

University Senate  
December 13, 2010

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, December 13, 2010 in the Lexmark Public Room, 209 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Hollie I. Swanson called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:02. She noted that quorum was reached with 54 senators, and thereby turned the meeting over to Senate Chair Lee T. Todd, Jr.

1. State of the University Address - University Senate Chair Lee T. Todd, Jr.

Senate Chair Lee T. Todd, Jr. spoke for about 25 minutes on a variety of topics. He then answered questions from senators.

Referring to the topic of “town and gown” issues that came up at faculty town hall meetings [regarding UK’s next president], Blonder asked President Todd to comment on the new mayor coming into office in Lexington. President Todd said that he has known Jim Gray for a long time, and that there have been continued efforts to stay in contact with the local community. He said he would be meeting with incoming mayor Gray soon, and opined that Gray understood the importance of UK to Lexington and appreciates the integration of culture that UK brings to Lexington. He commented on a few of the problems that have occurred in the past and said that there would likely always be some periphery town and gown issues.

Grossman asked President Todd to comment on what he regretted most that was under his control. Todd said that he could do something every hour on the hour, and still not do what everyone wants. He said he regretted the fiscal situation but loved the improved student quality and changes to the undergraduate curriculum. Todd said he was proud of the people that had been brought to UK and retained. He said he was an optimist, and thought positively all the time regardless of what went on. He said what irritated him was that there are hard funding choices the state could make regarding prisons and mandatory sentencing, but was not. President Todd said that not having forward-thinking leadership is bad, and there is an opportunity to make a difference. The state says that everyone has money problems, but no one else has asked their flagship to do what Kentucky has asked of UK. There are Medicaid issues that are not monitored at the state level, and when UK offers the expertise of its College of Pharmacy and faculty, Frankfort turns it down. Todd said this situation frustrated him very much. He recalled being told by former president Otis Singletary that UK’s president would have influence, but that the power lay in Frankfort. President Todd said that recurring state dollars used to support teaching, raises, maintenance of buildings, etc. have been flat for about nine years. He said that he had thought he could influence things more than he did.

Brion asked President Todd to share what he would tell UK’s next president about three requirements for continued progress. Todd replied that he was not sure if Frankfort knows what they asked of UK, and that funding for higher education must change. There have to be investments with a return, and wealth should be created where you have a shot at it. If wealth is created in this part of the state, then people who come from rural KY areas can return some of their money to their local areas. That will not happen if UK creates wealth in California. Secondly, UK needs to pay attention to the needs of the state. Land grant universities were created to generate jobs in the state, and UK accomplishes that through a variety of means, including start-ups. President Todd said that he was asked on his first day what he would like

said about him on his last day. Todd went on to say that if it can be said that UK as a land grant did more for its state than any other university, it would make him happy, and he said he thought that was indeed the case. Thirdly, the talent of employees must be given a high priority – the best people must be hired, but he said he was very disappointed in the lack of resources. Todd opined that Provost Subbaswamy was interested in the Top 20 Business Plan and its opportunities, but the rug was pulled out from under UK with respect to finances, and the Provost never complained, even though he cannot fund deans and raises as he would like. UK must have strong people, and students who come to UK don't always understand what they are capable of accomplishing. With the best people, UK can best assist those students. President Todd summed the three requirements for continued progress as people, money and outreach.

There were no additional questions, so the Chair asked President Todd if he would say a few things about the national research committee on which he sits. Todd replied that he was nominated as a member, but was not initially included. After some complaints from others that land-grant universities were not represented, he was called with an invitation to participate. He noted that many corporations are no longer doing basic research anymore so they are relying on universities to do that. President Todd said that he also wanted to propose that UK get research buildings paid for out of economic development funds, and use building monies for academic buildings. The federal government ought to have matching monies for research buildings. If a university can offer a proposal and show a return on investment and the capacity to build research, there ought to be a reward.

There being no further questions, the President departed.

#### 1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair commented that the November 8, 2010 minutes were not ready for review. The Chair offered the announcements below.

- Professor Kaveh Tagavi, former SC Chair, is serving as parliamentarian for the day's meeting.
- Please submit final grades within 72 hours of the end of the final exam, NOT the Monday after the end of finals week.
- The Chair approved inclusion of four students to UK's December 2010 degree list, on behalf of the Senate Council (SC) and Senate, who were omitted due to a college clerical error: two students from the College of Education, one student from the College of Business and Economics; one student from the College of Social Work, and one student from the College of Arts and Sciences.
- The proposed changes to *Administrative Regulations 1:2* were presented to the Board of Trustees' University Relations Committee (URC). The URC chair thought the language was too complex, and as a result the language was simplified and moved into *Governing Regulations II*. The URC asked that the newly revised language be re-vetted with constituencies before taking Board action. Trustees Joe Peek, Sheila Brothers and Ryan Smith will meet and re-review the language very soon and the Senate will see it in the spring. In response to a question from the Chair, faculty trustee Peek confirmed that the proposed changes were favorably received.
- The SC rescinded one degree and subsequently approved the conferral of a different degree for one student in the College of Design.

