

University Senate Meeting
April 9, 2007

The University Senate met on Monday, April 09, 2007 at 3 pm in the Auditorium of the W. T. Young Library. 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 3:04 pm. The Chair said that the minutes from March 19 were not yet ready for approval.

The Chair said there were some announcements to be made. He asked that senators keep Professor Emeritus (and until recently Parliamentarian) Gifford Blyton in their thoughts and prayers during his health complications. The Chair said that Brad Canon (Arts and Sciences/Political Science) had agreed to serve as parliamentarian for the remainder of the spring semester. He explained that among various other positions at UK, Canon has also served as University Senate Council chair.

The Chair said he had some announcements to make. With regard to the recent letter from the Senate Council (SC) to the state legislature about the relationship between UK and Frankfort, the Chair shared that he received a letter from President Todd in which the President thanked the SC and expressed appreciation for the good working relationship between him and the Senate.

The Chair told senators that the date for the special meeting was incorrect on the day's agenda handout – the special Senate meeting would be held on May 7, 2007. He noted that it was the last day for submission of grades but urged senators to attend. The Chair said that there were many curricular items to be approved on May 7.

Part of the process of evaluating President Todd was input from constituencies, including the SC. The Chair said the SC would request input from senators and college faculty councils.

The Chair announced that the first round of the process of electing a faculty trustee to the Board of Trustees (BoT) ended on Friday. He said that Richard Clayton (Public Health), Stephen D. Gedney (Engineering), Joe Peek (Business and Economics), Ernest J. Yanarella (Arts and Sciences) and David Watt (Medicine) were the five nominees. The Chair asked that senators share with colleagues that the voting would run from April 16 – 20; if no one received a majority of votes during that period, the top three candidates would be on a second ballot. If necessary, the second round of voting would be held from April 23 – 27. The Chair said that authentication process for electronic voting would be some combination of the SAP person ID, date of birth or the active directory account.

The last announcement dealt with college elections for senatorial seats. He said he had received a complaint about one college's process. He said that the elections should be secret and accurate. For example, it would be inappropriate to have an ineligible faculty member on the ballot, for whom faculty were casting honest votes, but whose votes were moot. The Chair asked senators to be the eyes and ears and remind colleges how elections should be conducted.

2. Memorial Resolution for Professor Emeritus Raymond Betts, Founding Director of the Gaines Center for the Humanities (Presented by Daniel Rowland, Director of the Gaines Center)

The Chair explained that while he searched for a photograph of Raymond Frederick Betts, he was humbled by the number of Betts' achievements; he added that the Kentucky House of Representatives passed an adjournment resolution in his honor.

In response to the Chair's invitation, Director of the Gaines Center for the Humanities Dan Rowland read a memorial resolution for Professor Emeritus Betts.

Memorial Resolution
Presented to the University of Kentucky Senate
Professor Emeritus Raymond F. Betts
April 9, 2007

Ray Betts was a protean figure whose contributions to an astonishing array of institutions and endeavors make him one of the most distinguished faculty members ever to serve at this university. The choice of Ray to receive an honorary degree last year is a good indication of how unusual his achievements are. He was a scholar of exceptional energy and imagination, whose academic interests centered on with the history of France, the subject which he was hired to teach here. The idea of confining Ray to this one area, however, would be like holding mercury in your hand. His publications span a huge intellectual territory, from topics in the history of metropolitan France to the study of French colonies abroad, particularly in Africa, to his last book, which squeezed the history of popular culture in the twentieth century into the pages of a slender and wonderfully imaginative volume.

Although history as a discipline tends to be wary of theory and theorizing, Ray loved theory, read it eagerly, and applied it energetically both to his teaching and to his research. Contemporary Africanists consider him one of the foundation figures of their field, and Ray was a pioneer in using largely ignored types of evidence like architecture (in which he had a lifelong interest) to answer historical questions. I can honestly say that Ray is the most imaginative historian I have known. He always had a fresh idea, a

new approach to suggest, a perspective that no-one else had ever thought of.

Ray was also deeply involved in his several communities, again to a degree that seems almost unprecedented. He loved Lexington, and was constantly proposing ideas, some realized and some not, to make our town a more exciting place. Among the latter was his scheme for turning the Martin Luther King viaduct over Vine Street into a kind of Ponte Vecchio, complete with merchants' stalls and jugglers; among the former was a temporary series of small exhibits along Limestone Street from UK to Transylvania tracing the history of the street and the many things that occurred on it. He was a founding member of the Kentucky Association of Teachers of History, an alliance of history teachers at both the college and high school levels from every corner of the state, an organization that continues to flourish. He contributed in many ways to the Kentucky Humanities Council, as board member, and as speaker. At UK he founded or co-founded many important and innovative programs, including the Emerging Leader Institute, UK 101, and the series of historical markers that now inform current students of the history of UK's campus. And, of course, he was a member of this body, and a notably successful faculty representative on UK's Board of Trustees.

