

Xcript 3-17-08 Senate.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

MARCH 17, 2008

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
DAVID RANDALL, VICE-CHAIR
LISA E. HOINKE, COURT REPORTER

to go ahead and

CHAIR:

Okay. I'm going

call the Senate meeting to order. Minutes for the February Senate meeting, I am sure you have all noticed are -- they are not in your handout. Sheila sends her regrets. In fact, Sheila has been out for almost the last -- past month in and out, and tomorrow she's going to have back surgery. So please have her in your thoughts, and she apologizes. She told me, tell them that this is the very first time and she was so sad that this is the first time. I tried to comfort her, said, no, Sheila, it's not the first time; it's the second time. So I think it did not comfort her that much. Another observation is amazing, but when she has back pain, I get back pain too because she cannot come and help me.

Xcript 3-17-08 Senate.txt

We also don't have a parliamentarian. I've been trying to get a parliamentarian. Please, I'm asking you guys, if you know anybody who likes this type of -- of material, the parliamentarian, please forward their name to me. I'm going to send a formal announcement and request that you nominate people. If you have any enemies, this is...

Okay. I have sad news about Professor Ross Scaife, in Classic and Modern Languages, he passed away this past Saturday. He was only 47. And I am told, although I didn't know him, perhaps I would remember his face, but I couldn't put the name and the face, that he was attending the Senate meetings in the throes of his cancer treatment. So what I'd like to ask you to please stand and have a moment of silence for our colleague.

(PAUSE)

CHAIR:

Thank you.

Continuing with announcements.

There's going to be a Board of Trustees election very soon. Trustee and Professor Jeff Dembo has indicated that he is not seeking re-election, although by rules he's entitled to do so. So start thinking about -- about volunteering yourself or somebody else. And if you are on the fence, remember -- I think there are some basketball tickets and free parking anywhere on the campus.

Okay. The Senate apportionment is going to be computed pretty soon, and we're going to report to the Deans regarding how many new or vacant spots they have, and there's going to be college elections hopefully before May 15.

And honorary degrees recommended by the Senate were unanimously approved by the Board, all of them, including the one for Gifford Blyton who is our beloved parliamentarian for 35 years. Please try to attend the May graduation ceremony, if at all possible, to support all the students but also our parliamentarian.

Okay. Let's go to our first major item. Now, you are all familiar with this. I should have first got this thing to work, but I'm going to do it right now. I hope it will work. Well, I should have known, the pointer doesn't work today. This is a new computer; they couldn't get it to work and this hotlink is not working. But the timeline, actually, I was smart enough to ask Adrea to also put in your handout. You can see the timeline, and if this would be working, I would also show you the principles. But it is not working. Okay. It worked. What happened? Yes, it does work. Okay. So this is the timeline.

Xcript 3-17-08 Senate.txt

It's actually abbreviated timeline. And here is the principles. They are also in your handout. You are familiar with this. We have already considered this last week. So now it's time to get to the approval. This set of principles has been approved unanimously by the Senate Council with a positive recommendation to the Senate. And the recommendation -- and I'm going to show you later on again, is that the Senate approve the set of principles as distributed. Now, let me take about a minute or so to do a background -- give you the background for this, to set up the situation. When contemplating how much time we should give to this agenda item, I thought, okay, 15 minutes approval and 45 minutes for me to explain to you what it is that you are going to be approving. But joking aside, major undertaking such as this -- such as General Ed cannot be accomplished, of course, in a few weeks, not even a few months. And in fact, this has been -- taken several years as you already know from the timeline document that I just showed you. However, major proposal such as this will present an internal contradiction. On -- on one hand, we would like to be sensitive and respectful to the product of years of the labor of faculty colleagues who have come up with this proposal, and not make any changes -- changes on-the-fly. On the other hand, the Senate final and absolute authority must be respected. We simply cannot treat the Senate as a (inaudible). This inherent contradiction is resolved by the Senate Rule that requires any major proposal to be first considered a discussion only item. And then in the subsequent meeting, it would be represented for final vote and approval. The purpose of the discussion only is to give the Senate Senators that we just discussed, to bring up their objection, to make their suggestions and -- and these suggestions to be considered. Indeed, these suggestions were considered and they were all implemented in this final version. We had our discussion in February. It was one of the best meetings that I ever recall Senate had, and these thoughtful suggestions have been all implemented. Now this modified version that you have in front of you is up for approval. So I'd like to remind you one more time to please remember that we have already discussed this and your suggestions have been implemented and please restrain yourself and I'm just imploring you and not amend this product of several years of work of faculty colleagues on-the-fly. Now, of course, if you do not like the proposal, then you are entitled to

Xcript 3-17-08 Senate.txt

-- to reject it. If this is something UK will not be proud of, and we are not proud of, again, you don't have to approve it. But I'm only asking you not to amend this on the spot here. This document, as I said, has the unanimous support of the Senate Council, and the Senate Council is recommending, and -- and the Provost is also supporting this proposal. So maybe I could switch to -- put this up one more time. It doesn't fit all of it; there are seven principles. Okay. Well, you have it in your handout. So let me ask Provost Subbaswamy if he wants to add anything before I start the approval process?

