

University Senate
February 8, 2010

The University Senate met in regular session on Monday, February 8, 2010 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 voice vote unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Dave Randall called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:03 pm.

1. Minutes from December 14, 2009 and Announcements

Hayes **moved** to that the minutes for December 14, 2009 be approved as distributed and D. Jones **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair then reported a number of announcements.

- Approval for distance learning (DL) delivery for 800- and 900-level courses from the health care colleges will reside with the Health Care Colleges Council (HCCC) chair. In the past, such requests came to the Chair for approval, but because everything else dealing with those types of courses is handled in the HCCC, it was logical for this approval authority to also fall to the HCCC chair. All other requirements remain the same.
- There is an expedited review process for requesting DL delivery for a special topics course (assuming there is an existing special topics course). After college approval, a faculty member can submit the DL Form and a sample syllabus to the SC Chair for DL approval for four semesters.
- Senator Fran Harding-Fanning (Nursing) was chosen as the faculty representative to the Work-Life Supervisor of the Year Selection Committee.
- The Senate's Admissions & Academic Standards Committee (SA&ASC) asked Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mike Mullen for some clarification regarding guidelines for and approval of undergraduate certificates. The issue of undergraduate certificates will return to the SA&ASC soon, and be presented to Senate later this semester.
- There is an ongoing effort to revise the language in the *Administrative Regulations* pertaining to a joint faculty/administration committee for information technology (IT). One primary goal is to involve faculty more intimately in decisions regarding IT. The new language will be presented to the Senate soon.
- A new web transmittal was posted February 4 – objections will be received through Monday, February 15.
- The Provost has requested faculty nominees for the Summative Evaluation of the College of Medicine Review Committee. Please send suggestions to Mrs. Brothers by Friday.
- While no one doubts that the activities and decisions of academic area advisory committees are very important, there is a desperate need for volunteers for these committees. An email

solicitation to approximately 350 faculty sent on three separate occasions thus far netted just 11 responses. The Chair implored senators to ask colleagues to serve, noting that faculty who do not participate in the tenure and promotion process cannot complain about said process.

- Reminding senators about the SEC Affiliated Faculty Leaders (SECAFL) meeting at UK this past fall, he explained that current faculty senators will receive email from a graduate student associated with the group, Amber Stegelin-Fallucca (University of South Carolina doctoral candidate). Her dissertation project is entitled, "Faculty Senate Knowledge and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics: A Conference-Level Perspective." UK's IRB has already been contacted, the survey takes 10-15 minutes to complete, and a summary of results will be sent to the Chair, and also posted on SECAFL web site. The Chair urged senators to participate.
- There is a new curriculum website at www.uky.edu/curriculum being piloted to track approval of course and program requests. Jeannine Blackwell, dean of the Graduate School, has been the driving force behind this effort.

2. Proposed Change to Masters of Business Administration

The Chair invited Merl Hackbart (Gatton College of Business and Economics) to explain the proposal. Guest Hackbart said that it was relatively simple – until present, the admission exam required for students applying to the Masters in Business Administration was the GMAT. Business schools are increasingly accepting the GRE, and accepting that exam score is the proposed change. Hackbart explained that the largest percentage of students coming into the Masters in Business Administration come from engineering and the hard sciences, where many have taken the GRE in anticipation of pursuing work in their disciplines.

Hackbart said that the same rationale applied to the request to change the admissions requirements for the PhD in Business Administration. He said that the GRE score was as meaningful as the GMAT.

The Chair said that he had failed to mention that all the day's proposals came from the Senate Council (SC) with a positive recommendation.

Wood **moved** that the Senate approve the proposed change to the Masters of Business Administration, effective fall 2010 and Chappell **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Proposed Change to Ph.D. in Business Administration

Hulse **moved** that the Senate approve the proposed change in the Ph.D. in Business Administration, effective fall 2010 and Sellnow **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Code of Conduct Issue – Pharmacy Senator

The Chair noted that the matter was not an action item, but rather something about which the SC wants the Senate to be informed. He invited Senator Daniel Wermeling (Pharmacy) to the podium.

Wermeling began by thanking the Chair for giving him the opportunity to meet with the SC on several occasions, and giving Pharmacy faculty the opportunity to express their concerns. He then gave a presentation outlining how the Code of Conduct policy was instituted without faculty input, how it contradicts other current University policies and how Pharmacy was able to move forward.

