

University Senate  
February 9, 2009

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, February 9, 2009 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 David Randall called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:04 pm.

1. Minutes from December 8 and Announcements

The Chair noted that one correction was made to the minutes after being distributed to senators. Hayes **moved** to approve the minutes from December 8, 2008 as amended and Bollinger **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion passed without dissent.

Turning to announcements, the Chair noted that in terms of expenses, paper was second only to personnel costs in the Office of the Senate Council (OSC). He said paper copies of meeting agendas (“handout”) would be gradually phased out to save on paper costs and trees, although a senator who wished to reserve a hard copy of the handout should simply alert the OSC in advance of the meeting.

Bollinger commented that since many senators would merely print out their own copies, there would be no change to the amount of paper used, only to which office supplied the paper for printing, which Randall acknowledged. Peterson explained that she reviewed the agenda in advance, printed what hard copies she needed, and followed along with the rest of the agenda on a laptop.

The Chair said that a complete handout was provided for the day’s meeting, but that as mentioned, if a senator needs a paper copy, s/he merely needs to contact the OSC and request a paper copy in advance.

Regarding waivers, the Chair explained that the Senate Council (SC) voted to allow a student to earn a fourth bachelor’s degree, waiving the limitation in the *Senate Rules (SR)* of two bachelor’s degrees.

Yanarella, senator and trustee, is scheduled to give the 2009 Chellgren Center kickoff address on February 12.

The Staff Senate is collecting pennies to benefit pediatric oncology – senators were given a complete list of drop-off points for pennies in the handout.

Revisions to the *Administrative Regulations (AR) II-1.0-1 (Parts I – III)* (pertaining to tenure) have been reviewed by the SC and others over the past few months. Six months ago, in the first round, pages I-III of *AR II-1.0-1* were combined into a single *AR* on faculty policies and procedures, and it was reorganized to improve the usability of the regulation. A recent round of revision was precipitated by the Provost’s whitepaper on Top 20 Faculty Policies; among the changes being looked at carefully are a

comprehensive tenure review and explicit language for terminal reconsideration of tenure after a negative tenure decision in the previous year. The Chair noted that the comprehensive review would be one that could not be stopped by a dean and would be initiated sometime at or before the sixth year. The next consideration is under what circumstances would a terminal year review be allowed; the Chair said that the SC was discussing the issue aggressively and that the Senate would be kept informed and would have an opportunity in the future for input on the language.

## 2. [Program Deletion - Minor in Quantitative Financial Analysis](#)

The Chair invited Scott Kelley, director of the School of Management in the Gatton College of Business and Economics, to explain the proposal. Guest Kelley said that the minor had been approved about five years ago and since that time, to his knowledge there had never been a student pursuing the minor. There has been a bit of a shift in the focus of finance faculty away from the minor's topic. That, coupled with a lack of student demand and an inability to resource the minor, was the impetus for the School of Management to request deletion of the minor.

Bollinger **moved** to approve the deletion of the minor in Quantitative Financial Analysis and Steiner **seconded**. Snow referred to the current national financial crisis and asked if it was possible that the area of quantitative financial analysis could be a hot topic in the future. Kelley replied that two of the three courses required for the minor would remain available. The Chair noted that the proposal was positively recommended by the SC and that the SC had wondered about the possibility of suspending the program instead of deleting it. Kelley said that he appreciated the comments of Steiner during the SC's review of the deletion; Steiner was of the opinion that if there were no expectation of offering the program in the near future, it would be more honest to delete the minor rather than suspend it. Steiner added that the minor would remain in the Bulletin if it were to be suspended instead of deleted, and that he still thought deleting the proposal was more appropriate.

In response to Moliterno's question as to whether there were any lessons the Senate could learn from the approval and subsequent deletion of the minor, Kelley opined that he was not able to answer that question because he had not been overly involved in the creation of the minor. He said it was possible that the original proposal would have benefitted from a better job of assessing student demand.

There being no further comments or questions, the Chair called for a **vote** on the motion to approve the deletion of the minor in Quantitative Financial Analysis. The motion **passed** without dissent.

