

University Senate
November 11, 2013

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, November 11, 2013 in the Auditorium of W. T. Young Library. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Lee X. Blonder called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:10 pm. She apologized for the technical difficulties.

It being Veteran's Day, the Chair suggested senators observe a moment of silence in honor of the country's veterans; those present did so.

The Chair reminded senators to:

- Sign in upon arrival;
- Give name and affiliation when speaking;
- Attend meetings;
- Respond to emails and web postings as appropriate;
- Acknowledge and respect others;
- Silence all electronic devices; and
- Communicate with their constituencies.

1. Minutes from October 14, 2013 and Announcements

The Chair stated that there were no corrections to the October 14, 2013 Senate meeting. There being **no objection**, the minutes were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair reminded senators of the Annual Stakes Reception, which will be held on Tuesday, December 17, 2013. Staff and faculty from both Senates are invited, along with members of the Board of Trustees. She added that senators should expect an email in the near future with additional details.

2. Officer and Other Reports

a. Chair Report - Lee X. Blonder – Medicine

Provost Christine Riordan hosted a lunch meeting with the current (Lee Blonder) and former SC chairs (Hollie Swanson, David Randall, Kaveh Tagavi, Ernie Yanarella). Discussion centered on the Senate and SC; the group plans to meet again in the future.

3. Presentation on Council on Post-Secondary Education (CPE) Budget, 2014-2016 - Vice President for Financial Planning Angie Martin

Guest Angie Martin, vice president for financial planning, gave a presentation on the Council on Post-secondary Education's budget recommendations for 2014-2016. There were no questions.

The Chair explained that Hippisley could not attend the day's meeting, so he arranged for committee members to present the two program proposals.

4. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) – Andrew Hippisley, Chair

i. Proposed New Undergraduate Certificate in Appalachian Studies

Arthur, a member of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal for a new Undergraduate Certificate in Appalachian Studies. The Chair said that the recommendation (positive) from the SC was that the Senate **move** to approve the establishment of a new Undergraduate Certificate in Appalachian Studies, in the Appalachian Center, within the College of Arts and Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary.

Jones asked if the certificate was to be housed in the Appalachian Center, or if it would be part of the Appalachian Studies program. Guest Ann Kingsolver (director, Appalachian Studies program) replied that it would be through the Appalachian Studies program. Jones **moved** to amend the motion so that the certificate is housed in the Appalachian Studies program, not the Appalachian Center. Grossman **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with one opposed and one abstaining. There were no further questions.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to approve the establishment of a new Undergraduate Certificate in Appalachian Studies, in the Appalachian Studies Program, within the College of Arts and Sciences and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstaining.

ii. Proposed New Undergraduate Certificate in Clinical Healthcare Management

Charnigo, a member of the SAPC, explained the proposed new Undergraduate Certificate in Healthcare Management. The Chair said that the recommendation (positive) from SC was that the Senate **move** to approve the establishment of a new Undergraduate Certificate in Clinical Healthcare Management, in the Division of Clinical Leadership and Management within the Department of Clinical Studies in the College of Health Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. Harrison commented that the department name was Clinical Sciences, not Clinical Studies. She **moved** to amend the motion accordingly and Brion **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion that the Senate approve the establishment of a new Undergraduate Certificate in Clinical Healthcare Management, in the Division of Clinical Leadership and Management within the Department of Clinical Sciences in the College of Health Sciences. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) – Greg Wasilkowski, Chair

i. Proposed Merger of the Department of Molecular and Biomedical Pharmacology and the Graduate Center for Nutritional Sciences into a New, Single Department of Pharmacology and Nutritional Sciences

Wasilkowski, chair of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC), explained the proposed merger. The Chair said that the recommendation from the SC was that the University Senate **move** to endorse the merger of the Department of Molecular and Biomedical Pharmacology and the Graduate Center for Nutritional Sciences into a new, single Department of Pharmacology and Nutritional Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary.

Grossman asked how the support of the unit faculty was determined, regarding the comment that all faculty supported the merger. Guest Lisa Cassis, chair of the Department of Molecular and Biomedical Pharmacology, explained that there were unanimous votes as well as individual letters sent.

There being no further questions or comments, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

c. Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) – Davy Jones, Chair

i. Proposed Changes to Senate Rules 6.4.7.A.1

Jones, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), explained that the proposed change pertains to recordkeeping and reporting of minor academic offenses. He said the current language in the Senate Rules violates some external recordkeeping laws. Below is the language, as changed.¹

1. In Case of Minor Offense. When the Registrar receives a copy of a letter of warning from an instructor to a student, pursuant to paragraph 6.4.3.A.7, the Registrar shall place the instructor's letter of warning in the student's record. ~~When the student graduates, if the student has committed no offenses subsequently, the letter shall be destroyed.~~ If the student commits no offenses subsequently, then, after the student graduates, the Registrar shall reveal the existence of the offense to parties outside the University only under the following circumstances:

(1) when a court-ordered subpoena seeks a student's entire academic record (not just the transcript), or when it specifically seeks the record of a student's academic offenses;

(2) when the student has authorized the release of his or her record to a third party, and that party requests either a student's entire academic record (not just the transcript) or specifically the record of a student's academic offenses.

The Chair said that the recommendation (positive) from SC was that the Senate **move** to approve the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 6.4.7.A.1*. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There were no questions. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstaining.

ii. Information on Officer and SC Member Elections

Jones reported that two election processes will occur in parallel. The Senate Council (SC), which has nine elected faculty senators on it, has a membership cycle in which every year three members roll off. An election is conducted to replace those departing with three new members, who will take office on January 1, 2014.