- The newly-elected officers of the SC, for a term of office of June 1, 2010 - May 30, 2011 are:
  - Chair: Professor Hollie Swanson (ME/Molecular & Biomedical Pharmacology); and
  - Vice-chair: Professor Robert Grossman (AS/Chemistry).
- The Chair offered many thanks to departing SC member and senator Joe Chappell (AG/Plant and Soil Science). He was honored with a round of applause.
- The Chair invited Steiner to offer an update on the Presidential Search Committee.
  - Steiner said that there had been no meeting since the last update. He showed a copy of the position description to senators. He opined that having overwhelming support on the committee for language about scholarly achievement in the description boded well. ([www.uky.edu/presidentalsearch](http://www.uky.edu/presidentalsearch)) Debski asked about if there had been a change to the process from the last search, so that presidential candidates this time would not be interviewed by faculty. She said that she heard a Board of Trustees member on the radio say that the Board would choose the next president without public campus interviews. Steiner said that he was unaware of any decision to not announce finalists publicly. Peek opined that a final decision has not yet been made, but he had heard it voiced that it is very dangerous to identify candidates publicly, since they can lose their jobs or be punished at their home institutions. A better group of candidates can be had without a public announcement of finalists, but that has to be balanced against openness. Peek said there was a lot of sentiment for not making finalists public, but that meant a lot of input from constituents would be required. He said a closed process made him nervous.
- Faculty volunteers are still needed for the committees performing the summative evaluations of the Graduate School and Engineering deans, as well as for the periodic program reviews for the colleges of Communications and Information Studies, Medicine, Pharmacy and Social Work, and the Graduate School.

### 3. Officer Reports

#### a. Chair's Report

The Chair reported on a newly formed Joint Ad Hoc Committee for University Ombud (JCUO), with the Staff Senate. Terry Olson is the (Staff Senate) co-chair. The charge to the JCUO is to formulate a recommendation for creating an employment Ombud office at UK. Such an office will serve as a mechanism for addressing faculty/staff work disputes. Many benchmarks/top 20 universities have an employee ombud, so the formation of such an office would be consistent with the actions and policies of most top 20 institutions and UK's benchmarks. It would also be consistent with UK's Strategic Plan, specifically Objective 3.3: "Create a workplace culture that articulates values and initiatives to engage employees as stakeholders." The Chair said that the staff had formulated a great report, which she was happy to share with anyone.

If there are senators interested in serving on the JCUO, please email Mrs. Brothers ([sbrothers@uky.edu](mailto:sbrothers@uky.edu)).

### 4. Committee Reports

#### a. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) – Alison Davis, chair

Proposed Change to BHS Clinical Leadership and Management: Davis explained that the proposed change would do away with the requirement that each incoming student have one year of work experience after receiving an associate's degree. It will smooth the transfer process for students entering the program. The SC positively recommended the changes.

The **motion** from the SAASC was that the Senate approve the proposed changes to BHS Clinical Leadership and Management, effective spring 2011. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Proposed Change to Progression Requirements for BA Art Studio: Davis explained that the proposed change to progression requirements would change one pre-major requirement of a 2.8 GPA to a letter grade of C in all pre-major foundation courses. The changes also restructured the major requirements for clarity, and to better align it with peer institutions. The revised program is also more rigorous. The SC positively recommended the changes.

The **motion** from the SAASC was that the Senate approve the proposed changes to the progression requirements for the BA Art Studio, effective spring 2011. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Proposed Change to Progression Requirements for BFA Art Studio: Davis explained that the proposed change to progression requirements was very similar to that of the proposed changes to the BA in Art Studio. The revision to the program would change one pre-major requirement of a 2.8 GPA to a letter grade of C in all pre-major foundation courses. The changes also restructured the major requirements for clarity, and to better align it with peer institutions. The revised program is also more rigorous. The SC positively recommended the changes.

Davis clarified for Chappell that the changes were the same for that of the BA in Art Studio, and would get more program education into the earlier part of the student's undergraduate career.