## 3. [Graduate Certificate in Distance Education](#)

The Chair invited Doug Smith, from the Department of Curriculum and Instruction in the College of Education, to explain the proposal for a new Graduate Certificate in Distance Education. Guest Smith explained that both the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation Counseling and the Department of Curriculum and Instruction were heavily involved in distance education matters for years. Each department had plans to create its own graduate certificate, but opted to instead create one graduate certificate with two tracks.

Hayes **moved** to approve the new Graduate Certificate in Distance Education, effective immediately. Parker **seconded**. There being no discussion regarding the proposal, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** without dissent.

#### 4. [New Dual Degree Program: PharmD and Masters of Public Health](#)

The Chair invited Kelly Smith, from the Department of Pharmacy Practice and Science in the College of Pharmacy, to explain the proposal. Guest Kelly said that the proposal was similar to other dual degree programs with colleagues in Public Administration and Business Administration.

Moliterno **moved** approve the creation of a new dual degree program of a PharmD and Masters of Public Health. Chappell **seconded**.

In response to a question from Wood, Smith explained that the student would pay tuition based on the area in which the student had primary enrollment for the semester, which would likely be in the College of Pharmacy for the majority of the time. Responding to concerns from Tagavi about an undergraduate degree, Smith stated that a student must achieve the PharmD degree prior to the MS in Public Health. If the student was struggling, and as long as the BS requirements were met, a student could just earn a BS with the MS in Public Health.

There being no further comments, a **vote** was taken on the motion to approve the new dual degree program of a PharmD and Masters of Public Health. The motion **passed** without dissent.

#### 5. [Informational Presentation on Coldstream Research Campus](#)

The Chair invited Vice President for Commercialization and Economic Development Len Heller to give his presentation on Coldstream Research Campus, which he did. After speaking for about 10 minutes, he invited questions.

Yanarella asked if Coldstream Research Campus was a money-making enterprise for UK, and if not, when would it be? Heller replied that the primary source of revenue came from leases for the use of the land. Due to costs, UK cannot build roads or raise buildings on its own there, but it can give developers a large space of land, on which they can construct buildings and create roads.

The Chair thanked Heller for his presentation.

#### 6. [New Distance Learning Form](#)

The Chair explained that the Senate was being asked to approve part of a process, and not necessarily the form itself. In order to satisfy accreditation processes, new review procedures had been developed for proposals to change the delivery mode of instruction, i.e. utilize distance learning (DL). The Chair explained that the DL Form in the handout was based upon a SACS policy statement regarding distance education. The Chair clarified that the Senate was not being asked to approve the form, since it would be unwieldy to request Senate approval of any change to the form, but rather was being asked to approve the requirement of submitting the form with requests for change in delivery method.

Yanarella **moved** to approve the requirement that the Distance Learning Form be submitted with any course form requesting distance learning delivery. D. Anderson **seconded**. Yost noted that at the top of the form there was language stating that the DL Form was intended to be used in conjunction with requests to change the delivery mode. He wondered about requiring the form for any request to make any type of change to a course, not just a change in the delivery mode.

Dean Blackwell commented that the new form was done in conjunction with a variety of other DL initiatives. She noted that Distance Learning Programs has posted an online toolkit to help guide faculty through the process of developing DL courses. She added that an advisory committee was being formed to review currently existing courses and programs that have been designated as DL, and will use "Quality Matters," a national assessment tool, to ensure the included courses and programs are delivered in accordance with the SACS definition of DL and that quality measures have been reviewed, which SACS will expect during the next accreditation visit. She said that she would be in contact with various individuals about the schedule of the review, as appropriate.

Yost again asked why there would be no requirement to submit the DL Form when any change to the course was made, not just a change regarding delivery mode. He also wondered about use of the DL Form for courses that had already been approved for DL delivery. Wood supported Yost's comments and opined that if a course was already approved for DL delivery and any change was requested, the DL Form should be submitted again, since it was possible that a change in the course content could affect the course delivery mode.

