

University Senate
September 14, 2009

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm in Lexmark Public Room of the Main Building on Monday, September 14, 2009. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

University Senate Chair Lee T. Todd, Jr. called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:03 pm.

1. State of the University Address – University Senate Chair Lee T. Todd, Jr.

Chair Todd offered his annual “State of the University Address” to senators. He touched on a variety of topics, including enrollment statistics, development, research and the state legislature. After about 30 minutes, he welcomed questions from senators. [The text of the address is in the meeting transcript posted at http://www.uky.edu/Faculty/Senate/university_senate/minutes_transcripts/index.htm.]

Grossman asked if President Todd was aware of the several states in the region in which some universities are state-supported, yet not state institutions. President Todd replied that while he had looked at different models, it would be difficult to move towards that type of arrangement. He thought it would be less difficult for certain private schools, but as “the” state university, a lot of political support could be lost if UK moved in that direction, support which could be necessary in the future. He said that funding from the state is a critical link. Grossman noted that such a move would free UK from the requirements of being a state agency. The President explained that it was still irksome for UK, as an organization of \$2.4 billion dollars, must ask the state for permission to building permission. As one example, UK spent time at the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) explaining the use of a specific gift from a donor for a children’s garden in The Arboretum, which was not a good use of the CPE’s time. The continued lack of Senate support for UK to retain bonding authority does hold UK back.

Many other institutions use third-parties to build buildings. President Todd said that when UK built dorms and the Kirwan/Blanding Complex back in the late 60s, UK entered into a debt covenant that did not allow it to enter into agreement with another contractor. The third-party bonds were bought out a few years ago, giving UK some flexibility in those types of buildings. Although there were still some such debts occurring, there was a limit of two-year’s duration.

Nadel, referring to the spring 2009 presentation by Provost Subbaswamy to the Senate, said that one option shown would be for part of the raise pool to fund the proposed new Gen Ed. In light of the President’s assertions (during his address) that ensuring a raise for employees next year was his highest priority, would the President be willing to remove that (funding a new Gen Ed through the raise pool) as an option? Nadel asked if the President would state that a new Gen Ed would not go forward if it came out of the raise pool. President Todd said he was unaware of that assertion, and Nadel directed him toward that meeting’s minutes. Nadel asked the President to commit to a staff and faculty-wide referendum about doing away with Gen Ed if it would affect raises.

President Todd said that faculty remained a high priority and that he would talk to the Provost about that funding option. He opined that the Senate had been very helpful through the process of designing a new Gen Ed, and that decisions would have to be made about where money was spent, since there was not much of it.

D. Anderson made a comment about political policies. She mentioned the KY Youth Advocates group specifically, and said that what that group promoted were issues to which UK should attach its name. Presently, the group was looking at K-12 and graduation rates. Anderson opined that UK should be on the front line working with that type of organization. President Todd said that it was somewhat difficult to organize formal relations with external agencies, and commented lightheartedly that doing so with the state legislature was sufficiently challenging. He agreed that the general positions were comparable with UK's interests, and asked that D. Anderson send him some information about the group. Anderson said that she would, and added that one current movement was changing the drop-out age from 16 to 17 or 18 years of age. President Todd said that UK could support that type of legislation. He suggested Anderson contact Steve Byars [in the Office of Government Relations].

Wermeling asked if President Todd would comment on the recent publicity surrounding Coldstream Research Campus. The President replied that he found the publicity at Coldstream interesting. In contrast to the negative series of articles, though, there was one very small article nestled in a back section of the day's paper about UK completing a redundant power source project at Coldstream. He acknowledged that there had been challenges there, and that involvement in development deals can have drawbacks, explaining that UK only owns one of the buildings – the remainders are owned by the developer who leases the land from UK. President Todd said there was a desire for those buildings to fill up. He thought it would be nice if the media would also report when an investigation resulted in nothing untoward being found.

Swanson asked about how to envision UK as an institution for meeting the needs of Kentucky. The President opined that UK had re-envisioned itself quite a bit in the last several years. A spectacular example was medicine in rural areas. Patients are able to remain at home for routine care, unless there are acute needs. Professor Everett McCorvey has visited many schools for opera performances and Professor John Nardolillo is taking orchestra members to middle and elementary schools. President Todd said that due in large part to UK's involvement, the 16% preterm birthrate was now down to below 6%. An outwardly focused mandate on being a top-20 institution was important to him even when he interviewed at UK. A focus only on research could bring top-20 status, but it was far more important to look out and change the state. He said that he was asked on his first day to describe what he would want to be said on his last day at UK and that his answer was that UK had done more for its state than any other land grant institution in the country. President Todd said that UK did send mailers out to all the congressional districts, to show what UK is doing in each that district.

