

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

MAY 4, 2009

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

* * * *

* * * *

DAVE RANDALL, CHAIR
STEPHANIE AKEN, VICE-CHAIR
KAVEH TAGAVI, ACTING PARLIAMENTARIAN
SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR
LISA E. HOINKE, COURT REPORTER

seems to be

CHAIR:

Well, the group

quieting which indicates that you understand that we have one incredibly full meeting today. It's 3:00. Let's start.

Minutes and announcements. The April minutes are not yet available, so we'll bring them to you first thing in the fall. The SEC Academic Consortium also has a group of chairs of the Senate, and the chairs will be meeting here in October which I'll be calling upon lots of people to help for. But I'd like to inform you that that group will be meeting here, and hopefully will get us together in some way.

I inadvertently failed to make

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

clear what the start date of the new Dead Week would be. In other words, we approved the change in the Dead Week rules, but I am going to ask that they start in the fall of the 2009 semester, and I at least need to inform you of that.

The Academic Approvals Workshop, which is a group trying to develop procedures for approval of academic proposals, we will continue to meet over the summer, and we'll have a report to you in the fall as things develop.

And finally, there were some proposed changes in the GR VII which the Senate Council endorsed on behalf of the Senate. More on this item will come when we get to agenda item number 13.

A number of you are rotating off, and I would particularly like to recognize you. So please stand if you're rotating off. Please go ahead and let us recognize you.

AUDIENCE:

(ROUND OF APPLAUSE)

CHAIR:

I would also particularly like to recognize Professor Kaveh will be rotating off as past chair of Senate Council. I don't know what I would have done without him. Everything I know and none of my mistakes, I learned from Kaveh.

Stephanie Aken, where are you Stephanie? Stephanie is rotating off as vice chair. Again, I don't know what I would have done without Stephanie's help. So thank you.

AUDIENCE:

(ROUND OF APPLAUSE)

CHAIR:

Unfortunately, we had yet another memorial resolution. Bart, would you please come up and -- and read this?

MILLER:

Thank you.

WHEREAS, Russell Glenwood Williams, II staff representative of the University of Kentucky Board of Trustees passed away April 8, 2009. And,

WHEREAS, he was elected to four consecutive terms for the Board of Trustees by his fellow staff members. And WHEREAS, he boldly took issues impacting staff to the Board of Trustees and represented all staff with unwavering dedication. And,

WHEREAS, he was instrumental by working many hours with a small group of staff, helping to organize and implement the Staff Senate as the official body representing the staff to the administration in July of 2002. And,

WHEREAS, his willingness to share his knowledge and wisdom helped develop countless leaders within the University staff, student, and faculty communities. And,

WHEREAS, he was a beloved mentor, friend, and staunch advocate for countless employees. And,

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

WHEREAS, he was a valued member of the campus community working as a Senior Training Specialist for Human Resources.
And,

WHEREAS, he sought to communicate with each and every staff member by maintaining a listserv, launched a website for blogging, and always made himself available to staff and their concerns.
And,

WHEREAS, he was a UK alumnus, earning his Bachelor's and Master's degrees in social work.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the University Senate of the University of Kentucky mourns the passing of a dear friend and colleague, offers condolences to his family and friends, and orders that this resolution be made part of the Minutes of the meeting.

CHAIR: Thank you. Would you all rise, please for a moment of silence.

(MOMENT OF SILENCE OBSERVED)

CHAIR: Thank you. I need, please, a motion to this effect, to adopt the resolution that he read.

BOLLINGER: So moved. Chris Bollinger, Economics.

CHAIR: Second?

MCNEILL: Sam McNeill, College of Agriculture. Second.

CHAIR: Discussion of the motion?
All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE).

CHAIR: Thank you. Motion carried.

We have a proposed new degree program, a Ph.D. in epidemiology and biostatistics. Professors Kryscio and Mendiando. Please, come on up.

While he's coming, some concern has been mentioned over the voice voting issue. So at least for the moment, please recall that unless you have a vote, that no one is to vote except voting members of the Senate on a voice vote. Thank you. Please. Fill us in --

KRYSCIO: This is a new degree program.

It's neither a degree program. It's neither a degree program, doctoral program in biostatistics, nor is it a degree program in epidemiology. It's a joint program between the two disciplines, meaning that if you look at the core curriculum, it's 50 percent from each discipline. And if you look at the elective, it's 50 percent of each discipline. And I think we do the same thing in terms of splitting the committee assignments on the doctoral dissertations. And the reason -- part -- part of the

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

reasons for that is because we don't have enough faculty between the two departments to offer separate degree programs. We think this is a unique idea. It's an idea you won't find elsewhere in the country, and it takes advantage of the strength of our faculty. We will answer any questions.

CHAIR: Questions for Dr. Kryscio.
Please.

ROHR: Does it mean you -- you --
BROTHERS: Sir, your name, please?
ROHR: Jurgen Rohr, Pharmacy.
Does it mean you stop the
Ph.D. program for epidemiology if there was one and for biostatistics and unite them now into (unintelligible) a new one?

KRYSCIO: I don't think it will stop the program. I think eventually as the faculties of the two departments get more senior, and as we add more faculty -- remember we're in a new college, the College of Public Health. This is being offered through the College of Public Health. And I think down the road, you may see these two programs split, but I won't make that prediction because I won't be here. That's the other faculty.

CHAIR: Further questions? Thank you.
I need a motion to this effect,
please.

SEGERSTROM: So moved.

CHAIR: Need a name.

SEGERSTROM: Suzanne Segerstrom, Psychology.

CHAIR: Second?

SNOW: Diane Snow, College of Medicine.

CHAIR: Get that? Discussion?
All right. All in favor aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed nay?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: I should mention all of the proposals that are coming forward today are coming with positive recommendation of Senate Council.
Thank you. Motion carries.
Dr. Kryscio, need you again.
You may stand in place there if you....
Fill us in here briefly.

KRYSCIO: Yeah. This program is, of course, a fail-safe program for those who entered a doctoral program.

UNIDENTIFIED: (Unintelligible)....

KRYSCIO: It is because of the discussion at the Senate Committee over the number of hours associated with the program. They're really -- you're not going to be recruiting people directly into this program.

CHAIR: Questions for Dr. Kryscio? I need a motion to this effect, please.

WILLIAMS: David Williams, Agriculture.

CHAIR: Second?

HOUTZ: Bob Houtz, Agriculture.

CHAIR: Discussion?

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

All in favor aye?

AUDI ENCE:

Aye.

CHAI R:

Opposed nay?

AUDI ENCE:

(NO RESPONSE).

CHAI R:

Motion carries.

We have a proposed new degree program, a Master's and a Doctorate in reproductive sciences. Dr. Baker and Campbell and Associate Dean Stewart, if you would fill us in please.

BAKER:

I think I've prepared more information, perhaps, than was necessary. The Division of Clinical and Reproductive Sciences are in the College of Health Sciences, and we're proposing an interdisciplinary Ph.D. in reproductive sciences, and it will have an accompanying en passant master's, a fall-back also. So I'm going to concentrate on the Ph.D. since our MS will be a fall-back, and I'm going to discuss that later.

The program of study is interdisciplinary, in that, the first year of course work is going to be completed in the integrated biomedical science's curriculum which has been approved by the BS. Additional courses will be completed in other colleges at UK. For example, our graduate stats will be in the College of Math and Science. And other courses will be delivered in the home division, and this will include courses already in our current programs as well as four new Ph.D. courses that have been developed for the new Ph.D. degree. Core faculty are going to be interdisciplinary as well. This includes members from Health Sciences, Medicine, and the College of Ag. This Ph.D. is both typical and unique in -- in structure and nature. It is a typical research Ph.D. first, and that it will focus on basic research to prepare our graduates for positions in research and academics. And then it's unique in that students have an option to extend the time in the program by approximately one year and complete graduate clinical curriculum in reproductive laboratory sciences, including courses in embryology, andrology, kryobiology and also clinical practica and reproductive laboratories throughout the U.S. and also some internationally. This clinical curriculum has been added, and it's important to add to this basic curriculum because it prepares graduates for a field that has a shortage. They can direct the more than 480 reproductive laboratory science labs throughout the country. This field is growing. Now at almost 500, it's also expanding in what's included. The laboratory field, that includes genetics, reproductive cancer, fertility preservation, and therapeutic

stem cell research. So with our curriculum, the graduates who elect to add this clinical component would be ideally educated to assume those advanced positions. The program is also innovative. It is the first Ph.D., and the same for the Master's, the en passant. It's already been approved by the CPE for development, both degrees have -- will be the first and only in the Commonwealth. And the Ph.D. with the clinical option is the first in the country that will provide education for people to direct these highly complex reproductive laboratories. We've actually taken the lead in this field already at UK. We had the first graduate program to train clinical embryologists, and we've been offering that degree since 2001. The curriculum, it's composed of the IBS courses that I mentioned, in the first year study, followed by courses in the CRS curriculum and four new courses that have been added, including Molecular Reproduction, Reproductive Immunology, and Reproductive Cancers. All of the courses being offered in the ongoing Clinical Science Master's program in the CS unit. Those would be the others (unintelligible) curriculum. There will be a total of 39 didactic hours, concurrent with seminars, laboratory rotations, and these will be followed by dissertation, research, and selected laboratories. The core faculty who will deliver the curriculum consist of seven tenured faculty, including three full professors, three non-tenured faculty, one faculty member who is a reproductive lab director appointed as clinical faculty at Brown University, and she is also appointed here at UK to ensure that we do deliver current clinical materials. And we have one instructor who will serve as the education coordinator for the Ph.D. These faculty members are already funded currently, or they have a history of funding. The faculty members who will mentor the students in research have well-equipped laboratories in the College of Medicine and in our college, and they all have active research programs. Additional faculty contribute to the clinical curriculum. This includes more than 30 reproductive faculty across the country, and we also have lectures in the areas of reproductive law, policy, ethics and laboratory management. Dean Gonzalez has provided four fellowships for the first class, and we are not going to be asking for any other sources other than those provided by the College of Health Sciences. The en passant MS, as we mentioned, is a fall-back degree, and this was recommended by Dean Blackwell. We are not going to be

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt
recruiting any Ph. D. candidates -- sorry,
any Master's candidates, only Ph.Ds. So
this en passant degree would be for a
student that had an exception, had some
illness, were unable to complete
dissertation research. So in order to
receive this degree, a student must
complete the first two years; that's the 39
hours total, and take the qualifying exam
which is based on didactic work rather than
research. And then they could receive this
MS degree. And under no circumstances
would they receive it if they had not
completed a minimum of 30 hours in our
program.

CHAIR: Questions? Thank you.
I need a motion to the effect
given here. Please.

ENGLISH: Tony English, College of Health
Sciences. So moved.

CHAIR: Second? Stephanie Aken.
Discussion?
All in favor aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed nay?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Motion carries.
So I have two older boys. They
and their wives kept us waiting six years
for grandchildren. Then it occurred to me,
they'd never had a course in physiology.
This is very valuable.
I failed to note that Professor
Tagavi has volunteered to serve as our
parliamentarian today. Thank you for doing
it.

New degree in clinical research
design, Master's in clinical research
design. Dr. Kryscio.

KRYSCIO: This one lagged a little behind;
it was actually put in six or seven months
earlier than the other two degree programs.
I apologize for that. This degree program
is our answer to the 42-hour degree program
at the MPH. If you recall last year or
year and a half ago, you approved moving
the MPH program from a 36- to a 42-hour
program. And many of the clinicians come
over to the College of Public Health to
seek further education like a program that
does two things. One is a little shorter
in terms of the number of credit hours.
And number two, emphasizes research skills.
And this is our answer to that particular
request. And so we created this 30-hour
program. It's a thesis-oriented program,
24 hours of course work. And it -- it
basically would give people research skills
that they're seeking. And graduates of the
certificate programs that we have in
clinical and translational research can
also enroll in this particular program. We
set it up so that there would be a, more or

less, a seamless transition for those individuals.

CHAIR: Questions for Dr. Kryscio?
A motion, please? Debra Anderson.

