

University Senate  
March 9, 2009

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, March 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.

Senate Council Chair David Randall called the meeting to order at 3:01 pm.

1. Minutes from February 9 and Announcements

Hayes **moved** to approve the minutes from February 9 as distributed. Perry **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the minutes from February 9 were approved as distributed.

The Chair had a couple of announcements to report to senators. The first was a rule waiver approved by the Senate Council (SC) for a student who wanted to utilize the repeat option but was not currently enrolled at UK. Secondly, the Chair reported that revisions to *Administrative Regulations II-1.0-1*, Parts I – III would be sent to senators and faculty councils in the near future for input; the Senate is scheduled to vote to endorse or not to endorse the proposed changes prior to the end of the semester.

2. [Memorial Resolution for College of Design Professor Stephen Deger](#)

College of Design Professor Bruce Swetnam read a memorial resolution in honor of Professor Stephen Deger.

STEPHEN C. DEGER  
1939-2009  
Professor of Architecture  
University of Kentucky College of Design

Stephen C. Deger, Professor of Architecture at the University of Kentucky, died January 8, 2009 of natural causes at his home in Lexington, Kentucky.

Professor Stephen Deger always knew that he wanted to design buildings. It was this desire that guided him through a successful career as an architect and an educator. He received his B.S. in Architecture from the University of Cincinnati in 1963, and his M.S. in Architectural Engineering from the University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, in 1966. He began teaching at the University of Kentucky College of Architecture in the fall of 1966 and taught here continuously through the fall of 2008.

Professor Deger was passionate about architecture, but he was even more passionate about the work of his students. He was a truly inspirational teacher, mentor and colleague, and he touched all those fortunate enough to have known him. His students remember fondly his unique ability to both challenge and inspire, while his colleagues and friends will always remember his wit, intelligence, and selflessness.

Friends of Professor Deger shared these memories of his endearing idiosyncrasies: he loved Reese's Peanut Butter Cups to a fault; he spent hours in libraries reading Mid-Century Modernist magazines; and he loved to explore the built environment by attending real estate open houses.

A former student, Brian Stephen Rosen (Class of 2001), had this to say about Professor Deger: "He changed my life. I remember when I came to visit UK's campus, trying to find a home in architecture and not sure of my abilities or myself. Professor Deger believed in my potential, he believed that anyone with the heart and passion for architecture could be a part of it. That is such an important ingredient in a professor and teacher. I feel very fortunate that our paths crossed. I will always remember Professor Deger. Thank you for believing."

Another of his former students and colleague who is now an architect and professor remembered Professor Deger this way: "As we traverse through life there are milestones. We may not recognize them when they are in front of us, but when we look back they are clearly visible. Stephen C. Deger is responsible for a number of those moments in my life. As a student in Professor Deger's third year studio I learned, more than any anywhere else, analytical thinking and creativity. Stephen opened the doors for me and influenced my development as an architect and a teacher. He was a mentor and a friend and I am deeply in his debt."

We celebrate Stephen's life, his quiet demeanor, his quirkiness, his insight, his wonderful sense of humor, and most of all his teaching. Stephen was a devout Christian and I believe that in his eternal life he will have the great pleasure of knowing how many lives that he touched and changed for the better. Well done, Stephen!"

Stephen C. Deger changed lives one at a time and as a result he left the University of Kentucky and this world a better place than he found it. His contribution will endure for years to come. In honor of Stephen's ability to change the lives of so many incoming undergraduates, the Stephen C. Deger Scholarship fund has been established.

The College of Design will hold a Memorial service for Stephen Deger on Tuesday, April 14, at 6:00 p.m. in the Student Center Theater. The service will be followed by a reception in Pence Hall.

A moment of silence was held in Professor Deger's honor.

Hayes **moved** that the resolution be made part of the minutes of the University Senate and that a copy be sent to Professor Deger's family. Chappell **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion passed without dissent.