Hayes asked about the "Kentucky Proud" food campaign. She said that she did not know how much food UK purchased, but perhaps it would be possible for UK to look into buying locally. That could be a selling point for legislators and an opportunity to show UK providing revenue to that county. President Todd deferred to College of Agriculture Dean Scott Smith, who said that UK buys from a unique KY dairy, as well from a local cattle company for all the meat. Dean Smith added that UK Catering was very helpful with such initiatives. President Todd noted that having to ask that question illustrated that it was not common knowledge. He said that the bricks for the new hospital were made in Winchester. Health care and the economy and education hit people where it counts, and he said he appreciated knowing that such information needed to be disseminated.

Allen asked about the status of the Office of Intellectual Property, and the President replied that when he was at UK there were no patents received. Currently, Director Len Heller was under some mandates on how the office can move faster and retrieve other input. President Todd said that UK was also looking into consolidating external legal services; currently, UK sends certain types of technological patents to a

law firm in Pennsylvania. He added UK has quite a few start-up achievements, and had started an “angel network” involving those willing to provide funds.

Rohr asked the President a question regarding UK’s health care costs and UKHMO. The President said he did not have the information necessary to answer Rohr’s question. He asked that Rohr email him so he could respond more informatively.

In closing, President Todd expressed his appreciation for the faculty’s service. He said that he receives notes from people who continue to move forward in their area of expertise, and that he is extremely proud of UK. The President urged senators to keep the fight going – it is important to UK and to so many others.

Senate Chair Todd then gave Senate Council Chair Dave Randall responsibility for presiding for the remaining time.

Chair Randall introduced the various members involved with the Senate:

- David Randall, Ph.D. (Medicine/Physiology): Chair of Senate Council (SC)
- Hollie Swanson, Ph.D. (Medicine/Molecular and Biomedical Pharmacology): Vice Chair of Senate Council
- Sheila Brothers: Office of Senate Council, administrative coordinator
- Adrea LaRoche: Office of Senate Council, staff assistant
- Michelle Sohner (Office of Academic Ombud): sergeant at arms
- Kate Seago (Library/Administration): parliamentarian
- Lisa Hoinke: court recorder
- Everett McCorvey, DMA (Fine Arts/Music, Director of Opera): faculty trustee
- Ernest Yanarella, Ph.D. (Arts and Sciences/Political Science): faculty trustee
- Ryan Smith (SGA President)
- Kyle Kirk (representative to Senate Council)
- Mike Mullen, PhD, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education

The Chair read off the names of new senators and asked that they stand and be recognized.

2. Minutes from April 13 and May 4 and Announcements

The Chair said that no changes were received for the minutes from April 14, 2009.

Paz **moved** to approve the minutes from April 14, 2009 and Hardesty **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Dean Blackwell **moved** to approve the minutes from May 5, 2009 and D. Anderson **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair said that he would next read a series of announcements. During the summer the SC continues to conduct some business, and this past summer was very busy. He explained that when acting on behalf of the Senate, it was required that the Senate be informed.

- Three two-year waivers for retroactive withdrawals were delegated to the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee.
- For the BA Education, Middle School Education, Science, the Chair approved (for APEX purposes) a clarification that two content courses are required, not one content course plus lab. The department was instructed to complete program change process in fall 2009.
- There was a waiver of *Senate Rules (SR) 6.2.3* for an abbreviated search for the Academic Ombud.
- The use of the repeat option for a graduated student was allowed.
- *SR 1.2.2.1.B* and *1.2.2.1.C* were waived to allow the Colleges of Fine Arts and Social Work to conduct fall 2009 Senate elections.
- The proposed new course A-E 680 was by the SC on behalf of the Senate.
- When the BA in Gender and Women's Studies was proposed and approved, the corresponding BS degree was overlooked. The SC determined that after approval by college faculty, only approval by the chairs of the Undergraduate Council and the SC chairs would be required.
- The Chair approved official inclusion of required Communication courses in the BA in Interior Design.
- There was approval of a degree for an Engineering student on behalf of SC and Senate, who needed it for a job in Japan.
- The proposed new MS in Epidemiology was not posted for approval by the CPE prior to approval by the Senate. Thus, the proposed new PhD went forward to the Board of Trustees (BoT), but the MS was delayed until the CPE posting finished.
- The BoT now reviews President Todd in the fall semester – senators saw emails, etc. to that effect. The Chair was pleased to have twice the respondents from the last solicitation for input (approximately 24 respondents this year).
- Due to enhanced rigor in oversight of Substantive Change by SACS, UK has been asked by SACS to develop an Institutional Substantive Change Policy. Substantive Change is a significant

modification or expansion in the nature and scope of an accredited institution, and specific cases of substantive change are defined in the SACS Substantive Change Policy.