Mitchell commented that although the Senate was not being asked to approve the particular form, the wording of the motion (specifically "the") implied that the DL Form presented to the Senate was indeed being approved, not just the requirement to use the form. Mitchell **offered a friendly amendment** to change "the" to "a" in the motion's wording. Yanarella commented that it was his interpretation that the Senate was being asked to require the use of the DL Form, not to approve the contents of the DL Form. He acknowledged that the proposed friendly amendment add clarity, and said that he **accepted** Mitchell's friendly amendment. D. Anderson also **accepted** the friendly amendment, so the new wording was changed to read as follows: Senate moves to approve the requirement that a Distance Learning Form be submitted with any course form requesting distance learning delivery.

Yost reiterated that he would like to see a requirement that the DL Form be submitted when there was any change to any DL course, not just a change in the delivery mode. Tagavi wondered if there should be a requirement to submit the DL Form even if a course was changed via a minor change request.

Bollinger stated that he was rather uncomfortable with the vagueness of the motion – he was not clear on which form had to be submitted (because the motion language had changed and could apply to any DL form, not just the one presented to the Senate), and he was also not clear on the circumstances under which the DL Form had to be submitted. Bollinger **moved** to table the proposal for a New Distance Learning Form until the March Senate meeting. Jones **seconded**.

Mrs. Brothers commented that the DL Form was currently posted online and was marked with “Pending University Senate Approval”; she wanted senators to know that it was being utilized while Senate deliberations were continuing. No one expressed any concern about the ongoing use of the DL Form in its current state.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to table the proposal for a New Distance Learning Form until the March Senate meeting. The results of the vote were not clear after a voice vote was taken, so the Chair called again for a vote, this time by a show of hands. The **motion** to table subsequently **passed** with 38 senators in favor and 20 against.

#### 7. [New University Senate Syllabi Guidelines](#)

The Chair explained that the Senate was being asked to approve new University Senate Syllabi Guidelines for faculty to use as guidelines when preparing syllabi for course applications for submission to an academic council (Graduate Council, or GC; Health Care Colleges Council, or HCCC; and Undergraduate Council, or UC). The Syllabi Guidelines are based on wording from the Ombud and from input received.

D. Williams **moved** to approve the use of the Syllabi Guidelines by the Graduate Council, Health Care Colleges Council and the Undergraduate Council when reviewing course applications. Chappell **seconded**.

Troske asked if faculty at large would be bound by the Syllabi Guidelines; Tagavi (senator and Ombud) replied that that was not the case – the Syllabi Guidelines were designed to give uniformity amongst the GC, HCCC and UC when reviewing course applications. The Syllabi Guidelines would be neither retroactive nor would faculty at large be expected to adhere to them; the Syllabi Guidelines were intended to be used by the academic councils, within the Senate apparatus.

After a few additional comments, a **vote** was held on the motion to approve the use of the Syllabi Guidelines by the Graduate Council, Health Care Colleges Council and the Undergraduate Council when reviewing course applications. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 8. [New University Scholars Program: BS Hospitality Management and Tourism & MS Hospitality and Dietetics Administration](#)

The Chair invited Janet Kurzynske, from the Department of Nutrition and Food Science in the College of Agriculture to the podium. Guest Kurzynske explained that there are three majors in the Department of Nutrition and Food Science – Hospitality Management, Human Nutrition, and Dietetics. She said that students in the bachelor’s program in Human Nutrition typically went into other related areas, such as pharmacy, physical therapy, etc., and not necessarily into a master’s program in human nutrition.

Kurzynske said that students in the undergraduate programs typically ended their four years of academics with an internship at a particular organization, which was frequently followed by a job offer

from the internship organization. In such situations, pursuing a graduate degree was not seen by students as favorable. Kurzynske noted that if approved, students in the University Scholars Program between a BS in Hospitality Management and Tourism and an MS in Hospitality Management would be allowed to have up to 12 hours of credits count toward both the BS and MS.

