

University Senate
February 12, 2007

The University Senate met 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 otherwise indicated.

The meeting was called to order at 3:02 pm.

1. Announcements

The Chair said that the minutes from the special January meeting were not ready but would be available at the next meeting.

The Chair shared that the Senate Parliamentarian, Professor Emeritus Gifford Blyton, was still not feeling well and had tendered his resignation to the Office of the Senate Council. The Chair asked senators to sign one of the two thank-you cards circulating during the meeting and said he would be soliciting suggestions from senators for a parliamentarian.

An email was sent to senators recently requesting nominations for faculty members to be a part of the College of Law external program review. The Chair added that while a sufficient number of nominees had been received, there was still a great need for nominations of faculty members to serve on academic area committees. He again requested suggestions for potential faculty members to serve on academic area advisory committees. He ended the announcements by reminding senators that the March Senate meeting would be one week later than usual, **March 19**, due to spring break.

2. [Ombud Report \(Academic Year 2005 – 2006\)](#)

The Chair said that the Ombud's report was on the website as well as in the handout; he thanked Michelle Sohner for preparing the report. He went over the various statistics in the 2005 – 2006 Ombud report, the period for which the Chair (Tagavi) served as Academic Ombud. He invited questions.

Forgue asked if there were any difference to reporting of academic offenses since the new rules were approved. The Chair deferred to current Ombud Joel Lee. Lee said that he entered the position in July 2006. The statistics from fall 2006 were still being tabulated, but Lee said that there had been a substantial increase in the number of cases, approximately double. He said that several students had received a failing grade and assumed the failure was due to a cheating offense but the student had received no communication about the offense. Lee said that when the faculty members involved were contacted, they all said that they were unaware of the new academic offenses rules. Lee thought there could be large numbers still unreported.

In response to Grossman's question about whether or not the number of appeals had increased or decreased, Lee said that there was already a modest number of appeals that had been completed and that there would likely be many during the spring semester.

There were no further questions.

3. [New Department: Department of Neurosurgery](#)

The Chair referred senators to the time log (on the PowerPoint overhead slide) for the proposal. (The proposal was received from the Graduate Council (GC) on 10/24/06; approved by Senate's Academic Organization & Structure Committee on 12/21/06; and approved by the Senate Council (SC) on 2/5/07.) The rationale for the new department was, among other things, to help in the recruitment of neurosurgery faculty. The standard across the country is a separate department of neurosurgery. The Chair said that College of Medicine Dean Jay Perman and Dr. Byron Young were present to answer questions. The motion was from the SC and thus needed no motion or second from the floor.

Dean Perman thanked the Senate for its consideration of the proposal for a new Department of Neurosurgery. He said that the division of neurosurgery was like most disciplines in that, until the 1980s, neurosurgery was predominantly housed in departments of surgery. Over the past 20-25 years, the academic rationale for having various surgical disciplines in one department had evaporated. In years past, all surgeons received several years of general surgery before training in a specialty. It was no longer customary to have a grounding in surgery on the way to neurosurgery or orthopedic surgery or another surgical specialty. Perman said that holding the surgical disciplines together because they all cut skin was akin to putting a pediatric gastroenterologist into a department of medicine because of a shared use of an endoscope; disciplines could not be held together solely due to a common technique. He said he was particularly concerned that in an era in which 80% of medical schools contained an independent department of neurosurgery, it would be difficult to recruit neurosurgery faculty members or, once Dr. Young stepped down as division chair, a new chair for a section in the Department of Surgery.

Snow said that the benefits to a new department of neurosurgery were evident; she asked Perman to explain the effect on the remaining surgical areas. Dean Perman said that a principle concern throughout the process had been the financial impact; he said that materials provided in the supplied documentation offered information about financial matters. He said that the income raised by surgical divisions was kept separate; the important thing had been the contribution of various divisions to support the overhead of the Department of Surgery. Due to concerns and discussions, Perman said that an independent department of neurosurgery would continue to purchase infrastructure services from the Department of Surgery.