SUBBASWAMY: Only that, you know, we took all the valuable comments that had arrived before the last meeting, as well as the discussion that took place here, and I met with a faculty focus group and tried out some of the changes. And then subsequently, that changed version was submitted to the Senate Council, and the Senate Council had its own thoughts and so there was a lot of back and forth. And in the final analysis, I thought that the version that the Senate Council approved was far superior to the previous versions and -- and made some substantive but important changes, and I'm very pleased with where we are, and I think -- I hope you'll approve it. And if you do, I promise that we'll promptly get to the real task of coming up with a curriculum that flows from these principles and keep you updated and make sure that along the way, we are fulfilling the charge that you give to your colleagues, faculty colleagues to take these principles and come up with a General Education curriculum for the 21st century that you can be proud of. Thank you.

CHAIR: Associate Provost Kraemmer, would you like to add anything to that?

KRAEMMER: Ditto.

CHAIR: Okay.

KRAEMMER: And quite seriously, I would only say that, realize we're -- we're approving these general guidelines, design principles here, that -- that will unleash an effort -- there will still be a lot of work by faculty to actually develop a concrete proposal, and that will come back through the Senate. So I just want all of our Senators to realize what we are approving here and what we're not. These are design principles, so most of the work is yet ahead, and I hope that we can enthusiastically and quickly endorse these principles and get on to that next stage of work.

CHAIR: Okay. Again, I'd like to remind you we have already discussed this last

Xcript 3-17-08 Senate.txt
month. If some of you were not here, you missed a very Senate meeting. So are we ready for approval? This is coming from the Senate Council. Doesn't require a motion. It's assumed that it's already moved and seconded. Are there any comments, questions, suggestions, praises? Okay. Then I'm going to ask -- yes, please.

CALVERT: Ken Calvert, College of Engineering. So one of the concerns that was expressed by the College of Engineering is about double dipping and the potential disruption of the existing engineering curriculum, many requirements for which are imposed by accreditation requirements. And I may have missed it, but I -- I don't think I've seen a concrete response to that concern yet. I wondered if the Provost or if anyone could address that -- that concern?

CHAIR: I'm going to go to my colleague here, Ernie Yarnarella.

YARNARELLA: The Senate Council had a very spirited discussion about that particular issue, and I that out of the revisions that you find in guiding principle number 2, the narrative that focuses on the sentence that begins: As a result, it is expected that there will be fewer opportunities for double-counting courses to satisfy both general education and pre-major disciplinary requirements. And what counterbalances this, the narrative in guiding principle number 3 that says: Similarly, it is expected that some general education goals will be achieved and reinforced by incorporating them into the course of study in the major and through program electives. I think that that was the spirit in which it was suggested. I believe Connie Wood, who I don't see her right at the moment, was quite insistent on making the language a bit more flexible, and she certainly prevailed in the Senate Council in light of suggestions, such as the one that was made by Engineering at the last meeting.

CHAIR: Anybody else want to speak to that particular issue?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Chemistry, Arts & Sciences. I get -- some of the discussion -- a lot of discussion in our department has actually focused on this issue of the first year curriculum and the amount of time that -- that will be required to be taken up by these general ed requirements, and then versus our current curriculum and pre -- the sequence of prerequisites that we need. And original -- as this was originally formulated, we basically saw no way of doing an ACS, American Chemical Society-approved degree in -- in four

years. So, do you -- if you also envision that the commitment of the first year curriculum, all students take these courses in their first year, be flexible or -- or is it something that's -- that's going to be very rigid.

CHAIR:

Please.

SUBBASWAMY:

Certainly what needs to happen is we need to, first and foremost, agree on learning outcomes. That's really where it's headed. How you then achieve those learning outcomes will depend -- will, in fact, dictate the curriculum and derive from the curriculum. So I think that for a complex undergraduate set of majors that we have in a university like this, we have to be cognizant of that. But I think the learning outcomes have to dictate how we achieve that and it may well be that -- I mean, you know, can I guarantee -- can any of us guarantee, that they will have to be -- there will be no changes at all for either -- any of the pre-major requirements or the pre-major courses. I think that -- that -- they may have to do some interaction with that. That -- maybe certain things get incorporated into the pre-major courses, certain things get incorporated into upper division courses. So I think there has to be flexible on both sides. I think if it's -- the flexibility has to come solely from the first -- first and second year curriculum, I'm not sure how far we can go if we have very specific learning outcomes that are specified. But if there is flexibility on both sides, to the extent that the accreditation agencies also permit, of course, then I think absolutely that would have to be a part of the conversation.