### 3. [Annual State of the Library Address – Libraries Dean Carol Diedrichs](#)

The Chair invited Dean Carol Diedrichs to offer her [presentation](#). After Dean Diedrichs' presentation, she solicited questions. Hayes asked about improvements to the Engineering Library. Dean Diedrichs replied that attention by the accrediting agency helped push improvements. Hayes went on to comment about the inordinately high cost of digital library subscriptions and wondered if universities ever got together to lobby for lower prices for digital libraries. Hayes added that it was a shame for faculty to do without some articles, especially current ones.

Dean Diedrichs replied by noting that faculty should never have to do without an article that was not available through UK Libraries – she said that Interlibrary Loan fields over 32,000 request every year for articles not available at UK. Regarding digital libraries, Dean Diedrichs said that libraries did work together in group purchases and have been for more than 20 years, but that it would also be helpful for faculty who are members of their professional society/association to lobby their professional groups to lower costs as well.

In response to a question from Janecek about print monographs, Dean Diedrichs replied that UK Libraries is at full capacity and any new print item coming in requires something to be moved to remote storage. She noted that over \$100,000 is spent annually to store materials.

Dean Diedrichs answered Snow's question about professional development in times of decreasing budgets by saying that although travel costs may seem easy to cut, the amount of money spent does not overly burden the budget. In addition, professional development is essential for librarians.

The Chair thanked Dean Diedrichs and she returned to her seat.

### 4. [New Graduate Certificate: Global Health](#)

The Chair invited Professor Julia Costich, from the College of Public Health, to explain the proposal. Guest Costich said that the proposed graduate certificate was developed by an interdisciplinary team from a handful of different colleges. All required courses were already in existence, and students would have a large variety of electives to choose from.

The Chair noted that all of the day's proposals came to the Senate with a positive recommendation from the SC.

Jensen **moved** to approve the new Graduate Certificate in Global Health. Arnold **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** without dissent.

### 5. [New Bachelor of Arts Degree: Gender and Women's Studies](#)

Professor Susan Bordo, from the College of Arts and Sciences, explained the proposal. Guest Bordo said that development began back in 2005, along with a proposal to transition from program status to

departmental status. She explained that this is why all the faculty resources are currently already in place. She noted that a flowchart illustrating deployment of faculty resources was also included.

Chappell asked about the number of students who were anticipated to enroll. Bordo replied that it was somewhat difficult to estimate, but that a best guess would be an initial enrollment of about 20 students, with an increase of 10 students or so per year afterwards.

Sellnow **moved** to approve the new Bachelor of Arts degree in Gender and Women's Studies. D. Anderson **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** without dissent.

#### 6. [Update on Curricular Teams](#)

Susan Carvalho, convener of the General Education Reform Steering Committee, offered senators a brief update on the activities of the 10 curricular teams. Guest Carvalho commented that many curricular team members were present in the audience. She also noted that the curricular team information in the handout and posted with the online Senate agenda was already out of date by at least two versions – she asked senators to visit [www.uky.edu/GenEd](http://www.uky.edu/GenEd) to access a newer version.

Regarding resources, Carvalho explained that at the end of each template, the curricular teams (CT) were asked to outline some possible delivery models for courses, including the number of students and what type of TA support would be required. The 11<sup>th</sup> CT, along with Provost Subbaswamy, was doing the math to find out what the program will cost. They are also looking at costs of the current gen ed, “University Studies Program.” Carvalho said that in conjunction with products from the CT, senators would also receive a statement of feasibility of implementation from Provost Subbaswamy. The delivery information will be removed from the CT documents, however, since they are not really part of the curriculum. She said that anything extraneous, such as bibliographic material, would be pulled out of the frameworks prior to the Senate vote – they were included currently so faculty would have access to that information.