There being no further questions, a **vote** was taken on the motion from the Senate Council that the Senate approve a new Department of Neurosurgery. The motion **passed** unanimously. The Chair thanked Dean Perman and Dr. Young for attending.

4. New Program: University Scholars Program b/w BS in Electrical Engineering and MS in Biomedical Engineering

The Chair referred senators to the time log (on the PowerPoint overhead slide) for the proposal. (The proposal was received from the GC 11/20/06; approved by the Senate's Academic Programs Committee on 12/21/06; and approved by the SC on 1/22/07.) He said that the proposal would allow bright undergraduate engineering students to pursue an MS in Biomedical Engineering, since there was no such BS program offered by UK. The new program would also help to keep students interested in biomedical engineering instead of losing them to other undergraduate programs. The Chair noted that the proposal came from the SC so no motion or second was needed. He invited Graduate School Dean Jeannine Blackwell to suggest her amendment to the proposal, to change the effective date.

Blackwell said that she would like to **offer an amendment** to the motion (from the SC to approve) that the proposal would go into effect for the spring 2007 semester. She said that there were interested students who would be graduating at the end of the semester and currently in the coursework. Cibull **seconded**.

In response to a question from Grossman, Dean Blackwell said that the students she referred to were currently undergraduates who wanted to count their coursework toward the MS degree. A **vote** was taken on the **amendment** to change the effective date of the proposal to spring 2007. The motion **passed** unanimously.

The Chair asked for discussion on the main motion. Bollinger acknowledged limited knowledge of the engineering field – he asked why electrical engineering was being combined with biomedical engineering. Guest Regina Hannemann said that there was already a University Scholars Program between a BS in Mechanical Engineering and an MS in Biomedical Engineering – the Department of Electrical Engineering also desired such a partnership.

There being no further questions, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** from the Senate Council to approve a new University Scholars Program between a BS in Electrical Engineering and an MS in Biomedical Engineering and make it effective for spring 2007. The motion **passed** unanimously.

5. University Calendars

The Chair said that if anyone so requested, the eight calendars could be approved separately. Voss asked if there had been any update to previous considerations to make the Wednesday before Thanksgiving a holiday. The

Chair said that the Calendar Committee, a SC committee, would be submitting a recommendation by mid-March that would include modifications to fall break and the Thanksgiving week. He confirmed for Grossman that if changes to the University Calendar were approved, amended calendars would need to be approved. Greissman, liaison to the SC from the Office of the Provost, added that the Office of the Provost was aware that the three-year trial period for the winter intersession had ended with the last winter intersession; a report with efficacy information would accompany any additional requests for a winter intersession.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** that the Senate approve the [2007 – 2008 Calendar](#); [2009-2010 Tentative Calendar](#); [2007-2008 Medicine Calendar](#); [2009-2010 Medicine Calendar, Tentative](#); [2007-2008 Law Calendar](#); [2009-2010 Law Calendar, Tentative](#); [2007-2008 Dentistry Calendar](#); and [2009-2010 Dentistry Calendar, Tentative](#). The motion **passed** with a vast majority in favor and one abstention.

6. KCTCS List of Candidates for Degrees

The Chair said that the Senate would be approving lists of Bluegrass Community and Technical College (BCTC) candidates for degrees until 2010. Due to the understanding reached after the community colleges separated from UK, UK was the grantor of degrees for some students at BCTC. The lists did not go through a procedure similar to UK's vetting of degree through the elected University Faculty; after receipt of every BCTC list, it was sent to the faculty leader counterpart there who helped identify numerous corrections. The Chair said that the original list, however, had been approved by the KCTCS Board of Regents so no corrections had been incorporated. He said that some corrections would likely make their way to the Senate. The Chair said that no motion or second was needed.

Forgue expressed concern that excluding the corrections could negatively affect students. The Chair said that only students on the list would receive approval. He added that the information about corrections was not part of the motion, but was an alert that the Office of the Senate Council was aware of corrections coming from BCTC and working their way through the system. Only students who fulfilled the necessary requirements would be granted a degree. In response to Forgue, the Chair said that a new list would be generated with the unincorporated student information.

