

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGDECEMBER2007.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

DECEMBER 10, 2007

3:00 P.M.

* * * *

* * * *

W. T. YOUNG LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY CAMPUS
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

* * * *

* * * *

AN/DOR REPORTING & VIDEO TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
179 EAST MAXWELL STREET
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40508
(859) 254-0568

* * * *

* * * *

KAVEH TAGAVI, CHAIR
LARRY GRABAU, VICE-CHAIR
SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

LISA E. HOINKE, COURT REPORTER
CHAIR: All right. I'm told by Michelle that I'm allowed to go ahead and start so I'm going to go ahead and start. So I call the meeting of the Senate to order. Our first item is minutes from November 12. We distributed this on Friday. We were supposed to distribute it on Tuesday. So I'm going to pause a little bit. If you did not have a chance to look over it then nobody would make a motion to waive the six-day rule or the motion would -- would fail.

While you're thinking about these, there are only two changes that we have received since we gave you. So there were two changes since we distributed it to you. It's on page 3 the -- at the bottom. There is an editorial change as you can see on the screen and on page 12 of the handout, at the bottom again, we had one name incorrect, and

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGDECEMBER2007.txt
that has been corrected since this has been distributed.

So before I could consider these approved, I need a Motion to waive the six-day rule.

GROSSMAN: So moved. Bob Grossman.

CHAIR: I need a second.

ANDERSON: Second. Anderson.

CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. All those in favor of waiving the six-day rule please indicate so by raising your hand. I see a lot of hands. We don't need to count. Any opposed? Abstained? Okay. It's unanimous. Thank you for helping me approve the minutes on time. Okay. So now let's discuss the minutes. Are there any -- any other further questions to the minutes? If not so, then under Robert's Rules of Order the minutes stand approved.

I have a few quick announcements. As I told you last time, traditionally we have had the Holiday Reception tomorrow. Today or tomorrow?

BROTHERS: Tomorrow.

CHAIR: Tomorrow afternoon we would not have it because of the inauguration. You guys asked me to send a letter to the President regarding Robinson Forest and give the sense of the Senate motion; I did that. Here is the letter. Basically the bottom part is exactly what was passed by the Senate and I conveyed your sense to the President. And after that, I received this response from the President. So since this was your sense and your motion, I thought I should share what happened with you guys.

Okay. If you recall we had a blood drive challenge between Staff Senate and the rest of the Senate and we lost. So I will have to go and give the trophy to the other Chair of the other Staff -- of the Senate. So I will do it on your behalf. But next time, all of you have to come and do it yourself.

Okay. I sent a mass email to all faculty including, of course, Senators, that there is new timetable for GenEd. There was some details in there. I asked you and your colleagues to go to the Internet and here is where the new site, the modified site is. If you see this red here, this is Principle of General Education. You click on that there are two new documents. One is going forward which is basically a timetable with some dates in there what the Senate Council has approved to be the mechanism under which we submit the input of the faculty. Not on the proposal. That proposal is now shelved. It's not dead or in a coma or anything, but it is shelved. So there is going to be a -- there is going to be a new committee that would work on these principles of General Education which you saw last time.

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGDECEMBER2007.txt

And these principles are going to be there momentarily. You have -- License, I Do, I accept on behalf of the University.

Here are the principles. And what we would like you to do, please tell your Senators, you are the vehicle that we discuss things with your colleges. Please tell your -- ask your colleagues to read the principles. They are short and sweet and make -- make a comment. And we are going to post the comments as we receive them. We have only received one comment. If you look at the date, these other comments are from before; so I just noticed it today so we'll go ahead and remove those comments or keep it somewhere else, but please let us know your comment and your ideas. Okay. Back to -- okay.

We had Senate Council Chair -- or Senate Council Officer election. Dave Randall was elected Chair Elect. Dave, could you please stand up so we could see you? Please join me to congratulate Dave.
(APPLAUSE)

His Chair will start on June 1st, and he could be re-elected one additional time. Stephanie Aken is -- I -- I saw her earlier. Stephanie, please get up so everyone can see who you are. Stephanie Aken is the Vice Chair Elect for next year. Please congratulate Stephanie.
(APPLAUSE)

We also have three departing Senate Council members. Senate Council is three years. It's every single Monday except when they come here. Actually, it is every single Monday for them, even sometimes during the summer. It is very hard work, but it is very satisfying work. Lesnaw, Thelin and Harley, are you here? Would you please get up so we can recognize you?
(APPLAUSE)

Three years of hard labor. Okay. As a result of these three wonderful members departing us, we are having or in the midst of election right now. In fact, you guys have been voting. Sheila, I don't remember the number of people -- members that voted in the first round. Do you have it off hand?

BROTHERS:
CHAIR:

I'd say around 20.
It's not enough. Now, it was a nomination, perhaps it's somewhat acceptable if the nomination participation is not enough but, please, I implore you to go and vote tonight. You know, you could do it on the web site. In fact, let me show it to you so you have no excuse. Here it is. Now, for me, I went to my Senate web site and I had panicked because I didn't see this part but because I had to refresh. So if you go in there and you don't see it, please refresh, and then you click on that. You have to put your UK ID, (inaudible) your paychecks and

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGDECEMBER2007.txt
your birthday and your e-mail. You have to vote for three people, and you have to put the ranks. Okay. The six people who have been -- the six highest vote getters are -- after I read your name, if you are here, please get up so the rest of us can put the name to faces. Deborah Anderson, I saw you earlier. Okay. Joe Chappell; is Joe here? Janet Ford. Hans Gesund. All right. Samuel Jasper. Hollie Swanson; is Hollie here? Okay. Great. These are the people who are going to -- who are -- who are running for election. Please go to the Senate website. I'd like to claim to the next Chair, that under my chairmanship 94 senators, which is every single senator, voted. So please, I ask you to go and vote for your two top choices.

Okay. I am -- I have immense power as the Senate Council Chair. I can waive rules on your behalf, and I did that because due -- due to an oversight, and this would affect a lot of students with their degree, I had to obtain (inaudible) and everything, I had to approve a list of degree candidates from Bluegrass Community and Technical Colleges. So I did that on -- on your behalf.

Senate Council also reviewed -- no, no, sorry.

So now I'm going to go to the first agenda item which is Method for Proposed Change in the Method of Appointment to Graduate Faculty. This was reviewed thoroughly as you can see, three times by Senate Council. We had some concerns, and we went back and forth. Now, it is in front of you. These are the changes as has been provided to us by Dean Blackwell. I'm going to go over this. I'm just going to leave it on the screen in case Dean Blackwell wants to refer to that or you want to refer to that. They are in your handout, and these are the rationale for these changes. So without any further comment, let me ask Dean Blackwell to see -- if she wants to add anything to what is on the screen or want to discuss this or add anything to what is in the handout.