CHAIR:

Okay. Anything else?

CALVERT:

Ken Calvert again. A process question, after this, then presumably the next step will be to -- will be to formulate the learning outcomes, and will they then go through the same approval process as the principles have?

CHAIR:

I can partially answer that. I don't think I -- I don't think I know the answer. What I know is that after this we will be shortly -- maybe very shortly, maybe even this week, to the start the process of appointing a steering committee who will then help us to appoint a couple of other committees so that the implementation stage will be done. Your specific question, I do not know the answer to. If anybody knows the answer, please let us know.

SUBBASWAMY:

I mean, I don't know the answer, but I can pose some more questions I think. I think the challenge is the following: The Senate meets so many times, and we have

faculty committees that have to go do the work. Some vetting to be done with undergraduate councils, and other groups that are more directly involved, obviously. So at which step of the process or which steps of the process we need to come and have two readings with the Senate and get an approval, intermediate approval, and which processes can be done at the undergraduate council levels and the Senate Council, obviously, being informed and using their judgment on when something may need to come to the Senate versus, okay, here is a green flag, continue until the next step. That needs to be negotiated. Frankly, every step of the way, if we had to get first reading, second reading, and approval. It may be five, ten years before we will have a new curriculum, and I think, having already spent three years, I would urge that we all use prudent judgment in arriving at a process that, you know, makes sure that we're listening to adequate input from across the University, and then at those stages where it is critical, that we come to the Senate and make sure that we have the Senate with us, we do that as well. I don't have an answer, but those are the kinds of considerations that I think we need to take into account.

CHAIR: What I can add is that I will assure you that nothing can be done -- of course, once we approve this today, if we approve this, then that part becomes a done deal. If these things were a done deal, we would already have a Ged Ed program last December, if I remember. That's the truth, that nothing is a done deal. And the Senate is the final authority.

STEINER: Steiner, Biology. A few faculty asked had the Senate Council come up with some ideas of what -- what the systematic type of assessment that they're thinking of. I got some questions from faculty. This was something that they couldn't -- that was -- all I'm looking for is some thoughts about what -- what -- what kinds of things are you thinking about by systematic assessment of outcomes and other things, just --

CHAIR: Anybody from Senate Council, Ernie? And if anybody else from Senate Council want to chime in, please let me know.

YANARELLA: I believe from a fairly early point in the General Education Reform effort, there has been a concern with the necessity of avoiding what we had experienced with USP, which was the lack of any kind of systematic assessment. As things sifted out in the discussions that took place, not only within the General Education Reform and Assessment Committee,

but also at the various college forums, what -- what became clear was that there are two aspects of assessment which are critical. One is student assessment and the student's ability to learn over a period of four or six years in the undergraduate curriculum. The other is program assessment. There was a misconstrual of this notion of systematic assessment to -- by a few people who thought that this was going to be turning a critical light on -- on faculty in -- in particular. This would be another -- another burden on faculty. That's really not what has been considered during this long discourse on the issue of -- of varying reform, general education reform with assessment.

CHAIR: Any other comments?

SUBBASWAMY: I can certainly bring the national perspective to bear with this question a little bit, in that in -- well, first of all, accrediting agencies as well as the federal government have gotten the act a little and -- and certainly being more adventurous in trying to tell us how we need to -- I guess we need to do assessment and demonstrate we do that. But setting that aside, there are multiple levels of this. One is at the program assessment level, there are now instruments that are being developed that are sample -- that -- that are sample -- that are given to samples of student groups; that is, you give it to, you know, 300 freshmen randomly chosen, and either follow them through the senior year and see have you added to their just collective knowledge or whatever, your learning outcomes. Even the current USP has fairly well specified learning outcomes which we haven't necessarily measured in -- in these kinds of ways. And then at the course level, if you have, you know, your own learning outcomes well defined in your course, you can embed those kinds of things, questions into your own tests and examples, you -- I'm sure you already do, but perhaps a little more thoughtfully than we might have done previously. And then there's student self reporting, and then on top of that, you know, you can do grade analysis and other, you know, course level kinds of analysis. So there's nothing, you know, magical about this. The only new thing that's being talked about nationally is, for general education, is critical thinking and those kinds of things are, in fact, learning outcomes. There are now, I think, fairly sophisticated instruments that are being developed that can be used on -- on samples of populations, not everybody takes it, but samples of populations. And that's one way of getting

some idea of whether the program learning outcomes are being met or not.