Of all of Ray's contributions, however, the one I know best, and perhaps his greatest achievement, was the creation of the Gaines Center for the Humanities. The only term I can find to describe this deed is the Russian word 'podvig,' a term used in epics and saints' lives to describe the deed that made the person a saint or epic hero. Like an epic hero, Ray enlisted the help of a remarkable group of supporters led by John and Joan Gaines and including President Otis Singletary and Gov. Ned Breathitt. These impressive and diverse people were drawn to the Center by Ray's personal magnetism and what can only be called his institutional imagination.

When I became the director of the Center in 1998, I felt that I had inherited a splendid estate, one which was populated by talented and dedicated people and was well stocked with delightful features. The architect of this whole estate, and its manager for 15 years, was of course Ray Betts. Over the last nine years, I have become intimately acquainted with each feature of the Center and have never ceased to be grateful for the many features that Ray created: the intense process of selecting new fellows, Exit Exams, the Jury Projects, the Breathitt Undergraduate Lectureship in the Humanities and the Bingham Seminar. At the very founding of the Center, Ray realized that the Center physically connected UK to the downtown (a visual

hyphen is the way he put it), and this led him to start our major public programs, the Bale Boone Symposium in the Humanities, and the Lafayette Seminar in Public Issues.

Time after time, faculty members tell me that they have found in the Gaines Center the sort of experience that they were seeking when they entered academe in the first place. The university gets to see its best students, the most talented sons and daughters of the Commonwealth, succeed beyond their dreams, winning the most competitive national scholarships and going to the very best professional and graduate programs. All of this comes from Ray's marvelous invention, a machine that enriches all connected with it, students, faculty, and the staff of the Center, most especially, as I can testify, the director of the Center.

Our undergraduate fellows are, of course the heart of the Center. We now have over 200 former Fellows, and their impact is being felt all over the country and the world. To mention but one example of many, three of the 12 Fellows who finished their fellowships in 1999 have now attended the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, and are now making a major impact on our nation as employees of the Center for American Progress, Harvard University, and Barak Obama's Senate Office. Jeff Fugate, from this same class and not finishing a degree in architecture and urban planning from M.I.T., recently wrote to our Board to note the ways that Ray and the Center had given him the courage and self-confidence to apply to the best programs in the country and then, as one of the very few students from a public university, to impress his Ivy League colleagues with his work. Former Fellows came to Ray's memorial service on very short notice from all over the country. The ever-growing Fellowship at the Gaines Center is surely Ray's most important legacy. In his eulogy to W. B. Yeats, W. H. Auden wrote that Yates "became his admirers." Through our lives in the Center, Ray's marvelous invention, and through our experience of his fierce intelligence, his unrelenting high standards, and his boundless imagination, we have all become him, and in us his legacy lives on.

A moment of silence was held in Betts' honor.

Clark **moved** that the resolution be made part of the minutes of the University Senate and that a copy be sent to Professor Betts' family. Bollinger **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously in a show of hands.

3. [Proposed Change to Senate Rules 5.1.8.5.A.2 \("Two-Year Window"\)](#)

The Chair said that students could submit a retroactive withdrawal appeal, (RWA) usually for familial or medical reasons. The current language in the *Senate Rules*

(SR) said that the RWA could not be granted after two years passed, hence the recent, several reports of waiving SR 5.1.8.5.A.2 for students. The Chair explained that many times the student submitted the RWA to the dean or the Office of the Senate Council but by the time the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Application Committee (SRWAC) could meet to review it, the two years had already passed. The Chair said that the proposed changes to the SR would close that gap.

The Chair said that the **motion** to approve the proposed language came from the SC with a positive recommendation. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken to approve the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 5.1.8.5.A*. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Grossman then **moved** to make the changes effective immediately and without further input from the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee and that the Office of the Senate Council revises the RW Application accordingly. Cibull **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

4. UK May 2007 Degree Candidates

The Chair referred senators to the list of candidates for degrees and the summary page in the agenda handout. He invited Jones to offer general background information on both the approval process for UK and for KCTCS¹ (for certain BCTC² students) degrees.