BLACKWELL: I think I want to just ask if anybody has any questions or comments or needs clarification on any of this? The major changes here are to just clarify the language. The substantive change is to make graduate faculty status, full graduate faculty status automatic on the award of tenure in the regular title series and to clarify that these -- that this is limited to faculty title series of the UK faculty. To expand the possibility, something that we've already been doing, de facto, but to codify it to allow me, the Dean of the Graduate School, to appoint faculty members from sister institutions, from other institutions

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGDECEMBER2007.txt
to serve on graduate faculty for specific committees which we already do, but we do not have it codified, and to clarify a primary and secondary appointment which are possible in the University.

CHAIR: Okay, I saw a hand up here.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Arts and Sciences.

So I have a few questions which may lead to some other proposed amendments, but I guess the first question I have is under Part A which is Qualifications for Membership. The first and the second sentence don't really mesh with one another, so you say: Any faculty member whose assignment includes a research component and who is a faculty title series appointment is eligible for consideration. And then the next sentence says, eligibility qualifications. Is that second sentence to refer to anyone who doesn't fall under the first sentence? Because the first sentence says, if you're -- if you're in a regular title series and you have a research component, you're eligible. So there's no need for eligibility qualifications.

CHAIR: Doesn't say (inaudible) about faculty. It says, if you are a faculty, any faculty.

GROSSMAN: Any faculty whose assignment includes research component --

CHAIR: Yes.

GROSSMAN: -- and who is in a faculty title series appointment, is eligible for consideration for membership on the Graduate Faculty; that's what it says.

CHAIR: So -- so it does not say only regular faculty series in that sentence.

GROSSMAN: It says, faculty title series appointment --

BLACKWELL: Right.

GROSSMAN: -- is what it says.

BLACKWELL: And they're eligible for consideration.

GROSSMAN: Right.

BLACKWELL: That's the limited -- the limited group that can be considered.

GROSSMAN: Automatically.

BLACKWELL: And then the considerations are terminal degree --

GROSSMAN: For anyone else. And then -- then there's -- so then these qualifications refer to anyone who doesn't fall under the first sentence?

BLACKWELL: No. That is the limitation of the group that falls under consideration for eligibility and now comes the qualifications that are necessary --

GROSSMAN: Then I propose an amendment that it say, only faculty members whose assignment includes a research component and who is in a faculty title series appointment are eligible for consideration for membership on the

Graduate Faculty.

BLACKWELL: Okay. Only instead of any?
GROSSMAN: Correct. There's a big difference.
BLACKWELL: Okay.
GROSSMAN: I -- I propose that amendment.
BLACKWELL: Is that what I meant? It's
been so long... Yeah. Okay.
GROSSMAN: If that's what you meant.
BLACKWELL: Uh-huh (AFFIRMATIVE). That's what
I meant.
GROSSMAN: Is that -- so I guess this could be
a friendly amendment then, but it's a
substantial change to the meaning as written.
CHAIR: But not to the intent of Dean
Blackwell?
GROSSMAN: Not to the intent.
BLACKWELL: Right. Not to my intent.
CHAIR: It's okay with you, Dean Blackwell?
BLACKWELL: Yes. It's okay with me.
CHAIR: Okay. Are you finished?
GROSSMAN: No.
CHAIR: I will come to you next.
GROSSMAN: I -- I have another.
CHAIR: Please go ahead.
GROSSMAN: Okay. Second, under the first
eligibility qualification, you say a
doctorate degree or its equivalent in
scholarly reputation. What examples do you
have in mind that would be the equivalent in
scholarly reputation?
BLACKWELL: Appointing Wendell Berry to full
Graduate Faculty status even though he does
not have a terminal doctoral degree because
of his accomplishments in the field as an
author. And there are very few of these, but
we do have some specific examples.
GROSSMAN: Okay. So who is it who decides
the -- because what I thought you meant here
was, you know, a SED or a JD or other -- or
other forms or, you know, other terminal
degrees. So I guess who decides what is the
equivalent in scholarly reputation?
BLACKWELL: The dean of the graduate school on
the recommendation of the graduate faculty
from the program --
GROSSMAN: Uh-huh (AFFIRMATIVE).
BLACKWELL: -- they send it to me and I agree,
and I agree or disagree that -- that the
scholarly equivalent requirement has been
fulfilled. This also goes along with SACS
requirements for teaching qualifications for
graduate courses, and so it's -- there's a
similarity there; to mirror requirements.
GROSSMAN: Okay. I'm getting it -- I -- I'll
just leave that one alone then at that point.
Under section B, item 1, I believe
there's a couple of words missing. It says,
associate membership by University, and I
think you mean, University faculty members,
under Associate Members. I'm printing the
clear version -- I'm looking at the clear
version with changes incorporated.
BLACKWELL: Right. Right. It just -- just

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGDECEMBER2007.txt
delete by -- by University.

GROSSMAN: It came out in the clear version with the changes incorporated, it says, associate membership by University is limited to a term of six years.

BLACKWELL: Yeah.

GROSSMAN: That's what it says.

BLACKWELL: Just scratch by University.

GROSSMAN: Okay. Scratch by University?

BLACKWELL: Uh-huh (AFFIRMATIVE).

GROSSMAN: Okay. I guess that's just an editorial change.

BLACKWELL: Yes.

GROSSMAN: Okay. Now, under full members where it says, appointments to full graduate faculty membership is made by the Dean of the Graduate School, after consultation with Graduate Council, when appropriate, again, who decides when it's appropriate?

BLACKWELL: That follows in the next section, and those are the cases where we have an assistant professor who is proposed for full membership --

GROSSMAN: Uh-huh (AFFIRMATIVE).

BLACKWELL: -- early, so to speak.

GROSSMAN: Okay.

BLACKWELL: And those cases are taken automatically to Graduate Council.

GROSSMAN: Okay.

BLACKWELL: And then on the decision of the Dean of the Graduate School, if I have a particularly problematic or unclear case, I may take it to Graduate Council for advice.

GROSSMAN: Well, I'd like to propose some amendments to clarify that meaning then. First of all, I would like to -- I propose -- this is a proposed amendment, that we strike starting in that first sentence, full members, starting with the sentence, after consultation, that we strike everything up to the colon and replace it with, under one of the following circumstances. Make it clear that the Dean is acting under one of the following four conditions -- scenarios. I also think that -- and then the second part is under section D at the very end, after the two bullet points, add the approval of the Graduate Council as required. And that makes it clear when the Graduate Council is required to sign off on an appointment and when the Graduate Council is not required to sign off on an appointment. Of course, nothing prevents you from consulting with the Graduate Council any time you want.

CHAIR: So you are -- this is a two part appointment -- two part amendment?

GROSSMAN: Two part amendment, yes. The first part of -- the second -- the first part doesn't make much sense without the second part.