We are currently trying something called the Collegiate Learning Assessment, CLA. We have both a -- it's a cross-sectional analysis, we both had a sample of freshmen and a sample of seniors take it this year, and we're going to follow this through three more years, and we'll have some baseline data.

CHAIR: Okay. Anybody else? Please.

BOLLINGER: Chris Bollinger, Economics.

Forgive me if this was discussed a lot the last time, but you said you've got some preliminary data on our -- whether our general education is meeting these goals through these assessments. So is our general education currently broken? Do we have evidence that there's a problem that we have to fix?

CHAIR: Well, either this has already been discussed or should have been discussed, but if somebody has a -- I never said that by the way. When you said, me, you meant the Provost, or did you mean me?

BOLLINGER: Either.

CHAIR: I did not say that. And I do not know that to be the case or not. But if anybody has a short answer to that question please, let us know. Name?

ELDRED: Janet Eldred. We did a small piece of it for the writing requirement when we had the one year, and it was broken.

BOLLINGER: Okay.

ELDRED: That led us to do the two tier. You know, we discovered things that we weren't particularly happy with.

SUBBASWAMY: I think if you follow the -- now approximately three-year history of this process, there were several committees, including the general education reform and assessment. There was a self-study. All -- if you look through those reports which are all available on that site, there was a, I think, fairly widespread dissatisfaction with -- certainly we're not being measured and certainly there's not been a systematic assessment. But I think in general that various pieces that people have looked at were broken. And apart from that, I think we've also argued that certain things have changed about the world. When in -- 20 years is when USP was set up, and now it's time to take another look at what has changed in the world of us.

CHAIR: God knows after three years I'm not trying to rush you at all. Are there anymore questions.

Okay. Yes.

HALLMAN: Diana Hallman, Fine Arts. I got some commentary from a few professors, but

some of the comments seem to be more relevant to the next stage. But at this point, there was a reaction to under 4, the not-so-great- writing of item 3, specifically mentioned a dangling modifier and -- and just lack of clarity, at least to his mind. And I'm just wondering, you know, if that -- if that can be refined in terms of how that's expressed. I personally reacted to under one, we should intentionally set knowing how to learn, it's kind of awkwardly written to me but -- so I -- it's something we might... But especially 4, 3, if anybody could suggest how to write it a little bit more clearer and grammatically.

CHAIR: Okay. Michelle, can you help me with the counting? All those in favor of this set of principles, please indicate so by raising your hand.

I'm going quickly to oppose?
Abstain?

MICHELLE: None.

CHAIR: We don't -- thank you. So it's unanimous, and I think we owe each other a round of applause.

Thank you. Okay. The next item, you have proposed change to Senate Rule 5.1.8.2 and 6.3. They are connected to each other, course withdrawal deadline change and academic evaluation deadline change. Very briefly -- and we did this as a pilot or only applicable to -- to freshmen two years ago, and at that time it was mentioned that the proposal to make this permanent and for everybody is in the pipeline and here it is in front of you. Basically, it changes the nine weeks to eleven weeks. As I said, I don't want to give you any excuses, but Sheila not being here, I made the mistake and did not put, instruction after week, after -- in number one. And the reason for that is we don't the spring break to count as one of those 10 or 11 weeks. So please, that's -- I think in your handout, I'm correcting that. If we vote, we are voting -- in fact, this was approved by the Senate Council, so doesn't need any amendment or voting on it. I don't know who is -- who wants to speak to this before I go to the general Senators? Are there some proposals? Yes. That's right. I was going to -- I forgot. Thank you.

I told her if I forget, please raise your hand so I remember. We made one other mistake. The parenthetical part of this where it says, except for those used to meet the writing requirement, is that why you raised your hand?

ELDRED: Yes.

CHAIR: So many people are making sure I do a good job.

Xcript 3-17-08 Senate.txt

The parenthetical statement was also removed by Senate Council, but Sheila wasn't in that meeting, and yada, yada, yada, we are here right now.

So, please, I cannot -- I'm not talented enough to scratch it out right now for you, but I want you to make sure what you are approving. Does anybody want -- okay, let me go to all the Senators. Are there any questions for this? It's very simple. It's a profound change. This is not a -- it's a very serious change, but it's very simple to go from nine to eleven.

GROSSMAN: What is the rationale for this?