McNeil **moved** approve the new University Scholars Program of a BS Hospitality Management and Tourism and an MS Hospitality and Dietetics Administration. D. Williams **seconded**. In response to a question by Troske, Kurzynske assured him that there was indeed student demand for the proposed program – even if a student were offered a very good starting salary after the end of an internship, students were more likely to pursue a graduate degree if they could use one semester’s work to satisfy both the BS and MS.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion to approve the new University Scholars Program of a BS Hospitality Management and Tourism and an MS Hospitality and Dietetics Administration. The motion **passed** without dissent.

#### 9. [New University Scholars Program: BS Dietetics & MS Hospitality and Dietetics Administration](#)

Kurzynske explained this proposal, as well. She said that in order for students enrolled in Dietetics to become a registered dietitian, an internship program must be completed, and in order to complete an internship program, students had to be admitted to the Graduate School. Even though students have to complete 148 credit hours, plus a seven-month internship, to earn the BS, many students do proceed to the master’s degree. Kurzynske noted, though, that there was a desire to give students a bit more flexibility since there were so many hours required just for the BS.

Bollinger **moved** that the Senate approve the new University Scholars Program of a BS Dietetics and an MS Hospitality and Dietetics Administration. Chappell **seconded**. Kurzynske confirmed for Bollinger that if a student took a 400G-level course as a part of this USP program, the hours would count towards both undergraduate and graduate credit.

Wermeling asked about how such a proposal would affect the scholarly productivity of faculty. Kurzynske replied that the proposal would hopefully attract more graduate students, which would aid in the production of presentations and research papers.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion to approve the new University Scholars Program of a BS Dietetics and an MS Hospitality and Dietetics Administration **passed** with none opposed.

#### 10. [2009 Honorary Degree Nominees](#)

The Chair noted that his previous request for senators to communicate with their constituencies did not apply to the agenda item regarding honorary degrees. He said it was important to keep the names confidential until such time as the Board of Trustees met and ultimately approved the nominees. He noted that even the meeting minutes would not contain the nominees’ names.

The Chair suggested that senators discuss each nominee separately, but that if there was no objection, one motion could be made to approve all three nominees at once. The Chair invited Dean Blackwell, chair of the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees (UJCHD), to describe the first nominee, which she did.

When Dean Blackwell was done describing the first nominee, Jones asked for additional information regarding why the first nominee was particularly distinguished. Kalika spoke up; he said that he had no involvement with the UJCHD deliberations, but that he was pleased to see the nomination. Kalika went on to offer additional information regarding the candidate's credentials.

Troske referred to his status as a first-term senator and asked for some basic information about honorary degrees in general and the conditions of merit for nominees. Dean Blackwell explained that the purpose of an honorary degree is to reward excellence and long-standing performance at the premier level in any discipline, not just academic disciplines. There was a desire for some type of connection to Kentucky and/or the University of Kentucky (through contributions to UK, a personal connection to UK, etc.), although that was not required to be nominated.

The Chair commented that as chair of the Senate Council, he was involved in the selection process – he said that he had not observed a series of more careful or heart-wrenching decisions as the UJCHD reviewed the many nominations and ultimately came up with three nominees.

In response to a variety of questions about the usefulness of offering an honorary degree to a person who has already earned one undergraduate and two graduate degrees from UK, Dean Blackwell explained that the titles of honorary degrees differed from earned degrees (the honorific is obvious in the degree type awarded). In addition, such awards would be listed separately on the curriculum vitae, under a heading pertaining to honors and awards.

Jones asked about the honorary degree type to be awarded – Dean Blackwell replied that it would be an Honorary Doctorate of Engineering.

There being no further questions, the Chair suggested Dean Blackwell present the second nominee, which she did. There were no comments about the second nominee.

Dean Blackwell then presented information about the third nominee and there were no questions posed by senators. In response to a question from Jones about the degree types for the nominees, the Chair showed senators a PowerPoint slide that identified the proposed honorary degree types for the first, second and third nominees as an Honorary Doctor of Engineering, an Honorary Doctor of Science, and an Honorary Doctor of Letters, respectively.

There being no further discussion, D. Anderson **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 Board of Trustees. Chappell **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 11. December 2008 List of BCTC Candidates for Credentials

The Chair requested a motion to approve the December 2008 list of Bluegrass Community and Technical College Candidates for Credentials.