Carvalho explained that members of the CT were meeting with departments, colleges, educational policy committees, deans, deans' staff, etc., whenever they were invited, to make sure all faculty have seen, talked about and voiced concerns regarding the output of the ten CT. She added that all comments and concerns are shared with the CT so when the finalized version comes to the Senate in April, there will not be any new, major issues to contend with. Carvalho reiterated that the collective wisdom of the faculty was best offered presently, and not on the floor during the Senate's April discussion.

A meeting with DGS and DUS faculty in the College of Engineering resulted in a good discussion about the number of credits required for Engineering programs; that area was looking good. Carvalho noted that such activities should be taking place in all colleges, so colleges can report to the CT what the changes will mean to students in terms of required credit hours for a degree, how TAs might be affected, etc.

Nadel asked if the implementation feasibility statement would include feasibility if salaries were frozen or if it would be implemented with funds that should be used for faculty salary increases; Carvalho said that she would pass that question on to those responsible for the report.

Chappell noted that a list of instructional outcomes will be presented to senators in April, and wondered when senators would have a chance to see something like a list of approved Gen Ed courses. Carvalho replied that the work of the CT would need to be approved first, after which some as-yet-unnamed committee would receive the report and be charged to act upon it. She added that, if the Senate approves the course templates in May, then there will be work ongoing over the summer. In the fall semester, faculty members, departments and colleges could begin the process of presenting syllabi to illustrate how a course syllabus meets the Senate-approved course requirements. A launch date for the new Gen Ed cannot effectively be decided upon until there is a sufficient number of courses to offer. One option might be a pilot implementation if there were not enough courses ready to be approved under the Gen Ed guidelines. Carvalho added that if the current templates were confusing, she wanted to know so that they could be revised for better understanding.

In response to a question from Wermeling about existing courses, Carvalho explained that some courses would no longer be used in a new Gen Ed, although they could still be used for other purposes; some courses would be modified to meet requirements for a new Gen Ed; and new courses could be created. Wermeling wondered about how programs would know if Gen Ed requirements were met without the benefit of seeing all the courses approved for inclusion in Gen Ed. Carvalho replied that one could look at the template to see the requirements for Gen Ed and compare that to what the program already requires/offers. If there is a tension between satisfying a Gen Ed template and a program's requirements, the Gen Ed template would be used and the other requirements would be satisfied through the program's required courses. Since Gen Ed would require 30 hours (compared to 45 hours for the University Studies Program , or USP), there would be wriggle room. Carvalho reiterated that departments should be reviewing their program requirements to see what adjustments would be needed. If a department was not sure about how to go about doing that, Carvalho and others were consistently available to help departments with such efforts.

Janacek asked about the resource requirements that were in the handout for the curricular teams – he expressed a desire to be able to access that information somewhere if it were removed. Carvalho said that there was a desire to ensure there was sufficient detail present for programs to know that a new Gen Ed would be implementable and would not wreak havoc. The curricular teams are made up of 120 faculty members who will present the curricular aspect to Provost Subbaswamy, who will be responsible for figuring out the finances. The University Senate, however, is charged with determining if a new Gen Ed is a curricular framework which will benefit students.

Yanarella suggested that Janacek communicate any resource concerns to the curricular teams so that known issues can be worked on.

The Chair asked if there were any further questions for Carvalho – there were none. He noted that each of the 10 curricular teams’ templates would be reviewed in April, and strongly suggested that senators be familiar with each one prior to the meeting. Carvalho asked that senators act as liaisons for the April Senate meeting and talk about the efforts of the curricular teams with colleagues.

Arnold asked about the process for implementation if problems were identified. Carvalho responded that there was currently no plan for dealing with failure, but that any identified problems should be shared with the curricular teams as soon as possible. She assumed that the back-up plan would necessarily be a continued use of the current USP.

#### 7. [Revisiting the New Distance Learning Form](#)

The Chair recalled that discussion on the new Distance Learning Form had been tabled in February to clarify when it would be required. He noted that senators were being asked to approve the requirement that the form be used for requests to modify the delivery mode of courses, as well as for [requests to modify courses that have been previously approved for distance learning \(DL\) delivery](#).