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson. So moved.

CHAIR: Second?

JENSEN: Rob Jensen, Fine Arts. Second.

CHAIR: Discussion?
All in favor aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed nay?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Motion carries.
Proposed changed in the Bachelor of Science in Nursing going from a RN to a Bachelor of Science of Nursing. Professors Lowry and Dean Burkhart. Thank you.

LOWRY: Sorry Dean Burkhart is on a conference call with the NIH, so I'm -- you've got me.

CHAIR: We're happy.

BLACKWELL: That's okay. Let her talk.

LOWRY: That's right. What we're doing is looking at changing part of the BSN program at the University, and it will be only the part that applies to the RN to BSN. That's the student who is a registered nurse either graduate of an Associate degree program or a diploma program who now wants to return to school and get her Bachelor's or his Bachelor's degree. The first change would be removing the requirement that the person be a registered nurse to enter the program, and we ask for that change because the Kentucky Board of Nursing now requires that students put in 120 hours of precepted experience post graduation before they are eligible to become licensed. They have to take the board and do those 120 hours. And that may interfere with people being registered nurses in August when the semester begins. We are asking that students be registered nurses before they enter the clinical courses in the second semester. The other change we're asking for relates to the diploma nurses. There aren't many diploma nurses around any -- many programs around anymore, but there are still a few. But these are nurses who were trained in hospitals rather than in universities. They may have had some university courses, but basically they were trained in hospitals. Our current requirements say that they have to take this test to give them nursing credit, ACT test. Well, essentially, that test no longer exists anyway, so it would be very difficult for them to take that. And we have decided that we would rather give them credit based on portfolio of licensure; they are

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

registered nurses; and their professional experience. So that's the second change. The third change, I had wanted to delete the letter of recommendation, but the council convinced me to leave that in. We are taking out the interview requirement because we haven't really done that for some time for people coming into the program. Thank you.

CHAIR: Wait just a moment. Questions?
I need a motion, please.

SELLNOW: Tim Sellnow, Communications
Information Studies. Move approval.

CHAIR: Thank you. A second?

YANARELLA: Second. Ernie Yanarella.

CHAIR: Discussion of motion?
All in favor aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed nay?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Motion carries.
Proposed change to the BS/BA in
telecommunications. Professor Lindlof.

HERTOG: I'm not Professor Lindlof, but
he can't make it today. I'm Jim Hertog in
telecommunications. The main changes being
made in telecommunications or proposed in
telecommunications remove one of the
pre-major requirements and adjust the
pre-major GPA to get in, and then adjust
some classes within telecommunications,
especially having to do with the required
courses in the Social Science major
expertise that we expect from our students.
As we've gone through time, we've added on
business-oriented telecommunications
courses, and a lot of our students are
taking those exclusively and sort of not
taking the social effects courses. So we
are now require -- or proposing to require
that they take at least a couple of those
social effects courses as part of their --
part of their major.

CHAIR: Questions? Thank you.

CHAIR: I need a motion, please.

BOLLINGER: Chris Bollinger, Economics. So
moved.

CHAIR: Second?

CASE: Donald Case, College of
Communications and Information Studies.

CHAIR: Discussion?
All in favor aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed nay?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Motion carries.
A new graduate certificate in
maternal and child health. Professor
Cecil.

CECIL: Yet another proposal from the
College of Public Health this afternoon.
We're proposing a graduate certificate in
maternal and child health, a 15-credit hour

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt
certificate, six hours of which are required courses, the introduction to epidemiology and introduction to maternal and child health with the balance, 9 hours, composed of selected courses already in existence throughout the University. The applicant must satisfy graduate school requirements for admission, must be admitted to the graduate school, plus write a two-page essay on the reasons the applicant desires to pursue and certificate in MCH and how it would be used in their careers for consideration by the director of the graduate certificate in MCH. The graduate certificate is intended to enhance education and training opportunities for students and public health workers with an interest in maternal and child health and satisfy needs for MCH education and training identified in an e-mail survey of public health workers in Kentucky's public health system during 2005, sanctioned by the ad hoc MCH advisory committee. One of the mandated courses was recently approved by the Senate Council, CPH 740, Introduction to Maternal and Child Health, which was formerly a special topics of public health course; had been offered for the last four years. The graduate certificate in MCH must be completed in five years once the applicant has been accepted by the graduate school. During this review process, two -- two nutritional -- nutrition courses, NFS 516, Maternal and Child Nutrition, as well as CNU 502, Obesity: Cell to Community, will be added to the list of selected courses that will be offered to candidates for the graduate certificate in MCH as recommended by Dr. Geza Bruckner of the Graduate Center for Nutritional Sciences. The funding for this certificate is provided by the State Block grant for the Division of Maternal and Child Health in Kentucky Department of Public Health.

CHAIR: Questions? Thank you.
I need a motion, please.
ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing. So moved.
CHAIR: A second, please.
AKEN: Stephanie Aken. Second.
CHAIR: Discussion?
All in favor aye?
AUDIENCE: Aye.
CHAIR: Opposed nay?
AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)
CHAIR: Motion carries.
In April, the Senate approved a three-year pilot project for the Winter Intersession. And we will be expecting a report on that come fall. What we are now asking is that the center approve the third and last on this stint of the 2009-2010

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

Winter Intercession calendar. May I have a motion to that effect.

WILLIAMS: David Williams, Agriculture.

CHAIR: A second, please?

YANARELLA: Second. Ernie Yanarella.

CHAIR: Discussion?

All in favor aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed nay?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Motion carries.

This is a proposal to change the foreign language requirement, that is to say how it is satisfied. Dr. Carvalho will explain that to us.

CARVALHO: This is a recommendation that

you've seen before, and it clarifies the place of foreign language in the proposed general education reform. Based on the fact that the vast majority of the Kentucky high school graduates, and the vast majority of our entering students from other states have had the two years of foreign language study, that is now an entrance requirement to the University, and it duplicates the USP requirement of two semesters of foreign language study or two years of high school foreign language study. So that had become an empty line in the USP requirements, and we've proposed that that entrance requirement be replaced with simple wording, but -- but significant implications, that students demonstrate the proficiency equivalent or the competency equivalent of two years of high school foreign language study. And we have consulted with the Kentucky Department of Education which does hope to have this same test in place by the graduating class of 2016, and they're moving in that direction, encouraging the implementation of this test in more districts each year. They have met with funding issues. They think those funding issues will be improved by the University of Kentucky endorsing this kind of entrance requirement. Our proposal is that students who don't have the test in high school would take the proficiency test during the summer of their advising workshop. And statistics so far have shown a marked improvement in the test scores once districts do start giving the test. The early results were -- were very disappointing. About 50 percent of the students did not reach the mark for second-year competency after two years of high language study. But there are two factors to keep in mind: one, that figure drops to about 30 percent, 20- to 30-percent failure after two consecutive years of giving the test. We're not sure what that means. Either instruction is improving or the teachers are learning

about the test. We hope instruction is improving. The second factor is that a large percentage of entering freshmen have, in fact, had three or four years of high school language study, and they don't seem to have much difficulty exceeding the expectation. We set the expectation at novice mid which is one level above the category that means 20 words of functionality. I have a description of novice mid that I could show you, but it -- it says there's still significant errors; there -- it's impossible to communicate with an unsympathetic native listener. Those are all language terms, but they're kind of fun too. So it's not a high bar. In fact, the state is urging us to set the bar one level higher at novice high which is their goal for 2016. Our anxiety about that was that we don't want to get out ahead of the school districts. What we want is to understand what the bar is statewide, and so I've encouraged us to pin this level to the State Department of Education. Once they set novice high, we would go to novice high. We certainly wouldn't want a bar lower than the high school -- state high school expectation. But at this point, our committee is comfortable with the test being given and the level being set at novice mid. For further comfort level all around, we propose that the test be given starting with the entering class of 2010, but remediation not be instituted until 2012 so that results can be reported back to districts. We think that will have a significant effect on foreign language instruction in the state, as well as put foreign language back into the discussion of our general education expectations, even though it would be an entrance requirement with remediation rather than a general education credit.

CHAIR: Questions? Please.

ROHR: What are the -- what are the recommendations or the requirements of other top 20 schools in that regard for foreign languages?

CARVALHO: Most of them do have a require -- all of them have a requirement for liberal arts, but a lot of institutions don't have a campus-wide language requirement. If they do, it's two semester. They -- they don't have this proviso that it can be satisfied by two years of -- of high school language. They have a system whereby students can test out of it. We also have that system. But we don't -- because the two years on paper satisfies the requirement, not all students have to take our placement test. They only take our placement test if they're going to continue

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt
on because of the Arts and Science's
requirement. So the answer is, no.

CHAIR: Further questions? Thank you.
A motion, please?

JANECEK: so moved. Jerry Janecek, Modern
and Classical Languages.

CHAIR: Second?

SNOW: Diane Snow, College of Medicine.
CHAIR: Did you get that?

BROTHERS: Yes.

CHAIR: Discussion? Yes.

ANDERSON: I just have to say out loud that
I think we need to go to mid-high at the
very lowest. I've said it before, so...

CHAIR: Further discussion?

CARVALHO: I would add that we can bring
this back in 2012 once we have more data.
We -- we just want to make sure that we
don't turn any students away because other
institutions don't have this requirement,
and they can't make it, so we're trying to
find that -- that balance. But we can
bring it back with the data in 2012.

CHAIR: I think we can do this by voice
vote. Let's try. All in favor aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed nay?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Motion carries.
Curricular Team's Course
Templates. What we are voting on today is
course templates.
I will read it for you. The
Senate Council expects that prior to 2010
the Senate must -- thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED: Is that better?

CHAIR: Much better. The Senate Council
expects that prior to 2010 the Senate must
be satisfied that all necessary resources
and so forth are available for a new
general education curriculum, with ultimate
intention paid to the tentative
implementation date of 2011. The Senate
Council expects that the process for
forming a group to vet proposed gen ed
courses will be approved by the Senate.
Those are the basic expectations that I
think you can count on for where we're
going from here. And so we are going to
have a report on the 10 basis, particularly
the one that was changed, and then an open
discussion. In the open discussion, only
Senators may comment. So Professor Caton.
Susan, are you doing this or --

CARVALHO: Who is Professor Caton?

BLACKWELL: She's in Arts and Sciences.

CARVALHO: Oh, the co-curricular team.

BLACKWELL: Co-curricular committee.

CARVALHO: I'm sorry, yes, okay. I'd
forgotten that.

CATON: If I could ask the members of the
co-curricular team to stand up or to step
forward if some of you are in the back of

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

the room just to identify who you are. I spoke with this group last month. To give you just a brief overview of the work that we've been doing, what we'd like to do today is share with you some of the highlights of the recommendations that we're going to send forward to Provost Subbaswamy's office. So Toni Thomas with CARES and multi-cultural affairs is a member of my team; as well as Abby Hollander who is an advisor in the Spanish Department; Jared Tippetts who is with New Student and Parent Programming; and John Hurak who is in the College of Undergraduate Studies. This is Tony Liquori-Grace from the College of Nursing who is also an academic advisor, and my name is Erica Caton. I'm the director of advising in the College of Arts and Sciences.