CHAIR: Yes. Name, please.

MCMAHAN: Adrienne McMahan, College of Arts & Sciences. The main reason for this is because we -- the institution has gone heavily into academic advising and getting in touch with students (inaudible) the early warning system and so forth. As the deadline stage right now, by the time they file their midterm grades, advisors have between two and four days of turnaround. This time they had zero because we didn't get the information on the warning, to get in touch with students about withdrawing and so forth. So we're trying to be more of an advocate; and also currently researching our benchmarks, we find that this is also very similar to the approaches they are taking.

CHAIR: By the way, there was consideration discussion whether this could be effective immediately, meaning this semester. This semester, the last day to withdraw was --

MCMAHAN: Was the Friday before spring break.

CHAIR: -- the Friday before spring break. And my colleagues on the Senate Council almost unanimously said, no, it's just too late to do that; so it's going to be effective -- you're going to see -- effective summer 2008. Are there any questions about this proposal? Okay, then, we're going to go ahead and vote.

All those in favor of the proposal, please indicate so by raising your hand.

Any opposed? One.

MICHELLE: One.

CHAIR: Any abstain? One --

MICHELLE: Three abstain.

CHAIR: -- two, three. So it's --

Let me write it down. I know it's being transcribed but -- unani -- everybody except one opposed -- was it three?

MICHELLE: Three abstain and one oppose.

CHAIR: Three abstain, okay. This was item number 3. Okay. We're done with that item.

Item number 4, proposed change to

Xcript 3-17-08 Senate.txt
Senate Rule 5.4.1.1, Application for Degrees, Standardize Degree Application Deadline. This has been considered and approved with positive recommendation by the Senate Council to the Senate, and the recommendation is that the Senate approve the changing in the application deadline effective Fall 2008. Now, I think there is a -- it's always friendly amendment, but Dean Blackwell do you have any recommendation on that?

BLACKWELL: Yes, actually, because I just talked to Adrienne about this. The grad -- the way that this change is -- is made leaves out graduate students, and we don't -- the graduate students do not need to have, nor do we request having that very early application for degree. It's much better for us to do it in the semester in which the degree is -- is granted. So I will introduce something at Graduate Council that's specifically for graduate students that will then come forward, and I hope it will come forward in a timely fashion so that these could go into effect then for the degree period, you know, Fall of 2008. I'll try to hustle it up and get something out there. We will essentially keep the rules as they are now, but probably give specific dates so that it's in time for approval by University Senate and Board of Trustees.

CHAIR: So this one as it is is okay for now as far as the concept?

BLACKWELL: Right. Yeah. We'll have to add something to it.

CHAIR: Okay. Anybody else? Over there.

CALVERT: Ken Calvert, College of Engineering. So if I'm understanding correctly, the note will be part of the rule that's removed after -- in the Fall, when it's no longer relevant, right?

CHAIR: The note?

CALVERT: The -- the -- the note that talks about when it's going to be effective. So do we need the part that says for degrees to be awarded beginning with May 2009 be in the rule? It's a little bit clumsy because it says, the college from which the undergraduate degree is to be awarded or degrees to be awarded beginning with May 2009 by November 30, et cetera.

CHAIR: Okay, so we are not talking about effective date Fall 2008 which is here, but rather something in the --

UNIDENTIFIED: In the note.

CHAIR: Okay. Well, if you have a suggestion?

CALVERT: My suggestion is to delete the phrase, for degrees to be awarded beginning with May 2009 --

UNIDENTIFIED: It's in there twice.

CALVERT: -- out of the rule --

Xcript 3-17-08 Senate.txt

CHAIR: Oh, it's in it twice.
UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.
CHAIR: Okay. Please show to me where it is right after the meeting so I will know exactly where it is. Why don't you make that an amendment?
CALVERT: So I propose to amend the text of the rule by deleting the first occurrence of the phrase, for degrees to be awarded beginning with May 2009.
GROSSMAN: Second.
CHAIR: Okay. Bob Grossman second it. All right. Are there any discussion on the amendment?

Okay, all those in favor of the amendment, please indicate by raising your hand. That's what I thought.

Okay. Opposed?

Abstain? One abstain.

Okay. The amendment passes.

Now, the entire proposal, are we ready to vote on that?

All those in favor of the proposal, please indicate so by raising your hand.

Any opposed? One.

Any abstain? One opposed; one abstain.

The motion passes, amended motion passes.

Okay, next item, we have four program suspensions. They are Secondary German Education, Secondary Spanish Education, Secondary French Education, and Secondary Classic Education. I normally know who from these departments are going to be here so I would introduce them. I do not know that, so let me ask if anybody from any of these departments is here to speak to these program deletions -- sorry, suspensions?