Chappell **moved** that the Senate approve the requirement that the Distance Learning Form be used in conjunction with: requests to modify course delivery; and requests to change current DL-approved courses, as appropriate. Houtz **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 8. [New Graduate Certificate: Assistive and Rehabilitation Technology](#)

The Chair invited Professor Margaret Bausch to explain the proposal. She said that federal law mandates that all students with disabilities be considered for assistive technology, affecting over six million students in the United States. She said that school districts and rehabilitation agencies need people trained in this area, which is the population to be served by the proposed graduate certificate. She volunteered to answer questions, but there were none.

Yanarella **moved** to approve the new Graduate Certificate in Assistive and Rehabilitation Technology and McCormick **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 9. [Change to College of Engineering Probation and Suspension Rules](#)

College of Engineering Associate Dean for Administration and Academic Affairs Rick Sweigard explained the proposal. Guest Sweigard said that there was just one substantive change, pertaining to the time frame in which a certain cumulative GPA must be earned. He explained that under the current policy, a student whose GPA drops below a 2.0 after one semester is suspended from the college. Sweigard said that the primary change would be to require a 2.0 GPA after two semesters – this would give a student the opportunity to utilize the repeat option and perhaps bring up their grades without having to be suspended from the college and moved to “Undergraduate Studies.” He added that there were a few wording issues that were changed, too.

In response to a question from Zentall, Sweigard explained that there was no lower limit by which the old rule would apply. Sawaya wondered if the suspension and probation activities were a benefit to students. Sweigard replied that there are freshman advisors who help students remediate the problem, as well as select appropriate courses. It was relatively simple to improve the GPA in the second semester with the appropriate use of repeat options.

Chappell commented that he appreciated the spirit in which it was proposed, but wondered if the revised language would only serve to save marginal students. Sweigard said that it was a retention step – it would give students one more semester to get back on track. Such a policy is common in other programs. In response to Arnold, Sweigard said that in the fall semester, such a change would have affected 90 students out of the 450 students in the freshman class.

Hayes suggested additional information be shared about pre-engineering status. Sweigard obliged, saying that any student admitted to the College of Engineering (CoE) is placed in “pre- standing” and has to satisfy certain requirements prior to taking any upper level classes. He noted that the proposed change would not result in more substandard students graduating, but rather would give students one more semester in which to increase their grades. He opined that many students with a GPA below 2.0 after the first semester likely have the intellectual capacity to succeed, but might have just encountered a bump in the road.

Sottile commented that under the proposed language, if a student went on probation in the first semester, they could remain in CoE for advising, which was preferable to the student being removed from the college’s advising net. In response to a question from Parker, Sweigard explained that with appropriate use of repeat options, a student could get quite a bit above a 2.0, even to a 2.5, during the second semester. There were no other comments or questions.

D. Anderson **moved** to approve the changes to the probation and suspension rules in the College of Engineering. Effgen **seconded**.

Tagavi **offered a friendly amendment** to add “UK” to modify “GPA” in the last line of number three. Both D. Anderson and Effgen **accepted**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 10. Informational Presentation on UK’s Advising Network

The Chair invited Matthew Deffendall from the Central Advising Service and Transfer Service to share information about UK’s advising services. Guest Deffendall gave a presentation and spoke for about 10 minutes. Afterwards, it was suggested that his presentation and the web address for the department (<http://www.uky.edu/UGS/centadv/>) be emailed to senators.