LIQUORI -GRACE: Okay. So we started with some -- some pretty big questions. And the questions were: Who are we and why are we here? And specifically, what does the general education curriculum have to say about those two questions? And we came up with the idea that having a common vision, a common purpose, and shared values is the answer of what general education curriculum hopes to achieve. These three elements will create a unified identity and a standard from which all other things can be assessed. We figure that without values, we cannot do any assessments. Without a purpose, we cannot establish any goals. And without a vision, we really can't achieve anything. And in order to create such a community and identity that are common to all top 20 institutions, the University of Kentucky must first educate students, faculty, and staff of the vision, of the mission, and of our values. And we -- we figured that -- we looked at what we are doing across campus, and we realized that we really aren't accomplishing that purpose in and of itself, of making it known what our values are, what our purpose is, and -- and what our vision is. And so as an acronym of using our Wildcats, we came up with these as our values stemming from the very values that our Senate has passed. W would be worth of all people. I for integrity. L for leadership which we stood for responsibility and accountability. D for diversity of thought, culture, gender, and ethnicity. C for civic responsibility. A for academic excellence and freedom. T for teamwork and collaboration which is shared governance. S for sensitivity to work life concerns. And an exclamation point just to emphasize the community aspect of what UK is trying to achieve. We discovered that our values

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

are the core of the general education curriculum. It's not the facts and the figures, although they're really important that are central to the education that our students receive, but it's the values. The information we -- we share with our students is the means and not the end. Our students may not remember all the facts, but they will remember how to go about solving problems and taking personal

responsibility and internalizing the value of teamwork. If we instill the Wildcats values into our students, we prepare them to become the solutions to the world's current and future problems. If a student walks away with a diploma but doesn't exemplify these values, they haven't received the education we had hoped, and we have failed to achieve our goal. So I end with a quote by William Ralph Inge, a former Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral in the other UK which is England, and he said, the aim of education is the knowledge not of fact but of values. And from that we recommended we're going to highlight four of our recommendations.

CATON:

So our first recommendation would be that a work group be charged to connect the See Blue campaign, all the wonderful photos that we all see in the plastering onto our elevator doors. Do our students really understand because the marketing campaign hit home for them. So how do we connect those images to what our true goal is in helping students to identify first as student understanding academic expectation. We'd like to use our myUK system to communicate to students in an individualized method or way how they can connect with their department, how they can get involved in activities. The third piece we'd like to encourage is further enhancement of the living/learning communities whereby which classes would be directly connected to those communities and further collaborate with the student life aspect on our campus. And then finally, this fall we hope to pilot our UK 101 the E-portfolio concept where students will take what they're learning in the classroom, tie it to what they're doing outside the classroom and package themselves for the future and using that tool to better communicate to the world around them the skills that they've learned while they were here. So thank you. Our report ultimately will be up on the gen ed website for you to review with all of our recommendations. They were just -- these were just 4 of the 15 that we ultimately came up with.

CHAIR:

Thank you. All right. So we

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

have now the issue of the course templates and the appendices. There were some typos that will be corrected in the -- in the final copy. In particular, Communications should have been Communications and Information Studies in terms of the title of the department and another error there. So are you prepared to...

CARVALHO: I just have a couple of comments, updates since the April meeting. First, we continue to receive really valuable and stylistic suggestions. I remind you that the templates were written by a committee, and we will continue to receive those stylistic suggestions for the versions that will be printed in the bulletin and -- and distributed once the program is in place. So thank you for that. I know you all are comma experts, but I hope we go to more substantive issues here.

As I mentioned in April, the only significant change between the first reading and now has to do with the communications templates. And I just want to let you know about the vetting process that went forward and the feedback we received. We did receive important input about clarifying what we meant about visual communication. I would add that the color of PowerPoints will be part of that.

BROTHERS: Duly noted.

CARVALHO: Those who thought the visual training might not be needed. So we did clarify, especially in the assessment section, what we intend for students to produce in terms of visual communication and explicit mention of critical thinking and the development of thesis as part of the -- the training that students receive in both oral and written communication, and the strengthening of the presence of training in mechanics, grammar and stylistic training for both oral and written communication. In addition, in the appendix section, there was a great deal of substantive input, primarily regarding two features. One is the mention of a center that would manage these two integrated courses and invite the participation of graduate students from various colleges. The curricular teams felt that it was important to put this idea forward because of the challenges of managing such a large program that involves multiple colleges. And in that appendix, page 3 details the reasons for that. That would page 155 of the large numbers or page 3 of the appendix section. But it was strenuously pointed out by the largest -- one of the largest state-held departments, Department of English, that such a recommendation -- such a determination goes beyond the purview of

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

the curricular teams. We agree with that, and we put wording to that effect in the appendix. That is the recommendation of the curricular teams but it will now go forward through the appropriate processes,

as will many aspects of implementation of this curriculum. So I would remind you all that we're here to vote on the first part of the document, the learning outcomes, and it's very difficult to proceed further on the implementation issues without having agreement on the learning outcomes. The second piece of the appendix that was put forward with some emphasis in the Department of English is the teaching mode of the graduate assistants. They currently teach 12 hours a year which is well above the average, well above benchmarks. Because of the 4-hour English 104, that was able to be converted to a one and two load, three courses per year. Once this becomes a 3-hour requirement, it will be very difficult for students to go back to a two and two load, graduate assistants, especially with the kind of training that this new integrated approach will require. And we do believe and -- and many in the English Department agree that the training these graduate assistants receive will make them very marketable and will be extremely useful to them, but we do have to acknowledge that there is time involved in that. So they put forward the recommendation which, again, goes beyond their purview to determine, but is their recommendation that the course load for graduate assistants be no more than three courses per year, 66 students per year. And when you think about the intensive review of assessable products that needs to take place, we think that's a reasonable, very reasonable recommendation. So I put both of those items forward as the subjects of significant debate over the past weeks. And that is the only report that I have so, any comments or questions?

CHAIR: Questions for Dr. Carvalho?

CARVALHO: The conveners are here, and I'll ask them to respond to the questions about their particular template as well.

CHAIR: Please.

NADEL: Alan Nadel, A&S. I am very puzzled by the separation of the course

load, which may be beyond the purview of this document, and the objectives or outcomes, as you call them, that are part of the document because anyone who's taught Composition knows you can't separate those two. And for us to vote on a specific outcome without knowing the course load and class size and the amount of work that

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

people correcting individual papers must do each week, and therefore the amount of attention they give their students, is -- is a kind of a smoke and mirrors.

CARVALHO: I can respond to that. I invite input from the Provost. The charge from the Senate to the curricular teams was to use their scholarly expertise to put forward the objectives that our courses needed to achieve. They certainly weren't the groups who can either make the resource determinations or make final decisions about teaching loads. And there are teaching loads and class -- there are class size expectations throughout the appendices for all of the templates, but that is beyond the -- the purview of this vote.

NADEL: I just --

CARVALHO: And could I ask the Provost to respond since I think that is a provost issue?

SUBBASWAMY: You can -- you keep responding.

CARVALHO: Okay. Go ahead.

NADEL: I understand that; I -- and I understand that, but the point is that there's a third body which is this voting body which must vote on one thing without knowing the other, even if one is beyond the purview of this document. I understand exactly the problem. I'm not missing it, but I'm saying for us to vote for something which we could then find is being implemented in such a way as to make it useless is -- is -- puts us in a very difficult position.

PROVOST: May I --

CHAIR: Please.

SUBBASWAMY: David, could you bring up the slide, prior slide. I think there was one where you referred to what the process going forward is going to be. If you

recall, I was asked to make a presentation on a rough estimate of resources based on what was available at that time, and I did that last time. And you know, that was sort of a feasibility answer: Is this hundreds of millions of dollars, or is it, you know, within the general amounts of money we are currently spending, and it's within a margin of errors, and I think, at least I -- to my mind, we passed that test. Now, this particular item had not been there yet in the computation, but frankly, you've got the fail-safe here. I mean, the fail-safe here is that we -- we explicitly agreed, and I hope the minutes, in fact, will reflect this again, is that not only the Senate Council will bring back to the Senate the full resource proposal before you actually put -- give the green light to the implementation of the full curriculum. As I pointed out last time, there are still

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt
multiple steps left. Assuming that you approve the learning outcomes and the curricular templates now, starting immediately, like this summer, we have to develop some of these courses, try them out. We have to take existing courses, modify them, test them. So there's plenty of work to do. And so I urge you to not try to do something because this just came up, and it's in the general mix of the total resources, and you have the green light -- I mean, you have the fail-safe here. This body has the fail-safe of saying, no, we're not going to need to eliminate USP which is the currently operative requirement for the degree, and that's in your hands and your hands only. It's not in my hands to simply say that USP goes away and general education curriculum is turned on.

CHAIR: Yes, again.

NADEL: Well, I just have one question to ask about that. That sounds fine. The only question I have to ask is when we have that opportunity to vote on the resources, will we be able to vote on them in discreet sections, or will we be forced to vote on the entire resource as a block as we had to earlier?

SUBBASWAMY: I -- I guess I'm not sure I understand the import of your question, but let me -- let me try to answer that. It is not really my position nor my purview, nor my opinion nor my prerogative, to impose a certain class size or a certain workload on teaching assistants or even faculty, for that matter. These are collective national standards that as any, you know, research university we aspire to, and in fact, with the English TAs, the fact that we have such high teaching loads is, in fact, counter to what we're trying to achieve on the graduate front. And so this is an oppor -- I see this as an opportunity to right some of the wrongs we have had in place rather than seeing this as a problem. You know, we've got research and graduate education, undergraduate education, professional education, and -- and -- engagement as all parts of our mission, so if this ends up advancing some of the potential -- I mean, problems we currently have with graduate education, that's all the better. So I'm not sure -- I -- I don't see a tension there. I see this as an opportunity to right the wrongs just as much as you do, I think.

NADEL: Well, I agree with you. I just wanted to know if we'll be able to vote on each part of the budget separately. Otherwise, a mass vote when -- when it comes up, when we have this opportunity

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt
will obscure any particular problems.
That's all.

SUBBASWAMY: Frankly, I haven't given it enough thought to make sense of the pros and cons. My inclination would be that would be too much micro management, but you know, maybe at the Senate Council level, they can look at some more detail.

CHAIR: It would seem to me how the vote comes before this body is up to Senate Council, and I would certainly think we would work to get the most efficient, effective way to do that.

SUBBASWAMY: And with integrity. I mean, you know, we're all committed to the same for all of us.

CHAIR: We're in the same boat. We want it to float.

YOST: Yes.
Scott Yost, College of Engineering. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the Provost, last month I raised an issue about the resource -- I raised a question about the resource issue last month, and looking at the assumptions that were performed by the Provost versus the assumptions that are now more fully articulated by Dr. Carvalho here. And I'm just curious, I mean, it was a month ago that this issue was raised. Maybe it was not deemed necessary, but it's not the first time the issue was raised and people have the same issues, and I'm just wondering if the Provost had an opportunity to update some of his numbers, given that we had a concern a month ago, and the concern has translated into a definitive action as far as an item on here. What's -- what's taken place along those lines?

CHAIR: I know there were some

recalculations, but I --
SUBBASWAMY: No, in fact, the primary item that has changed, as nearly as I can tell, is with regard to the integrated Composition and Communication, 1 and 2. Now, that, in fact, I got my hands on it over the week -- yesterday or so. I was -- I think it was settled on Friday, if I remember correctly because there have been lots of discussions taking place. I was in Berlin, and not at your expense, I'd like you to know before that question comes up. And I was there for -- even had that been ready, I would not have had the opportunity to look. So the real -- the true answer is, I haven't had the opportunity. But -- but frankly, when I calculated for the communication piece, I already did a very similar calculation, and on the English or the writing side or Comp I -- we have to change the language still -- on -- on that -- in fact, what we're talking about is

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

going from a 4-hour course to a 3-hour course. We already have that workforce in place, but not at the level of teaching load that we would like to have. So that's a marginal difference. It's -- it's a small difference that you're talking about, and then therefore, in fact, I strongly would argue that we need to put that into this mix and fix that problem while we're at it. So I -- I don't see this as a major change in the previous calculation.

CHAIR: Go ahead.

MOUNTFORD: Roxanne Mountford, English.

BROTHERS: I'm sorry, your name again, please?

MOUNTFORD: Roxanne Mountford, English.

There are -- in the English Department 30 percent of all of the current courses that we teach at the first year level are taught by TAs. Seventy percent are taught by full-time lecturers who have a really difficult teaching load, 4, 4, and very poorly paid. And so one of the great benefits of this change that we're putting through is -- is not -- not just for the TAs, but -- but also for full-time

lecturers. From our point of view, this is a much -- it's a very significant proposed change that will make a big difference to some very talented people, including the writer, Erik Reece.

SUBBASWAMY: And, in fact, that was in my calculations I might add. If you recall, that that calculations of TAs having lower loads and better pay and all that was built in to my calculation.