The request to develop such a policy was received by the President on June 16; over the summer a work group discussed the request & provided input for the development of the policy. There is an October 1 deadline. SREC called emergency meeting Friday afternoon to review language, etc. and the SC is set to approve the proposed new *AR 1:5* on behalf of the Senate.

- Jurgen Rohr is the newest SC member. He replaces Piascik, whose term ends December 2009.
- The Senate's web page address has changed – please use www.uky.edu/Faculty/Senate.
- There are a plethora of various administrative & academic committees in need of faculty membership – look for email solicitation this week.

3. [Ombud Report, 2008 – 2009 Academic Year](#)

The Chair invited Professor Kaveh Tagavi, past ombud, to present the 2008 – 2009 Ombud's Report. Guest Tagavi explained that the current ombud, Lee Edgerton, was unable to attend due to illness.

Tagavi began by saying that the numbers in the report resulted from his time in the Office of the Ombud. He referred senators to the handout for a complete listing in the Statistical Report but said that there were 316 cases, with an additional 106 cases of academic offenses. He said that as might be predicted, complaints regarding Grades were still the highest, and that there were 43 cases of Exams/Class Requirements complaints. The highest number of complaints came from the College of Arts and Sciences, which he said was also predictable, given the very large size of that college.

Tagavi said that as Ombud, he received more than the usual number of complaints regarding Dead Week, understandable since the rules had changed the previous year [2007-2008]. He said that it took time for all levels of faculty to get information about changes in policy. The Office of the Ombud did send out messages, and he encouraged senators to talk with colleagues. He added that he wanted to mention that the current policy did not allow quizzes or other evaluated work during Dead Week.

Paz commented that the policy as she understood it involved the caveat that mention of such quizzes, etc. during Dead Week had to be in the syllabus. Tagavi explained that that rule had changed – the Senate had modified the Dead Week policy twice in the past 10 years – at first, quizzes were allowed and the Senate limited them to quizzes announced in the syllabus, which were about every other week and less than 5% of the grade. Students initiated a subsequent change, in which quizzes were no longer allowed.

In response to a question from Prats about outcomes of complaints, Tagavi said that information was not tracked. He said he was surprised, though, that just a little less than half of the complaints were found in favor of the student. Grossman asked if there was any information about second offenses available from the statistics regarding academic offenses. Tagavi clarified with Ms. Sohner (assistant to the Academic Ombud) that the academic offenses number did not include grade appeals, and she said that she would track such numbers so they can be reported for 2009 – 2010. Grossman explained that one of the reasons behind the reform of the academic offenses policy was to ensure that all initial offenses were entered into the system, so that it would be obvious when a second offense occurred.

Tagavi noted that before the reform not all cases when through the Office of the Ombud, and if the number of cases were higher than the previous year, it would show that more academic offenses were being appropriately reported.

D. Anderson asked that next year's report also include information about the rate of occurrences, such as "one per XX number of students." Tagavi asked Ms. Sohner to track that information for the next report, too, and she agreed.

4. June 2009 KCTCS Candidates for Credentials

The Chair reminded elected faculty senators that they were responsible for approving the names of graduates who will be receiving degrees.

Jones **moved** that the elected University faculty senators approve the June 2009 KCTCS 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. Wood **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. August 2009 UK Degree List

Jones **moved** that the elected University faculty senators approve the August 2009 list of degree candidates, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Grossman **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. Work+Life Connections – Ann Bassoni, WLC Coordinator

The Chair invited Ann Bassoni (Office of something) to share information about the (something). Guest Bassoni explained that she was a licensed social worker, and was hired to begin the Work+Connections program, which is a free counseling service to employees with at least 0.5 full-time equivalency. Bassoni went on to say that there were a variety of types of assistance available to couples, children and families, including council for marital issues, grief, stress, etc. Some referrals for financial assistance are also made, along with offering concrete (food, clothing, etc.) services.

