

02-08-10 UK Senate.txt

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
SENATE

\* \* \* \* \*

Regular Session  
February 8, 2010  
3:00 p.m.  
W. T. Young Library  
First Floor Auditorium  
Lexington, Kentucky

Dr. David Randall, Chair

An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.  
179 East Maxwell Street  
Lexington, Kentucky 40508  
(859)254-0568  
University of Kentucky Senate

\* \* \* \* \*

DAVID RANDALL, CHAIR

SHEILA BROTHERS, SECRETARY TO SENATE COUNCIL

ROBYN BARRETT, COURT REPORTER

\* \* \* \* \*

0

3

1 THE CHAIR: Good afternoon. Welcome to  
2 our first Senate meeting of the  
3 spring semester. Though it may not  
4 feel too much like spring out there,  
5 there's hope. I am probably going  
6 to be pressing us through things  
7 today. We have a lot of business.  
8 Apparently this isn't record  
9 thickness, but it's close I'm told.  
10 However, if you think we're going  
11 too fast, just slow me down. We do  
12 have a lot of material to cover, so  
13 let's launch here. The usual

14 admonishments, if you would. We  
15 have a guest court reporter today,  
16 Robyn Barrett. Welcome. We're  
17 delighted to have you. But she  
18 needs to be able to hear, so speak  
19 up and that will be very helpful.  
20 So minutes and announcements:  
21 Minutes for the December 14th  
22 meeting were distributed on February  
23 2nd. There was one revision, which  
24 is seen on track changes here. The  
25 recommendation is for approval of

□

4

1 the minutes. Do I have a motion to  
2 that effect?

3 HAYES: Jan Hayes, College of  
4 Engineering. I move the minutes be  
5 approved as distributed.

6 THE CHAIR: And a second?

7 JONES: Second. Davy Jones, Toxicology.

8 THE CHAIR: Discussion? All in favor,  
9 aye.

10 SENATORS: Aye.

11 THE CHAIR: So some additional  
12 announcements. Final approval for  
13 distance learning delivery for 800  
14 and 900 level courses from the  
15 health care colleges is now going to  
16 reside within the health care  
17 colleges. In the past they've come  
18 to me for a pro forma change. Since  
19 everything else dealing with these

20 courses is handled in the health  
21 care colleges, we are just going to  
22 leave distance learning there as  
23 well. Everything else remains  
24 unchanged. Distance learning  
25 delivered for special topics

□

5

1 courses, after there's faculty  
2 approval a faculty member can submit  
3 a DL form and a sample syllabus to  
4 Senate Council Chair and, again, the  
5 Senate Council Chair will approve  
6 that for semesters. This bypasses  
7 the academic councils and speeds  
8 things up for these temporary  
9 approvals; then full subsequent  
10 approval can come through normal  
11 channels. The faculty  
12 representative for the worklife  
13 supervisor of the Year selection  
14 committee is Fran Hardin-Fanning  
15 from the College of Nursing.  
16 Guidelines for and the approval of  
17 undergraduate certificates: Senate  
18 Council has asked for some  
19 clarification from Dr. Mullen on  
20 this issue, and we'll be bringing  
21 that back to you soon. Faculty/  
22 Administration Joint IT Committee is  
23 looking at some revisions of the  
24 AR's with respect to IT. One of the

25

0

6

1

faculty more intimately and more  
directly in decisions regarding IT,  
and that's coming along nicely.

2

3

4

We're actually working on the AR's  
now, and they should be ready soon.

5

6

You'll notice web transmittal was  
posted on February 4th. If you go

7

8

to the Senate web page and up in the  
upper left-hand corner, click on it,

9

10

and it waits for people's comments.

11

If objections are not received

12

between now and next Monday, that

13

will be approved. There's a call

14

gone out for a Committee for the

15

Review of the Dean of the College of

16

Medicine. Virtually all of these

17

committees we need to provide

18

nominations; and so if you have a

19

nomination for this committee,

20

please send it to Sheila Brothers.

21

There's not one of us that doesn't

22

believe the area advisory committees

23

and the decisions regarding

24

promotion and tenure are important,

25

and yet we desperately need

0

7

1

volunteers for the area committees.