CHAIR: Further questions for Susan.

Yes, Peter.

PERRY: Right, Peter Perry, Mathematics.

I -- I simply feel duty bound because of the conversations I've had with a number of colleagues to echo some concerns that others have expressed about precisely at what point we're going to know what the real cost of the -- the proposed changes are. We are in a situation where the resource situation at the University is unclear; where the faculty are now in their second year of -- of no pay increases. I -- I understand and appreciate the distinction between design templates and implementation, but I think it would be very helpful to have some clarity as to how and when we will know the cost of what we are intended to vote on in the future.

SUBBASWAMY: May I?

CHAIR: Yes. Except I will -- we will vote to implement this only after we know that, but please.

SUBBASWAMY: I -- I stand by my number of approximately four-and-a-half-million dollars as the minimum cost. I stand by

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

that number. I mean, if you want to hire Price Cooper -- Price Water Cooperhouse, whatever the company is to, you know, do another full audit of this, you're welcome to. But you know, my numbers are out there. They've been posted. The assumptions are out there. And there are mathematicians and statisticians all around. So those numbers are out there on how I got to those numbers, and I stand by those numbers. I think (unintelligible) with this new wrinkle, which is a small wrinkle, I -- I stand by those numbers.

And -- and therefore I claim not only are they manageable, I -- I would argue we have no choice but to act, you're working with a 45-year-old curriculum, I think we really need to move ahead and -- and make the change.

CHAIR: Yes, please.

BOLLINGER: You said that's a minimum, though. Do you have a maximum?

SUBBASWAMY: Oh, gosh, the economists in the audience.

BOLLINGER: (Unintelligible) so I'm on both sides.

SUBBASWAMY: No, I mean, actually, I -- I stand by the number. This is a physicist number. The financial mathematics did come from (unintelligible).

BOLLINGER: (Unintelligible) financial mathematics discussed?

SUBBASWAMY: What I'm saying is, though I say -- though I stand by how many precision points, I mean, it's about four-and-a-half-million, call it five; call it four, but to find the offsets; I assume there were no offsets. There are going to be some offsets. By the time you're all said and done, I think it's going to be somewhere in the four- to five-million-dollar range.

CHAIR: Please?

WOOD: Point of information. Is there a motion on the floor?

CHAIR: There is not, so I would like to -- thank you. I would like to confine questions to Susan, please. Any further questions for Susan. Thank you. So the recommendation is someone move that the Senate approve the 10-course template. Connie.

WOOD: I'd like to move that the Senate approve the 10-course template with intended implementation date of fall 2011, subject to final confirmation by the University Senate of: one, the implementation date; and two, the process of vetting general education courses for inclusion during the fall of 2010.

CHAIR: Did you get that?

BROTHERS: That the Senate approve the

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt
10-course templates with an intended
implementation date of fall 2011, subject
to final confirmation of, one, the
implementation date --

WOOD: By the University Senate.
BROTHERS: Final confirmation by the
University Senate, of one, the
implementation date, and two, the process
of vetting gen ed courses for inclusion
during the fall of 2010.

WOOD: Yes.
CHAIR: Thank you. A second to the
motion. Dr. Yanarella.
YANARELLA: I second.
CHAIR: Now, we can discuss the motion.
Please.

YOST: Scott Yost, College of
Engineering. How does -- if you go back a
slide, is that what she's trying to
articulate there?

WOOD: Exactly.
CHAIR: Yes. She's incorporated that
into the motion.
YOST: And so if either one of these two
things does not pass the Senate, then the
whole thing is off; is that what I'm
understanding?

CHAIR: In order to be implemented, the
Senate must approve these things, so I
guess you're saying the adverse, and yes, I
believe that's correct. Connie.

WOOD: May I speak to my motion?
CHAIR: Yes.
WOOD: Thank you. That is exactly my
intent. Currently, students are admitted
under USP requirements for graduation.
Therefore we have to have a firm date as to
when any new curricular reform would have
to go into effect, but we still have the
issue of, you know, I understand that this
is a physicist's estimate of what's
required, therefore it's done without
error... But still at issue is -- is the
funding going to be available in order to
do this in the way in which it is attended
-- intended, and also the process which is
going to be very important to all of us,
the process by which these courses are
vetted in order to be included in this
curriculum. What my motion does, it says
that this does not go into effect until
those two things occur, and we will have a
firm implementation date.

CHAIR: Further discussion of the motion?
YOST: I just have to say something
else. I'm sorry. Scott Yost, College of
Engineering. I've had issues or I've
raised questions with you all about the,
you know, there's -- in the system there's
an awful lot of trust being set up. Trust
that under our current gen ed -- or current

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

USP requirements where we have put together a curriculum in light of our paid -- or our accreditation agencies that we have the mix all put together. We redo the mix. Okay. We still are subject to our accreditation issues, but we do not know -- even if all this stuff gets in place here, okay, we pass the templates today; we -- the resources become available which I think they will be, and that will be -- we put together this group to vet the actual curriculums or the courses that are being put forward, we do not know for sure whether our -- the new courses that get put through with these -- these templates will, in fact, create a hardship to programs who are subject to external accreditation issues which we've already put to forward here, I mean, as far as -- we know, right, we know what we're dealing with now. We still don't know what we're dealing with, and I -- and I -- I asked the Senate to look at, you know, what happens if we have these adverse consequences? Substitution, I think, was one of the things that we talked about in an e-mail to Dr. Carvalho and an e-mail to the Senate about the possibility if this does have an adverse impact to the programs to -- you know, what are we going to do? Case in point, I'll give an example, if under requirements that we say we have Physics 2 being required for our accreditation which is part of our -- the way we put together part of our general education in science elective, if that comes through that physics doesn't want to take and make a class that fits the new template, but we still have it to be required, we now have an up in credit hours for graduation for our program, and that -- I mean, I like the proposal. I like everything that's been put forward here,

but there still is an awful lot of trust put into the system that it's not going to have adverse consequences to programs that are already pushed to the limit by their accreditation requirements. And I'm just wondering -- I mean, I haven't heard anything back. I mean, Dr. Carvalho and I have talked a little bit, but I haven't heard anything back from the Senate Council on -- are you even at all concerned about that? That's issue number one. So I'll just leave it there for --

CHAIR: We have certainly spent time talking about it. The issue of the mathematics, calculus has come to our attention. Trust in that if this program should fatally injure one of our important programs that does no one any good. Susan.

CARVALHO: I can only say that the questions were complicated. We were immediately hit

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

from all sides with questions of: Does this course count, either because the department offering it wants it to count, or because departments are subject to other department decisions, as in the cases that you very legitimately raised. Both -- our -- the answer of the curricular teams that looked at them was either, one, this is beyond or purview, or two, yes, with modification. So then the question is: Is the offering department willing to make the modification? We couldn't get to those answers, but the -- this time does give us a space for that conversation, and I -- I would say that we are all on the same team in terms of wanting to work something out that is feasible for students to graduate in a timely fashion. That's the -- certainly a goal that we share. So the conversations will happen, but we have to have a vetting group in place looking at these type -- kinds of modifications in dialogue with the department offering the course before we can definitively answer this question.

CHAIR: Provost Subbaswamy, please.

SUBBASWAMY: Again, you know, apart from the goodwill of the department that's supposed

to offer the course, as a chief academic officer, I have certain responsibilities. I had certain responsibilities, including making sure that the programs that need to be accredited remain accredited. I think the issue you bring up, in fact, if you go back to the slide presentation I made -- I made last April -- in April, it talks about all the remaining steps, and one of them was, in fact, for all the departments majors to go back and say, okay, what does this program do to my major and what are the problems and what are the possible solutions? Are we likely to encounter, you know, a situation where for a particular major that -- such as, you know, engineering, there is just no way around the new curriculum. I doubt it simply because it's also a reduced number hours. If Physics is unwilling to modify Physics 2, I'm sure English would be willing to teach a physics could that would both satisfy the general education curriculum and meet the requirement. I mean, I think, you know, those are the negotiations that would have to take place through the provost's office. Or Engineering can start teaching it's own physics and that will certainly bring a little competition into the field. These are issues that universities deal with once every so often when they deal with changes in -- in general education. So we're not the first ones to go through a general education

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

reform or change, and we won't be the last, and this won't be the -- this is not the first time we've done this, and this won't be the last. But it will be the last under my watch at least.

CHAIR: All right, yeah.

NADEL: Before we vote on these, I'd like to read into the record that by my count the 800 words or so describing the Composition and Communication courses contain 13 errors in standard usage, 4 examples of deadwood, 4 redundancies, 2 uses of ambiguous modification, 1 error in paralogsism, and a faulty pronounce -- pronoun reference, and the grotesque nominalization, curriculum imbedded performance based assessable products, which albeit, not in grammatical, gives us a great shot in getting into The New Yorker. And the reason I bring this up is not just because these are editing, but because I was told by two people that attempts to make this more grammatical were voted down in committee. And since this proposes committee work, I wonder if the committees that -- work that's going to be produced by these courses is going to have the same ethos and group thing where a group can outvote standard English.

CHAIR: If that's a serious question, I --

CARVALHO: I don't mind answering.

CHAIR: -- but I'm a bit of a stickler for grammar myself and --

CARVALHO: Editorial suggestions will be welcome. A lot of editorial suggestions change the meaning. While they come in the form of suggestions, they involve changes

in meaning. It will be up to the curricular team to articulate its meaning. Language has seldom been such a black and white issue, although I'm sure in some of the cases that you mention, it is; in other cases, it may not be. And I think we need to stay to the substance of this issue for the sake of the audience.

NADEL: This is exactly the reason I want to read this into the record. We're going to start with the premise that competent English is at odds with meaning; that you cannot say what you mean in competent English; you'll undermine the premise of teaching the course whatsoever.

CHAIR: Thank you for your comment. Yes.
BOLLINGER: Chris Bollinger, Economics. I've been at least sort of peripherally involved with some of this for quite a few years. I was on the undergraduate studies program committee some years back. Somebody who was on it with me can probably remember when. And then I was on one of the -- I was on the inference committee here. And

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

I've struggled with -- with this. I'm -- I'm concerned, as my colleague Dick Yost has been --

YOST: Scott Yost.

BOLLINGER: I'm sorry, Scott Yost has been with whether -- with how this is actually going to be implemented, and we had a number of long talks about this on the inference team. And I think that the -- the only way to do this is to keep going forward. And -- and I don't say that lightly because I think that this is asking for a tremendous amount of resources of ours, faculty time in particular, be invested long before the University invests its money, and that's the trust issue that is being brought up, is we're being asked to put forward a lot of our time and a lot of our energy and some of us already have. But I don't see any way around that because this is kind of where you have to put the cart before the -- or you have to put the horse before the cart, and we've got to get these things laid out and the details put

together before we actually implement it. So I'm glad that we have this fail-safe in that, and I hope that the next Senate when faced with whether we go forward with this, will take that very seriously. And I won't be on it because I'm leaving, and that's my say.

CHAIR: Further discussion.

YOST: One last thing just for the record. A question I wanted to ask is we approve it, and I -- at the -- at the risk of alienating my constituents, I'm generally in favor of everything as far as moving forward, but I -- I know there's a huge concern, and I want -- I want the Provost to please address this, and I want it on the record, we take -- we -- we approve this; we get the resources we approved; we get these curriculum teams formed; vet the process; we get everything in place, and we wake up that day when it comes to implementation, and we find that in order to satisfy gen ed and our accreditation agencies, our credit hours increase from right now -- in civil engineering, it's 134; mechanical, I think it's 132, and all of a sudden we have to do 145, for instance, what can we do -- what -- what do we have as a College of Engineering to come back and make this right so we do not have to take -- to satisfy accreditation as well as gen ed without saying, okay, just cut your classes out, what -- what can we do? What is our out on this one?