CHAIR: Okay. So go ahead and tell us one more time I make sure Sheila got it correct.

GROSSMAN: So in the -- in the opening

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGDECEMBER2007.txt
paragraph, the full members, strike
everything after, Dean of the Graduate
School, up to the colon.

BROTHERS: Okay.
GROSSMAN: And replace it with, under one of
the following circumstances.
CHAIR: And then the second part was?
GROSSMAN: The second part is to after section
-- or in section D after the two bullet
points, the approval of Graduate Council is
required. Okay?
CHAIR: Let me go back to --
GESUND: Hans Gesund --
GROSSMAN: That's the amendment so...
GESUND: Hans Gesund. I don't think we
should -- first of all, I haven't had a
chance to read this. I only got it today.
Second, making all these detailed amendments
on the floor in a document that nobody here
has had a chance to read is futile. I think
what we need to do is table this and bring it
back at the next Senate meeting so that by
which time everybody will have had a chance
to read this and possibly suggest amendments
to the Senate Council and to the Graduate
School. I don't think what we're doing right
now is fruitful. So I move to table and to
bring back at the next meeting.
CHAIR: That's not a debatable motion; is
it? To table?
CANON: Motion to table is debatable, yes.
CHAIR: Its debatable.
CANON: It needs a second right now.
CHAIR: It needs a second.
SAWAYA: How does the Dean feel about --
about tabling it?
BROTHERS: Your name please?
SAWAYA: Are you in a hurry to change
the rules?
BLACKWELL: I'm -- I'm not in a huge
hurry as you can tell, it's been going on for
a couple years now. It's -- it's up to you
all. It's, you know...
CHAIR: Okay. We can discuss very
briefly the table -- the motion to table, but
then I need a second, otherwise we have to
move on to the original or the previous
amendment. Yes.
HAYES: Jane Hayes, College of Engineering.
I -- I've had plenty of time to over it, and
I feel like we should let the Dean move on.
So I don't think we should table it.
CHAIR: Okay. So we have the motion to
table, is there a second?
(NO RESPONSE)
CHAIR: Okay. Now, we go back to -- then
move quickly on yours. Is there a second to
Bob Grossman's two additions, and my feeling
is that, Dean Blackwell, correct me if I'm
wrong, is proba-- you are just trying to
clarify what the intent of the Graduate
School is?
BLACKWELL: Yes. I can accept those as

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGDECEMBER2007.txt
friendly amendments.

GROSSMAN: Then we're good.
CHAIR: Yes.
BARNES: Tom Barnes, Agriculture.
Actually, you have a motion to amend for the very first, to change the word only which did not have a second yet and --
CHAIR: That was accepted by the Dean so didn't vote on it. It was -- it was her intent. It was consistent with her intent.
BARNES: Well, I take considerable exception in the College of Agriculture because that eliminates a third of our faculty by including the word only because we have extension title appointments. And I'm a perfect example. I have 100 percent extension appointment. I have multiple Ph.D and Master students. I publish as much as our other regular title series, and I know that extension faculty will feel very disrespected by that change.
BLACKWELL: Could I just clarify that? Faculty title series include extension, clinical, research, special and regular. Those are the title series. So they're all included in that group.
BARNES: The understanding I had from Bob was that it was only regular title.
GROSSMAN: I -- I -- well, I misspoke. It says, who is in a faculty title series. I added the word regular there myself. It's not --
CHAIR: I actually added -- clarified that it was not written --
BARNES: Incorrect?
CHAIR: Yeah.
GROSSMAN: That was my mistake.
BLACKWELL: So this is indeed for all faculty title series lines. It's not for lecturers.
GROSSMAN: It includes special title series also.
BLACKWELL: Right.
CHAIR: Okay. At this point I have to ask for a second to the previous -- otherwise, we don't know what we are discussing, whether we are discussing the original motion or the amendment. You all heard Bob Grossman's two points to clarify -- you said it's okay with you; isn't that what you said?
BLACKWELL: Yes, yes.
CHAIR: Okay. So we, perhaps, we don't have to vote on that either. Now, let me go to over there, yes.
CALVERT: So this is along the same lines as Bob's first point about the --
BROTHERS: Your name, please?
CALVERT: Ken Calvert, Computer Science. The first two sentences under A, I would like to suggest since they both talk about eligibility but really the first one is about -- I would suggest striking the word,

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGDECEMBER2007.txt

eligibility from the second sentence.

BLACKWELL: Ken, are you on page 25 or on page 24?

CALVERT: I'm on page 24 now under the big A, the very first thing that Bob -- same section Bob was talking about.

BLACKWELL: And just leave it as qualifications?

CALVERT: Just say qualifications.

BLACKWELL: That's fine. That's -- I accept that.

CHAIR: Okay. We are being very friendly today.

BROTHERS: I'm sorry, you're going to have to tell me again where that is?

CHAIR: Page 25 --

BLACKWELL: Twenty-four.

CHAIR: Twenty-four under A, the title is changed to --

UNIDENTIFIED: No, not the title.

CHAIR: Not the title.

BLACKWELL: It is the last -- under A, qualifications for membership, the last sentence for paragraph, eligibility qualifications, where it says, full, should just be qualifications.

BROTHERS: Didn't Bob's motion get rid of that so it says --

CHAIR: No.

BROTHERS: No, something else, okay.

CHAIR: Okay, now, are there any -- this is coming to you from Senate Council, therefore it doesn't require moving and second; it just is in front of you so to discuss.

Yes. I go over there; and then there; then go back over there.

MILLER: Joe Miller, College of Communications. I just have a question. I'm not clear about Bob's second change under full members. Was that just under letter D or was that last change made to be filed as under all four, A through D?

GROSSMAN: It was just to D.

MILLER: And what was it again?

GROSSMAN: To make explicit that the approval of the Graduate Council is required for item D, under circumstance D. But that it is not required for circumstances A, B, and C. Of course, the Dean can consult any time she wants, but --

MILLER: Right.

GROSSMAN: -- but that the approval of the Graduate Council is required under D.

CHAIR: And according to Dean Blackwell that was the intent actually.

BLACKWELL: Uh-huh (AFFIRMATIVE). It was al -- -- that was already the practice, yes.

CHAIR: Okay. Next question on that area.

EFFGEN: Different question, different topic.

CHAIR: Name?