The **motion** from the SAASC was that the Senate approve the proposed changes to the progression requirements for the BFA Art Studio, effective spring 2011. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Proposed Change to Progression Requirements for BA Art Education: Davis said that there were not previously any pre-major requirements, so the proposed change added pre-major requirements similar to the ones in the other Art programs. The SC positively recommended the changes.

The motion from the SAASC was that the Senate approve the proposed changes to the progression requirements for the BA Art Education, effective spring 2011. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) – Dan Wermeling, chair

Proposed New PhD in Clinical and Translational Sciences: The Chair noted that Wermeling was unexpectedly absent, and asked Kelly if he, as the contact person, would explain the proposed new PhD in Clinical and Translational Sciences.

Kelly said that the proposed new program was interdisciplinary, and designed for the individual with professional training in one of the medical fields who is interested in supplemental research training as

part of a profession. He explained that the student's advisory committee would be multi-departmental, but would always have one faculty member from Behavioral Sciences. Committee membership is open to all faculty members with appointments in the Graduate School. Students coming in with professional degrees or in dual degree programs will be given the academic equivalent of a master's degree upon entering, so they can move forward with a maximized amount of time spent on research.

The Chair noted that the **motion** from the SAPC was that the Senate approve the proposed new PhD in Clinical and Translational Sciences, effective fall 2011.

Connors said that he understood the philosophy behind the proposed new program, but asked for clarification regarding the meaning of "translational science." Kelly replied that it could be complicated, but using the definition from the National Institutes of Health it is, in general, translation from basic research to the laboratory to improve clinical care, evidence-based research translated to the community, and back to the medical center and basic scientists, etc.

There being no further questions, a **vote** was taken and the motion to approve the proposed new PhD in Clinical and Translational Sciences, effective fall 2011. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

c. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee – Dwight Denison, chair

Proposed New Department of Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) Education: Denison referred to widespread discussion about better educating children in science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) education, and the associated need for STEM training for teachers. The proposed new Department of Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) Education (STEM Ed) will be founded on the reallocation of eight tenure-track lines from the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, and will provide institutional coordination for faculty in the STEM disciplines and those affiliated with STEM education. It will also be the new home for a variety of existing degree programs and will be developing additional degrees in the future.

The proposal came with many letters of support from a wide variety of deans and department chairs. The SAOSC reviewed the proposal twice, and ultimately sent it forward to the SC with a positive recommendation.

The Chair noted that the Senate would vote on two motions, the first based on the proposed new department's academic merits, and the second on its nonacademic merits. There were a few comments about the use of two motions. The Chair voiced a correction to the PowerPoint presentation – the first vote was for approval, based on academic merit, not endorsement.

Miller asked about the state of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) after the movement of faculty into the proposed new Department of STEM Ed. Guest Jennifer Wilhelm (ED/C&I) explained that it is a reorganization of the current C&I. The department chair of C&I, Parker Fawson added that C&I will still be in existence after the formation of the proposed new Department of STEM Ed.

Prats asked how the proposed new department would make STEM education better, or what the difference would be. Wilhelm replied that one aspect was the creation of innovative undergraduate programs. One example is that the teachers in the undergraduate math and science programs cannot be certified to teach in four years, so they have to go into the master's initial certification program. Sixty percent of students do not go on to the master's program at UK, but go elsewhere. With the creation of the proposed new department, a new undergraduate program will be created to prepare students to be

certified in four years to teach in the STEM area. Prats asked how students would gain a greater ability to teach STEM with a new department. Guest Margaret Mohrschroeder said that the current undergraduate program had not been revamped for 15 years. A new undergraduate program will address attrition issues and update and create new content as required by national standards. Mohrschroeder said that the content departments were very happy about it.

Nadel declared a point of order. He said that debate must be had after discussion. The Chair then suggested there be debate on the motion. Brion asked if the mentioned new undergraduate program could be created under the current departmental structure. Mohrschroeder said that it could not, for a variety of reasons. The department already offers programs in six different areas, amounting to over 13 different degree programs. To form an undergraduate STEM education degree program within the current structure would necessarily affect three other areas, and would be classified as a general secondary education degree, which is what they were trying to avoid.