Chappell asked if there was any explanation for the lack of responsiveness by University attorneys when Wermeling pointed out obvious language conflicts. Wermeling said he was never given an answer, although he assumed it had something to do with his suggestions being perceived as an eleventh-hour change when the language was to be presented to the Board of Trustees (BoT) in less than two weeks; if his suggestions were investigated and incorporated, that would have required postponing the BoT presentation to another meeting. He said it was also possible that the then-impending accreditation of the College of Medicine (Medicine) was the impetus. Both the Dean of Medicine and the Provost said the Code of Conduct only applied to Medicine, but the official version on the books applies to all health care colleges, even though it is only being enforced in Medicine.

Referring to comments made by Wermeling during his recent visit to the SC, Grossman asked him to share that information with the Senate. Wermeling said that there was language in the Code of Conduct that attempted to restrict a faculty member's ability to hear someone speak – it restricted a faculty member's ability to be in a professional society that might be subsidized by the industry for continuing education, and overreached into other aspects of association with professional societies.

The Chair said that Code of Conduct language was currently being revised by the *Administrative Regulations* review committee, and he expected a positive outcome.

5. Quality Enhancement Program Topic Selection Plan

The Chair invited Guest Deanna Sellnow (Communications and Information Studies) and Senator Diane Snow (Medicine) to present information on the Quality Enhancement Program (QEP) Topic Selection Plan as required by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in anticipation of UK's accreditation visit in 2012. Sellnow said that the day's presentation was the update mentioned during her visit to the Senate in November. Sellnow then gave a presentation to senators.

Grossman asked her to comment on the financial aspects. Sellnow explained that the brainstorming session was intended to be open and without restrictions, but that another phase would follow in which criteria will be developed and guided by constraints in terms of budget and personnel. It will be important to ensure the QEP plan can be accomplished within a certain budget.

R. Jones asked about the members from Libraries. Snow replied that there were some staff members in Libraries that were also included. Snow said that she and Sellnow will return in April.

6. Relocation of Masters in Health Administration Degree Program (from Martin School of Public Policy and Administration to College of Public Health)

The Chair explained that the Senate had the authority and responsibility to approve or not approve the move of an academic degree program based upon its academic merits. There were very specific delineations between academic (Senate's purview) and non-academic responsibilities. While the Senate holds direct responsibility for academic merit, its role in the review of the proposal's non-academic merits takes the form of endorsing or not endorsing. The Chair said that the Senate would be asked to hold two votes after discussion, one on the academic merits and one on the non-academic merits of the move.

Director Bill Hoyt (Martin School of Public Policy and Administration) and Dean Steve Wyatt (College of Public Health) were in attendance to help explain the proposal, as was Jeannine Blackwell, dean of the Graduate School. The Chair invited Dean Blackwell to explain the proposed relocation of the Masters in

Health Administration (MHA) degree program from the Martin School of Public Policy and Administration (MSPPA) to the College of Public Health (PbH). She then gave a presentation explaining various aspects of the proposed move.

Noting that the motion at hand dealt with approving or not approving, the Chair noted that the vote on the proposal was not unanimous at the Senate Council (SC), but it did come with a positive recommendation. Grossman **moved** to approve the move of the MHA degree program based upon its academic merits, effective summer 2010, and Swanson **seconded**.

Hayes stated that she had a very direct question to pose; she asked Hoyt if it was the case that the issue revolved around sour grapes and if the tenured faculty member who moved from MSPPA to PbH attempted to force the MHA program to follow. Guest Hoyt replied that while it was possible it played some role, he noted that just that one departure was a significant reduction to the number of faculty devoted to the MHA program. Hoyt said fairness required a broader view – that departure certainly precipitated the discussion, but so did the Provost's formation of the committee charged to investigate the MHA program and its associated campus resources, access to healthcare professionals for internships, and faculty expertise.

Noting that the motion on the floor pertained to the academic merits of the proposed move, D. Jones asked Hoyt to speak on behalf of the MHA program faculty and explain the best case of the academic merits to not approve the proposal. Jones reiterated that he was looking for the perspective of those faculty currently in the MHA program. Hoyt replied that as an economist by training, the best argument for not approving would be to view the MHA-graduate job market as the test, and the MHA program did a very good job placing its students. While acknowledging the need for accreditation, Hoyt added that the most relevant measure of the program's viability in its current home was the success in placing students. Hoyt said that MSPPA faculty have been moving forward with the MHA's move to PbH, in spite of faculty members' opposition to the move.