SUBBASWAMY: I think, you know, one -- one of the external factors that will help you is the fact that councils of postsecondary

education, our own TP, but such bodies, have all been trying to -- not only trying to -- forcing us to cut back on the total hours for graduation, so if we took to them a proposal that had increased hours, I can guarantee that it will come back with, you know, change it. And ABET is going to say you have to have these competencies and so forth. And so you if anything gives, it would be somehow an adjustment on the general education side. There -- there

were some conversations already about science courses and how they might be modified and how might -- they might be useable and so forth. Again, I think these -- some of these are so hard to answer in the abstract that, comma, you know, I want to be pragmatic here. Until you actually start sitting down and going major by major and saying, okay, how will we manage this and what -- where are the issues and how -- what is the resolution, I don't think we will get to the resolution. There will be a resolution, but we won't know what that is or what the nature of that is going to be until we actually go through the details.

CHAIR: Further discussion of the motion.

We'll do a show of hand vote, only Senators voting. All right. All in favor raise your hand, please.

SOHNER: Forty-eight, I got.

CHAIR: Forty-six is what I got.

SOHNER: Okay.

CHAIR: Register as 48.

Opposed, raise your hand, please.

Abstain? One.

SOHNER: One.

CHAIR: Motion carries.

For those who have done so much

work. . . .

AUDIENCE: (APPLAUSE)

CARVALHO: May I just add one more -- one

final word which is that all of these discussions about the process are very important. I just found out this weekend that we were lapped by one of the regional universities that started well after we did and finished before we did, but it doesn't matter because we do pay attention to these processes, and I think that's a good thing. But in all of the discussion today and maybe in April about the processes, I just want to say that the vision that these curricular teams put forward is an exciting, innovative vision grounded in the best practices and tendencies of their fields, and they're exciting. And the kinds of conversations that took place in each of those 10 arenas is just the kind of conversation that we need to have more often, and I think the curricular team

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

members when they get over the exhaustion will agree. Thanks for that opportunity.

CHAIR: We have some proposed changes in the ARs which we will be endorsing, and Provost Subbaswamy has graciously agreed to present those to us.

SUBBASWAMY: Do you want me to speak to the Senate Council's discussion of those, or do I -- do you want me to first describe what they are and then we'll --

CHAIR: The Senate Council has endorsed everything that's coming forward, but I'll add anything that seems appropriate.

SUBBASWAMY: There are two items before you by way of Administrative Regulations. Item number 13, which is proposed change -- proposed changes to Administrative Regulations 11-1.0-1, that's the combined version for faculty appointments, and then number 14, which is proposed changes in Administrative Regulations 11-7.0-1 verse 3 -- chapter 3:14, Faculty Practice Plans. And -- and I just want to first point out

that both of them are -- have been in circulation and in discussion for at least two-and-a-half years because I feel more -- I was at the initiation of both of them. The one on competence of Administrative Regulations pertaining to faculty tenure, promotion and appointments started with a whitepaper that I -- I put out among many that I did when I got here, and then those were basis for discussions. And so there were certain things about faculty series, title series that I pulled back on, and there were procedural issues on -- there were a lot of consensus, and so those were then put forward as -- as changes, and they have gone to the deans; they have gone to the faculty councils; they have gone to the Senate Council; they have gotten responses; then I made some changes, and they've then gone back and so forth. So there's been a two-year deliberative process, at least in, you know, from where I sit, it seemed like adequately vetted. So let me just sort of highlight what to me seems to be the substantive changes, but I'm sure others may disagree because there's going to be obviously bias on, let's say regulation 11-1-0-1, pertaining to faculty appointments and so forth, on page 5, I think of what was circulated to you, section 3, the comprehensive tenure review is a more substantive piece. And what it ensures is that faculty, all faculty, will have -- will be entitled to one comprehensive tenure review which involves the tenure review being -- going all the way up to the committees, to the Provost, and the President, and the Board of Trustees. As it currently stands, if a dean say no, it

stops right there. It is not further reviewed, and that seemed like -- there was not really good reason in my opinion why that should be the case because why -- why would you give more deference to a negative vote at the dean's level than to a positive vote, and they would -- they both carry, you know, equal weight or not. And so in that sense -- so that really is a -- is a primary substantive change there. And then in -- in the second paragraph, there's an explicit statement now about considerable deference in tenure cases shall be shown by the Provost to the judgments emanating from the college, especially in cases where those college-level judgments are nearly unanimous either for granting or against tenure. And you know, that again, I think, is -- is an indication of the mature -- maturation of the institution in that area committees tended to be seen as policing over departmental and college decisions, and you know, each of the colleges is now a -- they're all trying to get national ranking, and -- and they're all highly research active faculty, and so forth. And so the justification for saying that the final voice of the area committee somehow automatically is a stronger and a more objective voice than a more knowledgeable voice than that of a college and the department is something that, I think, we

need to re-examine. And so this exclusively makes clear that considerable deference should be given in tenure cases by the provost to the judgments emanating at those levels. There was one point of disagreement -- because our meeting, you know, we went back and forth and most changes were made, and I believe that those -- that's really more that one of anxiety over change rather than the practical consequence of it. And that is this notion of somebody being put up for early tenure, and then if that doesn't go well, that person being able to come back again for a second consideration. That is not how our benchmark institutions do business, folks. The notion of early tenure is -- is an antiquated concept. The concept is that within the probationary period, the person is put up when the individual is deemed ready. And so, you know, the statement on page 7 here in item 4 says: An assistant professor shall be considered for promotion and tenure no later than the next-to-last year of a probationary period, instead of saying it is in the next-to-last year of probationary period. And -- and how does that happen? It happens in an informal way. Basically, if you think there's some genius running around, and that person

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

needs to be tied down, you take their case, and you take it to the chair and the chair says, hey, this is absolutely a case that's a no-brainer. Takes it to the dean. The dean says, let me talk with the provost. The provost talks to the area committee and says, look, folks, I think we ought to go with this individual, and then you, you know, build a case, assuming, you know, that everybody says this is a clear no-brainer. Otherwise, you wait because what's -- what's the danger in waiting, and then, you know, you don't want to do it casually by simply saying, let's get a few letters, and if they don't look right, then we can suppress them next year and get new letters. And that's not how we do

business. And so that's the one point on which I respectfully disagree with those who think that, you know, we will end the University as we know it. It won't be that, I promise you. And so if, in fact, the University ends as we know it, in two years, we can come back and fix it. So that would be the way that works. My stand on that one.

CHAIR:
JONES:

Comments? Dr. Jones.

Yes. I'm speaking for the College of Medicine, the College of Medicine Faculty Council which represents nearly one-third of the tenured and tenure track faculty at the University. I'm a member of the body as well. They voted unanimously to ask me to bring some concerns to the Senate here. The College of Medicine Faculty Council recognizes and is strongly supportive of the several positive features in the draft language. The new guaranty that the untenured candidate will have an occasion for their case to be considered all the way to the President's level for a final decision is an improvement in the current policy, in which case it might never get above the college level. The Faculty Council also expresses its appreciation to the positive response that the Provost had to an earlier suggestion from the Faculty Council that language be clarified to fully secure the availability of the appeal's process. That was put in there. The Faculty Council is very concerned, however, about several features that could have long-term harmful effects on the growth of the academic programs at the University and our college. One new feature which the Provost just described is that if a department advances a candidate for an early consideration for tenure, the candidate be placed on terminal re-appointment if the early tenure is denied instead of the person being put on a re-appointment until a later guaranteed

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

consideration that took place the sixth year. Faculty Council did not consider this to be antiquated and felt that as we

aspire to attract faculty to increase our competitive achievements to the top 20, the prospect of an early tenure consideration that is unlinked to termination is an important recruiting tool. And we're not aware that any data have been provided to show there's a downside to the current procedures for an early tenure consideration. The Faculty Council is especially concerned about another provision which is also new and hasn't been there for a while and Provost did not review that, and that is effecting those untenured faculty who waive tenure consideration at typically the sixth year and who agree they would like to have a terminal re-appointment during their seventh year. The proposed language denies to these candidates the guaranteed comprehensive review all the way to the President's level that otherwise would have been available to them had they not waived the consideration during the required year. There are many legitimate reasons that an untenured candidate may seek to waive consideration until the terminal year. In many of the disciplines in our College of Medicine, it's necessary for faculty to obtain extramural funding to fuel their productivity. In times of national economic stress that are outside the control of the candidate or of the University, it takes longer to demonstrate securing that extramural funding. In such cases, it's to the benefit of both the candidate and the University that the candidate be able to waive consideration until the terminal year without the punitive loss of that candidate's guaranty for the same comprehensive review that is available to other faculty and other disciplines who do not have extramural funding pressures. In summary, we appreciate the Provost's invitation for the college faculty councils and Senate to recommend the best improvements in our tenure process and were very supportive of the significant improvements that have been

proposed. We also strongly urge the Senate Council to continue working with the Provost to enable further modification of these areas of remaining concern that we just described. Thank you.

CHAIR:

Respond?

SUBBASWAMY:

A short response. I think the -- the larger issue really that's in the -- in the second item has to do with the length of the probationary period in -- in general

really. And there are many universities that have gone in -- in certain periods or certain colleges, for example, to an eight-year probationary period, even nine years. Washington University in St. Louis has -- is in fact 10. I think those discussions ought to take place. I think in light of, you know, the expectations and the funding environment and so forth. And so I -- I think that's a -- something that's, you know, ongoing discussions we ought to have. There are still items pertaining to title series and things that we haven't taken up. So I'm not suggesting that we've, you know, done everything that can be done to improve our lot. But I think on the issue of, you know, where is the data, is that under the current system, it is impossible to gather the data because if a -- if a college or a department even solicits letters and says, oops, these letters are bad, so let's just suppress them, it doesn't even come forward. So there's no way of even knowing if -- how much of this is going on right now. And I think so let's wait and see. You know, I've been at other universities where this has not kept them from hiring national academy level people, and I don't think it's going to keep us from hiring high quality faculty members at all. So I think that, you know, the data I have is from other universities that have this one -- one, you know, up or out, and they have early tenure. In fact, they have systems in which somebody is brought up for tenure after three years, four years, and then is promoted to full rank because the committee

and everybody says, this person is a real keeper, so let's have that, you know, dispense with the second promotion and go right to full professor. So I mean, I think that you -- you have to enough confidence in the system to be able to recognize that extraordinary performance and reward it.

CHAIR: Questions, further questions for the Provost. Yes.

YOST: I -- I'm still unclear what is the motivation for the -- if they voluntarily waive to go for tenure, why is it in that terminal year they don't get a comprehensive review? Why -- what specifically is the motivation for that one issue?

SUBBASWAMY: I guess I can ask, what is the motivation for waiving your right in the first place? I mean if you waive, by definition, you waived it. And then saying, oops, you know -- in other words, to not -- or to waive it and have no penalty is the same as extending your --

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

your tenure period, basically. And so what I'm -- I would ask is just, you know, turn this around and ask: Why would you waive in the first place? And secondly, there's a related issue, I'm sorry, I lost my thought there, is that how about an appeal then? If you go through a full thing, and then you need to appeal, you automatically get an extension to an eighth year if you go through a seventh-year period and then appeal towards the end, and then, you know, some -- you go to the SACPT and it says, this needs to be redone or they found some, you know, procedural thing or something like that. That's the reason we have the terminal year always being coming after the tenure consideration have been made, but that really pushes it. And you know, frankly, I think it harms the faculty member because there's too much at risk at that point in that seventh year when the individual should be making other career plans rather than be waiting for this decision to be made until the very last minute. I don't think it helps the individual who's being put in that position.

CHAIR: Dr. Jones, will you make that available --

JONES: Yes.

CHAIR: -- directly? Dr. Wood.

WOOD: Connie Wood, College of Arts and Sciences. It's my pleasure to serve not only on this body, but on the Senate Council, but on the executive committee of the College of Arts and Sciences who has voted to -- who has really considered this proposal and has voted to have me read into the record some of their concerns for the college. The College of Arts and Sciences executive committee has reviewed the Provost Offices proposed changes to the Administration Regulations and offers the University Senate the following feedback.