EFFGEN: Susan Effgen, Health Sciences. The

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGDECEMBER2007.txt
question has to do with Associate Members.
They can now only be reviewed for a second
three year term. So those of us that have
inter-institutional agreements, doctoral
programs, that eliminates those agreements?
BLACKWELL: That is only for UK faculty in --
in the title series, that it's eligibility
for two renewals at the Associate level. For
people from other institutions, it's -- it's
renewable indefinitely.
EFFGEN: Where does it say that?
BLACKWELL: It says that that membership is
available at the Associate level renewably,
and I don't remember where it is.
EFFGEN: Does it say --
BLACKWELL: Oh, that it is. It says, Associate
membership from -- for those from other
universities --
EFFGEN: Where do you see that?
BLACKWELL: -- is limited to a renewal
three-year term, but it's renewable ad
infinitum.
EFFGEN: Is there a way of making that
clearer because to me it sounds more like, a
renewable.
BLACKWELL: Okay. We can make that plural.
Is limited to renewable three-year terms.
CHAIR: Okay. One other small change.
There was somebody back there -- no? Okay.
I'll go to you.
VIELE: Kert Viele, Arts & Sciences.
Just a question on -- on Bob's amendment. Is
-- is this A, B, C, and D, are these the only
way you can make full graduate faculty
status? Because the notion of, as I read
Bob's amendment, this says that if you're
acting only under those four conditions,
there's no other way it can happen. If
that's true, then the only way -- and I'm
asking, if that were to be true, does that
mean the only way that you can become a full
graduate member is if you have tenure or if
you're an advanced assistant professor? Does
that --
BLACKWELL: Right.
VIELE: You mentioned that Wendell Berry
issue, would that --
BLACKWELL: He's a professor.
VIELE: He is, okay, I -- I'm sorry. I
haven't been here that long.
BLACKWELL: Yeah.
VIELE: So --
BLACKWELL: And I -- I think that these are
the -- the operating rules. You never know
when there is going to be some major, major
exception that comes along that we can't
anticipate. And at that point, it's me, you
know, it's -- the decision of the Dean of the
Graduate School. If it's something that's
way crazy, I would consult with the provost
program, the DGS, the chair, the dean in --
in that college area, whatever it is. You
just never know. I also appoint the visiting

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGDECEMBER2007.txt
distinguished faculty member on committees who are from other universities usually, so they would fall into that category. Sometimes I appoint them in a unique full position for that reason -- for that specific assignment for that specific committee. So there are some exceptions out there. This is the operating document, but there may very well be exceptions.

- CHAIR: Any other questions? Back there.
ELDRED: Janet Eldred. English. Does the amendment that Bob made about approval of council, Graduate Council, interfere with your ability to make a call in those circumstances? I mean, how do you have to go back and get that individual approval?
BLACKWELL: I want to have that approval for advanced assistant professors because I think that that needs to be a more seriously considered kind of approval, and also I need to have council members who can look at the -- the disciplinary subject matter to make that call with me --
ELDRED: Okay.
BLACKWELL: -- because I can't know it all. So I'm cool with it in that specific instance of advanced assistant professors who are being proposed by their program to obtain full graduate faculty membership.
ELDRED: Thank you.
CHAIR: Any other comments? Yes. I'll come back to you next.
KIRSCHLING: Jane Marie Kirschling. I think you probably know the tension that I'm going to raise here, but as a dean of a professional school that has a Master's program in it, I have faculty who teach in my Master's program, who don't have a research component on their DOE, but they make a substantive contribution to the graduate program in the College of Nursing. So by adding, whose assignment includes a research component, seems to me to eliminate a good chunk of people for whom we may use them in Master's education because of our discipline and they're very qualified to do it, but now they're no longer eligible for associate or full. Do you see my tension? Because you've added --
BLACKWELL: They have no research component on their DOE at all?
KIRSCHLING: No. My special title people would, but my clinical title series people, we have not had the resources within the college to allocate scholarship time for them or research time for them. And we run a whole series of advanced practice programs that in fact rely very much on that very gifted practitioner to offer those, and so technically, I can't have any of them as faculty of record in the courses that there are -- what we absolutely have to have in order to be accredited.

BLACKWELL: I would -- this would be one of those special circumstances where we would have to have some negotiation about -- in the clinical translational areas, whether their -- their contribution to the graduate education program practicum is so strong, is so important in the plan of study that I would make a judgment call and say that would -- that one falls within the expectation for program requirements.

KIRSCHLING: So is there an exception statement in this that allows for that to happen?

BLACKWELL: No.

KIRSCHLING: Okay. Because if I just literally take A as a very concrete exercise, it will not tell me, as a dean, that I have the option to come to you and to Graduate Council to advocate on behalf of a program need, at least for the Associate level.

BLACKWELL: Maybe what you could propose is a very brief sentence here, exceptional cases should be brought to the Dean of the Graduate School for consideration.

KIRSCHLING: So I introduce that to you and would you accept that from a friendly perspective?

BLACKWELL: Yes. I was trying not to get 79 million exceptions but -- because there -- there has been -- in some areas there, you know, people are just pushing it down, and that's -- that's hard, but I would accept that.

CHAIR: Is that consistent with the language as it was written or we have to vote on that?

BLACKWELL: I want that language to stand because for the huge majority of our faculty, that's what is the defining criterium for graduate faculty activities.

CHAIR: Okay. Sheila, did you get that one sentence?

BROTHERS: Not completely. Is that -- proposed that exception -- should be a sentence, this is A, qualification for membership, after Bob's statement, then it would say, exceptional cases will be brought to the dean of the Graduate School.

UNIDENTIFIED: For consideration.

BLACKWELL: Yeah.

CHAIR: First we need the sentence, then we need to know where it should go.

BLACKWELL: Exceptional cases should be presented to the dean of the Graduate School for consideration. And it should be at the end of that first sentence under qualifications for membership.

KIRSCHLING: Which is on page 24.

BLACKWELL: On page 24.

BROTHERS: Thank you.

CHAIR: Okay. Now, we go to Bob and then over there.

GROSSMAN: Two things. First of all, it doesn't sound to me like this is an

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGDECEMBER2007.txt
exceptional circumstance. This sounds like this is actually a quite regular circumstance within the College of Nursing, so I don't think that this should be treated under an exceptional clause. And that was also one of the reasons why I asked if the first word under A, any, meant any or only. You said, oh, no, it's only. But now we're finding out, well, it's not only. So I -- I think that the entire word -- way that this is phrased really needs to be reconsidered at this point if there's a whole body of faculty who you want to consider the graduate faculty membership and aren't accounted for in these rules.

CHAIR: Okay. So I see a sense in here that perhaps that last one has to be a formal amendment, so let me go to this gentleman and then I'll ask you to make the amendment, if that's what you want to go with?

GROSSMAN: Yes.

BARNES: Tom Barnes, Forestry. Again, by saying, with a research appointment, you effectively eliminate about one-third of the College of Agriculture faculty members that may have 100 percent extension appointments but are still very active in terms of their research programs which is expected within our college. It's just that we do applied research. And so I think just like Nursing, you've got another large number of faculty, and again, I'm a perfect example, I have 100 research appointment, I would now have to leave the graduate faculty under that statement.