2

Again, the Provost asks for and must

3

have our nominees. We have sent

4

solicitations to 350 faculty on

5 three different occasions, and thus  
6 far it's netted 11 responses. So  
7 please encourage your constituents  
8 to consider seriously if they  
9 wouldn't be willing to serve on this  
10 committee. We can't complain about  
11 tenure and promotion if we refuse to  
12 participate, and this is fairly  
13 typical of our response on this  
14 matter. So please send in your  
15 nominations. We are a member of  
16 something called SECAC. The  
17 SEC-affiliated faculty leaders, once  
18 a year the chairs of the various SEC  
19 committees get together. We  
20 actually met here last fall. A  
21 young graduate student is working  
22 with SECAC to look at, for her  
23 project, faculty senate knowledge  
24 and perceptions of intercollegiate  
25 athletics, a conference level

0  
1 perspective. Under the aegis and  
2 the pool of SECAC, she is going to  
3 be querying all of the Senators, so  
4 you should receive an e-mail from  
5 her. Again, this is part of her  
6 dissertation. If you would be so  
7 gracious to respond to that e-mail.  
8 I'm told it will take 10 to 15  
9 minutes to fill out that query, but

8

10 this is for her doctoral  
11 dissertation. Results will be sent  
12 to me. I will share them with you.  
13 They'll be posted on the SECAC web  
14 site, so we have been working -- a  
15 number of individuals have been  
16 working very, very carefully and  
17 intensely for quite some period of  
18 time to develop mechanisms for  
19 tracking the approval of courses and  
20 new programs and we're almost to the  
21 point or we are at the point of  
22 piloting that process. And so you  
23 may see it if you go to the  
24 "/curriculum" page on the UK web  
25 site. Dr. Blackwell has put heart

9

0  
1 and soul into this, and I think  
2 you'll find it would be very helpful  
3 once we get things rolling here.  
4 The first matter, then, is a  
5 proposed change to the master's of  
6 business administration, and we may  
7 couple this -- not invoke but in  
8 presentation with the same issue  
9 with respect to the doctoral  
10 degree. So Professor Hackbart,  
11 thank you. Come up and present your  
12 proposal.

13 HACKBART: The proposal is a relatively  
14 simply proposal. Up until the  
15 present time, the exam that the

16 students basically applying for the  
17 master's in business administration  
18 program has been the GMAT, Graduate  
19 Management Aptitude Test.

20 Increasingly business schools are  
21 also accepting the Graduate Record  
22 Exam, which of course is more  
23 conventional across our campus. So  
24 essentially what we're proposing is  
25 to ask your support to permit us to

□

10

1 accept both the Graduate Record Exam  
2 as well as the GMAT for the MBA  
3 students. Couple of special reasons  
4 why we're proposing this. Number  
5 one, probably the largest percentage  
6 of our MBA students come out of  
7 engineering and the hard sciences,  
8 percentage-wise. A lot of those  
9 students already have taken the GRE  
10 or may take the GRE in anticipation  
11 of pursuing graduate work in their  
12 disciplines at the same time they  
13 also may apply for the MBA program.  
14 We really see no reason why those  
15 students should be asked to spend  
16 another \$250 or so to take the GMAT  
17 test when we accept the GRE in some  
18 of our disciplines as well, so  
19 that's the principal reason for  
20 basically asking your support to



02-08-10 UK Senate.txt  
change our admission requirements  
from simply accepting the GMAT alone  
but also to accept the GRE as the  
entrance exam, along with grade  
point averages and other associated

11

information. A corollary to this is  
that also for our doctoral program  
in business administration,  
basically we are proposing to make  
it optional for doctoral students  
who are applying to the program to  
submit either a GRE or a GMAT  
score. Again, in some of our  
disciplines for the doctoral program  
in business administration, students  
may come with backgrounds in  
mathematics, economics and so forth,  
areas where basically the GRE is the  
more conventional pregraduate school  
entrance exam. Our faculty in  
finance as well as some of our other  
disciplines feel that GRE is  
certainly as meaningful as the GMAT  
test for their consideration of  
applications for admission to that  
doctoral program. So two things,  
then, on the program for this  
afternoon: One, to request your  
approval of accepting the GRE as  
well as the GMAT for the MBA program

12

1 and then also to change our rules  
2 and guidelines to accept the GRE for  
3 our doctoral program in business  
4 administration as well. If there  
5 are any questions, I'd be glad to  
6 respond to those, but they're really  
7 fairly simple sort of  
8 straightforward requests. I  
9 appreciate your support of that  
10 request.