The committee agrees that the review of all tenure track faculty are entitled to undergo in no later than the sixth year of their probationary period should be a so-called comprehensive one. The committee, however, expressed deep

concern about the proposed change to limit to one the number of times a probationary faculty member can undergo a review prior to the seventh year of his or her probationary period. The committee believes that this limitation will dampen the willingness of outstanding, untenured faculty, who often undergo tenure review prior to the sixth year, to go up early. Out of caution and fear for receiving a terminal contract in case the tenure application is declined, such faculty are

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

likely to delay their promotion and tenure review. This delay might prompt some of them to look for jobs elsewhere. The limit might also cause highly qualified job candidates to hesitate accepting offers from the University of Kentucky once they learn of this policy. The committee strongly urges allowing faculty to undergo more than one review prior to the seventh year of the probationary period. Perhaps all probationary period could be guaranteed one comprehensive review to take place in the sixth or seventh year, and the option of an earlier, noncomprehensive review could be left open. That is a review that could be stopped by the college dean. Thank you.

CHAIR: Would you care to respond?

SUBBASWAMY: No

CHAIR: All right. Yes, Dr. Perry.

PERRY: Peter Perry, Mathematics. Having served both as a department chair and as a member and chair of the Senate's advisory committee on approving of tenure, I appreciate many aspects of the proposed revisions to the ARs and the -- an easy, streamlined tenure, but I must express my absolute support for the statement that was read by Connie and to the reservations that it expresses. When the folks who serve in the trenches, the folks who -- department chairs, the folks who do the recruiting, the folks who go in to the field with the University of Kentucky's particular recruiting situation, particular standing on academic institutions, universally express their apprehensive that the new

regulation eliminate or make it more difficult for early review will hamper their ability -- ability to recruit outstanding faculty. Those concerns should not be lightly dismissed.

CHAIR: Thank you. I would like to have a motion to discuss if we could.

NADEL: So moved. Alan Nadel.

CHAIR: Here, you're moving.

NADEL: So moved.

CHAIR: Let me -- let me point out, however, that this incorporates both endorsement of this in saying that it will apply to everyone. Second to the motion.

JONES: A clarification. When you say apply to everyone, you mean --

CHAIR: All non-tenured individuals whether you were hired before today or after today. Please.

SUBBASWAMY: No. That was a known fact, there was a time-honored rule that you have to grandfather people who came in under a different rule. So, no, this would only apply prospectively to those who are hired July 1 forward.

CHAIR:

Okay.

SUBBASWAMY:

Sorry, my -- I mean, if we conveyed that that would be incorrect. I mean, if somebody else wanted to opt in, that would be fine, but it's by -- by law, we would only apply it to those who come in.

CHAIR:

Okay.

SUBBASWAMY:

Because there will be an opt in. In other words, the comprehensive review is something that, you know, I would expect everyone would want at that (unintelligible).... I think by in large many deans have already changed the process, and they're sending forward now anyway even though it's not required. So I think it has had its intended effect already. But again, you know, I don't mean to suggest that I was taking the objection lightly. I just have -- having worked at, you know, others universities that do this and not having seen any harm, I think that harm, potential harm is being exaggerated. I don't think there is any harm in going forward because now we will have clean records. Because, you know, in the past --

I mean, frankly, I -- I was also a department chair; I was also an associate dean. I've done all of those things, and I -- and I understand the difficulties. The issue is -- is the following: If you go to your best references on -- in year four, quote, early, there is no concept of early in my thinking at all. When ready, but let's say still you did. And those folks -- two of the folks said, yes, and two said, no, you've basically taken four really outstanding, relevant references out of the picture. I mean, how much do you want to burden them? You they go back a year later and say, oh, by the way, we're actually going to put this person up again, we weren't quite ready, and so send your letter or you actually decide, you know, those two people were really bad people, had it in for this guy, so we're going to go and avoid those two experts and go to somebody else. You know, it -- it gives rise to those kinds of issues where the system -- the University cannot monitor a clean process in terms of, you know, in -- in the first place bothering all these experts that are out there, and do you -- do you want to do that multiple times, or you just sort of take out a few people through your trial balloon, and then sort of go back and say, this is the real time we're going to do this. I just don't understand why we would want to do something where -- don't we have enough judgment to be able to say, this case is so clearly superior that, yes, we -- we're

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt
confident that this will go through. I mean, I think that ultimately there has to be that degree of confidence in terms of what is expected and what is really extraordinary, and in those extraordinary cases, you just go forward with tenure when ready. Generally, in those instances, you're trying to get enough of a teaching portfolio built up because the research productivity is already clearly indicated.

CHAIR:

Please.

NADEL:

I would like to --

BROTHERS:

Excuse me, I need a second; I need a second.

CHAIR:

I thought we had a second; I'm sorry.

BOLLINGER:

Chris Bollinger, Economics.

CHAIR:

And for clarification, we are simply voting to endorse the change in the AR.

NADEL:

I would like to agree with the recommendation made by A&S, by pointing out this, that the most cost-efficient way to recruit people as you're trying to build a national reputation is to take people who are tenurable at their current institution and are assistant professors and bring them in, saving them the process of going through tenure. Two outstanding people were hired in the English Department through this process a few years ago. And we are not the only institution who knows this. Therefore, the -- getting people to delay going up for tenure for fear that it may be terminal, even if that fear is not particularly rational, makes them easily picked off by other institutions also aspiring toward top 20 status. It is a very, very good option for retaining faculty to give them the option without penalty to go up for tenure, in quotes, early.

CHAIR:

Further discussion. Yes.

ZENTALL:

Tom Zentall, Psychology. I've served on a number of college tenure promotion committees as well as university tenure promotion committees, and I've seen bias against early tenure exactly because of the option for normal review at the end of tenure process. And I've seen senior faculty members on this committee who have argued that one needs to really be quite superior to get tenure early. And therefore, since there was another option to come up later, that that should be followed, and I think this would eliminate that problem because one would judge tenure based on an absolute process rather than a relative process that one has to have extraordinary abilities in order to get tenure.

CHAIR:

Further comments? We'll do a

show of hands. Did I miss someone? We'll do a show of hands. All in favor, raise your hand.

PERRY: Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa.

CHAIR: I'm sorry.

PERRY: There -- there have been a lot of serious concerns addressed about this particular revision to the proposal, and I think we ought to have an opportunity to -- to consider a revision to the motion.

TAGAVI: Nobody asked for amendment.

CHAIR: Are you going to propose a --

PERRY: Yes, I am. I would like to propose adding the language -- the following language to paragraph 3 of the proposed revision to the ARs.

TAGAVI: They can't --

PERRY: A probationary --

TAGAVI: They can't change the revision of proposal. They can change the language of the endorsement.

PERRY: A probationary faculty member is entitled to an early tenure review without prejudice.

CHAIR: Dr. Perry, I don't think it's within our purview to change the language of the document, you know.

PERRY: I'm sorry, I really would -- I really -- I -- I do not want to -- and I'm sure I shared this with my colleagues, I do not want to obstruct progress, but if I were to ask -- if I were asked to vote to support the ARs without such a recommendation, I could not in good conscience support it.

CHAIR: All right. Would you say again what you're proposing so we can hear it down here, and then we'll -- say it again, please.

PERRY: Okay. A probationary faculty member is entitled to an early tenure review without prejudice prior to the sixth year.

CHAIR: Okay.

SUBBASWAMY: I have a procedural question here, as well, because the -- as an Administrative Regulation, as I understand it, it requires -- it -- it is to be presented for Senate's endorsement. You can -- you cannot endorse it. If you don't want to endorse it, you don't have to endorse it. But I don't think that it's appropriate to try to change -- we've had a two-year-long discussion about this, and so I'm not sure that at this stage and -- you know, it's other than a recommendation to me, I'm not sure what the particular role of an amendment would be.

CHAIR: I'm afraid I have to agree, but yes, ma'am.

SEGERSTOM: Is it possible to just aggregate the --

BROTHERS: Name, please?
SEGERSTOM: -- changes so that we don't have
to --
BROTHERS: Name, please?
SEGERSTOM: I'm sorry, Suzanne Segerstom,
A&S. Is it possible to just aggregate the
changes so that we could endorse some of
them but not others?
SUBBASWAMY: Let me -- I mean, you know,
we're -- we're going through a really
interesting debate here in terms of
administrative matters, and you know, where
things -- where we draw the line. Academic
matters is absolute prerogative on the part
of the faculty, and I've been very
respectful of that. In -- in this

particular instance, what you're really
saying is, let's pick and choose and take
those things that we really like and -- and
really reject those that we don't like.
You can do that, but I'll respectfully have
to say that ultimately, you know, I take
your advice and -- and I'll have to do then
what I -- I'll have to make my
recommendation to the President. So I
don't think this aggregating it makes sense
because that's just basically saying that
we'll pick and choose every time something
comes up; we'll pick and choose in terms of
what, you know, is to our liking and what
is not to our liking -- on administrative
matters.
NADEL: Isn't that our job?
SUBBASWAMY: Not for administrative matters.
I think that --
NADEL: Well, to make recommendations to
you which --
SUBBASWAMY: Yeah, to make --
NADEL: -- you can ignore.
SUBBASWAMY: Absolutely.
NADEL: Isn't it our job to tell you
what we do endorse and what we don't?
SUBBASWAMY: Well, sure. That's -- that's why
I said you don't have to endorse it. I'm
saying you don't have to endorse.
NADEL: We can endorse some things and
not others. That's our job.
CHAIR: So what we can do, I believe, is
we can place that language in the
endorsement. So if you would like to --
that Senate endorse the changes with the
recommendation that we can do that. So you
in effect would be changing the motion. Do
you wish to amend the motion?
PERRY: I do.
CHAIR: Would you please read your
amendment?
PERRY: I -- I apologize to the
assembled. I -- I assumed that I was off
the amendment. I'm searching for my
recommendation.
CHAIR: I'm going to ask you if that's a

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

PERRY: friendly amendment?
All right. A probationary faculty member is entitled to a tenure review without prejudice --

TAGAVI: It's not a motion.
PERRY: -- prior -- prior to the sixth year.

CHAIR: All right, is there a second to that?
WOOD: Second.
CHAIR: Do you accept that as a friendly amendment?
NADEL: According to Robert's Rules, there is not such thing as a friendly amendment, but since it is the custom of the country here to use such usages, I happily do.

CHAIR: All right. Who seconded it?
BOLLINGER: I did, that's fine.
CHAIR: All right. So this is what we are now discussing. We'll have to look at Robert's Rules again. Further discussion? Yes, Dr. Kelly.

KELLY: Do -- can I just clarify that we were also -- the -- the portion of the recommendation where this applies to all probationary faculty in tenure track lines, that has now been changed?
CHAIR: That's gone.
KELLY: Okay, thank you.
CHAIR: It was my error, my misunderstanding --
KELLY: Thank you.
CHAIR: -- to let it go to Senate Council, but that was my misunderstanding.

Further discussion?
We'll do a show of hands. All in favor --

TAGAVI: That's not the amendment.
(UNINTELLIGIBLE/INAUDIBLE COMMENTS BY MANY)

TAGAVI: First on the amendment.
CHAIR: No, it's -- if it's a friendly amendment, we don't need to vote.
UNIDENTIFIED: Well, point of order --
TAGAVI: If anyone has -- if any -- friendly amendments are only good when everybody agrees.
UNIDENTIFIED: That's right.
TAGAVI: If anybody doesn't agree, you know, we can't -- we have to vote on the amendment. There is no such thing as a friendly amendment. It's like friendly fire.

CHAIR: Then we will vote on the amendment, and we'll do that by show of hands. All in favor, raise -- aye -- I'm sorry. We'll do it by voice vote, all in favor aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.
CHAIR: Opposed nay?
AUDIENCE: Nay.
CHAIR: Show of hands. All in favor,

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

raise your hand. This is on the amendment.

SOHNER:

Nineteen, I got.

CHAIR:

Nineteen?

SOHNER:

Yes.

CHAIR:

Opposed?

SOHNER:

Twenty-six.

CHAIR:

Twenty-six. All right.

Amendment fails. So we're voting on the original full endorsement. Any further discussion? All right.