Nadel raised a **point of order**. He stated that the only discussion allowed should take the form of pros and cons, and not a question and answer session. Nadel said that the Senate needed to debate the motion on the floor. If the Senate wished to move to a question and answer session, the the motion should be withdrawn. The Senate should be debating business once something is placed on the floor. The Chair replied that senators were debating the motion and Nadel asked if questions and answers were allowed according to Robert's Rules of Order (RRO). Parliamentarian Seago began to answer, but Nadel cut her off, saying he was not interested in her opinion, but rather the language in RRO.

The Parliamentarian requested a few moments to research Nadel's question, and quickly offered a response. The Parliamentarian read from RRO, which said that the distinction between debate and questioning should be kept in view, but that questioning was allowed when it would assist discussion, within the discretion of the Chair. The Chair ruled that the questioning was relevant to the motion on the floor.

Yanarella addressed his question to the Chair. He said that when he was last involved in discussions about the move he had some concerns, particularly the academic merits. Given the lack of majority support in MSPPA and Yanarella's understanding that moving the MHA program would shift 30 – 40% of the students in the MSPPA toward PbH, the SC moved a motion to request that the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAO&SC) investigate some very specific questions, specifically related to the academic merits. He asked for an update since that time. Dean Blackwell replied that the

questions given to the SAO&SC were then passed to the MSPPA for responses, which were returned to the SAO&SC. The SAO&SC reviewed the answers and offered the SC a positive recommendation for the move. Dean Blackwell added that Provost Subbaswamy offered a statement ensuring continuation of resources for the MSPPA.

In response to Snow's question about student input into the move, Hoyt replied that he was unsure of the level of student input. He said that they did meet with students and discussed possibilities, but he did not recollect any attempt to ascertain their views. The anticipated move was explained to make sure that students' academic training would not be disrupted. Swanson opined that in terms of academic merits, it would be helpful for senators to understand what students in the MHA program were trained to do, and where they could be placed. Hoyt said that among other degrees, the MSPPA offered the Masters in Health Administration and the Masters in Public Policy, which trained students for careers in administration and management. Students were primarily but not exclusively placed in non- and for-profit health administration institutions and public health agencies. Initially, though, many students were placed in fellowships.

Grossman said he had a statement regarding the academic merits of the move. He pointed out that past success was no predictor of future success. It was clear that no one was trying to punish the MSPPA, and the MHA program had done well in the past. Accreditation could become an issue, since the MSPPA was moving away from a policy focus. In light of these considerations, it would make sense to look to the future of the MHA program and a better fit in PbH. Grossman said that the issue was not the MSPPA, but rather that PbH is the best fit for the future.

Wood said that at least part of the academic merit seemed to revolve around reaccreditation taking place in 2010. The MHA program is a multidisciplinary program, has been for decades, and has been reaccredited time after time with the cooperation of faculties across campus, even before the existence of the College of Public Health. She asked Hoyt to share any direct communication he received from the accrediting agency to imply that the accreditation of the MHA program was in jeopardy. Hoyt replied that he met with a representative from the accrediting agency soon after he (Hoyt) was appointed to the position of director in January 2009. Shortly thereafter in early March, he and then-director of the MSPPA met with John Lloyd, the head of the Commission on Accreditation Healthcare Management Education, and discussed matters with him. Hoyt said he left that meeting with the view that it was possible to be reaccredited, although it would be challenging. Hoyt said that he did not receive any communication about the MHA program being in peril.

Estus said that he was puzzled by the accreditation requirement for five MHA faculty, if the MSPPA had one tenured faculty member remaining, one who left and a slot unfilled, which only amounted to three positions. He asked for the home location of the faculty who are used with the MHA program. Dean Blackwell said there was a very interdisciplinary team approach to coursework for the MHA program. She said that the first year of coursework was made up of specialized sections of coursework from the MSPPA, with special sections of the same type of course for public policy and public health. Courses heavy on examples of the health administration world are taught by faculty from the MSPPA, including the individual who is the primary faculty member in the MHA program. As students move into other coursework, faculty members on overload from various related fields do more instruction, although faculty are primarily drawn from PbH and Pharmacy. Individuals from the community have also taught those courses. Dean Blackwell said that the most serious academic challenge in her eyes had to do with the revision of the entire curriculum to meet the accrediting requirements for a practice-based competency curriculum.

Noting the time and the other agenda items, the Chair asked if there were any additional questions. Wasilkowski asked how many faculty will become primary to the MHA program if it moved to PbH. Dean Wyatt replied that there were already five faculty with backgrounds in the MHA field and will work with that program, and that there were currently 13 or 14 faculty in PbH's Department of Health Services Management who will also be engaged.