Denison commented that the SAOSC did look at the possibility of offering an undergraduate STEM education degree program. Denison said that the point most convincing to him was the many faculty members from other colleges who will be involved. To create one point of access with a new department would provide an infrastructure which will allow other faculty to provide formalized input into the curriculum.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** that the Senate approve the proposed new Department of Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) Education, based upon its academic merits. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

Next, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** from the SC that that the Senate endorse the proposed new Department of Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) Education, based upon its non-academic merits. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Calendars (2011 - 2012 Calendar; 2013 - 2014 Calendar, Tentative; 2011 - 2012 Dentistry; 2013 - 2014 Dentistry, Tentative; Fall 2011 Law; Spring 2012 Law; Summer 2013 Law; Fall 2013 Law, Tentative; Spring 2014 Law, Tentative; Summer 2014 Law, Tentative; 2011 - 2012 Medicine; and 2013 -2014 Medicine, Tentative)

In reference to a comment by the Chair, Parliamentarian Tagavi said that approval of the calendars came from the SC, and did not require an additional Senate motion to be considered.

A **vote** was taken on the **motion** that the Senate approve the academic calendars (2011 - 2012 Calendar; 2013 - 2014 Calendar, Tentative; 2011 - 2012 Dentistry; 2013 - 2014 Dentistry, Tentative; Fall 2011 Law; Spring 2012 Law; Summer 2013 Law; Fall 2013 Law, Tentative; Spring 2014 Law, Tentative; Summer 2014 Law, Tentative; 2011 - 2012 Medicine; and 2013 -2014 Medicine, Tentative) as presented. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. Implementation of General Education Curriculum (second reading and vote)

The Chair noted that implementation of the Gen Ed was having its second reading. The motion was introduced in November. She invited Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mike Mullen to share information with the Senate.

Mullen said that he was happy to be present, and glad for quorum. He repeated that the first reading occurred during the November 8 Senate meeting, and that it was to approve the implementation of the

General Education curriculum for fall 2011. There were two requirements that needed to be satisfied – adequate resources needed to be shown and there needed to be processes to oversee the program. Those two issues in particular were discussed in November. Mullen said that \$5.3 million was allocated for the current and coming academic years, combined. Adequate seats and classroom space for students is available in all 10 course template areas, and the Interim General Education Oversight Committee (IGEOC) has information about its function and structure. IGEOC has reviewed 87 courses, with more coming in daily. Mullen said he would also offer some information about assessment.

Regarding the personnel funding of \$5.3 million across two years, Mullen said that it was permanent recurring monies to provide for the hiring of full-time lecturers, tenure-track faculty and well-placed TAs to allow UK to move to smaller classes and provide for breakout sessions in some courses to ensure a period in each class where a student is in a small-group environment, personally interacting with the instructor. Mullen explained that about \$4 million was allocated from tuition revenue increases and more returning students due to improved retention rates. Provost Subbaswamy has reallocated \$1.2 million internally toward Gen Ed, with a final, total new investment towards Gen Ed of \$5.3 million.

Nadel stated that during a presentation in September from Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration Frank Butler gave a report on the finances of UK and reported different monies as income from tuition than did the information just presented. Nadel asserted that the discrepancy indicated falsification of data. He added that Butler was rigorously questioned about the data he presented and Butler did not indicate any of the financial possibilities offered during the day's discussion on a new Gen Ed curriculum. Butler presented a \$7 million deficit. If the \$5 million for Gen Ed is included, that still represents a \$2 million deficit. He noted that he was not challenging the Provost's data, but rather the discrepancy. In response to Provost Subbaswamy, Nadel said that Butler had been projecting the 2011 – 2012 budget as a best-case scenario.

Provost Subbaswamy said that there was not yet a balanced budget for 2011 – 2012. He said that the budget folks start out knowing the shortfall and then fix it by the time the budget is presented to the Board of Trustees. The known deficit now is about \$10 million, and it will be fixed by the time it goes to the Board. Nadel said that the Provost's explanation was not what was given by Butler, and questioned whether the discrepancy was due to deceit or incompetence. The Provost opined that it was a communication failure. After some additional comments between the Provost and Nadel, the Chair asked that the discussion be restricted to Gen Ed.

Mullen noted that the next issue to address was that of long-term oversight of the Gen Ed process. The Senate put IGEOC into place this past May, and as such put in place a mechanism for Gen Ed course review, which will continue for a year. One question from the November Senate meeting had to do with IGEOC and faculty representation on that committee. Mullen reported that what has transpired is that IGEOC will formulate a policy to present to the Senate no later than the September 2011 Senate meeting regarding a permanent structure for how faculty are named to review committees. Lastly, Mullen said that the SC did vote unanimously to recommend the implementation of Gen Ed.

The Chair reminded senators of the motion before the body: that the University Senate approve the implementation of the General Education curriculum for fall 2011 for all incoming undergraduate students. She called for discussion.