CHAIR: Okay. I'd like to resolve the earlier comments. Of course, everybody heard your comments, when we -- we'll come to that. So, the earlier Senator, would you -- would you like to make that an amendment, please?

KIRSCHLING: I'm working on it back here, trying to --

CHAIR: Oh, you're working on it, okay.

KIRSCHLING: Yeah.

CHAIR: So any comments, any reaction to the previous comment? Over there.

SWANSON: Hollie Swanson, College of Medicine. I was thinking about your case there and as we, in the College of Medicine, what we're trying to do is increase our clinical translational emphasis which means clinical people interacting with basic people, and so that means if I succeed in doing that, then I can't put any of my clinical colleagues on my graduate students' thesis. The same -- the same situation. So it really inhibits what's trying to happen at the national level, right?

KIRSCHLING: I -- I wonder whether there's enough protection if we were to strike, whose assignment includes a research component, and say any -- only faculty members or any faculty member who is in the faculty title

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGDECEMBER2007.txt
series could be considered for membership, because we have scholarly maturity and professional productivity there, which our faculty may -- the faculty in the (a) extension service, the practice faculty, may, in fact, have it, but it doesn't tie it to this notion that it's listed on a DOE for the block of time, because they don't have scholarly productivity. I'm just wondering if that's the simple -- that may be my solution in the College of Nursing. It may not work for others.

GROSSMAN: It would work for you, right?
CHAIR: Okay. Let's go over there.
MCKNIGHT: Robert McKnight, College of Public Health.

The same issue would occur in the College of Public Health because we have individuals on clinical title series as well that have zero percent research, and that would impact us for a select number of faculty as well.

CHAIR: Okay. Over here.
YATES: Yates, College of Education. I think this has gotten too complicated, and I move this be tabled. I'm going to make another motion that this be tabled again and -- and reconsidered after this -- some of these issues have had a chance to think them out thoroughly so that -- so that we can digest them. I mean, we're -- we're now going about three different colleges, and we've got lots of different amendments that are friendly amendments and some are new amendments. So I -- to me it sounds like it is time to table this and bring it back.

GROSSMAN: I'll -- I'll second that.
CHAIR: Professor Canon, can we have a second motion to table on the same item, or is that not allowed? Is that allowed?

CANON: No. I think you would have a second motion to table.

CHAIR: Okay. All right. So now we have a motion to table, it has been seconded; it's in front of you. Let's have a brief discussion on that.

CAMMERS: I actually had my hand up before and you missed me, so...

CHAIR: I make mistakes.

CAMMERS: Okay. Well, I'm not -- I'm not bitching or anything. I'm just saying, it happened.

So can I jump in front of the last speaker or is that not in order?

CHAIR: No. You can be in your own place which is right now. But I -- but I would like to as you to discuss the motion to table. I know it's a little bit perhaps not what you want, but will you please discuss the motion to table?

CAMMERS: I can shift my perspective to be totally in regard to the motion to table.

BROTHERS: Name, please?

CAMMERS: Arthur Cammers, Chemistry.
I think that what we're really discussing here is state versus federal rights, and the -- it's going to be more utilitarian to have the educational prospectus, the (inaudible) prospective, defined on the basis of centers and programs versus some overarching, huge constitution that doesn't really apply to everybody. So when -- the faculty makeup of the committee -- the graduate committee, should fit the program, right, and with consultation from the program and the dean, each one can come to a consensus.

CHAIR: Okay. Any other comment regarding motion to table?
Okay. Let's vote on that, but before I ask you to vote, do we need two-thirds or majority?

CANON: Just a majority.
CHAIR: Just a majority.
CANON: It has to be tabled to a certain date which presumably would be the next meeting but could be later.

CHAIR: Table to a certain -- who made the table -- who made the motion to table --

YATES: Seconded. To the next -- to the next Senate meeting.

CHAIR: February meeting.
BROTHERS: The February meeting is technically taken up with the GenEd discussion, so that's just a point of information.

CHAIR: Okay. Well, if February is not available, then we'll go to -- go to March. So all those in favor of tabling this motion so that the comments that were given, the cumulative comments of the Senators, could be considered by the Graduate School, please indicate so by raising your hand. Opposed? Okay. It's a clear majority. Two opposed. Abstain? One abstain. Two opposed; one abstained. Otherwise, okay. So now there's a technicality here because the amendments -- I will discuss this with Brad Canon, because I think the amendments that were already passed and agreed to are part of the motion that we come back with the changes, but I will clarify that and discuss it with you.

BLACKWELL: Okay.
CHAIR: Thank you, Dean Blackwell. All right.

BLACKWELL: But you have to get it done while I'm still Dean of the Graduate School.

CHAIR: Yes.
SNOW: Diane Snow, Health Sciences.
I just want to make sure that you can come back to be part of this again; that you'll be present when we have this discussion the next time?

CHAIR: I will make sure that I -- I will communicate with Dean Blackwell and decide on a day which is satisfactory.
Okay. All right. This next item

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGDECEMBER2007.txt
is -- I changed the title from what is in
your agenda because I thought this title is
-- although that's not part of the proposal,
but I just -- I want to let you know I
changed the title. UK has a rule regarding
GPAs. Only grades given by UK are translated
into UK GPA, so for example, if you come from
Ohio State University and transfer here,
some of your courses might count toward the
fulfillment of requirement of your degree,
but none of your grades, whether good grades
or bad grades, will be calculated in your UK
GPA. So there is a UK GPA rule, and we are --
- this proposal is asking you for an
exception to that rule for a very narrow and
small segment of students, and we will see
briefly, those are students who are enrolled
in Engineering's Extended Campus Cooperative
BS Program. This, I admit, is somewhat
convoluted. It was already in front of you.
I'm going to go over that before I ask Dean
Lineberry -- I saw him earlier, give me a few
minutes and I'll call upon you.

This is a cooperative program among
Western Kentucky Community and Technical
College and Murray and UK leading to chemical
and mechanical engineering degrees. It's my
understanding that the volume of work is very
small, maybe two courses only. It is a UK
degree, that's what a cooperative degree --
it's not a joint degree, a cooperative
degree. UK used to include WKCTC, along with
many other community colleges, in the UK GPA
until the separation of Community College
from UK. This caused some hardship and
unfair disadvantage for students with respect
to, for example, honor designation Summa Cum
Laude and other maybe scholarships,
financial aid. So last year the College of
Engineering came to this body and asked for a
one waive -- one-year waiver or extension of
what used to be so things would not change,
and that one year was asked so that a
proposal would be given -- developed and come
to you and here they are asking you to make
that basically exception and waiver, making
it a permanent exception. So now I can go to
Dean Lineberry, if he would like to add
anything, and of course he will be available
for all your questions.