Noting the emphasis on the move to competency-based instruction for the MHA program, Thelin noted that such a move started in around 1972. He wondered what caused the sudden urgency. Dean Wyatt said that while public health had been in a competency-based instruction for some time, the MHA was only just moving in that direction.

There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was held on the **motion** to approve the move of the MHA degree program based upon its academic merits, effective summer 2010. The motion **passed** with a majority in favor.

Grossman then **moved** that the Senate endorse the move of the MHA degree program based upon its non-academic merits, effective summer 2010 and Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with a majority in favor.

7. December 2009 KCTS Candidate for Credentials

The Chair noted that Senate approval of KCTS candidates for credentials would be ending in the 2010/2011 academic year.

Estus **moved** that the elected university faculty senators approve the December 2009 KCTS candidate for credentials, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degree to be conferred by the Board and D. Anderson **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

8. TurnItIn Informational Presentation

The Chair invited Senator Ruth Beattie (Arts and Science) to share information about the plagiarism prevention software TurnItIn, and she gave a brief presentation. After her comments, she noted that a recommendation would be made to the SC towards the end of the semester about purchasing the software. She encouraged senators to email her with any strong comments or opinions.

9. Proposed Change in Admission Requirements for BS in Nursing

Associate Dean Patricia Burkhart (College of Nursing) explained the proposal to change the admission requirements for the BS in Nursing. Guest Burkhart said that the proposal came with a positive recommendation from the undergraduate faculty in the College of Nursing, the Health Care Colleges Council and the Senate Council.

Before offering the four main points of the proposal, Burkhart said that the overall rationale was to more accurately reflect the competitive applicant pool and for students to be more successful in practice. There were four primary changes.

1. The minimum high school GPA will rise from 2.5 to 2.75; students with a 2.5 GPA were not typically successful.

2. The minimum GPA for consideration for entry into the professional program will rise from 2.5 to 2.75; the average GPA of students accepted is 3.6. Some applicants and parents have wondered why the minimum GPA is so low when the competition is so high.
3. The new TOEFL requirement reflects the critical importance of speaking clear English to patient safety. The requirements were decided upon after discussion with campus experts and national standards.
4. The ACT composite score required for guaranteed admission to the professional level will rise from 26 to 28, to be more consistent with UK's Strategic Plan.

Chappell **moved** that the Senate approve the proposed changes in admissions requirements for the BS Nursing, effective fall 2010 and Wermeling **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

10. General Education Update

The Chair told senators that the vetting of Gen Ed courses was ongoing. He said that course submissions for Gen Ed approval need to include the undergraduate grading scale on the syllabus. Referring to the supplied draft Gen Ed form and draft Gen Ed processes, he explained that the approval process for Gen Ed courses mirrored the process for University Studies Program courses. There was an additional form that needed to be submitted, customized for Gen Ed purposes. When asked if there were any objections, no senator raised a hand.

11. Honorary Degree Recipients

The Chair invited Dean Blackwell to present the nominees for honorary degrees. He reminded senators that the names were highly confidential and asked that the names not be shared with anyone. Dean Blackwell offered a brief presentation.

Yanarella **moved** that the elected faculty representatives of the Senate approve each nominee submitted by the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees and each associated degree type, and send the recommendations to President Todd in his role as the Chair of the Senate for submission to the BoT. Chappell **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

12. Third Bachelor's Degrees – Receipt of Report from Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee

The Chair explained that senators were being asked to receive the report from the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee stating that more than two bachelor's degrees were allowed. Chappell **moved** that the Senate accept the report from the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee on more than two bachelor's degrees. Nieman **seconded**. D. Jones asked if the action by the Senate meant that the report would be received and filed, or if it would be endorsed as new policy. The Chair replied that it would be received and filed.

There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

12. Proposed Change to Graduate School Calendar

Dean Blackwell explained that the request meant that the deadline for international students to apply to the Graduate School would change from February 1 to March 15 for the fall term, and from June 15 to August 15 for the spring term. When the deadlines were established about 10 years ago, after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, there were new visa requirements established by the State

Department. The deadlines were created to ensure sufficient time for students to get a visa. Bureaucratic processes are moving more quickly, and the Graduate School wants more flexibility for admitting international students through a longer window. Dean Blackwell said that it was part of the Graduate School's attempt to address internationalization.

D. Jones asked if the change meant that the Graduate School needed less time than before, and Dean Blackwell confirmed that less time was needed to process documentation.