BLACKWELL: I'm here.

CHAIR: Okay. If you want to speak, please, Dean Blackwell, go ahead. On all of them or just the German?

BLACKWELL: Yes. I'm in my other disguise, I'm a German professor. The -- the reason for the suspension of these programs is because we've reorganized, restructured the way that teaching certification in the Modern and Classical Languages is organized. It's now managed through the program called Teaching Oral Languages that's located in the College of Arts and Sciences. We use some course work from the College of Education, but the degree is actually granted through the College of Arts and Sciences. This was the old way of doing it, and the last students have now cycled out of these teacher preparation programs offered under the aegis of the College of Education and the new students

coming out of the new system; a Master's with initial certification in teaching oral languages in the branches of the different languages.

CHAIR: Anybody else from any of the other programs? Any question on any of these? Yes.

ELDRED: Janet Eldred, English. I just -- one easy question. Why was it suspended and not deleted?

BLACKWELL: That I don't know.

ELDRED: Because if it's like deleted -- it's like gone; wouldn't you just delete it?

CHAIR: It's interesting that you ask. There is going to be some other deletions that is going to come later on, and the Senate Council was adamant, saying, why don't you suspend it first? It has the same effect. But in five years, you want to revise it, it's a matter of just flipping a switch, but if you delete it, you have to go through a lot of hoops. Now, I'm not speaking to this one. I just want to say it's ironic that you mention that. Usually, we suspend and then after a few years, then we delete.

BLACKWELL: Maybe the Dean of Arts & Sciences knows?

HOCH: I don't know why we're suspending it. We replaced it with something that's never going to come back so I don't where in the process it got changed, but we have full programs that do it in the new version. We're never going to have -- we're never going to reinstate those unless we abolish the old one -- or the new one that we currently have. So I recommend just deleting them because they're not going to be revived.

CHAIR: But I checked these, I can show you, randomly one of them, I wanted to make sure I'm not going to make mistakes since Sheila is not here, and it said that -- see this checkmark here?

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

CHAIR: Suspension. Right there.

HOCH: Well, Kaveh doesn't know why it was suspended either.

CHAIR: And --

UNIDENTIFIED: No, I would delete them as well.

CHAIR: Now, here's the Dean of Arts and Sciences, but if it was anybody else, I would be very nervous to change this right here, and -- but --

GROSSMAN: This is a College of Education program that we're voting on.

UNIDENTIFIED: Correct.

CHAIR: Oh, the College of Education.

GROSSMAN: We should not -- we should not change what they've asked for unless they give --

CHAIR: Or at least by amendment --

UNIDENTIFIED: Right.
CHAIR: -- not -- okay. So as much as I want -- yes, go ahead.
UNIDENTIFIED: They moved the program. They moved the program.
GROSSMAN: I understand. I understand.
CHAIR: Anybody from Education, Dean of Education? Associate -- yes, somebody raised their hand. Yes.
GREISSMAN: I'm neither --
COURT REPORTER: Name?
GREISSMAN: Richard Greissman.
CHAIR: Richard Greissman.
GREISSMAN: Richard Greissman.
I recall the representative who came from the College of Education to the Senate Council and he explained that it's simply a tactical move. Whether it has any meaning is another concern, and I think Steve's got it right, it's a tactical move without meaning, but it was a tactical move. There's no substance to the decision.
CHAIR: Now, as much as I want to only vote one time on these four, but I don't think we should mass delete or mass suspend programs. So let's do it one at a time. We can do it very quickly. Are we ready on the first one. Yes, Dean Hoch.
HOCH: Since there's no urgency to either delete or suspend these, why don't we go back to the colleges -- we won't have to vote multiply times. There's no urgency to this because there's no students in the program; there's no faculty in the program. Why don't we just go back to Education, ask them if they would prefer to delete them rather than suspend them?
CHAIR: On the other hand, we could delete them next month.
HOCH: Right. Delete them next month. There's no urgency deleting them now.
CHAIR: I will entertain any amendments. That's my job. Yes.
YATES: Yates from the College of Education. I mean, I think if the College wanted them deleted, they would have put them forward to delete them. I don't think it's our role in the Senate here to make decisions for them. So I think we're being asked to vote on whether they're being suspended. I don't think we can arbitrarily decide to delete them. So I think we should vote on the suspension only.
CHAIR: The problem is that it might not be our role, but we have the power and it's very tempting. Okay. Somebody back there.
RAY: Connie Ray. I just might add that one thing that's going to happen next year is that there will be a -- one of the CPE initiated Low Productivity Reviews, and

they'll look at these, and they'll come back and ask them to probably go ahead and -- and discontinue them at that time. So you know, Dean Hoch's suggestion might be a good one to take it back to the College and ask them if they'd rather just discontinue now.