LINEBERRY: The rationale for this request is
in your packet in a letter dated October 24,
2006. And the -- there were, I think, seven
examples of things that wouldn't go right if
we didn't revert the old way of calculating
the UK GPA. They fell in the categories of
financial aid and academic matters, and we've
had now a year for this to kind of percolate
and see whether it's going to operate to our
satisfaction and to the service of the
students and it has. And so we're just
simply asking for a continuation of this
waiver or to grant this exception.

CHAIR: It would be a permanent -- it would be basically -- once we approve it, it is part of the rule. Just to -- I don't know if he mentioned this, this would not apply and never did apply in the past to grades from Murray. It always applied to, again, Paducah Community College and now it's WKCTC, and here is a proposal in front of you; it is coming from Senate Council, Sheila, you have to help me, with a positive recommendation?

BROTHERS: I think so.

CHAIR: With a positive recommendation. There were some questions asked. I don't recall if there was any -- any consensus or otherwise. If I'm mistaken, those of you on the Senate Council, please mention. Otherwise, this doesn't require a second and I'm going to go to questions. Yeah.

CAMMERS: Question.

CHAIR: Name?

CAMMERS: Art Cammers, Chemistry. Sometimes we have students jumping out of the programs that are a little more difficult and taking a certain course that they know they aren't going to excel in in their current program, and then jumping back in. Is this just portraying to students that are coming from, let's say, Murray, coming into the program at UK that -- is it applying to --

LINBERRY: This would apply to students that are -- only students that are enrolled in the UK cooperative programs with -- with West Kentucky and Murray State. So once they are admitted to the College of Engineering they're program students. If they were to come to the main campus or if they transfer to Murray or what have you, they're treated -- when they come from Murray to UK, it would be treated exactly like any other transfer. Their GPA would not transfer if they go to Murray and take courses at Murray. It's only for students that are physically located on the Paducah campus. In fact, if they were to transfer from Paducah and come to Lexington, their GPA would go to zero.

That would be reserved for those students that are enrolled in chemical or mechanical engineering on the Paducah campus.

CHAIR: And we have discuss -- consult this with Jacque Hager, Associate Registrar, and we do think this is possible. So just for clarification, a student who goes to WKCTC and transfers, let's say to CoE at UK, their grade will not be counted in the GPA.

LINBERRY: Or -- or who attends there and is not registered in engineering courses, and therefore a part of our program. So if they're just PC -- I'm going to call it PCC, if they're just a PCC taking courses, and they're not admitted to UK, their -- they don't fall under this category. If they then transfer to UK, their GPA begins at zero

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGDECEMBER2007.txt
because they transferred from a former UK
Community College to UK, just like a student
from Madisonville or Henderson or anywhere
else would.

CHAIR: Could you tell us the total
number of students in this program?

LINEBERRY: Low 90's. We graduated about 110
since the program's inception. So we
have a total of 95 students, I think,
currently.

CHAIR: Okay. Any other comments from
Senators?

KOVASH: Why only --

CHAIR: Name?

KOVASH: Kovash, Arts and Sciences. Why
only chemical and mechanical?

LINEBERRY: We have two degree programs in
Paducah, chemical and mechanical; we have no
desire to add anymore.

CHAIR: Any other questions? Okay. You
seem ready to vote. All those in favor of
this permanent exception for this narrow
slice of students, please indicate so by
raising your hand. Any opposed? I don't see
any hands. Any abstain? Okay. It's
unanimous. Thank you.

Next, every year we approve
Academic Calendars. In fact, I'd like to
repeat, I was amazed that the Senate of this
University without any approval -- of course,
we always consult with the administration,
but without any approval from the
administration or the Board of Trustees,
could say no more, what is it, Fall break and
now we are going to be off academically the
day before Thanksgiving. So this is one of
the immense powers that this faculty has;
don't abuse it.

Here we are trying to approve this
calendar. Now, if there's going to be
any comment on any of these, it would be
unfair to vote this as a (inaudible). So I'm
going to pause and if nobody has any -- let
me give you, before putting this in front of
you, are there any concerns about any of
these? If not, I'm going to ask for a motion
for all of them together. Yes.

VIELE: This is more of a question.

BROTHERS: Name, please?

VIELE: Kert Viele, Arts & Sciences. We
run six-week courses that are not -- so they
-- they run from the start of the four week
and two weeks into the eight. These are not
mentioned in any of these calendars. And
whenever I teach them, people -- I always
have to deal with confusion on when they
start, et cetera, withdraw dates, and so on.
And just, I mean, I'm happy for it to start
in 2012 or whatever, but some day it would be
nice if these were incorporated.

CHAIR: Is Jacque Hager here? I wish --
she's almost always here when there's
anything to do with the Registrar. Surprised

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGDECEMBER2007.txt
that she's not here. I don't want to speak for her, but I think the reason we don't have a calendar for those, is because those courses are not uniquely started from the same time and end at the same time. I have seen the schedule of classes, many classes don't have a specific start time and a specific end time, and I'm guessing your courses are like that. Are they?

VIELE: I actually -- I -- I go when my DUS tells me to show up.

CHAIR: Okay. We do not have a standard six week, therefore it would be -- again, I don't want to speak for Jacques Hager, for Registrar, I think it would be possible to have standard calendar for those six weeks.

VIELE: Okay. Again, that was a question, not a complaint or anything like that.

CHAIR: Okay. So if I don't hear any concerns about these, then I would like to -- this is already in front of you. Doesn't need a motion, so we're going to consider all of these in one motion. It's recommended by Senate Council without any recommendation for or against it, so any last discussion? Are we ready to vote on that? All those in favor of approving these one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight tentative/calendars for university, please indicate so by raising your hand. Any opposed? Any abstained? Is there an abstain back there? One abstain and no opposed. So it's almost overwhelming majority.

Okay. We have one more item. This is a discussion only item. It's somewhat of a philosophical discussion, but eventually it's going to affect students lives. In fact, this went to the Senate Rules Committee as a rule interpretation. What happened was a few students, I don't remember how many, I would say probably less than five, showed up at the Registrar with a third Bachelor degree. And the Registrar are very good with when the letter of the rules doesn't allow them to do something, even if it doesn't prohibit them, they always consult us. So they came to Senate Rules Committee saying, are we allowed to? Senate Rules Committee said -- decided that this is not a matter of interpretation. In those three cases, if my memory serves me correctly, we said go ahead and approve it because it's totally unfair to tell a student after the graduation that, no, you're not going to get your degree. But then the Rules Committee said, this is a matter of a new rule, rather than rule interpretation. And Senate Council needed guidance. We need guidance from Senate, perhaps even the faculty at large, what do we do? So let me give you some further input into this. Second Bachelor's are mentioned specifically in the Senate Rule; it's SR

5.4.1.3. The gist of it is, and there's a brief statement by the way in your handout, the gist of it is that there is some double dipping. I don't know, for some reason the number 24 comes to mind. Is it 12 or 24?

