

University Senate  
October 9, 2006

The University Senate met on Monday, October 9, 2006 in the Auditorium of the W. T. Young Library. Below is a record of what transpired.

Absences: Aken\*, Bartilow, Bernard\*, Bhavsar\*, Biagi, Bordo\*, Brown, Burkhart\*, Butler, Cammers-Goodwin, Chew, Clauter\*, Cooper, DeSimone, Diedrichs\*, Draper\*, Duke\*, El-Ghannam, Forgue\*, Fox\*, Frost, Gaetke\*, Garrity\*, Hasselbring, Haven\*, Hoch\*, Hoffman, Houtz\*, Jackson, Jasper\*, Johnson\*, Karpf, Kim, Kirschling, Lee\*, Lester, Lillich, Look, McCormick, McKnight\*, Michael, Mobley, Mohney\*, Pauly\*, Perman, Petrone\*, Pulito, Roberts\*, Segerstrom\*, Smart, Smith, D.\*, Smith, M. S., Snow\*, Sottile\*, Steltenkamp\*, Stump\*, Subbaswamy\*, Sudharshan, Terrell, Thelin, Todd, Turner, S., Turner, W., Vasconez, Vestal, Voss\*, Williams, D., Williams, G., Wiseman, Witt, Wyatt.

\* Denotes absence was explained.

Non-members recognized by the Chair: Joan Callahan, Mary Beth Thomson.

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 pm.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair explained that because neither Mrs. Brothers nor a court reporter was present at the September University Senate (Senate) meeting, a set of abbreviated minutes was created. There being no changes to the minutes, they were approved as distributed.

The Chair announced that the newly created position for the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs replaced the position held by Dave Watt as Associate Provost for Academic Affairs. The Chair invited Assistant Provost for Program Support Greissman to introduce Associate Provost for Faculty (APFA) Affairs Heidi Anderson to the Senate. Greissman, on behalf of Provost Subbaswamy, shared his great pleasure in welcoming APFA Anderson to the Senate. Anderson holds the position of professor in the College of Pharmacy. He said the APFA would focus more tightly on faculty affairs and advise the Provost, deans and faculty members. In addition, the position would advocate for faculty and provide oversight in cases of promotion and tenure. In short, APFA Anderson will be the point person for all faculty relations in the Office of the Provost.

Due to the recent departure of Executive Vice President for Research Baldwin, Chuck Staben had become Acting Head, Office of the Vice President for Research. The Chair went on to state that Senate Council (SC) member Jones had resigned from the SC and from the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) to plan for a spring sabbatical. The Chair commented that some senators might not have known the extent of the energy and effort put forth by

Jones in the areas of faculty governance and the Senate. As SREC chair, Jones conducted weekly meetings during the summer months. Jones also served as chair of the Senate Council's Nominating Committee (SCNC), which fielded almost weekly requests for nominations to various committees.

The Chair asked new senators to stand and be recognized. He thanked them for accepting the challenge and serving.

2. [Memorial Resolution for Associate Professor of Medicine Steve Zimmer](#)  
(presented by [Ernie Yanarella, past Senate Council Chair](#))

Faculty Trustee Yanarella read a memorial resolution in honor of Associate Professor of Medicine Steve Zimmer.

Memorial Resolution  
Presented to the University of Kentucky Senate  
October 9, 2006

Stephen G. Zimmer, Ph.D.  
1942-2006  
Microbiology, Immunology and Molecular Genetics  
UK College of Medicine

Stephen G. Zimmer, Ph.D., associate professor of Microbiology, Immunology and Molecular Genetics and Cancer Center member, died Wednesday, June 14, 2006. He is survived by his spouse, Constance James Zimmer, and two children, Stephen G. Zimmer, Jr., and Courtney Anne Zimmer.

On behalf of the alumni, students, staff, faculty, and friends of the College of Medicine and the wider University community, I offer the following memorial to Stephen Zimmer:

Stephen was born in Trenton, New Jersey, on October 26, 1942. Those who knew him recognized that he was a gentle giant whose love of family, profession, and religious community were manifested in equal measures of selfless devotion and fond memories.