11 THE CHAIR: Questions? Actually, then,  
12 I failed to mention that all of the  
13 recommendations are coming with the  
14 positive endorsement of the Senate  
15 Council today, including this one.  
16 So this is the recommendation for a  
17 motion if someone would be so  
18 gracious. Yes.

19 WOOD: Connie Wood, so moved.

20 THE CHAIR: Second, please?

21 CHAPPELL: Second.

22 THE CHAIR: Discussion of the motion?

23 All in favor, aye?

24 SENATORS: Aye.

25 THE CHAIR: Opposed, nay? Any

0 13

1 abstentions? So ordered. Next  
2 proposal is with respect to the  
3 Ph.D. Again, a motion, please.

4 HULSE: Dave Hulse, College of Business  
5 and Economics. Move that we approve

02-08-10 UK Senate.txt  
the recommendation.

6

7

THE CHAIR: And a second?

8

SELLNOW: Tim Sellnow, Communications  
and Information Studies.

9

10

THE CHAIR: Thank you. Discussion? All  
in favor aye?

11

12

SENATORS: Aye.

13

THE CHAIR: Opposed, nay? Abstain?

14

Thank you.

15

HACKBART: Thank you. Appreciate it.

16

Thank you, everybody.

17

THE CHAIR: This is a matter for your

18

information. We are bringing -- we

19

have been bringing a number of

20

issues before you for your

21

information. These are not action

22

items, but Senate Council considers

23

that it's very important that the

24

Senate be informed on some of these

25

issues. So Dan Wermeling from

0

14

1

Pharmacy is going to bring us up to

2

date on the UK HealthCare policy and

3

procedures. Dan?

4

WERMELING: Thank you. And I want to

5

thank the Chair for giving me the

6

opportunity to meet with the Council

7

on several occasions and to present

8

the concerns of our faculty

9

regarding a process of the

10

implementation of a new policy and

11

procedure. And to begin, I pose

12 this question to you: How many  
13 Senators recognize this policy, its  
14 origins and its content? And I'm  
15 going to guess that, like myself,  
16 who chairs our College of Pharmacy  
17 practice plan for many years that I  
18 was not aware of Policy Number  
19 A01-015 and how it affected our  
20 faculty in the College of Pharmacy.  
21 And so this actually is driven by UK  
22 HealthCare policy and procedure, and  
23 as we came to learn through this  
24 experience that this may have been  
25 development of a new mechanism by

□

15

1 which policy and procedure that  
2 governs academic functions, the  
3 matters reserved to the faculty and  
4 to the Senate were actually  
5 addressed in this policy. And so I  
6 want to share some of our history of  
7 this with you and also so that you  
8 would understand that some of these  
9 topics, although they're related  
10 initially to UK HealthCare colleges,  
11 the intent is that these matters  
12 will be brought to all 14 other  
13 colleges in the university. And so  
14 I'm going to explain a little bit of  
15 how that's coming to be and what  
16 some of the issues were. Some of

17 this is also addressed in a memo  
18 report that I provided to the Chair  
19 and that may be in your packet from  
20 today. We came to learn in June of  
21 2009 indirectly that there is this  
22 document called a Code of Conduct  
23 and a Code of Conduct Addendum. And  
24 we came about this, as I said,  
25 indirectly. And as we came to read

16

0  
1 it in our committee at the college,  
2 we saw that it had broad coverage of  
3 a lot of things that weren't just  
4 related to managing UK HealthCare  
5 "fisc" and being compliant with a  
6 lot of different Medicare, Medicaid,  
7 HCFA, all these other different  
8 rules that govern health care  
9 delivery. As we read the document,  
10 we actually were directed to  
11 something that was approved by the  
12 Board of Trustees that actually  
13 governed us from the year 2004 and  
14 our faculty, including regular  
15 faculty, administration and those of  
16 us who serve on governance  
17 committees. We were totally unaware  
18 of the approval of this document and  
19 that we were likely, perhaps, even  
20 out of compliance with matters that  
21 were in the document. And so we  
22 became aware of this less than 30

23 days before the Board of Trustees  
24 was to vote on this matter at the  
25 June meeting. And so this Code of