Bassoni said that there were support and networking groups available for working mothers, parents of tweens/teens, child-free women, those interested in elder care, and a group would be starting in October for empty-nesters.

Bassoni said she would be very interested in responding to suggestions for other groups. Most met during lunch hours, but she was working on offering a few after work for employees who do not have 45 minutes for lunch. She said that Work+Connections can work with someone to find counseling services that will work with that person's insurance coverage, is affordable or is free. Stylized workshops are available for departments upon request. She invited questions, but there were none.

7. Update on Gen Ed and Selection of Experimental Vetting Teams

The Chair began by saying that faculty had worked over the summer to develop criteria for Gen Ed courses. Gen Ed had not been looked at for over 20 years, and many, many people have put a lot of work into a revised Gen Ed. The challenge over the summer was to develop courses and develop ways to vet courses to ensure they meet the guidelines.

A call for development of courses went out; about 30 applications were expected, but 66 were received. The Office of the Provost found a way to fund 60 of the courses, resulting in 60 faculty spending a significant amount of time this past summer developing courses. The goal for Gen Ed is implementation in 2011, but there was a desire for a trial run in spring 2010, the timing of which puts some constraints on the system. In order to be listed for next spring, the courses have to be listed, students have to be informed of their availability, and there needs to be a method of the proposed Gen Ed courses satisfying current University Studies Program (USP) requirements, among other things. The SC struggled with these issues over the summer, and talked in detail about how to go forward with Gen Ed at the August 17 retreat. The SC ultimately felt that the wisest thing to do would be to develop some experimental approaches so the Senate could review the data.

The Chair referred senators to [language from the SC meeting minutes](#) at the end of the handout, so the actions of the SC could be explicitly clear. He said that the expectation is that vetting groups will be formed for an exploratory trial over the next several weeks based on nominations, and then the data from that will be presented to the Senate at the December meeting. In addition to presenting that data, the Chair said that he envisioned that the Senate would be asked to provisionally approve (for one time) a set of classes for spring 2010. The Chair then read the language of the minutes from the SC meeting:

The Senate Council (SC) will solicit nominations for service on seven faculty vetting teams (four for Learning Outcome #1 and one team for each of the remaining Learning Outcomes) from full-time faculty employees; three members and the chair will be appointed (for each team) by the SC and the remaining three will be selected by ballot at the October Senate meeting; members of vetting teams composed in fall 2009 will serve through May 2010; a quorum of five is required for each of the vetting teams; vetting team meetings will be publicized, open meetings; and that the SC recommends future elections by ballot will involve the entire faculty.

The Chair then acknowledged a problem – he explained that during that SC meeting, an honest election of the entire faculty had been envisioned, since faculty had expressed that they wanted teams to be elected and representative of the faculty. However, there was no way to run an election of that magnitude in such a short time frame. What the SC proposed is that nominations for vetting teams will be solicited, and the SC will pick three members for inclusion, to ensure that members are appropriate, and the needed knowledge and background are on the each team. The Senate will vote by paper ballot during the October meeting for the remaining members of the vetting teams.

After that, the courses will be listed with the Registrar. The Senate will be provided with a list of courses in December. The Chair acknowledged that there were some obvious issues with the time frame, since it would be awkward if the Senate objected to a course that has already been listed and offered to students. He said there would be bumps, but that it was the job of the SC to keep the Senate fully apprised of what went on during the semester. In December, the Senate will also be asked for a trial period in spring 2010, so that information from that process can be gathered and reported back to the Senate. The Chair then solicited questions and invited SC members to comment on anything he said.

Mountford asked about the types of courses at which the vetting teams would be looking. The Chair looked for and received confirmation from Assistant Provost Richard Greissman (and Provost's liaison to the SC) that the majority of the 60 courses are existing courses that are being modified.

Wood commented that the intent of the SC was that the vetting process be viewed as experimental, not only from the point of view of the courses to be offered in the spring, that might carry credit for Gen Ed, (or USP if Gen Ed does not succeed), but also to explore the appropriate process for vetting courses for inclusion in a new Gen Ed. The SC recommended a vetting team structure which was half appointed and half elected, and a chair that is hopefully unbiased that can also assess the workings of the team and bring those evaluations along with the courses that have been approved for spring 2010 back to the Senate at its December meeting. Wood emphasized that nothing was written in stone, and that it was an exploratory process whereby 15 – 20 courses will be offered in the spring semester. The exploratory process will also inform the process of getting courses approved. The recommendations of the SC only apply to spring 2010; based on the information received the Senate will determine if the number of vetting teams was right, if the process is appropriate, etc. Wood described the recommendation as a pilot study.