UNIDENTIFIED: Twenty-four.

CHAIR: It's a number in that area number, that your second Bachelor's degree, you don't have to do certain requirements that you did in your first Bachelor's degree. So now here's the question: Lack of the mention of second, third, fourth or maybe even fifth Bachelor degree in the rules means what? And this is where we need guidance from you. Does it mean that no such degrees are allowed period, because it doesn't mention, doesn't mean you cannot get it, or does it you are not eligible, but there is no more double dipping, or is it the more literal interpretation -- I mean, this (inaudible) about interpretation; this is about the philosophy of this University. What does the faculty consider to be multiple degree. That the third Bachelor you would get it with the same amount of double dipping, you know you can have third, fourth, fifth, whatever, how many ever students want to get a Bachelor degree. So this is not a motion. There is no rule. We need guidance from you, so we'd like to hear from you. So please tell us what you think. Over there.

HAYES: Jane Hayes, Computer Science.
This might be a naive question, but is there a difference between a second degree and having a double major? Or does -- does this imply that the degrees are sequential as opposed to say a double major or a triple major, and you finished all at the same time and you went through graduation once. Do you see my question?

CHAIR: It might be a naive question, but I don't know the answer. So, does the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education know the answer to that question?

KRAEMER: It's too naive for me to answer.
I honestly don't know that distinction of a double major versus two degrees.

CHAIR: If I was betting, which this is not Las Vegas, I would say, no, it is not. I think that double major is like instead of having your minor, you are having an extra major within your program, but you get one Bachelor's degree. It's not two Bachelor's degree.

CANON: Kaveh --

CHAIR: Yes.

CANON: -- I think a double major requires that you get a different degree. That is -- I'm sorry, a second Bachelor's degree requires that you get a different degree. One might, say, major in German and English, but you would still be getting one

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGDECEMBER2007.txt
BA degree. If you majored in German and let's say, a BS in Chemistry or -- or Chemistry and Engineering which is cross college, that would be a second Bachelor's degree.

- CHAIR: Second Bachelor's.
YATES: Yates, College of Education.
I have a double major from this University. Okay. One in Mathematics and one in Kinesiology. It's a double major. It's not a double degree.
- CHAIR: Okay. So if I was betting, I would be a rich person now. All right. Good.
- HULSE: David Hulse, College of --
CHAIR: Give us some guidance on how to treat -- we already have a rule on the second. We'd like to have guidance from you what to do in the third and fourth times, et cetera. Yes.
- HULSE: David Hulse, College of Business and Economics.
We many students that do a double degree, not just a double major. My understanding is that the major difference is the number of hours required; that someone could do, theoretically, a double major within the 120 hours that are required. But to get a double degree, you have to do -- hit that minimum 144 hours. So, you know, it isn't just a difference in wording.
- CHAIR: Okay. Let's hear from you on the third degree.
- SNOW: Diane Snow, Health Sciences.
It seems what they're saying is that the double dipping part is that if you -- or your first year courses, or first and second year, general courses, that everybody take those, and then you just add on to them.
- UNIDENTIFIED: Right.
SNOW: So the alternative would be you'd have to take English 101 twice. It wouldn't make any sense, so you would be double dipping no matter what. If you had 20 degrees, you're still not going to take your general classes over. You would only take what's required for the fulfillment of whatever that next third, fourth or fifth degree is. So, I would say, let them go; they could have ten and they'd have all their basic education or GenEd and then they would have whatever it takes to get that next degree.
- CHAIR: I don't think necessarily you have to take English 101 the second time, but rather if -- if a degree requires minimum of 120 and you have already taken your English 101 or 102, whatever, 104, for the other degree, then you have to take other courses to bring you to the 120.
- SNOW: So double dipping is --
CHAIR: We are --
SNOW: -- (inaudible) specific courses

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGDECEMBER2007.txt
that require you --

CHAIR: Right. We are discussing that now.

HAYES: Yes. Back there.

HAYES: Jane Hayes, Computer Science.

So let me be just a -- a total capitalist. I think we need to make them take all the credits again so the University can make more money and be Top 20.

CHAIR: Over here.

THELIN: Thelin, Education.

On the other hand, if retention and degree completion is the measure by which you get state subsidy, hypothetically, we could have more degree recipients than enrolled students optimally, which would be optimal (inaudible).

CHAIR: That's interesting angle. Any other words of wisdom from you?

Back there.

UNIDENTIFIED: Kaveh, are you asking that for a third degree there should be some criterion equivalent to that for the second degree with 144 --

CHAIR: That's --

UNIDENTIFIED: -- (inaudible) should be like 168 or something. I mean, I'll just state my own -- that gets a little bit much. We begin to, I think, somehow dilute the whole concept here. You could conceivably have five degrees and 200-some credit hours, especially if there's so much double dipping going along here. I guess there's just something that doesn't feel right. I can't quite articulate what that feeling is.

CHAIR: By the way, I have to be faithful to the process. This A, B and C was not part of the question posed to you by Senate Council. This morning in order to facilitate discussion I put those three; doesn't mean there's no D or E or an F. So -- yes.

SWANSON: Hollie Swanson, College of Medicine.

So I think what doesn't feel right is it seems like it's keeping people in kindergarten for five years rather than advancing. (Inaudible) to advance; isn't that it what it feels like?

UNIDENTIFIED: It just feels a little strange.

CHAIR: Okay. We have 15 more minutes.

Yes.

HAYES: Jane Hayes, Computer Science.

Do we have any idea how many people we're talking about? I mean, if it's a small number of people, isn't this sort of an unreasonable thing?

CHAIR: It's -- the number that comes in my mind for last year is three. Now, I might be off by one or two but, Sheila, do you know?

BROTHERS: I think it was roughly that, but --

CHAIR: It is not like scores of people or dozens of them. Last year -- and maybe that was somewhat of an exception because the year before that Registrar did not come to

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGDECEMBER2007.txt
us. Maybe last year was a very -- an anomaly, that three students were getting a third Bachelor degree. Yes.

CHAPPELL: Joe Chappell, Engineering.

I think the -- the reason we wanted to get a sense of the Senate was, first of all, is there an issue with permitting three or more degrees, philosophically? And I think that's maybe what Phil had gotten to. And the second thing is, if there is no problem with that, what kind of requirements would have to be -- would have to be placed so that you just can't get -- at some point you could get one or two degrees every semester with all the overlap. And if no one has a problem with that, then no one has a problem with it. So, philosophically, is a third BS or fourth or fifth okay, and then if so, we need some guidance on, you know, what kind of restrictions should be made.