0 17

1 Conduct Addendum, that actually  
2 became university policy July 1 of  
3 this year. And there were very good  
4 reasons that the university health  
5 care system has for managing a  
6 number of different issues that are  
7 within this Code of Conduct  
8 Addendum. A lot of it deals with  
9 relationships between health care  
10 delivery systems, physicians and  
11 vendors or members of the  
12 pharmaceutical industry and the  
13 device industry. And if you read  
14 the Wall Street Journal and other  
15 papers, you can understand that  
16 there's some tension between  
17 industry and people who purchase  
18 health care products and whether  
19 patients' care is being driven in  
20 part by less than ethical decisions,  
21 perhaps. So there are reasons for  
22 some of the elements in there to  
23 exist. It was also driven by a  
24 different committee that was chaired  
25 by the Dean of Medicine and a

0 18

1 faculty member in Anesthesiology,

2 and it turns out they were also  
3 trying to address some policy issues  
4 that related to College of Medicine  
5 accreditation. But the challenge  
6 with the AAMC policy is that they  
7 were directing policy to all  
8 academic medical centers regardless  
9 of their colleges, and so this  
10 became something of a pass-through  
11 that would influence the other  
12 health care colleges that really  
13 relates to a specific College of  
14 Medicine accreditation activity.  
15 And as I said, there is an intent to  
16 expand this beyond health care  
17 colleges, and in our university  
18 that's probably quite relevant  
19 because I know Engineering and the  
20 Agriculture school and perhaps other  
21 schools at the university have some  
22 interaction with industry, perhaps,  
23 and perhaps even in health care  
24 delivery or perhaps compensated  
25 health care delivery. What does it

19

0  
1 cover? Well, as I mentioned, its  
2 principal intent is to deal with  
3 many matters in health care delivery  
4 that deal with vendor/industry  
5 relationships at a lot of different  
6 levels. But it also reaches and, in  
7 my initial reaction to reading the

8 document, it actually overreaches  
9 into traditional academic matters  
10 that are reserved to the faculty and  
11 to the Senate. So, for instance, it  
12 attempts to govern some of those  
13 other activities that we were  
14 generally accustomed to managing in  
15 our college through our own internal  
16 regulations and policies and  
17 procedures in our university such as  
18 sponsoring and speaking for industry  
19 or actually being able to sit and  
20 listen in a room like this where, if  
21 I was a physician investigator from  
22 Duke University who was  
23 knowledgeable about cardiovascular  
24 medicine and I wanted to hear them  
25 talk about their understanding of a

20

0  
1 new cardiovascular medicine and its  
2 properties, I might be restricted or  
3 discouraged from actually listening  
4 to that investigator because he was  
5 paid for by a company.  
6 Industry-sponsored research, how you  
7 are to publish, consulting and  
8 outside employment, this certainly  
9 affected a lot of our faculty as to  
10 what kinds of things you could do  
11 with industry to earn supplemental  
12 income. It goes into scholarships.



13 It conflicted with our  
14 administrative regulation actually  
15 approved by the Board of Trustees  
16 for practice plans. And another  
17 significant element was reporting  
18 requirements, that if you read the  
19 initial document an individual  
20 faculty member, depending on the  
21 activity, might have to report the  
22 same activity through four channels  
23 independently. Okay? So I know  
24 we're all burdened with lots of  
25 different things, and we don't care

21

□

1 to keep reporting things that we're  
2 doing over and over; and in fact,  
3 reporting mechanisms didn't even  
4 exist. In fact, procedures don't  
5 exist, even yet today. So there was  
6 a significant risk for faculty in my  
7 opinion relative to noncompliance,  
8 and the institution itself by  
9 writing a policy without procedures  
10 created its own jeopardy. What were  
11 our principle's related concerns,  
12 then? One is this went into faculty  
13 governance questions. As we read  
14 and tried to understand Senate rules  
15 and the university's rules, we  
16 understood that there are elements  
17 of this document that directly  
18 impacted the ability for faculty and

19 Senate to govern themselves. The  
20 policy has the ability to impose  
21 significant penalties on those who  
22 are noncompliant, including loss of  
23 employment. So, again, there were  
24 significant carrot and stick sorts  
25 of things in this policy to comply.