All in favor of endorsing the changes, raise your hand.

SOHNER:

I got 26.

CHAIR:

Twenty-six?

SOHNER:

Uh-huh (AFFIRMATIVE).

CHAIR:

So motion --

TAGAVI:

Opposed?

CHAIR:

Opposed raise your hand?

SOHNER:

Twenty-four.

CHAIR:

Twenty-three. Motion carries

endorse changes.

We will now -- we're going to look at some changes in the ARs relevant to the Faculty Practice Plans. Dadds will do that for us. We are not going to endorse this. He's simply going to inform us; it's a very complicated matter.

DADDS:

Good afternoon. I'm Harry Dadds, senior associate general counsel at the

University -- UK Health Care Medical Center legal office. For approximately two-and-a-half years, I, along with a group of people have been working on a review of the faculty practice plans for the health care colleges. This has been extensively vetted throughout the six health care colleges and with university health service. I believe everyone within those colleges has achieved a level of comfort with the documents now. We are planning to take this to the board in June for approval. What -- first of all, let's consider what is a faculty practice plan? Very simply, it's a means of accounting for and distributing revenue generated by the health care college faculty. One could have a faculty practice plan for other colleges. However, the ARs that are currently in existence have been oriented -- are specific to health care colleges. These are applicable only to the health science colleges, that is, dentistry, health sciences, medicine, nursing, pharmacy, public health, and the university health services. Medicine currently does not have a faculty -- have an AR as basis for its faculty practice plan. It has been operating under a 1978 Board action that has been amended multiple times. College of Public Health, likewise, operates under that series of documents. This is applicable to all revenue related to

patient care and any other revenue generated by a faculty member, depending on what the particular college cares to include. What we are hoping to do here is currently combine seven separate ARs and the one college that has no AR at all into one AR pertaining to health care college faculty practice plans. This will be, if you will, the constitution for faculty practice plans within the various health care colleges. We will have one unified AR for all health care faculty practice plans to cover basic plan requirement matters that have to be considered and included

within various faculty practice plans. Then the individual colleges will have the ability to modify, within a framework, to meet their particular needs. This will be coordinated with the other ARs. The current plans did not consider the relationship with either the consulting or intellectual property ARs or with the university's entrepreneurial programs.

Finally, the one change that is -- is quite significant from current practices, this will require persons participating in the faculty practice plans to file an annual disclosure requirement to identify potential areas of conflict of interest. We have a prototype in the works, and envision that this will be a document that will be filed online, essentially negative reporting with -- reporting by exception but giving information when necessary. The differences in operations between the various colleges will be set forth in individual college addenda for each of the six colleges and university health services. In these matters will be addressed such as the scope of planned membership, are basic science faculty in or out, does this apply to part-time faculty? When reviewing this, we find -- found a tremendous divergence between the various colleges. The types of revenue that are included, some include -- some exclude honoraria; some allow for a certain level of consulting; others do not. That again, can be preserved within this framework. The method that we have sought to utilize is to replicate what we have that's good wherever possible. Percent of revenue retained by each college, frequency of distributions to members. Some colleges distribute monthly. Some only once a year or twice a year. Identity of certain persons such as the fiscal agent who is responsible for billing, managing the money. The college addenda will be reviewed annually by the provost and -- and the EVPHA with a view that these addenda

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt
can be fluid documents and modified for

changing circumstances. Again, we plan to take this to the University -- University Board of Trustees for approval at the June meeting, but wanted to come to you and explain this, offer a chance to answer any questions.

CHAIR:

Yes.

SNOW:

Diane Snow, College of Medicine. At the onset, it sounded like what you were saying on the order of semantics, that they would just be taken from one -- many different groups and put together under one umbrella. But as I listen to you, it sounds like some groups will lose privileges they are used to. Is that the case?

DADDS:

No. No one will lose any privileges in this. In some instances, we did have faculty that had large consulting arrangements outside of the faculty practice plan. In those particular colleges, we made arrangements to grandfather those individuals.

SNOW:

And are there more things like that where people have had modus operandi but now they'll have to change that entire way to do things? What percentage of them fall under that --

DADDS:

That varies significantly from college to college. In the College of Medicine, there will be -- the reporting and disclosure annually will probably be the only significant -- only change other than semantics. In other colleges there may be -- there's more -- there will be more substance to it, but again, for example, dentistry has a large number of individuals that have consulting arrangements that have dated for years. They do not run through them practice plan. We are going to grandfather that -- those arrangements.

SNOW:

And how will this affect salary reimbursements because I think different departments have done that in their own ways? Will that be --

DADDS:

Will have no effect.

SUBBASWAMY:

I think, you know, one -- a general comment on -- on some of the impetus for the changes, you know, certainly those who are in the medical and the clinical side certainly know this, the federal requirements on disclosure of conflicts of -- conflict of interest, in particular, have really become very strict and -- and so right now in -- in a lot of our process, we just don't even necessarily know what everyone is engaged in, and among other things, I think, you know, therefore certain things will be brought under the plan that will at least have -- give a

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

scrutiny in terms of what's exactly is going on, what all faculty are doing, and are there potential conflicts that have been just created with the University itself. Somebody who's doing a lot of, you know, expert witness might, in fact, be creating a conflict of interest for the institution, and so some of those things are really now going to be clarified in this -- in this process. And -- and so, yes, I think that in -- if you define being completely outside of scrutiny and bringing back into scrutiny as loss of privileges,

I'm afraid there -- there is a certain degree of loss of privileges, and not all of it is really coming from just the University impetus. It's the NIH and -- and just the federal government now looking at cozy relationships between faculty members, researchers, and companies that manufacture drugs and all of that (unintelligible)....

DADDS: Gradually afford a degree of protection and transparency that we currently don't have -- or a little bit, however, not having disclosure requirements.

CHAIR: Further questions. Thank you very much.

We still have a few minutes, and if you'll indulge us for just another few minutes, it's been tradition, short-lived admittedly, but a tradition to have the Provost give his Academic State of the University. He's graciously agreed to do so.

SUBBASWAMY: I don't know that I really want to talk -- think about the academic state of the University, but thank you for the invitation. I did this somewhat in a hurry, but primarily what I did, for those of you who may remember this from last year is, since we have the business plan, and we have the strategic plan, and various indicators, I give an update on where are we in terms of the numbers and so forth. And I took the same exact slides and tried to give you the more current numbers to, you know, give you a sense of progress. So for those who don't remember this at all or you rotated in, and you weren't here, then this will all be new to you.

So it's an update to the University Senate, and I'll just take a few minutes, academic progress and then challenges -- and challenges, and then some. All right. You may recall that the strategic plan that we're currently operating under there is a quick way of describing what we're trying to do in terms of four Es and four Is. That's something that, you know, has been the way we

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt
described it, expansion, excellence,

engagement, entrepreneurship, integration as an interdisciplinary and inter-professional work, and innovation, inclusion or inclusive really, and internationalization. Those are the four Es and four Is that have helped define what we're trying to do at this University and how to get it up to the top 20, among other things. Expansion is on hold. I mean, the state cut our budget, and -- twice, and maybe a third time. We're just not expanding. So that's the difference between the, you know, two years -- a year ago and now is that that's on hold. We will never be on hold on excellence, hopefully. And so, yes, we'll continue to march on that. Engagement is really a part of what this land grant University does, and we certainly are very heavily involved in helping the state. And entrepreneurship goes along with questions of how do we generate money ourselves and a lot of work going on in terms of interdisciplinary and inter-professional training. Innovation, the -- you know, I think the general education curriculum that you just now approved, not implemented, approved, is one that, again, I think is very innovative by standards of what many universities are doing. And I think we made a lot of progress, as you'll see, on inclusion and diversity. And internationalization, as well, we're making progress.

In terms of faculty numbers, there's -- there's still been a lot of growth on the clinical side, and so that shows -- the red line is the actual numbers and then the underlined purple or whatever color, is what was projected in the business plan for those of you who are still familiar with the business plan. And so our faculty numbers are still there. I think that, again, as I said, it's largely through -- by the growth on the health care end of things.

Tenure status, you know, one -- one that really needs to be monitored for sure. Again, if you look at where all the pieces are, there's certainly significant growth in the clinical faculty side. Again, you know, partly fueled by the growth on the patient sector. But that is, again, sort of flattening out, as many of you heard, and we'll monitor these things carefully to make sure that we maintain the core of tenure, tenure-track faculty that we need to as a high-aspiring University.

In terms of salaries, you know, I wish I could sugar coat this. There's no way to sugar coat the fact that with this, you know, current year, we -- we don't have

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

salary increases. Next year, there's no prospect for salary increase. We've already fallen behind, and we will fall behind further because as you read in the Chronicle probably recently, even last year most universities really had an average increase of about three percent or so on salaries, so it will get caught up eventually, but there will be some time lag, but still I -- I just don't even know how to sugar coat this. This is really one

that's holding us back and will have to be our highest priority, getting the salary caught up again, or I mean, at least begin to catch up again. Right, you know, more data. If you compare to the SEC group, we, in fact, both at the median and average were slightly above, but that's the group we're trying to leave behind and go towards the top 20, so I think this is not really -- maybe a little sugar coating, but that's about it.

Enrollment statics, we were expecting to grow, as you know, but adding faculty first, but as the budget reduction hit and also some of it was -- happened sort of naturally, with tuition increase, it's also hard to predict what the (unintelligible) is going to be like. So we were well above the business plan numbers in '07. We dropped down, and we are slightly gaining again. And if -- with -- with higher retention, and so forth, we'll still, you know, be increasing because of that but not by admitting more students. We're not going to be admitting more undergraduate students until we can add faculty. We're cutting back a little at this point. So that, of course, means we'll have less revenue, but so be it.

This is, again, something that we monitor closely, our transfer numbers took a really drastic reduction in going from '06 to '07, transfer students from KCTCS, BCTC, and elsewhere, as well. And you know, in fact, that was one of the reasons for our drop in total enrollment, and glad to see that that is again picking up. But the BCTC and KCTCS numbers, our own community college system numbers really aren't growing. So this growth is from students transferring in from elsewhere.

This is one where it really bothered me when I first came here and took a look at what was going on. Our undergraduate international enrollment, undergraduate; these are the ones who are actually enriching our undergraduate student classes, and it took a total

nosedive. And apparently we weren't paying attention. And this shows what happens

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

when you pay attention. We are now paying attention, and it's turning around. And in fact, I'm confident that next year we'll see further growth. We now have an actual recruiter who goes out and puts the name of the University of Kentucky out in educational fairs and so forth, and we were doing that. So investment in -- I mean, and also this stuff pays for itself, you know, an additional 10 students would -- would -- gives you easily more than \$100,000. That more than pays for a recruiter plus the recruiter's trip, and of course, it enriches their education -- educational experience on campus along the way. So this is not something that we spend our money on.

Internationalization, there's some other things that took place campuswide. The strategic plan has been finalized. All colleges were involved in this. It was a really good campuswide exercise. American Council on Education, internationalization laboratory, we followed their process to have our campus become -- you know, our top 20 universities are truly out there in terms of internationalization, and we were behind. And I urge you to follow by going to the page on internationalization -- international activities, all that's going on.

Conditional-admit category, these are technical things, but I can explain if anyone has questions. Admission and financial aid process has been streamlined, and increase in students registered for educational-abroad credit has also increased. Again, another sign of how -- how we're trying to serve our students better in the global age.

As you know, we are in various wars, including a war on student attrition. And the first year retention rate has been, you know, fluctuating in this general range, and in fact, was again declining. And again, we started paying attention, and

we now had an all-time high of 81-percent retention from first fall to second fall. And hopefully -- we'll see what happens this year. If we have two data points, then that's a thing. One data point (intelligence/inaudible)....