CHAIR: But then again, they could delete them next month. It's doesn't have to be taken back to them. If they want to delete it next month, they can delete it next month. But again, I will take any amendment. But if there are no amendments, I will then ask you to -- anybody else want to say anything? Okay.

On German Education, all those in favor of this proposal to delete [sic], and I think these are all --

UNIDENTIFIED: To suspend.

CHAIR: -- to suspend. Sorry. To suspend effective immediately, please indicate so by raising your hand.

Any opposed?

Any abstain?

Okay, it's unanimous.

Now, we go to Spanish Education.

All those in favor of suspending this program, please indicate so by raising your hand.

Any objections? Objection, one.

Any that abstain?

Let's go to French Education, all those in favor suspending this program, please indicate so by raising your hand.

Any oppose?

Any abstention?

Unanimous.

All those in favor of Classics Education to be suspended, please indicate so by raising your hand.

Any opposed? One opposed. Did you oppose the other --

ELDRED: Yes, I was absolutely consistent.

CHAIR: So I will add --

ELDRED: I did it because I don't want to waste the paper of doing this again so...

CHAIR: One opposed. Any abstention on that one?

Okay, motion carries.

HOCH: Kaveh.

CHAIR: Yes.

HOCH: Would you be willing to go back to the College of Education and ask them if they would like to delete the program so that next year they don't have to file a bunch of paperwork on suspended programs which I'm sure they will do.

CHAIR: I will do that absolutely. Okay. Program deletion. Now, here is your chance to delete something.

Now, please let's not discuss why don't you suspend instead of delete.

CHAIR: This is for Doctor of Science in

Clinical Sciences with emphasis in Hematology and Transplantation Sciences. Is there anybody from that -- we had two guests when Senate Council discussed this. Are any of them here today? College of Health Sciences? Would you like to speak to this, please?

UNIDENTIFIED: The only thing I could say is I believe they substituted this whole page (inaudible) program now.

BLACKWELL: It hasn't gone forward yet, but it's coming.

CHAIR: Okay. The recommendation in front of you, that Senate approved the deletion, effective immediately. Are there any last comments on this? Yes.

MILLER: Joe Miller, College of Communication. On the document it says the date of suspension will be December 2010; is that correct or am I...

CHAIR: What page?

UNIDENTIFIED: Nineteen.

CHAIR: Anybody on the Senate Council remember, please?
(DISCUSSION AMONGST MANY)

CHAIR: Somebody raised their hand over there.

SWANSON: Hollie Swanson, College of Medicine. We talked about it and they still have students in there for 2008, so it probably give them those two years just in case they need that extra two years, I would imagine.

CHAIR: Well, it could be that it's my fault, that maybe in the Senate Council -- and if anybody in the Senate Council remembers this? Maybe this is my mistake. Yes, you raised your hand.

BLACKWELL: Yes.

CHAIR: Go ahead, please.

BLACKWELL: Jeannine Blackwell, Dean of the Graduate School. I worked with the program on this -- on the deletion and working on the (inaudible) for the -- the soon to be proposed Ph.D., and in 2010 they wanted to have that cushion precisely for what you said so that the students who are currently in the program would have enough time to finish, each of those students has got a plan and schedule for finishing up course work to make sure that there's enough course work and supervision for them to finish the Doctor of Science degree. Those of you all who have been around the University as long as I have, might recall that this college used to be located in the old motel long, long ago, and now is in the Wethington Building. And when they first proposed this degree in that college, it was not approved because of the lack of lab space, and other facilities that they needed. Now, the college is able to provide that kind of infrastructure for the

Xcript 3-17-08 Senate.txt

-- for this research degree, and so that's why they're moving from the Doctor of Science degree to the Ph.D., but they have a good plan for finishing up the students who are currently enrolled in the program.

CHAIR:

Back there.

ANDERSON:

Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.

I'm -- I know I raised this in the Senate Council as well, but I'm so curious why we don't suspend this program at least until the 2010 because there are students in it and because the other program hasn't gone through all the processes yet; it seems like it's a little bit premature. And I know that everything looks like it's in order, but there's always those things that happen in student's lives or happen in college life that may preclude this from happening.

CHAIR:

Why don't you say, and then I'll say something after you've spoken.

GROSSMAN:

I was going to --

CHAIR:

Bob Grossman.

GROSSMAN:

I was going to make a motion that regardless of what the Senate Council approved, that -- or recommended, that we approve the deletion as of December 2010, as the College requested.