0

22

1 So if you did not have a mechanism  
2 to comply, why should you face  
3 jeopardy? One of the reasons that  
4 was stated as to why these policies  
5 are necessary is that some health  
6 care institutions around the country  
7 have been found guilty of violations  
8 of various issues in health care  
9 delivery and have experienced, let's  
10 say -- perhaps it was either Penn or  
11 Hopkins -- a 100 million-dollar fine  
12 for noncompliance. And so when I  
13 think about this, and I was trying  
14 to think about this in the context  
15 of the entire university, if UK  
16 HealthCare is that closely related  
17 to us on our fiscal activity and the  
18 financial health of the university,  
19 what is the weakest department that  
20 we have? And I don't mean weak in a  
21 traditional sense; I mean in terms  
22 of fiscal ability to withstand a  
23 significant drop in budget. Okay?

24 So if I think back to main campus  
25 things, you know, would it be the

□

23

1 English Department, for example?  
2 That was kind of the first thing  
3 that came to mind. Would they be  
4 able to withstand the kinds of  
5 financial penalties that might come  
6 through UK HealthCare to the rest of  
7 the institution? It raises a  
8 question really about the  
9 relationship between UK HealthCare  
10 and the rest of the institution. So  
11 if you think, for example, that at  
12 the University of Louisville there  
13 are actually two separate  
14 corporations or how -- I don't  
15 understand the exact corporate  
16 relationship between UK HealthCare  
17 and the university, but I know that  
18 these are quite distinct separate  
19 entities at the University of  
20 Louisville. And that may provide  
21 some protection for a main campus  
22 relative to things that can occur as  
23 a relation to UK HealthCare. So  
24 there's financial risk, basically,  
25 to these kinds of things and

□

24

1 potential significant financial  
2 activity falling down through  
3 noncompliance. Content concerns:

4 The first significant content  
5 concern was that the College of  
6 Pharmacy uses 400 voluntary faculty  
7 throughout the Commonwealth of  
8 Kentucky to provide instruction to  
9 our entire fourth-year curriculum.  
10 This is their internship or  
11 practicals, if you will, where they  
12 go around every month to different  
13 pharmacists who are volunteering  
14 their time and effort and their  
15 facilities to supervise pharmacy  
16 students for their training. If we  
17 attempted to impose the financial  
18 inactivity and restrictions on  
19 our -- frequently our Alumni around  
20 the state for the kinds of things  
21 that impacted us, it would destroy  
22 the relationships we have between  
23 the College of Pharmacy, our alumni  
24 and the other pharmacists who are  
25 participating in our training.

□

25

1 Let's say they decided to up and not  
2 do this anymore. If we had to go  
3 and hire faculty as private colleges  
4 do -- for instance, Sullivan  
5 University in Louisville has a  
6 College of Pharmacy now, and they  
7 will pay \$900 to \$1,000 a month per  
8 student per rotation. So it doesn't

9 take much in terms of multipliers  
10 for 130 students a year for ten  
11 rotations a year that you can get  
12 into millions of dollars really  
13 quickly. Okay? So this would have  
14 been not just a professional issue  
15 but a severe financial issue if that  
16 were to be enforced. We also found  
17 that there were significant  
18 conflicts with other AR's and GR's,  
19 which are the typical governance  
20 systems that we understand as  
21 faculty and as senators. So, for  
22 example, conflict of interest policy  
23 or policy on practice plans, other  
24 kinds of other existing documents  
25 did not correlate with this document

□

26

1 very well and so they were in  
2 conflict with each other and, as I  
3 had mentioned earlier, restriction  
4 of certain academic freedoms. As I  
5 have alluded to, we also have  
6 process-related concerns. We were  
7 unaware of the '04 and particularly  
8 the '09 version until it was being  
9 implemented. It did not include  
10 regular faculty of the College of  
11 Pharmacy in the design of this  
12 document or its implementation. As  
13 the representative of the college to  
14 the administration, I attempted to

15 work with the attorneys who served  
16 on this original committee to say,  
17 "We have some significant concerns  
18 here; can we come back and edit this  
19 so that these matters can be  
20 managed?" we were rebuffed multiple  
21 times and said, "This is what it  
22 is." Okay? And so that's what  
23 brings me to you and to the Senate  
24 through our processes where I  
25 consulted with our dean and said,

□

27

1 "These are things that are not  
2 appropriate for us; we need to have  
3 a change in this document," and so  
4 we went through the Senate  
5 procedure. In the end we were  
6 concerned about this de novo  
7 mechanism about making new policies  
8 that doesn't fit with Senate or ARGR  
9 policy generation. So in the end,  
10 after much persistence and  
11 actually -- I think actually by  
12 moving to talk to the Senate, the  
13 College of Pharmacy in the summer,  
14 later in the summer in August, was  
15 given the opportunity to write what  
16 we call generically the Footnoted  
17 Code of Conduct. And you'll see  
18 that as an example in your  
19 document. And so the Code of