A **vote** was taken on the **motion** from the Senate Council to approve the KCTCS/UK candidates applying for credentials (July 29, 2006 – October 19, 2006). The motion **passed** unanimously.

7. Honorary Degree Nominations

The Chair read from *Governing Regulation IV.A*, which outlined the responsibilities of elected University Faculty with regard to approval of honorary degrees. He reminded senators that new processes had been created through

the approval of the June 2005 revisions to the *Governing Regulations (GR)*. The University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees (UJCHD) identified individuals judged by the six conditions approved by the Senate in November 2006. Four members of the UJCHD were selected by the SC and four were selected by President Todd, with the Graduate School Dean serving as chair.

The Chair said that a motion would be needed to approve the nominations for honorary degrees; although the SC received a presentation by Dean Blackwell, SC members understood the SC's role was to approve placing the nominees on the Senate agenda but did not have any approval authority regarding the nominees. The Chair requested that all those present keep the names confidential, even though the Senate would not be going into a closed session.

Dean Blackwell thanked UJCHD members and offered a presentation on the nominees.

Dean Blackwell **moved** that the elected Faculty representatives of the University Senate approve the nominees submitted by the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees and send the recommendation to President Todd for the President to submit it to the BoT in his role as the Chair of the University Senate. Bollinger **seconded**. In response to Grossman, Dean Blackwell said that a doctor of humane letters was recommended for all three nominees.

Grossman **offered a friendly amendment** to include another sentence recommending that the three candidates each receive a doctorate of humane letters. Dean Blackwell **accepted**. After brief discussion, a **motion** was taken on the **amendment**, which **passed** unanimously.

In response to Grossman, Dean Blackwell said that President Todd was unlikely to be opposed to any of the nominees. She said that all the nominees had some type of tie to UK. She said she would welcome numerous nominations for future UJCHD deliberations.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** by the elected University Faculty was taken on the motion below.

The elected Faculty representatives of the University Senate approve the nominees submitted by the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees and send the recommendation to President Todd for the President to submit it to the BoT in his role as the Chair of the University Senate. The elected Faculty representatives recommend that the three candidates each receive a doctorate of humane letters.

The motion **passed** unanimously.

8. Athletics Association Board of Directors Update- Faculty Representative Alan DeSantis

The Chair invited Faculty Representative to the Athletics Association Board Alan DeSantis to give his presentation.

Guest DeSantis thanked the Chair for the opportunity to speak with the Senate. He gave a lengthy presentation on a variety of topics relating to his faculty involvement with UK Athletics.

After the presentation, Forgue commented that some members of the public might think that money given to UK was not used properly because of big news items like the new basketball practice facility. DeSantis replied that it was a topic he wrestled with, but believed that the donations that the Athletics Association (AA) received came from donors who would not have donated to the academic side of UK. Athletics boosters would not be endowing an academic chair, anyway.

Grabau asked how DeSantis could keep from being co-opted by AA over time; there was a risk DeSantis could become an AA "member" as opposed to the academic representative. He also asked about how faculty could offer input. DeSantis replied that he had been a faculty member for a while and began his service as the AA faculty representative feeling somewhat cynical. He encouraged faculty members to send him any and all input and comments. DeSantis said that he did not think he was being co-opted into AA and that one method of preventing such a problem was regular meetings with the Senate. He said he spent a lot of time with student athletes on campus and on the road and said that he was impressed with how student athletes balance academics, sports and the travel schedule and community service activities.

Miller asked if it was true that student athletes received more academic counseling and assistance than other students. DeSantis said that CATS (Center for Academic and Tutorial Services) was funded completely by AA. Due to travel and athletic practices, CATS was needed to help student athletes excel academically. DeSantis expressed deep concern that it had become routine and acceptable for student athletes to miss class; it was a poor system in the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) that was at fault.

Houtz noted that as a faculty researcher, he needed to budget for a 48% overhead cost; he asked why AA only had a 22% overhead cost. DeSantis said that the 22% rate was indeed the rate AA had to meet. He noted that ticket prices had increased recently – as tuition rates increased, the amount AA had to pay for scholarships for student athletes also increased, resulting in the need for higher ticket prices to offset tuition prices.