Prats asked about the mechanism by which students find out the courses and register for them since the registration process will take place long before the December meeting. The Chair repeated the question for those senators who did not hear, and then explained that the vetting teams would have to be appointed very quickly, review the courses quickly, etc. Greissman added that faculty would be taking a leap of faith – if courses have to be posted at the beginning of October for advance registration, then the idea was to trust that fellow faculty will do good work on the pilot Gen Ed courses, and that the failsafe is the worst case scenario in which a course simply is not approved.

Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mullen offered some details. He said that if advising begins at the beginning of October, about 20 courses (of the 60 developed over the summer) from various colleges, including Arts and Sciences, Fine Arts and Agriculture, will be inserted into the fall course timetable and the electronic schedule by the end of September. A hard copy piece of paper will be handed out to all advisors listing the courses and the parallels to USP. Discussions with Mike Shanks, from APEX, have already begun so that if the courses are approved by the vetting teams, when a student and advisor will be able to look in APEX and see how the appropriate Gen Ed courses correlate to USP. The Advising Network will be heavily relied upon to ensure advisors know that the pilot Gen Ed courses are open for registration. It will be important for students to have full confidence that the pilot Gen Ed courses will count for USP.

Mullen agreed that the process was compressed. The vetting teams would have to look at courses and syllabi and ensure the courses are true to the Senate-approved Learning Outcomes (LO). If the vetting teams decide that a course is not quite right, the course will need to be re-reviewed. Mullen said that he hoped for sufficient data by next fall for an informed decision about moving forward with a fall 2011 implementation date for the proposed Gen Ed. The Chair added that a fair amount of faith was being requested.

Dean Blackwell said that there was a precedent for the current review of USP – the creation of the paired courses requirements involved a similar type of review process. She said it was normal for such “birthing pains” to happen every 20 years or so.

In response to a request for clarification from Grabau, the Chair said that there were seven vetting teams proposed – one for each of the four areas in LO1, and then one vetting team for each of the remaining LO.

The Chair then read the second motion from the SC:

As part of the experimental vetting process, the chair of each vetting team will be responsible for the assessment of the efficacy of their team's interactions and processes and that recommendations for further vetting processes be developed by the seven chairs (as a group) for the Senate's review.

The Chair agreed with Wood's assessment that the SC was trying to get pilot data for the Senate to review, rather than pontificate on how something should be done. Data will be gathered, and faculty will work on good faith that fellow faculty are working hard. Jensen stated that one of the things that the SC felt strongly about was that even though there will be lots of faith, things do not have to be taken sight unseen; all the vetting team meetings will be fully open, so there is no sense of shadow. She said that if there were any concerns about any area, a department can send faculty attend and observe.

The Chair said that transparency would work. When a call for nominations goes out, he said senators should prod colleagues to nominate the very best of their faculty so the vetting teams have the judgment of the best individuals. When those vetting teams make recommendations the Senate will also then have faith in them, since they are colleagues.

The Chair commented that he was taking the lack of any opposition to the recommendations of the SC as affirmation that the proposed Gen Ed process was heading in the right direction. There were no questions or comments from senators.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:47 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Hollie Swanson,
University Senate

Absences: Absent: Adams; Arents*; Arnold; Back; Bishop*; Brennen; Chappell; Conners; Culver; Edgerton; Dyer*; Effgen*; English; Ensslin; Ettensohn*; Gonzalez*; Hall; Hallman; Harris; Haurylko; Heller; Hopenhayn; Howard*; Huberfeld*; Jackson; Januzzi; Kidwell; Kovash; Lester; Luhan*; Maglinger; Martin; Marano; McCorvey; McCormick*; McNamara; McMahan; Mehra; Mendiondo*; Mobley; Montgomery*; Mullen; Nardolillo; Nieman; O'Hair; Nokes; Parker*; Patsalides; Perman; Peterson; Pienkowski; Randall; Reed*; M. Richey; D. Ritchie*; Roorda; Rouse; Schoenberg*; Shay; R. Smith; Snow*; Speaks; Sottile; Starr-LeBeau*; Stenhoff; Subbaswamy; Sudharshan; Swanson; Thelin; Tracy; Travis; Troske; Turner; Hazard; Viele; Watt*; Wells; Whitt; Wiseman; Witt

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Monday, September 28, 2009.

* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.