20 Conduct as it was originally written  
21 has all these little numbers at the  
22 top that you'll find, and our  
23 agreement is at the back of that.  
24 And so you'll see 11 or 12 other  
25 statements where we disagree and

□

28

1 say, "No, we're not doing it this  
2 way; it's towards the back." We  
3 also have agreement through the  
4 Provost -- and it's actually through  
5 him that we have this grant that was  
6 able to get, I guess, his attention  
7 versus the attorneys -- that future  
8 iterations of this are to go through  
9 our typical policy generation and  
10 vetting process. And so Richard  
11 Greissman -- I'm not sure if he's  
12 here today, but he has promised me  
13 that he will send me a draft of the  
14 administrative regulation that will  
15 hopefully supplant and replace the  
16 Code of Conduct and that other kinds  
17 of things like this will proceed  
18 through in a way that we all  
19 understand. So my purpose was  
20 really to come to you today because  
21 we spent a good six months intensely  
22 on this at the college to try to get  
23 this revised. It clearly is  
24 intended to affect other colleges.  
25 You should go back and read these

0

1 documents very closely. And my  
2 closing comment is if this was  
3 Number 15, I have no idea what the  
4 preceding 14 policies were. Okay?  
5 So I don't know where else I'm  
6 vulnerable or where else you're  
7 vulnerable, but that's the way that  
8 it's played out so far. So I'm  
9 hopeful through the Provost -- he  
10 seems amenable to wanting to make  
11 sure the faculty's concerns are  
12 managed. He's been very gracious in  
13 allowing us to try to move forward  
14 with some of these matters, and I'll  
15 stop and ask -- see if you have any  
16 questions about what we experienced.

17 THE CHAIR: Questions? He has put a lot  
18 of work into keeping us informed on  
19 this. I certainly appreciate that.  
20 Joe?

21 CHAPPELL: Joe Chappell, College of Ag.  
22 I'm not quite sure what the  
23 rationale from the university  
24 attorneys were in -- you were  
25 obviously pointing out some clear

0

1 conflicts in what the policies were  
2 going to impose upon the faculty,  
3 but they didn't seem to want to  
4 reconcile the policy with that. Did



02-08-10 UK Senate.txt  
they give any sort of indication

why?

WERMELING: I could not get a reason why we were unable initially to modify the document. If I had to guess, it's that this would be an 11th-and-a-half-hour change when this was being presented to the Board of Trustees in less than two weeks, so they weren't going to be -- they would have to postpone their presentation to the board and getting an AR approved for July 1. I think another issue, although I consider it a separate issue, again, was the College of Medicine's accreditation process was coming forward and they needed something on the books. And so the Dean and the Provost said, "Okay. Initially for the approval it's just medicine,"

31

□  
although it's on the books and on the UK web site as this applies to everybody; but they weren't going to enforce it, necessarily, on everybody, but it became official July 1. I could not get a clear reason why we could not edit it to support our needs.

THE CHAIR: Dr. Grossman.

GROSSMAN: At the Senate Council meeting  
Page 25

11 you mentioned, and I thought it was  
12 worth bringing to the everyone's  
13 attention, that this Code of Conduct  
14 prohibits you from attending a  
15 conference where some of the talks  
16 are sponsored by industry; is that  
17 correct?

18 WERMELING: There is a statement that's  
19 in there that attempts to restrict  
20 my ability to hear someone speak.  
21 It restricts my ability to be in a  
22 professional organization such as  
23 the Kentucky Society of Health  
24 System Pharmacists that is partially  
25 subsidized by industry to provide

0 32

1 continuing education credits for all  
2 pharmacists who can attend the  
3 semi-annual meetings. The overreach  
4 into other segments of professional  
5 society was severe and would have  
6 prevented us from the doing the  
7 things that we typically normally  
8 do.

9 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.