Jones referred senators to the additional handout (of three slides) that outlined an overview of the degree approval processes. He explained that the state law KRS 164.240 empowers the BoT to grant degrees to graduates, upon the recommendation of University Faculty. Along with that, this state law also legislates that the University Faculty, not the BoT, determines who has passed ("graduated") a course of study. Jones said that, for example, while a student's course of study could be academically complete in terms of credits, if the student was guilty of an academic offense the University Faculty might not recommend to the BoT that the degree be granted. The University Faculty thus has both roles under state law: 1) determining who has completed ("graduated") the required course work in the degree program; and 2) who among those graduates should receive a degree.

Referring to the second slide on the handout, Jones said the minutes from a meeting of the University Faculty in 1881 under that newly enacted state law, that today is KRS 164.240, provided an example of an early exercise of the state law that is similar to the exercise of the process today. The minutes included the stipulation that those who were recommended by vote of the University Faculty for the degrees named were required to satisfy the professors that all prescribed requirements of the courses of study were completed. Finally, the Board of Trustees in 2005 codified in the *Governing Regulations* that the elected Faculty

¹ Kentucky Community and Technical College System

² Bluegrass Community and Technical College, formerly Lexington Community College, or "LCC"

Senators, by their representative authority in being elected, act for the University Faculty to perform the functions that are reserved to the University Faculty by this state law.

Jones shared that the third slide detailed the degree approval processes in practice at UK and KCTCS. He noted that the most important errors in proposed lists of graduates to be recommended for degrees were those of omission, such as a student who had completed coursework but was not on the list for a degree, a badly misspelled name or the wrong degree having been listed. Jones said that at least one omission in the proposed list sent out for April 9 meeting was caught by a senator.

With respect to the list of candidates for degrees from KCTCS (Kentucky Community and Technical College) for BCTC (Bluegrass Community and Technical College) Jones said that when LCC (Lexington Community College, currently BCTC) separated from UK, the state legislature mandated that UK's Faculty would perform both roles of determining who had passed the course of study for LCC/BCTC degrees and recommending to the BoT who would be granted a degree with UK's name. The proposed list of names entered electronically by the BCTC Registrar is retrieved by the KCTCS Registrar and then sent to the KCTCS Board of Regents for approval, without going through the KCTCS system level Faculty Senate for final Faculty scrutiny before its Board of Regents' action. He said that because the UK University Faculty members are not in a position to know which students should be on the list, before action by the UK elected Faculty Senators Mrs. Brothers sends the list to BCTC Faculty Council Chair for the BCTC internal faculty process to check for errors and to confirm that degree honors being awarded conform to the criteria in the 2004 UK *Senate Rules*. Due to state law, which only allows the UK elected Faculty Senators to recommend for degrees those names on the list provided by the KCTCS Board of Regents, omissions identified by communication between the Office of the Senate Council and the BCTC Faculty Council Chair could not be walked on to the list to be voted on by the UK elected Faculty Senators. Once the BCTC faculty identify errors, they can make corrections internally, after which the KCTCS Board of Regents would approve the revisions and send them to the Office of the Senate Council, for later action by the UK elected Faculty Senators at a subsequent meeting. Jones reported that the BCTC Faculty Council Chair had committed to trying to arrange a better method within KCTCS to generate a more accurate list for UK action.

Grossman **moved** that the elected University Faculty Senators approve the May 2007 list of degree candidates for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Yanarella **seconded**.

Dembo wondered if, as much as the rationale for the approval was understood, some senators were uncomfortable with voting for something about which they

had no choice. In response to Dembo, the Chair said that if a majority of the voting senators did not approve the degree list, the names would not be forwarded to the President and would not be sent to the BoT, thus resulting in no degrees being granted.

Forge asked what should be done if there was a name not on the list that should be there. Jones said that in the past for the UK degree list, elected Faculty Senators had, on (emergency) occasion, walked a name onto the list from the Senate floor. He mentioned as an example the situation several years ago concerning omissions in the list for the first graduates coming through the Western Kentucky University-UK joint engineering program. He said the activity to assess and approve the list for degrees was not a passive activity, but required active participation from University Faculty whose hand at this stage in the process was the final quality control over awarded academic degrees. Forge replied that there was a student scheduled to take their PhD oral exam in time to graduate in May, and should be on the list.

The Chair invited Associate Registrar Jacquie Hager to join in the discussion. Guest Hager explained unpaid bills would not prevent a student from having their name on the list approved and sent to the BoT, although it could prevent the student from receiving the physical diploma. Hager added that each semester colleges collected cards students filed to show their intent to graduate. The college deans' offices confirm that the specific student is on their way to academically complete, during that semester, the credit hours required by the program of study. For graduate students, the process goes through the Graduate School (GS). If a graduate student did not have intent to graduate on file with the GS, the Registrar would also not have that on file. It is the student's responsibility to file the card. The Registrar collates the list submitted by each college into the total list of graduates that the Registrar provides to the Senate Council as the proposed degree list for that semester.