CHAIR:

That could be amendment.

GROSSMAN:

That's -- I don't know whether it's an amendment or not because I don't know what the Senate Council voted, but if they voted to approve it immediately, I move that -- that it be approved to take effect December 2010.

CHAIR:

Go next to our Senate Council member. Name?

RANDALL:

Randall. This was at the meeting where Sheila was missing, and I took notes. It's quite possible that I missed this December thing in -- in the proceeding. So I suspect we should stick with what's here.

CHAIR:

In the proposal.

RANDALL:

I do recall that the representatives from the College wanted to delete the program. We -- we talked with them about it and said, instead of suspension, and they said, no.

CHAIR:

Okay. It seems somewhat unanimous there is determination that it should be 2010. There is sentiment that it should be 2010. If anybody objects to considering it to be 2010, please speak now. Otherwise I consider that like an editorial mistake that is being corrected. Yes.

HULSE:

David Hulse, College of Business and Economics. I share the other Senators concern about the possibility that a student is planning to finish by 2010, but for whatever may not. I'd be open to a suggestion on how to modify this wording so

that the deletion would be effective upon the -- all three students' departure from the program.

CHAIR: Over here.

YANARELLA: Ernie Yanarella. In the supportive material on page 22, the last paragraph, the memo writer very explicitly indicates that a cushion has been built in. The Director of Graduate Studies has met with each student. They've worked out their plan. They all expect to be done by -- I thought I read 2008, but it's laid out very clearly there, and I think it was just an error of oversight in the note-taking.

CHAIR: So, correct me, you are to -- it should be --

YANARELLA: If Bob Grossman needs a second -- his motion needs a second, I will second it.

CHAIR: Okay.

GROSSMAN: (Inaudible) consider it an editorial comment.

CHAIR: I will accept that unless somebody wants to object? Okay, I don't hear any objection. So this is going to be effective, Bob, 2000 --

GROSSMAN: December 2010.

CHAIR: December 2010. Let me write it down.

GROSSMAN: Like it says.

UNIDENTIFIED: That's how it's written.

GROSSMAN: As written.

CHAIR: We all agree it says December 2010, correct?

GROSSMAN: Right.

CHAIR: Okay. All right. Let's vote on this proposal to delete this Doctor of Science. All those in favor of deletion effective December 2010, please indicate so by raising your hand.

Any objection?

Any abstention?

Okay. It's unanimous.

My Associate Dean is here.

Perfect timing. What an engineer. The proposed new University Scholars Program between BS Mechanical Engineering and MS in Biomedical Engineering. Senate Council, you have this proposal in your handout. Senate Council has approved it with positive recommendation, and the recommendation is in front of you. Let me ask Dean Sweigard if he wants to add any comments to that.

SWEIGARD: I really don't have any comments. I'll be happy to answer any questions. I think it's fairly well explained in the -- in the materials.

CHAIR: Dean Blackwell, since this is Graduate, do you have any comments on that? It's somewhat unusual to have Department A and Department B join together in

Xcript 3-17-08 Senate.txt
University Scholar, but it's not unheard of. There are some.

BLACKWELL: And because there's only graduate programs in Biomedical Engineering, their feeder programs are located in the other Engineering departments, and this is the last piece of the puzzle. University Senate has approved other University Scholars plans with other pertinent departments in the College of Engineering, and this was the last straggler piece. And so then they will have feeder programs from the significant undergraduate programs in the College of Engineering.

CHAIR: I think it is Electrical Engineering and Biomedical, and I should have mentioned, Biomedical does not have an undergraduate program. That's why it's important for them to have these feeder programs and these combinations.

Does any Senator want to make a comment, or does anyone have a question? I'm thinking of how I can stretch this to finish at 5:00. I don't if I will accept credit for this or blame. There are like another dozen or so programs waiting to be approved by the Senate, and we thought only this many could handle today, and obviously, I did not do a good job. So let's vote on them then.

All those in favor of this combined BS-MS University Scholars Program, please indicate so by raising your hand?

Are there any opposition?

Any abstention?

It's unanimous.

So the next Senate meeting is Monday, April 14, and we will have many, many, many programs because we didn't bring them to you today. So if I keep you next time to 6:00, remember today you went home at 4:00.

* * * * *

THEREUPON, the University of Kentucky Senate Council meeting for March 17, 2008 was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

* * * * *

COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

STATE OF KENTUCKY)

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 17th day of April, 2008.

Xcript 3-17-08 Senate.txt

LISA E. HOINKE
NOTARY PUBLIC
STATE-AT-LARGE
K E N T U C K Y