The graduation rate is a six-year lagging indicator because it's measured by cohort. All -- all the ones that you have meas -- you measure six years later, how many graduated, how many didn't, and that's how nationally these numbers are tracked. And of course, first of all, you notice that it's hovering around 60 which means 40 percent of the students who enter don't get

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt
degrees. They leave without getting degrees for various reasons. We hit a 61.4 percent, and then again whatever happened six years earlier, and -- and we've actually followed this; we really took it seriously as a research project and tried to understand all the trends. That was the year when there was a huge growth in undergraduate student numbers, and the entering quality of the students measured by ACT and high school graduate GPA were not as good, and that has an impact immediately six years later, no matter what you do. So you really have to monitor what you do at the entrance as well.

General education reform, I can now instead of saying University Senate vote, I can say positive vote on May 4th. Thank you for getting that to the next stage. So really, I think ultimately it will help our reputation as we get this right and implement it the correct way and admit students.

Graduate and professional, we are no where near the growth numbers that were -- and -- and, you know, hoped for and planned for in the business plan because that's the expensive part. I mean, on the graduate-doctoral student part, we have to pay them to come rather than their paying us. We don't have the money. Professional students, we're limited in terms of growth because of the facilities. You can only admit so many MD and so many PharmD students and so forth. So that number will just, you know, do whatever the economy does and whatever we can do with that. So we're not going to be able to do much other than hopefully improve quality.

Although again I think for -- because of all the steps that have been taken by various programs and by the graduate school, we're going to have record high degree completions for '08-'09, 350 doctoral degree, 1403 Master's degrees and first professional degrees as well.

Research funding continues to grow, although, you know, not at the top 20 business plan level. The business plan number were really extrapolations saying, this is where we are, and this is where we ought -- need to be to be at the, you know, in the top 20, and so let's draw a line. And so, you know, it -- this doesn't take into account the space limitations, the hiring limitations, the startup limitations, and all of those kind of things. But the fact that it's increasing even at a time when, you know, nationally things are really so tough and competition is so high, is really a tribute to our faculty. And in fact, for this year it's on a really nice clip of 19 percent

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

increase through March and probably even in April -- April, I would assume.

Jim Tracy and his team have been trying to do a great many things, including making research administration be more PI friendly, working with groups and with associate deans to see where the problems are and where improvement can be made. Now the (unintelligible) grants and contract awards are up 19 percent through March already. Our budget is expected to be steady even though other things are not so steady in the economy. Faculty startup, we maintained at the same level as last year. We saved and tried to keep all fund balances for that purpose. And then because of decreased faculty hiring in this year, in 2010, there will be less money on startup. Ad hoc faculty committee recommendations on animal use. You know, we tried to, again, improve quality on everything else we do to gear up for the expansion that's occurring.

On -- on the diversity front -- front, Dr. Judy Jackson, J. J. Jackson joined us last year, now completing almost a year. We have African-American retention rate for students is the highest since 1998. It's at 80 percent. And then we're doing a lot of streamlining. And the President's commissions are being collapsed into a single commission on excellence, diversity, and inclusion. And the general education, you see what's happening, I hope.

First -- first-year African-American student admission is something that gets a lot of press, especially because in '05-'06 there was this huge dip, and rightly, the University got criticized for, you know, what it was doing and what it was not doing. But subsequently, it's really been going up. In fact, it's really that trend that -- this is one (unintelligible) data point, but otherwise it's been increasing. We're doing a great deal of recruiting, and the -- and they're succeeding, as you can see from the previous graph, from the previous numbers, the retention and the graduation rates are also good. So we have a good story to tell there notwithstanding some bad stories in the press every so often.

Again, this is something that I think shows the institution's commitment to diversity. We had really years of flat numbers in total African-American faculty, where we had people coming and going, sort of -- sort of a revolving door. So the numbers really remained flat. But in the last couple of years, it's really picked up pace. All of you have been really aggressively recruiting as we've added more

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt
faculty. And so total number is now at an all-time high. And this really begins to

look at the same percentage level as many of our top 20 benchmark institutions at this point.

Just some numbers, in 1989-90, African-Americans, blacks, accounted for only 1.1 percent of all full-time faculty at the University of Kentucky, not so long ago. The current number is about four percent, and that's -- if you look at the University of Michigan, it's about five percent, for instance, is one of the leading examples of a university that has -- has -- puts diversity as a very high core value. And so really, being really respectable, you know, our work is not done but continuing.

And then the number of full-time women faculty members has increased -- the percent has increased -- the numbers have increased 126 percent. It's about 36 percent currently, starting with 21 percent in '89-'90, making progress but still a ways to go.

Space, you know, we -- just concluding the new Bio-Pharm building, but after that there's no hole in the ground other than the hospital. And so on the research front, we really need some additional space badly. But in the meantime, we're trying to press all the existing space into service, major renovation projects, these all add up to 30 million dollars or so. King Library is now consolidating with the Science Library, as you -- many of you know. And then the vacated space is being renovated with new Chemistry Teaching Lab, Chemistry Physics and Modern Research Labs and Biology Aviary building on Russell Cave Road and so forth. So at least we're trying to make the best use we can of existing space, and -- and additional things going on.

For 2009-'10, we hope to do some additional, again, renovation in other existing buildings to press more of the old space into service.

I think considering the time, let me sort of get to the budget situation. This is -- I'll post all of this, so you know, those of you who are interested can

see. I mean, this is telling. Basically, this is state support from 2001, 2002 through 2008-'09. State support has really remained flat, and in fact, ultimately any increases are offset by decreases. This is our tuition revenue. And remember that 80 percent of that is undergraduate tuition revenue. So basically anything that is increasing, including being able to pay

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

electricity bills and so forth is coming out of undergraduate tuition increase. Some of it was -- some of it is growth from -- growth in enrollment. Some of it is tuition increases. And the question is, have we reached an elastic breaking point where students will stop coming because our tuition is so high, and then what do you do? So this is really not a pretty picture in terms of all that we need to do or are trying to do. Well, general fund expenditure, I just -- again, I had this last time. Most of the money is spent in the so-called provost sector which means in the college or the Senate, research. So this is really the University's operation in terms of other things. I mean, this leaves out the hospital side, of course, because that's a completely self-sustaining part. But it comes with the general funds. This is basically, you know, the right way. It's all -- all -- mostly an academic budget. Again, I -- no point in...

Summary. Undergraduate tuition revenue is a significant part of the academic budget and, in fact, becoming ever so more increasingly significant. Some good things have happened.

But let me just end on the outlook. You know, I don't know how to sugar coat this. There's no point in sugar coating it with this body. So we're going to FY10 this year -- with FY10, FY, that's '09-'10, with an additional two percent reduction in state appropriation. You already know this. Your own units are all working on these reductions already. Utility costs are up 25 percent. If you

followed what was presented to the Board of Trustees. The endowment value is down by about 22 percent. That means that going forward, the income from that is going to be down. And in fact, just our cash balance alone by overnight investments, we used to get about 10 million a year into our general budget. And that's down to about five -- five million. So that's like another five million dollar reduction in the budget. So we're getting hit by -- hit from every direction. And this is true for other universities too. So don't get me wrong. It's depressing all over the country, so it's not just here. So there is that. Tuition increase was limited to five percent, and frankly, even if they had not limited us to that, it would have been irresponsible of us to go higher than that. I mean, you know, people can't afford it. So it's a poor state. Seventy-five percent of the students are resident students, and -- and so it wouldn't have made sense to

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt

increase it anymore. So given all that, you do the calculation. That's down; that's down; everything is down. Tuition -- utilities, barely pay for utilities and everything out of the increase in tuition. There is no money left for salary increases. And that's the reason we're going to a second year without salary increment for -- you know, there are some layoffs taking place even as we speak. There is a degree of -- to meet the two percent reductions -- we already had a six percent reduction, so there's not a lot of place left, so there's a certain degree of layoffs going on. Not on a massive scale yet, but who knows, that may come. So -- and you know, you've heard certainly of colleagues elsewhere who are going through furloughs, who are going through salary reductions, and various kinds of things. We haven't gone there yet, but next year doesn't look so good but...

All right. So what else? The state -- you saw the headlines, expects an

additional revenue shortfall of about a billion dollars in FY '10. I -- I was -- I was in Germany last week and missed the headlines, but I knew this was going to come, but I -- I think it was in the headlines if I remember correctly, if I was told correctly. How will federal stimulus funds be used is part B in the question here. You know, we're going to get about 568 million dollars, but remember, the shortfall is a billion. So the stimulus is going to backfill by maybe a half. And so what about the rest? So that's what really the Governor and others are currently occupied with.

Will there be additional revenue enhancements strategies, tax increases. Casino gambling and sales tax are being talked about, but -- whispered about, I should say. We don't know. Will tuition be capped again? You know, I -- I think I would be opposed to capping tuition at this point. If you're going to have other reductions, let the marketplace tell us instead of somebody else telling us. Is the value that we offer -- I see our economist friend here shaking his head in affirmative. I think the market should tell us. I mean, thus increase the tuition, then provide the value. Our new general education curriculum is going to be the value. So we'll have to wait and see.

So I think, you know, basically, if we go through another rough couple of years, the timeline of the top 20 -- remember the mandate says by 2020, is certainly very much on the line. And I think the 2020, at least, will have to be

Xcript 5-4-09 Senate.txt
moved forward. So we'll have to make some deal with the state on exactly what all of this means.

So folks, I wish I could leave you with a big smile, but this is really the way the situation is. Yeah, please, Hollie.

SWANSON: Provost Swamy, some people would argue that perhaps a furlough is better than having a no increase because by having a no increase you fall further behind with

no chance of catching up. Will you comment?

SUBBASWAMY: It's a one-time fix, Hollie, that's the problem, right. If you -- you send people home for two weeks, and you accumulate cash. So the way -- what you do with furlough is solve the immediate problem. If the state -- you know, we -- we hoarded cash, and that's why this year, even though there was a two-percent callback, we didn't collect it from the departments and the colleges because the President and I really knew this was coming, and we saved and -- and, you know, held our fund balances for that purpose. So that's all we can do. You really can't give a permanent salary increase from furloughs or avoid layoffs either from furloughs. So it's a -- it only solves a cash problem. Frankly, we really prepared for this well enough that we didn't have a cash problem. We have a base budget problem, recurring budget problem but not a cash problem. Anything else you want to know, you know, I mean, I think the more all of you know what's going on and why decisions are being made, the better. I mean, with total transparency really what all this -- Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED: Since this is one of our -- what we were talking about earlier, our concerns about the 4.4 million dollars or the four-and-a-half-million dollars because that isn't a one-time expense. That's going -- that's going to be a recurring expense.

SUBBASWAMY: Here's the argument. You're absolutely right. Here's the argument: When I said 25 percent increase in utilities, we didn't think twice. You just sort of pay that. I mean, that's -- that's a recurring cost. That's -- that's a permanent cost. So we automatically take certain expenditures as given, as -- as mandated expenditures. My argument simply is that as long as we're really dependent on undergraduate tuition, and we are. Next year also we're going to increase by 578 percent. I consider that to be in the same category. You -- you, you know, just

pretend like health care costs and utility costs went up an additional four-and-a-half-million dollars, and you know, we can do it in -- in two or three steps, but do it and put it away. And frankly, I have to tell you that I've already hoarded a little of that money. I mean, you've got to do that. I mean, certain things you have to think of as being in the same category as utilities and -- and so that's basically -- because the money is coming from undergraduate students, how do I deny that to them and say come here we have value proposition. So, yes, it's not that it's any -- it's easy, but I'm just suggesting that it's in the magnitude where it can be absorbed into the category of a mandated expense, if we so desire. I certainly would not do that in a year if we go, again, without salary increase. That's also equal to about 1.3 percent, as I said. I would rather give that in salary increase than implement it at that stage. Although I don't think it will come to that versus that.

CHAIR:

Thank you.

SUBBASWAMY:

Thank you. I appreciate that. This will be posted, and if you any questions subsequently, please don't hesitate to send me an e-mail, and I'll respond.

CHAIR:

I'm going to say I think we had a busy year is an understatement, but I think we had a good year. I really appreciate everyone's help and cooperation. We stand adjourned. See you September.

* * * * *

THEREUPON, the University of Kentucky Senate Council meeting for May 4, 2009 was adjourned at 5:25 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 5th day of July, 2009.

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