The Chair added that the degree list was provided to the elected Faculty Senators six days previously, to allow for time to rectify situations such as those mentioned by Forge and suggested that future necessary revisions should be identified ahead of time. He said that if a senator wanted to add a name, he could see no reason to object – having an extra name was not as bad as omitting a name.

In response to Hallman, the Chair said that when the list was sent out six days prior, potential changes should have been submitted immediately, as plainly indicated in the email communication to senators. Jones said that if a senator found an omission, the senator should contact the Office of the Senate Council so Mrs. Brothers and Hager could work together to incorporate revisions. After the list was revised, it would make its way to the Senate meeting as the list for action. He said it was important that one week's notice was given to the elected Faculty Senators to allow the University Faculty time to contact Mrs. Brothers with revisions.

Grossman suggested that because the list would be approved contingent upon completing coursework, a student could be added and then it could be checked on after it was approved. In response to the Chair, Hager said that the degrees would not be conferred until after graduation ceremony – the final day for entering grades fell after graduation. The Chair then said that if a senator wanted to add a name, the opportunity was nigh.

Wood said that due to her history working in the Graduate School, she cautioned senators against adding names to the list. She said the process of graduation was initiated by the student and was the student's prerogative to initiate graduation. She said that many students, for a variety of reasons, wanted to delay receiving a degree until August. Wood said she would be uncomfortable adding the names of students who had not indicated their intent to graduate by completing the application for degree processing.

Forgue said that the student he was concerned about was listed under the wrong degree title. He opined that perhaps a mistake was made on the degree application card. Hager suggested she and Forgue look into the matter after the meeting.

The Chair said he was glad for the active discussion and consideration of the proposed UK degree list. There being no further discussion, the Chair called for a **vote** on the **motion** that the elected University Faculty Senators approve the list of UK's May 2007 degree candidates, for submission through the President to the Board Of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. The motion **passed** unanimously.

5. March 2007 List of KCTCS Candidates for Credentials

The Chair said he would entertain a motion. Bollinger **moved** that the elected University Faculty senators approve the March 2007 list of KCTCS candidates for Credentials, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. The motion **passed** unanimously.

6. [Winter Intersession Report – Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Phil Kraemer](#)

The Chair reminded senators that in February 2004, the Senate approved a pilot Winter Intersession (WI), with the condition that after three years, the pilot would need to be re-approved. Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Phil Kraemer attended a recent SC meeting to offer the report to that body.

Kraemer gave a presentation on the WI report. Afterwards he asked for questions. Kraemer said that there was a concentration on making the WI a good learning experience, with the caveat that UK did not lose money in the process. In response to Sottile about a breakeven point, Kraemer said that there could be

students who dropped, so the enrollment data was unreliable with respect to computing a breakeven point.

Grossman spoke in support of the WI, noting that he was initially skeptical. He said that, similar to the four-week summer session, it was indeed possible to teach in a three-week session. Kraemer noted that while the content of some courses would not permit a successful compression, he supported a compressed format for select courses in the fall and spring semesters, as well. Grossman noted that some of the foreign language classes (101 & 102 and 201 & 202 series) were currently taught in one semester and were universally supported by students he advised.

The Chair noted that with regard to compressing courses, he taught an eight-week course, in which he asked students to let him know if they preferred a compressed schedule. He said courses could be compressed on a course-by-course basis.

Grossman **moved** to receive the WI report. Wood **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

7. [Extension of Winter Intersession Pilot](#)

The Chair said that the next item of business involved extending the WI pilot for another three years. He said that the courses involved had not been included in the Provost's learning outcomes assessment; SC members wanted to see those assessments for a three-year period before approving the WI as a permanent part of the university calendar.

There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion from the Senate Council to: approve another three-year pilot of the Winter Intersession (WI for 2007 – 2008; 2008 – 2009; and 2009 – 2010); that the courses involved be included in the Provost's learning outcomes assessment; and that such data will be provided to the Senate Council and Senate in time for re-approval. The motion **passed** unanimously.

8. [2007 - 2008 Winter Intersession Calendar \(contingent upon approval of extending the WI pilot\)](#)

Because an extension of the pilot was approved, the Chair stated that the 2007 – 2008 WI calendar needed to be approved.