#### 11. Proposed Resolution Regarding Tenure and the Kentucky Community and Technical College System

The Chair said that he assumed senators were aware of the news regarding the proposed action by the Kentucky Community and Technical College System (KCTCS) Board of Regents (BoR) to no longer issue

tenure-based contracts. The faculty who are currently tenured would be grandfathered in, but no new tenured positions would be created or filled. Instead, employees would be issued contracts for one to four years of service. He explained that the SC developed a resolution, as had several other schools in Kentucky. The Chair went on to say that if the Senate so approved, he would send the resolution to BoR and other interested individuals the next day. He directed senators to the language on the overhead screen:

In light of plans to place on the Kentucky Community and Technical College System (KCTCS) Board of Regents agenda for its forthcoming meeting a proposal to end tenure in the Kentucky's community and technical college system, we, the members of the University of Kentucky Senate Council and University Senate in our capacity to represent the faculty of the University of Kentucky, wish to express our strong and principled support for the practice of tenure in KCTCS for current and future faculty.

At the University of Kentucky, tenure is traditionally given to academic faculty members achieving senior faculty status after a successful probationary period that includes demonstration by the faculty members that they are likely to succeed and contribute to the institution on a long-term basis. The tenure policy exists primarily to ensure the continuation of an atmosphere of academic freedom. The tenure process rigorously applies the university's standards of teaching, research, and service to its faculty candidates. The representative faculty bodies of the University of Kentucky are committed to a tenure system as a measure of excellence and symbol of academic quality. As KCTCS is an institution that strives to maintain its status as a national leader in community and technical college education, it is important for KCTCS to maintain their current tenure policies.

According to the American Association of University Professors:

Tenure is a means to certain ends; specifically: (1) freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities, and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence, tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society.

Based upon information brought to our attention regarding this drastic, and likely irreversible step, it is our conclusion that the rationale and evidence thus far presented are neither strong nor compelling enough to warrant termination of tenure within the Kentucky Community and Technical College system.

In response to Wermeling, the Chair explained that the given rationale was to save money. The Chair commented that in the analyses he had read, it would not save very much money. He mentioned that he



had heard the intent was also to facilitate administrative types of things, but he was not satisfied that was a sufficient justification.

Jensen commented that KCTCS is made up of very diverse colleges – some junior, some technical – with a wide variety of institutional structures. She noted that when the term “tenure” is used at UK, it is used in reference to faculty, whereas in the KCTCS system tenure has been granted to non-faculty in solely administrative positions. She ended by saying, though, that the large issue at stake is tenure as it applies to faculty members.

There being no further comments, the Chair solicited a motion. Snow **moved** to approve the resolution, and direct the Chair to forward to it to members of the KCTCS Board of Regents and Chappell **seconded**. There was no discussion, so a **vote** was held. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:43 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Stephanie Aken,  
University Senate Secretary

Absences: Adams; H. Anderson\*; Arrington; Atwood; Bernard; Blackwell; Blades; Bollinger; Brown; Campbell\*; Crofford\*; Denison; Desormeaux; English\*; Enlow; Ford\*; Fox; Gesund\*; Gonzalez\*; Graham; Hallman;\* Hardesty\*; Hardin-Pierce; Hatcher\*; Heller; Hoffman; Hopenhayn; Hughes; Hulse; Humphrey\*; J. Jackson; V. Jackson; D. Johnson; Jung; Kidwell\*; Kirschling\*; Leibfreid; Lester; Lorch; Marano; Martin; McCorvey; McNeill\*; Mehra\*; Mendiondo\*; Miler\*; Mobley; Moise; Moliterno\*; Montell; Montgomery\*; Nardolillo; Neiman\*; Parrot; Patwardhan\*; Perman\*; Ray\*; Richard; Rieske-Kinney\*; K. Roberts\*; Rohr; Roorda; Segerstrom; Shay; M.S. Smith; Steiner\*; Stenhoff\*; Subbaswamy; Sudharshan; Swanson\*; Terrell; Thompson; Todd; Tracy; Troske; Turner; Viele; Waterman; Watt; Webb; Wiseman; D. Williams\*; G. Williams; D. Witt; M. Witt; Woods; Wyatt.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, April 2, 2009.

---

\* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.