Stephen's longtime research and teaching skills in microbiology and immunology were shaped in his early educational pursuits, specifically, at The Rutgers University, where he earned his bachelors degree in natural sciences in 1964 and his master of science degree in radiation sciences in 1966, as well as his doctoral degree in experimental pathology at the University of Colorado in 1973. After serving as a research fellow at the Washington University School of Medicine in 1974 and then as a National Institutes of Health research fellow there for two more

years, he came to the University of Kentucky in the summer of 1976 to begin his duties as an assistant professor in the Department of Pathology.

In addition to his research fellowships, he generated a list of impressive professional activities and other honors from various research programs and associations, including service on the editorial board of *Anticancer Research* and, most recently, on the board of trustees of the Wood-Hudson Cancer Research Laboratory beginning in 2005. He was also a member of the American Association of Cancer Research and the Metastasis Society. Described by his chair, Alan Kaplan, as a consummate free thinker, Stephen Zimmer was a significant contributor to the study of mechanisms of oncogenesis and in the last few years had the satisfaction of seeing two of the putative oncogenesis blocking agents elaborated through his laboratory moved into clinical trials.

His extensive c.v. includes nearly a hundred publications in research journals appropriate to his field and external funding from a wide array of government institutes and pharmaceutical companies for cancer research and training grants. It also lists an impressive number of students whom he mentored as postdoctoral fellows, for whom he served as co-director, and who conducted research under his direction. His students, both past and present, remember his dedication to the work of finding means to understand, treat, and cure a scourge of our industrial society and perhaps human condition, and his wry wit and humor. Besides his own contributions, his students' continuing work and subsequent success inspired in part by his example and mentorship will be the lasting legacy of Stephen Zimmer, teacher and researcher.

If Stephen was an esteemed colleague of high principle, unswerving dedication, and scientific integrity, he was also and not least of all a beloved husband, parent, and parishioner who somehow found a balance among the extraordinary demands of his personal, family, professional, and spiritual lives. Those attending Stephen's funeral on June 17, 2006, heard his priest advocate and speaker for the dead intone some of the recurring themes in his life among the standing room only audience of family and friends, students and colleagues--his profound love for family, his dedication to cancer research, his devotion to the teaching vocation, and his pursuit of peace and justice informed by his Catholic faith and spiritual practice. Even in his gentle and cordial manner towards those whom he touched and often inspired, he was a towering figure who deserved to be recognized for his

notable accomplishments and unflagging dedication to this University and its highest ideals and values.

In his last years, he pursued with passion and conviction an academic accolade that he believed he justly deserved and had worked many long years to achieve. Some believed that the achievements and stature of this man of science and liberal learning remained insufficiently heralded. If that honor was not conferred on him in life, it did not in any way diminish his stature and impact among those who knew him well and loved him for his exemplary behavior, his commitment to an ideal, and his life-long striving for an elusive humanitarian goal that eludes medical science still today.

Dr. Stephen G. Zimmer was an esteemed colleague who will be missed greatly. I ask that this resolution be made a part of the minutes of the University Senate and that a copy be sent to Dr. Zimmer's family.

A moment of silence was held in Zimmer's honor.

Yanarella **moved** the resolution be made part of the minutes of the University Senate and that a copy be sent to Dr. Zimmer's family. Jones **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously in a show of hands.

### 3. KCTCS List of Candidates for Credentials

The Chair stated that the list of Bluegrass Community and Technical College (BCTC) candidates for credentials came to the Senate with a positive recommendation from the SC. He asked Jones to offer background information. In an aside, Jones clarified that he had resigned from everything but the Senate.