Mendiondo **moved** that the Senate approve the change in the application date for international applicants, effective immediately. Wasilkowski **seconded**. Grossman opined that the applications dates of the calendar were more of an administrative matter. The Chair confirmed that the calendars were within the purview of the Senate.

There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

12. Memorandum of Understanding – Libraries and College of Law

The Chair explained that the agenda item at hand proposed to move six tenure-track faculty positions from Libraries to the College of Law (Law). He asked Dean David Brennen (College of Law) to come forward and explain the matter. Dean Brennan said that when he arrived at UK about seven months ago, he noticed that the administrative structure at the Law Library was out of sync with other law schools. Of about 200 law schools accredited by the American Bar Association, about six schools have structures such as the one currently in place at UK.

Currently, the Law Library staff and faculty, half of the director position budget and the budget for the Law Library is housed in Libraries. This has impacted the Law Library in a couple of ways – it has been more difficult to attract and in some cases retain directors of the Law Library and it affects the ability of Law to undergo a simplified accreditation process. The current structure does not make accreditation impossible, but it does require an extra round of questions and processes that would be avoided if the Law Library had some autonomy from Libraries. Dean Brennan said that he had spoken with a number of people at UK, include Libraries Interim Dean Birdwhistell, former dean of Libraries Carol Diedrichs, the current Law Library director, each law librarian and the staff members of the Law Library. All expressed support for the move, and all votes taken were unanimous in terms of supporting the transfer. He said that the move would be made effective July 1, 2010. Dean Birdwhistell added that Libraries offered a positive statement for the move, and had submitted letters of support.

Estus **moved** that the Senate endorse the administrative move of the Law Library unit from Libraries to the College of Law, under the conditions specified in the joint Memorandum of Understanding. English **seconded**. Estus asked for and received confirmation from Dean Brennan that the faculty involved in the move were supportive of it. D. Jones asked for additional information about law librarian tenure and promotion processes. Dean Brennan said that after the move, the tenure and promotion process would be within Law, and those tenured Librarians would be tenured in Law. A dual track was set up, so that after the move law librarians will be under almost identical policies to what had been used in Libraries. D. Jones asked about Librarians serving as voting members for educational policy-making in Law. Dean Brennan was unable to say which matters Law Librarians would be able to vote on, but said the Law Librarians, in terms of faculty status, would have rights as faculty of Law.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion that the Senate endorse the administrative move of the Law Library unit from Libraries to the College of Law, under the conditions specified in the joint Memorandum of Understanding. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

13. Proposed Change to SR 1.4.2.9 (“Senate Institutional Finances and Resources Allocation Committee”)

The Chair explained that the changed language regarding the Senate’s Institutional Finances and Resources Allocation Committee (SIFRAC) was a joint effort of the Staff Senate and Senate Council; the Senate was now being asked to approve the changes. Jones **offered an amendment** to change the language¹ in *i.* pertaining to the purpose of SIFRAC to read as follows:

...Committee shall analyze public budget documents, published reports about financial and other trends, ~~be routinely offered~~ shall routinely solicit an informational session by a university financial officer on annual budget proposals and....

Nadel **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken on the amendment to change the language in section *i.* pertaining to the purpose of SIFRAC from “be routinely offered” to “shall routinely solicit.” The motion **passed** with none opposed.

There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion that the Senate approve the change to language in SR 1.4.2.9. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Hollie Swanson,
University Senate Secretary

Absences: Adams; Almasi; Arents; Arnold; Atwood; Back; Cheever; Culver; Dyer; Edgerton; Etensohn; Gonzalez*; Gorringer; Hall; Hardesty; Hardin-Fanning; Harris*; Heller; Humphrey; Jackson; Januzzi; Jensen; Karan; Kidwell*; Kirk*; Kirschling*; Kornbluh; Kovash; Kwon; Lester; Maglinger; Martin*; McCormick*; McCorvey; McMahan; McNamara; Mehra; Meyer; Mobley; Montgomery*; Mountford; Mullen; Nardolillo; D. O’Hair; M O’Hair; Perman; Perry; Prats; Ray*; Richey; Riese-Kinney; Ritchie; Robinson; Rohr*; Rouse; Santhanam*; Shannon; Shay; M.S. Smith*; R. Smith; Speaks*; Steiner; Stenhoff; Suarez; Subbaswamy; Sudharshan; Sutphen; Telling; Todd; Tracy; Travis; Troske; Turner; Viele; Watt*; Wells; Whitt; Wiseman; Witt; Zhang.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on March 31, 2010.

¹ Strikethrough denotes deleted text; underline denotes added text.

* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.