Diedrichs clarified that Houtz was talking about budgeted overhead rates. DeSantis replied that the AA paid for utilities and maintenance costs, but

suggested that Rob Mullens would be an appropriate person to whom financial questions could be posed. Thelin asked how much the AA paid for annual rent or other land costs. DeSantis replied that Mullens would be able to answer that question. Thelin commented that while the AA began paying overhead costs two years ago, there was still a half century during which UK paid those costs. He also said that other expenses covered by other groups are left off of the AA's balance sheets.

Frost offered an observation: even though AA was self-sustaining and its own corporation, it owed its very existence to UK. It was not entirely accurate to say that the AA was self-supporting; and questions should be asked about how else the AA could do for the university. Frost added that comments that the AA generated income from donors who would otherwise not contribute to UK missed the point – much of the AA's income came from ticket prices, which were just raised. It was difficult in some colleges for deans to be able to access such tickets to share with very large academic donors.

Debski asked if there were any current or expected problems anticipated with graduation rates. DeSantis replied that the NCAA ruled a few years ago that for student athletes at the sophomore level, 40% of the degree requirements must be met; at the junior level, 60% of degree requirements must be met; and as seniors, 80% of the degree requirements must be met. (Student athletes are allowed five years in which to graduate.) DeSantis said that UK had met and exceeded the 40-60-80 rule – approximately 90% of student athletes graduated within five years. Debski then asked about rates for men's basketball and football teams, compared with others in the NCAA. DeSantis replied that he wished the graduation percentages were higher, but that UK did meet and exceeded the graduation rate.

In response to a question from Waldhart, DeSantis explained that in instances of allegations of academic offenses, the case was completely removed from the AA and that he oversaw the process. He added that at the end of the each year, he emailed all professors who changed a student athlete's grade during the academic year. DeSantis checked to make sure there was no coercion, etc. felt by the professor. He said about 80% said the grade change was legitimate.

The Chair asked how many grade changes were made during a year; DeSantis replied that it was about 88 per year. Segerstrom asked if DeSantis had observed instances in which students who were not academically capable were admitted to the revenue-producing sports team programs. DeSantis said that he had seen some of that. He related that he had talked about it with President Todd. DeSantis said that part of him wanted to bring kids on to campus to play that would never have had

an exposure to academic life; even if the student athlete was unable to handle the academic demands, he thought the student was better off having been exposed to academia. He said it was a dilemma he did not have an answer for how to balance winning and students athletes with a legitimate chance of graduating. He said that if the student athlete did not graduate within five years, it would also penalize the team and the university. In response to a follow-up question from Segerstrom, DeSantis said that the AA received “points” for returning athletes who subsequently graduate.

Smith asked if DeSantis was aware of any trends in the matter, and if there was a chance of reversal. DeSantis said that although faculty representatives at schools across the nation had high-minded ideas, coaches and athletics directors normally won out over high-minded academia. He also expressed concern with longer playing seasons and more games played. He said that there was huge demands on coaches to win and that any changes to the academic portion of student athletes’ lives would have to come from the NCAA.

Smith suggested that one aspect to focus on could be keeping students in class. DeSantis agreed; he said that games were on television on Monday and Tuesday evenings, sometimes as late as 9 pm. He said that when he traveled with some teams, he almost always had to take off the following day to rest. Student athletes, however, were in class the next day, even after returning at 3 am from an away game.

Grossman noted that the Ivy League schools did not have athletics scholarships – some competed nationally in some sports and did lose at times. He said some schools do just fine without extensive athletics programs – there was a way out but leaders were unwilling to take those paths. DeSantis replied that the fans would not give up the student athletic teams – giving up March Madness would be unthinkable to them.

Dembo noted that the Board of Trustees had delegated nearly all of its responsibilities to the Athletics Association Board of Directors. Any comments regarding the AA should be directed to DeSantis.