CHAIR: Just to add to that, a comment that I heard was, after your second Bachelor's if you really want to get another degree, maybe you could get a graduate degree. That's the comment I heard. So let me go back over there.

CALVERT: Ken Calvert, Engineering.

So on that issue, I think that the current rule is a little bit -- well, I would prefer to see it stated as a delta or an additional number of hours that you have to get for each subsequent degree because the current way it's stated makes it easier to get second degrees. Some -- different colleges have different numbers of total. For example, in Engineering, you've got to have typically 128 or so hours to get a first degree. So it's a smaller increment. So I would prefer to see it as a uniform -- but I have not idea what it should be in terms of numbers of additional hours.

CHAIR: Okay. Let me go over there.

KIRSCHLING: Jane Kirschling. A question for you in terms of -- I assume the second degree policy is applicable to individuals who have graduated with a first degree and a year later decide to come back. Let's say you have a Nursing person who graduated with a Bachelor's of Science and now comes back to the business school. So this is only for people -- they have to do these degrees simultaneously in order for this to qualify because I -- I -- I can see lots of scenarios where over the course of one's life, they may come back and get a second, fourth or third baccalaureate degree at University of Kentucky based on their career needs and consequently I did not (inaudible) come back and do 120 credit hours that they've already done, their liberal arts and their -- all that stuff so, just I need an interpretation in terms of the notion of a second degree from UK or a third baccalaureate degree from

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGDECEMBER2007.txt
UK?

CHAIR: Does anybody know before I make my best guess? I have to speak from memory, but does anybody know the answer to that question? Then my -- my -- my best answer right now is the rule for a second degree is independent of whether you do it continuously, whether you come back five years; it's independent of that. Yes, go back there, then over here.

REMER: Remer, Education.
I'm wondering does this just apply to degrees from University of Kentucky? As a potential Donovan Scholar, I'd love to collect a few more BS degrees or BA degrees along the way. Do I have to go back and take all the general requirements even though I have a Ph.D.?

CHAIR: This applies, to my understanding, only to UK degree. And if you have a Ph.D. from somewhere else, then it's a matter of accepting your general studies or not. I don't know; depends on the admissions -- the admission department. Yes, over here.

SNOW: Diane Snow.
To the previous comment, I have the same concern about how long it would make it because it does seem like if you left for a year and you came back, that would be just fine because all of your requirements would be current, but if somebody waited 10 years, it would probably not be; education would advance. So we need to put a number on that, it appears, when we finally get to a point of making the rules.

CHAIR: Okay. Any other suggestion to us? Yes, over there.

KIRSCHLING: Jane Kirschling, College of Nursing. I would just ask the people to think about flexibility as we think about life-long learners. We, for example, have a second degree undergraduate baccalaureate offering where we draw people from all sorts of baccalaureate fields, Master's fields, Ph.Ds. They may, in fact, be their first degree or second degree or fourth degree, but they're coming back at a time when the workforce shortage for a baccalaureate degree. So I would encourage us to think more broadly in terms of people who are coming back for additional education who started with us and now want to come back to us because we wouldn't preclude somebody who had two baccalaureate degrees, one from Murray and one from the University of Louisville to come get a baccalaureate degree. So I just -- I -- I think we've got to think as broad as we can in terms of the College of Nursing. So that's my plea--

CHAIR: That's exactly the type of wisdom and guidance that we want from you. All the way back there.

ELDRED: Janet Eldred, Writing Initiative.

Phil is not going to like that I bring this up, but what I do with the writing requirements now when I get applications for second degrees to try to determine whether the person needs new writing, is insufficient to Phil, and he looks at the whole case, how long -- asking the question, for example, that Dean Snow was bringing, how long has the -- how long has it been since the person has had a class and, you know, what did the class look like, you know, questions like that. So we put together a whole -- it's -- it's really a petition and you grant -- you probably don't remember this, but you grant exceptions or not based on those cases.

CHAIR: Anybody else? Yes.

KRAEMER: Are you saying -- I hope what you're saying is that we're going to have some subcommittee of the Senate asking questions whether -- apparently we don't have a policy for degrees beyond two. Because as I read the statement here, it's pretty explicit about two degrees.

CHAIR: Correct.

KRAEMER: So we have some group ask the question about what policy we would want to have, draft some proposal, and have the Senate evaluate that.

CHAIR: Correct.

KRAEMER: Including the question of whether we want to put some limit on the number of degrees, especially with respect to the double, triple, potentially quadruple dipping.

CHAIR: Okay. As I said, in fact, some interpret this as -- I was surprised that someone would interpret it this way, but somebody interpreted that a third degree is not allowed under the strict -- the ruling of the -- of the Senate rule, but that's what we are here -- eventually we're going to ask one of these committees to write a rule, to amend the rules that we have, and that's you're here, to get guidance from you. Yes.

SWANSON: Hollie Swanson, College of Medicine.

So I guess what we're saying would be that if it wasn't allowed, then that fourth or fifth degree would be (inaudible). They're would be a lower margin of satisfaction?

CHAIR: That's the idea. I have heard some people say it's not good for a student -- as I said, if you have -- after your second degree, if you want a third degree, why don't you get a Master's degree? People have forwarded that kind of an argument.

NARDOLILLO: Nardolillo, Fine Arts.

What about the idea, though, that these students that are accumulating these degrees are widening their base of knowledge. I mean, if you get an undergraduate degree and then you go on to a Master's degree,

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGDECEMBER2007.txt
specializing in that field, but what about students that want to broaden their total base of knowledge? Shouldn't we -- I mean isn't that the case where a third or fourth degree comes in handy or would be -- where we would want to encourage that, where a student has, you know, fulfilled the sort of general education requirements at the University, but then is adding specializations and -- and creating for themselves a wide bottle of knowledge that they'll later take out in the community with them.

CHAIR: Back there.

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.
One thing that occurred to me

when he was speaking was the possibility of some type of portfolio for that person who is going for third or fourth degree, where they might be able to -- instead of increasing credit hours, to demonstrate something, some kind of proficiency so that they could go on for their third or fourth degree without taking additional lower level credit hours.

CHAIR: Okay. All right friends. I guess we have exhausted all of our agenda items.

Have a wonderful holiday. See you in February.

* * * * *

THEREUPON, the University of Kentucky Senate Council meeting for December 10, 2007 was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

STATE OF KENTUCKY)
COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

I, LISA E. HOINKE, the undersigned Notary Public in and for the State of Kentucky at Large, certify that the facts stated in the caption hereto are true; that at the time and place stated in said caption the UK Senate Council Meeting was taken down in stenotype by me and later reduced to computer transcription under my direction, and the foregoing is a true record of the proceedings which took place during said meeting.

My commission expires: January 26, 2011.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 21st day of January, 2008.

LISA E. HOINKE
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE-AT-LARGE
KENTUCKY