrington could explain what was meant by re-evaluation over the three year period. Harrington explained that the USP Committee would develop criteria for re-evaluation over the three year period and added that other alternative paths to fulfilling the requirement could be developed and analyzed during that time. Waldhart added that Nursing and Agriculture were good examples of colleges that developed strong alternate paths with the assistance of Communications.

Bailey noted that if nothing changes over the three year period the requirement would be reinstated, but that the suspension would at the very least allow for alternate paths to be developed.

Tagavi noted each program could make the requirement a USP requirement again, in essence, by requiring it as part of their program requirements.

Noonan asked if students could prove they already have oral communication skills prior to entering college. Harrington said they could take the bypass exam. Noonan suggested making all students take the exam and having those who don't pass enroll in the courses. Waldhart said logistical difficulties prevented such a plan from being implemented.

Braun asked if students who enroll during the three year period will have to substitute a different course in order to have the required number of credits. Harrington replied the total number of credits necessary for degree would remain unchanged. Harrington added that if the requirement is reinstated at the end of the three year period those students who were exempt would not be expected to fulfill the requirement. Braun objected to Communication's use of the Graduation Agreement as a reason to suspend the requirement, especially since the Agreement is just a pilot program. Harrington replied the Agreement represented "the last straw" in that the home units having to pay for additional tuition for students who couldn't enroll in the necessary courses would create "ill will and trouble" among the colleges.

Staben said the Senate should not suspend a degree requirement because of resource limitations. He suggested evaluating issues on their academic merit and said he would not support this proposal. Harrington noted the same issue of "ideal versus resources" was discussed by the Senate Council. Chard noted the Senate Council also noted that using TA's to teach oral communication skills was not the best way to teach the skill set. Chard noted that suspended the requirement would allow Communications to rely less heavily on TA's.

Cibull noted how unfortunate it was that not only would the University not require the students to fulfill this requirement during the three year period but it would charge them more tuition in the mean time. He added that in light of shrinking resources this proposal would provide a good opportunity to create and evaluate other ways to fulfill the requirement.

Yanarella said "welcome to the resource wars" and expressed concern that 'we risk educational policy being sacrificed on the alter of budgetary exigencies." He hoped that during the three year period some form of dispersion model by which various programs could find ways to fulfill the requirement themselves could be identified and implemented.

Jennings noted that the Senate was "not driving this compromise in the quality of education. The state legislature is driving this compromise. They can cut enough money beyond which no idealism can preserve the quality of education. As long as Frankfort can cut money and see no real consequence, as long as we bend and cover over, they can continue to cut. There has to be visible bleeding before they'll recognize

it." Jennings added that approval of the proposal at hand could set an example that the faculty of the University is willing to make hard decisions and recommending sending these sentiments through the Board to the Legislature.

Albisetti noted that when requirements change students have the option of graduating under either the old set or new set of requirements. He asked Kraemer if students will be able to choose the new rule in this case. Kramer replied that this proposal represented a compromise and that all future proposals should be considered independently.

Staten noted that the underlying issue is how many students the University can reasonably accommodate with the given resources and said that the Senate has to engage in that dialogue.

Grossman noted that the change in the USP writing requirement was presented in a pedagogically sound way and wondered if Harrington had a similar proposal. Harrington replied that the suspension would allow Communications to identify various options.

Tagavi asked Kraemer to answer Albisetti's question. Kraemer replied that the proposal clearly speaks to incoming students only and that current students at UK would not be covered by the suspension of the requirement.

After further discussion the Chair called for a vote. The proposal **passed** with twelve senators opposed.

10. A word from the Chair
The Chair thanked the Senate for allowing him to say a few words during his last meeting as presiding officer of the Senate. A full transcript of the Chair's remarks will be made available as part of the usual Senate transcript. The Chair ended his remarks by passing the gavel to Chair-elect Yanarella. The Senate honored the Chair with a standing ovation.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted by
Jeffrey Dembo, Senate Council Chair

Prepared by Rebecca Scott on April 19, 2004.