Jones explained that when Lexington Community College separated from UK, state law enabled then-current students to obtain a BCTC degree with the UK name officially as the institution awarding the degree. Due to that, those students' degrees go before the UK faculty apparatus. Every time a list has been received from the Kentucky Community and Technical College Systems (KCTCS) Chancellor's Office, BCTC faculty were consulted to ensure the list appropriately reflected the students who should be receiving credentials. There is no similar faculty apparatus in place for BCTC faculty to review such a list at this phase of the process, because state law contemplates it is the UK faculty apparatus (UK being the awarding institution) that performs this final academic verification exercise prior to the BoT action. The majority of lists received from the KCTCS Chancellor's Office contained errors that were corrected by working with BCTC faculty. For this current list of candidates for credentials, 19 individuals from the list were listed as receiving the wrong degree. Jones added that BCTC faculty were very sensitive to the fact that they have no corresponding Senate-like

apparatus in their organization. The SC Chair's counterpart at BCTC and another BCTC faculty member, formerly a UK senator, requested that Jones share with senators their deep appreciation for the Senate continuing to stay on top of the BCTC faculty role in offering candidates for credentials. Jones reminded senators that only the elected Faculty Senators would be voting.

The Chair noted that since the list came from the SC, no second was needed. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion to approve the list of candidates applying for credentials, May 5, 2006 – July 28, 2006. The motion **passed** unanimously in a show of hands.

#### 4. [Changes to Portions of Senate Rules Section VI](#)

The Chair asked former SREC chair Jones to offer background information. Jones explained that the revisions were part of the SREC's ongoing task to align the *Senate Rules* with the revisions to the *Governing Regulations (GR)* in June 2005. He said that the SREC was very careful to not make changes on its own accord but rather to implement edits needed because of changes to the *GR*, or in UK's move to a provost system. Jones added that one senator pointed out some typos which would be corrected.

Steiner asked about *Section 6.1.2 Contrary Opinion*. He said he asked in the context of receiving an answer in class about evolution versus intelligent design. Jones replied that the text in question was unchanged. Debski wondered how Steiner's question about the interpretation of this existing statement in the context of this particular discussion could be addressed. Jones said it could go to the SREC as an interpretation or the Chair could be asked to send the issue to the SREC. The Chair offered to recognize Debski after discussion on the changes to *Section VI*. Finkel asked how the "???" notations in the text would be replaced. Jones answered that it was being determined which institutional officer was being referred to and had contacted the Office of the Provost. The Affirmative Action Officer referred to was the Associate Vice President for Institutional Equity. That edit would be made when the other changes to *Section 6.0* were incorporated into the *Senate Rules*.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken to approve the changes to *Senate Rules Section 6.0*. The motion **passed** unanimously in a show of hands.

Steiner **moved** that the SREC clarify *Section 6.1.2* and what is meant by "reasoned exception...without being penalized." Grossman **seconded**. Calvert suggested offering an example of a hypothetical situation to address. Steiner replied that an answer of "I don't believe in evolution so here is my alternate answer" was one situation that had occurred. The Chair opined that a student could be wrong without being penalized. Retaliation would be prohibited, but it would still be appropriate to mark an answer as "wrong." Infanger **called the question**. A **vote** was taken, and the calling of the question **carried**.

The Chair stated that debate on the issue had ceased. Senators would be **voting** to direct the SREC to clarify *Section 6.1.2*. The motion **passed** unanimously in a show of hands.

#### 5. [Change to Senate Rule 6.4.1.A Regarding Academic Offenses](#)

The Chair invited Grossman to explain the rationale behind the changes. Grossman, former chair of the Academic Offenses Ad Hoc Committee (AOC), explained that the section being discussed addressed jurisdiction. After a suggestion to give teaching assistants (TAs) authority to decide penalties, the AOC unanimously believed that TAs should not be given such authority. As a result, language was included to distinguish between faculty and staff employees. Grossman explained that the UK regulations very clearly distinguished, in writing, different terminologies for faculty employees (tenure track, instructor, lecturer) and staff employees (TAs, lab directors).

Over the summer, a group of faculty and staff in charge of large courses contacted Grossman to discuss changing the language. Staff employees among that group had dealt with TAs for years. He added that individuals such as these were colleagues, and it would be unfair to not offer such employees the authority for deciding penalties for academic offenses. Language addressing such a change was presented to the SC on October 2 and approved (with one modification). The change would give the department chair the authority to give an employee other than a faculty member the authority to assume the role of instructor.

Sawaya asked for the opinion of the dissenter in the motion, as described in the handout. Waldhart shared that she had voted against an amendment to the motion, which removed the word “staff” from the language. She said that the vote on the motion to change the language, though, was unanimous.

A **vote** was taken on the changes to *Section 6.4.1.A*. The motion **passed**, with a clear majority in favor and one against in a show of hands.

#### 6. [Approval of Existing Qualifications for \(2006 – 2007\) Honorary Degrees](#)

The Chair explained that a newly enacted *GR* gave the elected Faculty Senators in the Senate the responsibility for approving candidates for honorary degrees (HD) and working the Administration to create a joint committee to review candidates. As a result, the elected Faculty Senators in the Senate also needed to approve the qualifications for candidates. The Senate’s Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SA&ASC) was charged with reviewing the current qualifications, but due to a deadline in October for nominations, the elected Faculty Senators in the Senate would need to approve (for 2006 – 2007 candidates) the qualifications that were used in the past. At the Chair’s invitation, Jones added that the Senate had approved revisions to *Section V* of the *Senate Rules (SRs)* at its February 2006 meeting, which codified in the *SRs* what was changed in the *GRs* in June 2005. Under the authority of the University Faculty in

the State law concerning honorary degrees, the Board of Trustees had recognized that elected University Faculty, through the elected Faculty Senator representatives, recommends to the Board of Trustees (BoT) the necessary qualifications and nominees for HD. The SRs, though, did not include in the February 2006 action the qualifications, instead waiting for the officially approved qualifications. The Chair shared that the SA&ASC had already offered recommendations, which the Senate Council would review later in October and, the Senate in November, perhaps.

The Chair stated the motion to approve the existing qualifications came from the Senate Council with unanimous approval and a positive recommendation. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken by the elected Faculty Senators on the motion to use the existing qualifications for Honorary Degrees for the 2006 – 2007 year. The motion **passed** unanimously in a show of hands.

#### 7. [Granting of Ex Officio Nonvoting Membership in the Senate to Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs](#)

The Chair explained that in the SRs, the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs (APAA) alternated yearly between serving as an *ex officio* voting and nonvoting member. The new position of Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs (APFA) was changed enough that the new position needed to be approved by the BoT. Once that happened, the SRs could be changed to refer to the APFA. The APAA would have been a nonvoting member this year, and since the GRs give the Senate the authority to offer *ex officio* nonvoting status, it was suggested to approve *ex officio* nonvoting status to the APFA.

There being no discussion on the item, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to grant *ex officio* Senate membership without voting privileges to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs (current appointee Heidi Anderson) effective immediately, until 8/16/07. The motion **passed** unanimously in a show of hands.

#### 8. [GERA Final Report](#)

The Chair shared that a review of the University Studies Program (USP) was initiated by the Office of the Vice President for Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness in 2004. Shortly thereafter, two committees were formed, a USP Self-Study Committee and an External Review Committee. Around that time, then-SC chair Ernie Yanarella pushed for a general education initiative, which was formalized into the Joint Provost-Senate Council Planning and Coordinating Committee on General Education Reform and Assessment (GERA).

GERA members conducted a faculty survey of USP; coordinated campus forums; maintained a website; attended the AAC&U Summer Institute on General Education; and held a workshop in August 2006. The Chair invited GERA co-chair and faculty trustee Yanarella to present the GERA Final Report.



Yanarella stated that it had been a long year of extensive activity by the GERA committee, which reached fruition in the form of the final report that was sent to the Office of the Provost, as well the Senate. Three core concepts surrounded the general education reform initiative: hope, cynicism and opportunity. Yanarella made a presentation on the GERA final report, touching on the topics of major GERA activities; how GERA approached its work; what was learned through the faculty survey, GERA forums, the AAC&U Institute and the August workshop; suggestions for the entities carrying the initiative forward; and what the next steps should be.

As he ended the presentation, Yanarella outlined GERA's suggestions for future considerations:

- Keep continuity with the initial phase of the general education initiative;
- Institute mechanisms to advance curriculum design, new courses, and implementation;
- Work to balance general education, college, and major requirements in the design of any new program;
- Find ways to incorporate faculty development and graduate student teacher training into general education reform; and
- Work with Provost Subbaswamy and President Todd to align faculty resources and monetary support for general education reform as it relates to planned increases in undergraduate enrollments.

Yanarella, also on behalf of GERA co-Chair Kraemer, thanked GERA members for discernment and dedication. The Chair said that the SC received GERA's final report and as a result, [two motions](#) were made. The first motion received the report and forwarded it to the Senate for recommendation for review. The second motion suggested the SC work with the Provost to move the general education initiative forward.

There was discussion regarding the wording of the second motion and its intent. In response to Debski, Yanarella suggested that one possible clarification would be to substitute the phrase, "examine curriculum models, generate a new course structure and establish a plan for a curriculum implementation" for "next level of examination and articulation." Debski **so moved**. Mitchell **seconded**. Grossman offered a **friendly amendment** to also remove "to take the general education initiative into the next phase." Both Debski and Mitchell **approved**. A **vote** was taken on the amendment. The amendment **passed** unanimously in a show of hands.

Wood offered a **friendly amendment** to change the wording to read, "the Senate moves that the Senate Council." Debski and Mitchell **accepted**. In response to Wood, the Chair said the GERA final report was received by the SC and the Provost. He went on to say that the motion was brought to the Senate from the SC to get the Senate's counsel, buy-in and agreement. Hertog asked what the practical outcome of the motion would be. Yanarella explained that the Senate



would be putting its weight being the suggestion to move to the next phase in the general education reform and assessment initiative. The motion would not result in any closure; there was more work for other bodies. In response to Hertog, Yanarella confirmed that whatever was thought of by an oversight committee would be brought back to the Senate in some way. Any such mechanism would be decided by the SC.

Finkel asked Yanarella to explain why the Provost needed to be involved in receiving the report. Yanarella explained that the Provost was responsible for a university committee on planning and priorities, which had an undergraduate education domain committee involved in an effort to align undergraduate education with the Strategic Plan 2006 – 2009 (Provisional) and the Top 20 Business Plan. He added that this would necessarily involve the highest administrative officer in charge of academic matters. Secondly, the issue of funding was the domain of the administration, so it was vital to have a meshing of the SC and Senate with the Provost so neither side became misaligned with the other. Yanarella added that many general education proposals at other campuses had failed because they had not been tied to budgetary realities.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the Senate's motion that the Senate Council, with attention to general comments offered in the University Senate's review of GERA's final report, work with the Provost to propose curriculum models, generate a new course structure and establish a plan for a curriculum implementation. The motion **passed** with a clear majority in favor, none against and one abstention.

#### 9. [Domestic Partner Benefits Discussion](#)

The Chair related that the issue of domestic partner benefits (DPB) had been an item of interest over the years. The University of Louisville (UofL) recently adopted DPB and Northern Kentucky University was also looking into it. UK's Staff Senate (UKSS) took up the issue and made a recommendation. The Chair invited Staff Senate Chair Kyle Dippery to share information regarding the UKSS' actions. Dippery said that the UKSS passed a very simple motion, expressing support for offering benefits to domestic partners. The Chair said that the Senate Council had already sent a [motion](#) to the President and Associate Vice President for Human Resources Kim Wilson expressing support for offering benefits to domestic partners, including same sex and opposite sex partners. The Chair said the Senate was welcome to make a similar motion and opened the topic for discussion.

Grossman **moved** that the Senate support UK offering benefits to domestic partners. Anderson **seconded**. Steiner offered a **friendly amendment** to include "same sex and opposite sex" in the amendment. Both Grossman and Anderson **accepted**, so the motion would be for the Senate to support UK offering benefits to opposite- and same-sex domestic partners.

Grossman explained that he was able to be married to his domestic partner (DP) and have that union recognized legally, but there were others with DP who could not marry. He spoke to the retention and recruiting benefits of offering DPB and said that whether or not others agreed with another's personal decisions, those decisions would have no bearing on the ability to do one's job. Merely making the benefit available to domestic partners was not the same as officially condoning such decisions. Grossman added that since UofL had decided to offer benefits to DP, there would be political cover for UK if it opted to do the same. He ended by saying that the issue was a simple matter of fairness.

Bollinger asked if there was a legal definition of what constituted a DP. Grossman said that it was as an institution defined it. Hertog asked who would make the determination of what a DP was, and if it would be extended to students, such as graduate students. The Chair said that it would apply to employees, some of whom could be students. Deem supported Grossman's statement and said it would be to UK's advantage to move expediently. Swanson asked if benefits would be limited to one DP. Guest Joan Callahan said that the report from the President's Commission on Diversity showed how it would be defined and referred Swanson to the information on how exclusivity would be defined.

The Chair reminded senators that the fine details of how such an expansion would be offered was not the point of the motion. Once Human Resources and the Office of the President took action, the issue would be detailed and have specific definitions. Dembo said that as a faculty trustee and a member of the BoT Human Resources Committee, it would be helpful to report to the BoT the tone and nature of the Senate's discussion, i.e. if individuals were passionate or merely lukewarm about offering DPB. Anderson expressed passionate support of the motion, due in large part to the equity and fairness of offering DPB. Yanarella said that putting aside the political reasons, offering DPB was the right thing to do morally. Waldhart stated that the results of the vote would be telling as to the level of the Senate's support.

Randall stated that he was opposed to offering DPB and had said as much at the SC. He said that UK belonged to the people of the Commonwealth. Although it had been said that the university should not be run according to a plebiscite, the people of the Commonwealth and their deeply held ethical values should be respected. Mitchell said that the lack of support for same gender marriage was obvious, but that offering benefits was something entirely different. He thought that many urban areas could pass ordinances through city councils offering similar benefits to DP. The Chair reminded senators that he would try to recognize everyone one time before going back to hear comments from those who had already spoken. Campbell said that if a similar philosophy of not bucking common sentiment had been used in the 1940s, Lyman Johnson would never have attended UK. Crofford stated that she had thought long and hard about the issue, and said it was important to take the pulse of the community and

recognize political indicators in the state legislature. She said she was strongly in favor of offering DPB for all the reasons stated during the meeting. Crofford said that as members of UK, the Senate should help lead the Commonwealth into the next phase of development.

A **vote** was taken on the motion for the Senate to support offering benefits to opposite- and same-sex domestic partners. The motion **passed** with a clear majority in a show of hands, with two against and two abstentions.

#### 10. Senate's Library Committee Motions

The Chair explained that Dean of Libraries Carol Diedrichs approached the Chair to recommend Provost Subbaswamy be a signatory to a letter written by fifty or so universities to support United States Senate bill S. 2695 (Federal Research Public Access Act of 2006), which would maximize taxpayer access to the results of federally-funded research. The bill would require that, within certain parameters, the results of research funded by the federal government would be readily available to anyone. One of the ramifications could be a decrease in income for smaller journals, some of whom profit from subscriptions. The issue was sent to the Senate's Library Committee, which included Dean Diedrichs as an *ex officio* member.

The Chair said the Senate's Library Committee proposed the [first motion](#) that the University of Kentucky become a signatory to the public letter of support for (United States) Senate Bill S. 2695 (Federal Research Public Access Act of 2006), which would maximize taxpayer access to the results of federally funded research. Coming from a committee, the motion did not need a second. Guest Associate Dean for Collections and Technical Services Mary Beth Thomson added that part of the bill was a six-month embargo on articles and would only apply to agencies with a certain amount of federal research funding. The articles affected would be peer-reviewed articles.