In addition to the election of SC members, an election must be held to elect a new SC chair. The current Chair (Blonder) will finish her second term in May, but the election for the SC chair will occur in December. The election is conducted by the SC; in the early stages the 94 elected faculty senators can nominate one or more of the nine eligible elected faculty SC members. If only one SC member is interested, the election will be declared over at that time. If there is more than one interested person, senators will receive election statements of the nominees and will have an opportunity to offer opinions to the SC. After the SC gets the input, it will vote on the next SC chair, who will take office on June 1, 2014.

Jones added that senators will begin getting emails after the turn of the year about the faculty trustee election. The process will begin in early January so that it is completed by April, in time for the person to take office on July 1.

5. Proposed Changes to Senate Rules 5.4.1.10 ("Late Addition to Degree List")

¹ Strikethrough denotes deleted text and underlining denotes added text.

The Chair explained that occasionally there were students who do not apply on time, or there is an administrative issue involved at the college level in which the application to graduate is not submitted on time. In April 2010, the SC voted to accept the addition of a student to a degree list in cases of administrative error. Most colleges have students apply themselves, but there are one or two colleges that have an administrator involved in the process. There is a current policy that if a college emails the SC office to claim an administrative error and ask that a student be added, the student can be added. There were a couple of cases recently where a student missed the deadline and if the student was not added, they would not have been inducted into the military or allowed to sit for a nursing exam. The SC wanted to develop a policy for hardship, but students should take the deadline seriously. The proposed new policy was distributed to senators and posted with the agenda; the Chair commented that it required submission of a one-page statement from the student, along with other supporting documentation outlined in the proposed new Senate Rule language, within a certain timeframe.

The Chair stated that the recommendation (positive) from SC was that the Senate **move** to approve the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 5.4.1.10*. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There were no questions. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstaining.

2. Provost Christine Riordan- Update on Financial Model

Provost Christine Riordan spoke to senators at length about the new values-based budget model and answered questions from senators. Provost Riordan emphasized that UK is in the implementation stage of the new model; it is a partnership for the next 18 months while the model is adapted based on feedback from the community. Teams from the Provost's office and Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration's office are working together to educate units on the basics of the model and to gather feedback. [Eleven working teams exist to work through specifics of the model (e.g., research). Both faculty and staff are involved in this feedback process.]

Grossman asked if the changes would allow UK to compare itself to other universities, in terms of administrative bloat. Provost Riordan responded that the new financial model will offer openness and transparency and the ability to make such comparisons, as well as contrasts. Brion asked if the new model will allow UK to compute the dollars spent per student, or show a tuition ratio for student support. Provost Riordan said that such a computation was very complicated and would take a lot of effort to produce; she was not sure if that number would offer as much information as the ability to demonstrate how money is spent throughout the University, including its support units. In response to a follow-up question from Brion about percentages of the allocation pool, the Provost responded that it will vary by college. Brion asked if the entity that brings in money for a building will receive credit for that effort, with respect to the space tax. Provost Riordan said all building space will be treated the same, whether space is in the Mathews Building or the newer Biological-Pharmaceutical Building

Prats wondered what pressure the new model will put on departments that traditionally have not been able to produce any revenue beyond that of tuition; increased tuition revenues at the expense of large classes may be a questionable model for educating students. Provost Riordan responded at length, noting that she did not recommend dropping the model down into a college, because there will be units that have other priorities – their purpose may not be to bring in tuition dollars. Areas that have grown will need to be additionally resourced, but the model is not about generating more programs and getting more students. Units can grow immediately through increased retention – if all colleges had an 80% retention rate, there would be an automatic increase in dollars flowing through the system. Deans

can fundraise, and areas can talk about non-degree types of offerings, such as certificates and continuing education. These things can help UK avoid being a tuition-driven University.

Watkins commented that research challenge trust fund monies are allocated to programs of excellence; to what degree will colleges or universities have the authority to redirect those funds? Angie Martin, vice president for financial planning, said that everything was in the model but was flowing straight through. Provost Riordan added that many programs were mandated over the last decade; while UK is still reporting on some, others no longer need to continue to function yet are ongoing.

The Chair asked the Provost to talk about how the new financial model will affect graduate student funding. Provost Riordan replied that colleges will be able to allocate their own financial aid and may be able to increase that support once they understand more about the college's budget. The University support (\$26 million) will still remain.

There were a few additional questions from senators. By **unanimous consent**, the meeting was adjourned at 4:57 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Connie Wood,
University Senate Secretary

Absences: Adams, Andrade, Atwood, Bailey, Ballard, Bayliff, Birdwhistell, Blackwell, D., Brennen, Butler, de Beer, Debski, Deep, DeSantis, Dickson, Eckman, Effgen, Evans, Feist-Price, Ferrier*, Fox*, Galloway, Gross, Harris, Hertog, Hilt, Hippisley*, Jackson, Kaplan, Karan, Kilgore, Kirschling, Kornbluh, Mehra*, Mock, Nash, O'Hair, D.*, O'Hair, J., Palli, Pienkowski, Rabel, Richey, Rieske-Kinney, Riordan, Rogers, Spradling, Stewart, Tick, Tracy, T., Tracy, J., Tracy, S., Truszczynski, Turner, Van Wie, Voro, Walz, Wiseman, Withers, Witt, Wright.

Invited guests present: Lisa Cassis, Ann Kingsolver and Angie Martin.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, November 26, 2013.

* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.