Jones **moved** that the elected university faculty senators approve the December 2008 Bluegrass Community and Technical College list of candidates for credentials, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board of Trustee. D. Williams **seconded**. There being no comments or questions, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** without dissent.

#### 12. Update on Curricular Teams

The Chair said that he wanted to give senators an update on the 10 curricular teams. He said that the process for identifying the members of each committee began when Provost Subbaswamy submitted some suggestions to the SC. The SC agreed to one-third of the Provost's suggestions, then the SC came up with an additional one-third of names, and the other third were those names that were purely within the purview of Provost Subbaswamy. A total of about 130 names were identified and all but a handful of those contacted agreed to serve. By the time of the Senate meeting, every curricular team had met at least once. He said that senators would shortly be shown a SharePoint site where activities of the curricular teams could be reviewed, via curricular team rosters, documents and meeting notes. He said the intent was to make the process as open as possible so that any faculty member will be able to see all the activities involved as GenEd moves forward.

Regarding the timing of presentations to the Senate regarding the curricular teams, the Chair noted that while the original intent was to have a first reading in March and then a vote in April on the work of the curricular teams, it is unlikely that the curricular teams will have completed their tasks by early March. Therefore, the Chair informed senators that the first reading and subsequent vote would take place in April and May, respectively.

The Chair asked Provost's Liaison to the Senate Council Richard Greissman to walk senators through the SharePoint GenEd site. Chappell asked Greissman to first explain the eleventh team, a co-curricular team, to senators. Guest Greissman replied that individuals from the Advising Network and Student Affairs had been specifically working on co-curricular matters for about two years, which started with Provost Subbaswamy's call for a "war on attrition." The group submitted a final report after two conferences, and the Provost thought the report came at a propitious time, as the curricular teams were being formed. Although there were 10 faculty curricular teams, the Provost wanted to also recognize and use the report regarding co-curricular matters. The Provost asked the Advising Network and Student Affairs to each recommend five individuals to serve on an eleventh team, that of a co-curricular team. The focus of the co-curricular team is to reinforce the GenEd aspects that fall outside the classroom.



Greissman reported that the co-curricular team met for the first time during the past week, and would be watching the actions of the 10 curricular teams; recommendations would be offered as appropriate. Dean Blackwell added that the co-curricular team would look at things like experiential and career internships, as well as study abroad and the possibility of an online student portfolio which could be aligned with a new GenEd.

Greissman then proceeded to walk senators through the GenEd SharePoint site; he showed senators how to navigate to rosters, team documents and meeting notes. He added that the SharePoint site address was difficult to memorize, but anyone with a myUK ID would be able to log in via the GenEd SharePoint Website. The Chair mentioned that faculty could also contact Greissman personally if problems with logging in were encountered.

There being no further business to attend to, the meeting was adjourned at 4:36 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Stephanie Aken,  
University Senate Secretary.

Absences: Adams; Arnold; Atwood\*; Barnes\*; Bernard; Bishop\*; Blades; Brown, J.; Brown, S.; Crofford; Desormeaux; Effgen\*; English\*; Enlow; Ettensohn; Fox; Gonzalez\*; Graham; Griffith\*; Hoffman; Houtz\*; Hughes; Jackson, V.; Jackson, J.; Jung; Kidwell\*; Kirschling; Leibfreid; Lester; Marano; Martin; McCorvey; Mehra\*; Mendiondo\*; Miller, B.\*; Miller, J.\*; Mobley; Moise; Montell; Nardolillo; Parrot; Pauly\*; Perman; Perry; Richard; Roorda; Sandidge\*; Santhanam\*; Sawaya; Schoenberg\*; Segerstrom\*; Shay; Smith, M.S.; Starr-LeBeau\*; Stenhoff\*; Subbaswamy; Sudharshan; Swanson\*; Telling\*; Terrell; Thompson; Todd; Tracy; Turner; Viele; Waterman; Watt; Webb; Williams, G.; Wiseman; Witt, D.; Witt, M.; Woods; Wyatt.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, February 11, 2009.

---

\* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting