

University Senate  
September 10, 2007

The University Senate met at 3 pm in regular session on Monday, September 10, 2007 in the Lexmark Public Room (room 209) of the Main Building. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Kaveh A. Tagavi called the meeting to order at 3:05 pm. He invited President and University Senate Chair Lee T. Todd, Jr. to offer his state of the university address.

1. State of the University Address – Lee T. Todd, Jr., University Senate Chair  
President and University Senate Chair Todd thanked senators for a good year. He then gave a presentation on the state of the University of Kentucky. Afterwards, he asked if there were any questions.

Grossman asked if President Todd would elaborate on plans for research facilities, other than those related to the medical field. President Todd responded at length. He noted that the Chemistry-Physics Building was currently being renovated – some things were being moved to the Lucille Caudill Little Library and the Margaret I. King Building to create space for classrooms and laboratory space. In addition, the planned research building would have a broad representation with space for research-related activities for both the medical center and the campus. He offered a variety of comments on various non-medical research aspects.

Guest Buck Ryan asked about the types of conversations that President Todd had with Steve Beshear [candidate in 2008 governor's race] and what type of relationship might occur, in terms of resources for UK, if the current governor were not reelected. President Todd said that, as during any election time, he had briefed both candidates, Beshear and Governor Ernie Fletcher, as well as State Budget Director Brad Cowgill. He referred to past working experiences with Beshear and said he had worked with most of the recent governors in some fashion and that he would work with whoever was elected.

There being no further questions, the President ended saying he welcomed additional questions – they could be emailed to him. The Chair thanked President Todd for attending and reassumed the responsibility of leading the meeting in the President's absence.

2. Minutes from May 7 and Announcements

The Chair referred senators to one revision to the minutes that had not been distributed via email. There being no further changes, the minutes were approved as amended. The Chair said he had a variety of announcements to share with senators.

Brad Canon (Arts and Sciences/Political Science) will serve again as parliamentarian, until he retires at the end of the fall 2007 semester.

The Chair said that when he spoke to longstanding Parliamentarian Gifford Blyton earlier in the afternoon, Blyton sounded well. Blyton will celebrate his 99<sup>th</sup> birthday on September 18. Due to some health issues, the Chair asked senators to keep Blyton in their prayers.

The Chair introduced Staff Senate Chair Kenny Blair and thanked him for attending the Senate meeting. The Chair then moved to an interpretation request for the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), from the October 2006 Senate meeting. A question was raised regarding contrary opinion and the entitlement of students – how far could it go? What were the limits of expressing contrary opinion toward something like evolution? The SREC offered the following statement, "...there was little or no helpful clarification which could be made to the language of the rule, and...any interpretation should be given in the context of a specific situation...." The Chair said that he was part of the SREC and explained that it had been difficult to find an answer in the *Senate Rules (SR)* so the statement was the best the SREC members could come up with, lacking a concrete situation to address.

Moving to announcements of rule waivers, the Chair explained that the Senate Council (SC) and the Senate Council Chair were authorized to waive *SR* on the behalf of the University Senate (Senate). Assuming judicious use of the privilege, it was allowed so long as the issue had to be resolved prior to a Senate meeting and it was reported to the Senate at its next meeting.

First, the Chair reported that during its May 14 meeting, the SC acted on behalf of the Senate by recommending approval of degrees in Education and Dietetics. Graduating students in the College of Education encountered certification and promotion problems due to a September approval; and the Dietetics program was cited by their accrediting agency for the degrees having been held over the summer. Thus, there was a request to have the degrees approved prior to the September Senate meeting.

Next, the SC waived *SR 5.1.8.5.A.2*, the "two-year rule" for a student who had been injured in an accident. The student had been unaware of the option for a retroactive withdrawal and the student's advisor had been unaware of the accident.

Finally, the Chair reported that on behalf of the Senate and SC, he had recommended approval of a degree for a student who, according to her college (and the Office of the Registrar), had completed her degree requirements. The student was offered a job in Florida, but couldn't accept the job until officially licensed. However, she could not be licensed until the diploma was posted to her

transcript. If the student had been forced to wait until the degree list was approved in September, the job offer would have been gone.

### 3. UK September 2007 Degree List

The Chair explained that the process for the approval of the awarding of a degree began with a student applying for a degree. The department reviewed the credentials and completed courses by the student to see if the requirements for a degree had been fulfilled, assuming the student passed the classes in which he or she was currently enrolled. The information was sent to the Office of the Registrar, who conducted further checks. The list was then sent to senators for review. After approval by the elected University Faculty senators and confirmation by the Office of the Registrar of the student's successful performance in the immediate-past semester, the list then went to the Board of Trustees (BoT).

Chappell **moved** to approve UK's September 2007 degree list. Anderson **seconded**. The Chair asked for discussion.

Remer expressed concern that there were customarily individuals on the degree list who were not eligible to get their degrees – he wondered why they continued to appear. The Chair explained that hundreds and perhaps thousands of names were submitted. Theoretically speaking, even though an internship was not completed prior to a student's name being included in a degree list, if the student completed the requirements prior to approval by the BoT, the student fulfilled the requirements and should receive the degree. However, just because the name was on the list was no guarantee of receipt of the degree – only those students who fulfilled the requirements for the degree would receive them. The Chair explained that there was a lot of communication that went on behind the scenes. He added that as a result of such efforts, one (Nursing) student was added to the list earlier in the day.

There being no further comments, a **vote** was taken on the motion to approve UK's September 2007 degree list. The motion **passed** with a majority in favor, one against and one abstaining.

### 4. KCTCS June 2007 List of Candidates for Credentials

The Chair explained that because of the memorandum of understanding created when the community colleges separated from UK, some KCTCS students would be entitled to receive a UK degree. Because the degree had UK's name on it, the University Faculty senators of UK had to approve the list of candidates for credentials.

Chappell **moved** to approve the KCTCS June 2007 list of candidates for credentials. Anderson **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

The Chair used his prerogative to move to a different agenda item, since he knew an invited speaker had not yet arrived but would, shortly.

#### 6. Proposed Membership Change to University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees

The Chair explained that the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees (UJCHD) did not include a member of the BoT, but its previous incarnation had.

The BoT has the final authority over approval of honorary degree nominees, and a liaison would bring a helpful perspective to consider in the formative stages. The Chair brought the situation to the SC and they asked that a proposal be written for review and possible action upon. The Chair said that the resultant proposal was now in front of senators. There were some editorial changes in the current version; the substantial change to language in the *Administrative Regulations* would involve adding a BoT liaison to the UJCHD.

The Chair noted that the proposal came with a positive recommendation from the SC. He asked for discussion. Grossman asked why the BoT liaison was moving from ex officio voting to non-voting. The Chair replied that there were other non-voting members. In addition, the Kentucky Revised Statutes stated that only the faculty of universities can recommend degrees. There was an effort involved to keep the decision-making on the granting of degrees within the faculty.

Assuming approval, the changed language would be conveyed to the Office of the President for approval. Thelin asked about the chair of the committee being a voting member. He asked if the Chair only voted in the case of ties, as with most other university committees in which the chair votes.

The Chair said that the chair of the UJCHD did have a vote, but that because it was a committee under the Senate, and the Senate worked under Robert's Rules of Order, the chair's vote could only be used in breaking ties. He confirmed for Thelin that was the case for the UJCHD and asked the Parliamentarian for input. Canon replied that there were plenty of committees in which the chair was a voting member

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to approve the suggested changes to *Administrative Regulations III-1.0-6*, including the suggestion that the BoT Chair appoint a liaison to serve as a non-voting, ex officio member of the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees. The motion **passed** unanimously.

#### 5. 2007 United Way Campaign – College of Engineering Dean Thomas Lester

The Chair invited Dean Lester to offer remarks on the upcoming United Way campaign at UK. Dean Lester gave a brief presentation and urged members of the Senate to support the United Way campaign.

## 7. Overview of Next Steps for USP Reform – Phil Kraemer

The Chair offered some background information on the general education reform initiative – the process began with a report from the External Review Committee; continued through the General Education Reform and Assessment Committee (GERA) and its recommendations, with input from a wide variety of faculty, some through open forums and presented a report to the Senate; and, currently, with the University Studies Program Reform Steering Committee (USPRSC).

The Chair invited Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Phil Kraemer, also chair of the USP Reform Steering Committee, to offer an overview of the next steps of the University Studies Program (USP) reform effort.

Kraemer said that the USPRSC had met during the past spring and summer and had a draft proposal for which they would soon be soliciting feedback. The proposal had been presented to deans and also sent to undergraduate colleges in the hopes that those colleges' curriculum committees would review it. In addition, SC members also received a copy. Kraemer explained that the USPRSC wanted feedback by October 1 from those groups – after that, the input would be incorporated into the proposal and then be presented to the university community. There would be a variety of opportunities for input, including two or three open forums.

The USPRSC suggested that Input would be collected during the month of October (roughly) and then incorporated into a version that the Senate can discuss during the November 12 Senate meeting. After the November Senate meeting, the additional input will be reviewed and a final version of the USPRSC proposal will go to the Senate on December 10 for a vote. Kraemer repeatedly expressed a desire for faculty members and others to offer written comments.

The Chair noted that due to *Senate Rules*, any major item, such as the USPRSC proposal, had to come to the Senate for discussion during one meeting, and then be voted on separately, at the subsequent (or later) meeting. He encouraged senators to submit comments when the proposal was released. He asked if there were any comments or questions from senators.

Yanarella thanked the USPRSC for engaging in a thoughtful process over the past year. As former co-chair of GERA, he said that many elements put forth previously to move the university forward were realized in the USPRSC proposal. Due to the open-ended nature of the proposal, however, it would benefit from serious discussion by faculty. He then asked Kraemer to offer information on what would happen next, assuming the Senate approved the proposal in December.

Kraemer responded that there were a number of elements in the proposal. If the Senate did approve the proposal, an implementation committee would need to be established. Faculty committees would have to be created to work out criteria for

learning outcomes and other aspects. There will also need to be a discussion on how proposals for future changes would be vetted. Because the proposal also addressed pedagogy, there would be opportunities for faculty development; some faculty would need help while developing courses and techniques by which to deliver them. Kraemer said that the USPRSC proposal included a target implementation date of fall 2009. The USPRSC has been working on determining if that date would be feasible. He added that other groups would need to get involved, such as the Teaching and Academic Support Center (TASC) and the Chellgren Center for Undergraduate Excellence.

In response to a request from the Chair, Kraemer named the USPRSC members: Phil Kraemer, Associate Provost; Steve Hoch, Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences; Nancy Johnson, Associate Dean Gattton College of Business & Economics; Larry Grabau, College of Agriculture; Kim Anderson, College of Engineering; Richard Greissman, Assistant Provost; Deb Moore, Director of Assessment; Phil Harling, College of Arts and Sciences; and the assistance of various graduate assistants. There were no further questions, so the Chair thanked Kraemer for the timeline.

In response to a request from Hallman, the Chair said he would request an administrative report from the Provost regarding the current status of SAP to be given to SC members, which would be passed on to senators.

There being no further business to attend to, the meeting was adjourned at 4:24 pm.

Respectfully submitted by David Randall,  
University Senate Secretary

Absences: Adams, Aken\*, Arnold, Barbee, Barnes, Bartilow, Bernard, Bhatt\*, Bhavsar, Blackwell, Blades, Bollinger, Brown, Butler, Calvert\*, Cammers, Campbell\*, Cheng, Cibulka, Cibull\*, Crofford, Deem, DeSimone, Dwoskin\*, El-Ghannam, English\*, Fox, Garrity, Gonzalez, Harley, Hazard\*, Heller, Hoffman, Houtz, Johnson, Karpf, Kim, Kirschling\*, Lester, Lillich, Martin, Mattingly, McCormick, McNeill\*, Michael, Mobley, Parrish, Parrot, Patwardhan, Pauly, Perman, Phelps, Piascik, Roberts\*, Santhanam\*, Shay, Smart, Smith, Staben, Subbaswamy, Sudharshan\*, Terrell, Turner, Vasconez, Vestal, D. Williams, G. Williams, Wiseman, Witt, Wyatt.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on September 11, 2007.

---

\* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.