There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion to approve the 2007 – 2008 Winter Intersession calendar. The motion **passed** unanimously.

9. USP Reform Steering Committee Progress Report - Committee Chair Phil Kraemer

The Chair invited Kraemer to offer a progress report from the USP Reform Steering Committee.

Kraemer gave a presentation about progress thus far. There were no questions afterwards.

Yanarella **moved** to receive the USP Reform Steering Committee's progress report. Bollinger **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

10. State of Academic Affairs Address - Provost Kumble Subbaswamy

The Chair said that he hoped to make a presentation by the Provost for such an address an annual event. He said that with the State of the University annual address by the President at the first Senate meeting of the academic year, it was particularly fitting to have the Provost's address as the last agenda item. He invited Provost Subbaswamy to the podium, where the Provost gave his presentation.

Afterwards, the Provost took questions. Thelin noted that there was no mention in the presentation of private fundraising, which was included in the Top 20 Business Plan (BP). The Provost noted that the monies from that were not incorporated into the presentation – only those monies requested from the state. The BP said that 40% of what was needed would come from self-generated funds, an area in which UK was experiencing tremendous success. The institutions that began fundraising campaigns in the 1960s and 1970s currently had large endowments to work with – much of UK's current success would be realized for future students.

In response to Jones, Provost Subbaswamy said that the 54 added faculty lines were tenure-tracked and were a net increase and did not include replacing faculty positions that were empty due to retirement, etc.

Bollinger commented on the retention rates. He said that the problem was not created by letting in bad students – the information in the presentation said that 48% of those students who did not return had left while in good standing. Many actions, though, like increased tutoring and UK 101, were geared to students having academic problems. Bollinger suggested that the 48% who left should be queried as to why they left and where they went. The Provost replied that a faculty focus group did make some attempts to do so, but that the data was not included in the presentation. Some reasons given by students were a lack of a feeling of community (loneliness) and financial aid issues, both of which could be addressed more easily. However, one problem was that a student who earned a 3.5 GPA from a Kentucky high school was not necessary prepared to succeed in college, which was a much larger problem with the school systems, requiring a very expensive fix. The Provost added that he wanted to see improvements in the areas of retention and graduation rate.

Yanarella said that the issue of trade off between the state budget provisions and college tuitions and increases was displayed. He referred to the recent report from [Commonwealth of Kentucky Auditor of Accounts] Crit Luallen that outlined political concerns over increasing college costs. Yanarella asked how increasing college affordability would be addressed with respect to the BP. Provost

Subbaswamy replied that there were no easy answers – many top 20 universities experienced similar situations. The Provost said that tuition was an investment in which a student gained a lifetime of earnings for the cost of a degree; it would be an ongoing battle in terms of affordability.

Provost Subbaswamy explained that there was a problem with merit-based aid – a child of a wealthy cardiologist might get free-ride offers from 10 different universities due to test scores, regardless of need, when a similar scholarship could go to someone who truly had income issues.

Sottile asked if the decline in the six-year graduation rate was in part due to the increased freshman class. The Provost said that was certainly a possibility. It was because of the enrollment growth that resources had been allocated as they were to specific areas – it would have been criminal to grow without adequate resources to help students.

Due to the time, the Chair stopped the questions. The Chair thanked Provost Subbaswamy for attending. He also thanked Mrs. Brothers for her services on behalf of the Office of the Senate Council and Robyn Barrett for attending and transcribing Senate meetings. He reminded senators that there was a reception in the room next door, immediately following adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:11 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Larry Grabau,
University Senate Secretary

Absences: Anderson*, Anyaegbunam, Bartilow, Baxter*, Biagi, Blackwell, Bordo*, Brown, Burchett, Butler, Calvert*, Cammers, Campbell, Caudill, Cheng, Chew, Cibulka, Cooper, Crofford, Deem*, DeSimone, Deidrichs, Dippery, El-Ghannam, English*, Finkel*, Fording, Fox*, Gaetke*, Gonzalez*, Hasselbring, Heath*, Hoffman, Houtz, Infanger, Karpf, Kim, Kirschling, Lester, Lillich, Lock*, Look, Martin, McCormick*, McKnight*, Michael, Mobley, Mohney, Moliterno, Perman, Petrone*, Pulito, Roberts*, Santhanam*, Sawaya*, Segerstrom* Shay, Smart, R. Smith, M.S. Smith, Staben, Steltenkamp, Sudharshan, Terrell, Todd, Turner, Vasconez, Vestal, Waldhart*, Williams, Wiseman, Witt, Wyatt.

Invited guest present: Dan Rowland.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on May 2, 2007.

* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.