Grossman wondered how, considering normal requirements of having to sign copyright forms in order to submit to journals, a conflict could be resolved to allow for publishing. Thomson replied that it would be necessary to carefully read the agreement. She said that many major commercial publishers were making the legislation possible. Grossman asked for clarification regarding how he would be able to know if his federal grant requirements would allow engaging in a contract with a journal. Thomson said that many publishers had already begun letting researchers publish in pre-prints and post-prints. Grossman opined that he would have to shoulder the burden of figuring out which journals abided by which rules. Thomson shared that the Association of Research Libraries was putting together a website to help researchers with publishing questions. She said she would send out the link.

Randall said that researchers were already in a bind if they accepted NIH money. He said that S. 2695 would allow for depositing an article in a public forum and

there would be a six month embargo on placing articles in such a repository. Crofford said that she was on the editorial board for her professional society, which published a journal. She said that the mandate of depositing on the NIH website was an unfunded mandate with only voluntary involvement. Crofford added that current technology readily allowed for access to an author to find reprints. She said that she did not necessarily oppose the signing of the public letter of support, and that she understood the needs of the library, but expressed concern about political pressure on the medical scientific community who desired a one-year embargo.

Debski asked if journals would make a distinction between non- and federally funded research. Crofford thought that there would be a uniform policy that all articles would be available after a specific period of time. There was also a concern, Crofford said, about a lack of infrastructure or mechanism to oversee the deposits of articles. In response to Debski, Thomson replied that the bill spoke only about a manuscript and excluded research notes, lab materials and data. There were many commercial publishers who accepted payment from a researcher after the peer-review and then pay a flat fee to open access to the article forever. Thomson added that in some cases, the funding agency would pay. The issue was very new, and it was just recently that publishers charged fees for open access, along with how that would change what libraries pay for open access to journals. In response to a question from Steiner, Thomson said that there would be no limit on how long access would be available.

Thomson said that her own professional organization was discussing how the problem of decreased income from journals and subscriptions would affect the other things the society does. Grossman expressed opposition to the motion to sign the letter of support because of the number of items that had not yet been thought through. He understood the attempt to solve the problem of escalating journal costs, but thought the legislation was not the solution. Thomson said that the issue was also one of not just a library problem but a scholarly communication problem. She said she had recently negotiated a publisher down to a 34% increase for the cost of a subscription.

A **vote** was taken on the motion from the Senate's Library Committee that the University of Kentucky become a signatory to the public letter of support for (United States) Senate Bill S. 2695 (Federal Research Public Access Act of 2006), which would maximize taxpayer access to the results of federally-funded research. The motion **passed** in a show of hands with a clear majority in favor, six against and four abstentions.

The Chair read the [second motion](#) from the SLC. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion from the Senate's Library Committee that the Dean of Libraries be invited to appear annually before the University Senate to provide a 'State of the Library' report. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Despite the time, the Chair agreed to begin discussion on the next agenda item.

11. [New Minor in Folklore and Mythology](#)

The Chair invited Guest Willoughby to offer background on the proposal. Willoughby said that the Department of Modern and Classical Languages, Literatures and Cultures merged three years ago, and has been trying to develop new undergraduate programs. A degree in film studies was being developed and they were also working with F.L.I.E. personnel to work on a degree in multicultural communication. She said the folklore and mythology courses routinely held between 50 and 300 students. College of Communications and Information Studies Dean Johnson requested that, in reference to the development of film studies and of multicultural communication, the College of Communications and Information Studies be appropriately consulted. Willoughby readily agreed.

A **vote** was taken on the motion from the Senate Council to approve the new Folklore and Mythology minor. The motion **passed** unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Larry Grabau,  
University Senate Vice Chair

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on October 18, 2006.