Kovash commented that the current University Studies Program (USP) was 40 credit hours, and the new Gen Ed was 30 hours. He asked how transitions for programs would occur. Mullen replied that colleges

are working behind the scenes to change their programs to reflect the new 30 hours of Gen Ed requirements. It would be premature to present those to the Senate prior to Gen Ed approval. Also, flexibility is needed for current students who came in under USP. There may need to be exceptions for a USP course serving as a Gen Ed requirement for a particular student. In the next one to two years, when current students will be transitioning in and new ones arriving, there will be a collaborative effort to revise programs.

C. Lee asked about students transferring from other institutions and the current process for approving individual courses for Gen Ed requirements. Mullen said that there was a discussion going on at the state level regarding House Bill 160, which dealt with in-state transfers. Across the state there are discussions about building infrastructure for mapping Gen Ed courses across the state against common learning outcomes, being developed by faculty at universities across the state. Out-of-state issues will also be reviewed. Mullen said that equivalencies would largely be done as in the past, with a faculty member looking at an external course to see if it meets the spirit of the Learning Outcomes for a particular area. There will need to be a process in place and working, eventually, for a block transfer. A student from the Kentucky Community and Technical College System (KCTCS) who finishes all the Gen Ed requirements at their respective KCTCS institution will come to UK with all their Gen Ed requirements accomplished. The AP decision will still be made by a faculty member.

Grossman asked for confirmation that if a KCTCS student completes their Gen Ed curriculum at a KCTCS institution, UK is obliged to accept that. Mullen agreed, and said that would be a block transfer. He noted that it was that way, currently, too. Grossman asked if there were any plans for the KCTCS institutions or others to align their Gen Ed programs with UK's. Mullen said that discussion in each area as defined by the State as part of a general education curriculum are being had at Kentucky's colleges and universities. The goal is the development of a set of learning outcomes on which everyone can agree. Those would necessarily come to the Senate for approval. State institutions, however, have been charged by the state with developing a way to easily transfer Gen Ed from one institution to another to facilitate transfers. Dean Kornbluh (College of Arts and Sciences) said that UK faculty members were participating in each of those groups.

Debski asked if Mullen had any thoughts about the implementation of Gen Ed and its impact on students in their actual major. Mullen said that his personal feeling was that although Gen Ed was not in place yet, if UK was spending more money on faculty, lecturers, TAs, etc, and allowing for more interaction between faculty and students, it could not help but improve the situation. Provost Subbaswamy added that money was reallocated from upper division to lower division, as well as funds from professional schools moved to the undergraduate level. Overall, the small decrease in funding to those areas is tiny enough, and the benefits impact colleges overall, including the professional schools.

The Chair asked if there were any additional questions or points to debate. There being no response, she called for a **vote** on the **motion** that the University Senate approve the implementation of the General Education curriculum for fall 2011 for all incoming undergraduate students. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

Provost Subbaswamy stated that he wished to take a moment to thank UK's faculty and congratulate the Senate on what it had done over the past five years. The process was methodical and led by the faculty, and some very exciting things will be coming out. There may be difficulties encountered during implementation, but the Provost opined that UK's Gen Ed will be a national model. Once actual implementation discussions begin, UK will receive more attention. The Provost thanked the hundreds of



faculty who were involved in this large experiment, and noted that some universities never make it to the point of approving the implementation of a curriculum. He congratulated and thanked the faculty.

Jensen **moved** to adjourn, and Steiner **seconded**. The Chair reminded senators that the next meeting will be on Valentine's Day, in February. There being no objection to adjournment, the meeting was adjourned about 4:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Debra Anderson,  
University Senate Secretary

Invited guests present: Parker Fawson, Margaret Mohrschroeder, Kaveh Tagavi, Jennifer Wilhelm.

Absences: Adams, D. Anderson\*, Arents, Brennen, Campbell\*, Conigliaro, Denison, Edgerton, Ettensohn, Farrell, Feddock\*, Hardin, Harris, Hatcher, Hazard\*, Heller, Jackson, Jones\*, Kanga, Kelly, Kirk, Kirschling, Lester, Martin\*, J. McCormick\*, McCorvey, Meyer, Mobley, Mock, Montgomery\*, Morris\*, Murphy, Newman, Perry, Prats, Randall, Richey, Rohr\*, Roorda, Rostosky, Santhanam\*, Sarge, Shannon, M.S. Smith, R. Smith, Speaks\*, Subbaswamy, Sudharshan, Sutphen, E. Swanson, Tick, Todd, J. Tracy, T. Tracy, Turner, Wells, Wermeling\*, Wilson, Wiseman, Witt, Wood, Wyatt, Young, and Zhang.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, February 8, 2011.

---

\* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.