Due to the short time left in the meeting, the Chair said that unanswered questions could be emailed to him and he would send them on to DeSantis. The Chair thanked DeSantis for attending. DeSantis said that he welcomed questions and concerns.

9. SAP Campus Management Update - IRIS Project Director Phyllis Nash and Lead Michelle Nordin

The Chair welcomed IRIS Project Director Phyllis Nash to come to the podium. Guest Nash said that she had been privileged to work with

Campus Management Lead Michele Nordin. Nash said she had briefed Provost Subbaswamy earlier in the day and was happy to report IRIS had been given the go-ahead to bring up the rest of the system on February 26.

Guest Nordin offered a presentation on aspects of the Campus Management (CM) module of SAP. After the presentation, she welcomed questions.

Nordin explained that during the meeting with the Provost, a modification to the training plan was endorsed for faculty and staff who did grading, reviewed class roles, etc. She said that a simulation via the web would also be offered, in addition to the classroom training course. She said that while classroom teaching would still be offered, the standard would be to require just the web simulation; some colleges, though, could require stricter training requirements. Nordin said that post-go-live training would be available in an open lab from 7 am – 6 pm in McVey Hall for six weeks after go-live. In response to a question from Forgue, Nordin replied that the open labs were for walk-in purposes. The room would be staffed by IRIS personnel for the entire time, but those coming in for help were not expected to remain the entire time – they could come and go as needed. Nordin added that telephone support would be offered and staffed by knowledgeable CM team members.

In response to Finkel, Nordin said she would get back to him to find out if CM was compliant with non-PC/non-Mac systems. In response to Waldhart, Nordin said that the original requirement of three classes was still available, but some colleges could just require the web simulations instead of the classroom courses. Sottile asked how his training register could be changed – he was assigned to a course that was not applicable to his needs. Nordin replied that the training plans were supplied to IRIS personnel by college approvers. She suggested Sottile contact Rosie Hicks in the College of Engineering. Nordin added that anyone with similar problems could contact the appropriate college contact person or Nordin herself.

Parker asked if IRIS and APEX were separate systems. Nordin replied that IRIS would feed into APEX, which was currently fed by SIS. The new CM system would provide the same information in APEX. She said that if the U-Connect id was the same as the active directory id, the U-Connect id could be used to log into CM.

Grossman asked about fields on some screens for both the student id and the Social Security number. Nordin replied that it could be used for search purposes, but was not required. In response to Miller, Nordin said that she was unaware of any problems with Internet Explorer 7.

In response to a couple of questions about which colleges would allow only the web interface for training purposes, Nordin strongly suggested some senators check their email for notices from their deans.

There being no further business to attend to, the meeting was adjourned at 4:54 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Larry Grabau,
University Senate Secretary

Absences: Anderson, H., Anyaegbunam^{*}, Bartilow, Bernard^{*}, Bhavsar, Biagi, Bordo, Brown, Burchett, Butler, Cammers, Caudill, Cheng^{*}, Chew, Cibulka, Clauter^{*}, Cooper, Crofford^{*}, Deem, DeSimone, Draper, El-Ghannam, English^{*}, Fording, Gaetke^{*}, Goldsby^{*}, Gonzalez^{*}, Hallman^{*}, Hasselbring, Hoch, Hoffman, Jackson, Johnson, D., Jones^{*}, Karpf, Kirschling, Kraemer, Lester, Lillich, Look, Martin^{*}, McCormick, Michael^{*}, Mobley, Mohny, Moliterno^{*}, Odoi, Perman, Pulito, Remer^{*}, Roberts^{*}, Sawaya^{*}, Shay, Sheahan^{*}, Smart, Smith, M. S., Staben, Steiner^{*}, Steltenkamp^{*}, Subbaswamy, Sudharshan, Swanson, Terrell, Todd, Turner, Vasconez, Vestal, Williams, G., Wiseman, Wyatt.

Invited guests present: Alan DeSantis, Regina Hannemann, Phyllis Nash, Michele Nordin, and Byron Young.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on February 23, 2007.

^{*} Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.