10 WERMELING: Thank you.

11 THE CHAIR: I can, just as myself  
12 speaking personally, I can tell you  
13 that the AR committee to which he's  
14 referred is being very active now  
15 with -- primarily with Richard

16 Greissman on issues like this, and I  
17 think that's a very positive  
18 consequence of this interaction.  
19 The upcoming reaccreditation  
20 requires that we have a quality  
21 enhancement program, and as part of  
22 that we have to have a topic  
23 selection plan. So Dr. Sellnow is  
24 going to present for us -- she's  
25 been working, again, very hard on

33

0

1 this -- is going to present where we  
2 are in this process.

3 SELLNOW: You might remember that back  
4 in November Kaveh Tagavi and I came  
5 and presented what was going to  
6 happen with the Quality Enhancement  
7 Plan for SACS reaccreditation.  
8 Well, this is our update so that we  
9 make sure that we stay transparent  
10 and keep the campus informed and  
11 just to let you know where we're at  
12 and what our next steps are. The  
13 Preplanning Team operated in  
14 November until January to put  
15 together the overarching plan of how  
16 to proceed in selecting a topic and  
17 implementing our QEP, and Diane Snow  
18 and I were asked to be co-chairs of  
19 that group. Just a reminder what a  
20 QEP is, that's Quality Enhancement  
21 Plan and it's a core requirement now

22 for SACS reaffirmation of  
23 accreditation. It's new since our  
24 last SACS. Our last SACS  
25 reaffirmation of accreditation there

□

34

1 was no QEP requirement. And what it  
2 is, is a carefully designed course  
3 of action that addresses a  
4 well-defined and focused topic or  
5 issue directly related to enhancing  
6 student learning. If we don't get  
7 approved with this core requirement  
8 in SACS, we won't get reaccredited,  
9 so it's that important. Why did  
10 SACS change what they were doing  
11 since the last time we were  
12 reaffirmed? What it used to be is  
13 we used to have to prepare a  
14 compliance report. And we had to  
15 show how we were in compliance with  
16 463 "must" statements, and they've  
17 reduced that to 53 comprehensive  
18 standards. They reduced that  
19 because institutions were  
20 complaining and unhappy with it,  
21 felt like it was so prescriptive and  
22 top-down; so they were trying to put  
23 some more control about our  
24 reaffirmation into each  
25 institution's hands. So now what we

□

35

1 need to do is part one, which is the  
2 compliance report. That will be due  
3 september of 2012, and that will be  
4 us needing to demonstrate that we're  
5 in compliance with these 53  
6 comprehensive standards. But the  
7 other piece is this QEP, the Quality  
8 Enhancement Plan, and that will be  
9 due January of 2013. It's a  
10 100-page document showing our plan  
11 of what we're going to do to  
12 institute some aspect to improve  
13 student learning. There are four  
14 teams that have to be formed and do  
15 their work to achieve this process,  
16 and the first team was the  
17 Preplanning Team. And that's the  
18 team that developed the topic  
19 selection plan and timeline, and  
20 that's what Diane and I were  
21 co-chairs of that operated up until  
22 this point. At this point we're  
23 ready to move forward with the topic  
24 selection team, and that's the team  
25 that actually identifies the topic

0

36

1 that our institution is going to  
2 work on based on assessment of what  
3 we understand that our institution  
4 has a need for improvement in terms  
5 of student learning, something that  
6 we can do to enhance student

7 learning. So that's what we're at.  
8 After we finish that, there'll be a  
9 development team that will actually  
10 prepare the 100-page document that's  
11 due to SACS January 2013, and then  
12 over the course of the next five  
13 years there will be a QEP  
14 implementation team that will  
15 actually implement this project to  
16 enhance student learning and prepare  
17 an impact report demonstrating the  
18 results of implementing that QEP.  
19 Okay? What did we do since last  
20 visiting with you in November? On  
21 November 20th we actually met with  
22 representatives from three  
23 universities who have already  
24 completed a QEP: Northern Kentucky  
25 University, Eastern Kentucky

□

37

1 University and the University of  
2 Louisville. Okay? And we found  
3 that what they did, how they did it,  
4 their processes in order to try to  
5 figure out how we might put our  
6 process together. And we launched a  
7 web site for transparency where we  
8 are putting all of our  
9 documentation, all of our minutes  
10 from meetings, everything, notes, so  
11 that anybody in the campus community

12 can be aware of that. On December  
13 4th we prepared a draft of a topic  
14 selection process and we invited a  
15 QEP consultant, Dr. Robert Armacost,  
16 to review it and come and do a  
17 two-day retreat with us to talk  
18 about ways we might make it a better  
19 process. And so December 17th and  
20 18th we met with him to get advice  
21 in the form of a retreat and  
22 developed a draft of the process,  
23 and on January 11th we finalized  
24 that topic selection process and  
25 submitted it to the Provost for the

38

0

1 next steps. Okay? So now the next  
2 steps. From now, from February, now  
3 until April is the next piece, and  
4 that's when we're going to be  
5 collecting information from the  
6 campus community and ideas. Right  
7 now the Topic Selection Team is  
8 being identified. The Topic  
9 Selection Team, I should say, is  
10 going to be about 30 people, whereas  
11 the Preplanning Team was 16 people.  
12 This will double in size from that  
13 group, but it's still a broad  
14 representation from the campus.  
15 Also it was just identified the  
16 QEP -- it's not the QEP Leadership  
17 Team; it's actually the SACS

18 Reaffirmation Leadership Team was  
19 identified and the QEP co-chairs are  
20 part of that team. What we're going  
21 to be doing, the next step, and this  
22 is important for you to help  
23 generate involvement from the entire  
24 campus -- if you can help us with  
25 that, that would be great. We need

□

39

1 to launch a PR campaign to generate  
2 enthusiasm about this topic  
3 selection process. We need to  
4 collect and examine existing  
5 assessment data in terms of trying  
6 to discover what kinds of things we  
7 might choose or vet as possible QEP  
8 topics, and we need to invite broad  
9 input regarding potential big  
10 ideas. What we're looking for is  
11 input from the campus community at  
12 this point between now and April  
13 about big ideas and things that we  
14 might vet and develop into a QEP  
15 topic, so it's a brainstorming  
16 process. Right now we're  
17 brainstorming for the entire campus  
18 community to find out what kinds of  
19 things might be something that would  
20 interest people in terms of  
21 improving student learning on the  
22 University of Kentucky campus. Oh,



23

30 members. There'll be 20 that

24

will represent the different

25

colleges, and the library

□

40

1

representatives will be three to

2

five students, two people from

3

Co-Curricular, someone from IT, from

4

Budget, from PR and Assessment and

5

three ex-officio members, Jeannine

6

Blackwell, Mike Mullen and Connie

7

Ray. Questions?

8

THE CHAIR: Questions?

9

GROSSMAN: Can you talk about the

10

financial aspects of the requirement

11

for choosing a plan and implementing

12

it?

13

SELLNOW: That's great. One of the

14

things that will happen is when we

15

generate the big ideas. The

16

brainstorming process is anything

17

goes, right? One of the things that

18

we will do as a committee over the

19

course of the summer is we will

20

develop the criteria, and one of the

21

important criteria will be

22

constraints in terms of human

23

resources and financial resources.

24

How much -- what is the budget that

25

we can work with and make sure that

□

41

1

the QEP plan that we do decide on

2

can work within that budget? And

3 the budget hasn't been identified  
4 yet, but the leadership folks, the  
5 Leadership Team, will help figure  
6 those parameters out. It's a good  
7 question.

8 THE CHAIR: There's a question over  
9 here.

10 JONES: Brenda Jones, Libraries. What  
11 is the difference between the 20  
12 colleges and library  
13 representatives?

14 SELLNOW: I don't know.

15 SNOW: We have that separated for a  
16 reason, because there are some  
17 members who are not faculty members  
18 that are part of the libraries. I  
19 think they wanted to include all  
20 people associated with the library.

21 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.

22 SELLNOW: Thank you. We'll be back in  
23 April, a warning in case you want to  
24 skip. No.

25 THE CHAIR: So this next issue is a

0  
1 particularly important one. It is  
2 the proposed relocation of the MS  
3 Health Administration degree program  
4 from the Martin School to the School  
5 of Public Health. So the Senate has  
6 the authority and the responsibility  
7 to approve or not approve the move

8 of an academic degree program based  
9 upon academic merit. You'll find  
10 there are a lot of very specific  
11 delineations between academic  
12 responsibilities which fall under  
13 our purview and nonacademic  
14 responsibilities. This is the one  
15 for which we have direct  
16 responsibility. We also have the  
17 authority or the responsibility to  
18 endorse or not endorse the move of  
19 an academic degree program based  
20 upon administrative nonacademic  
21 merit. And what comes before you,  
22 you'll often notice we're asking for  
23 your approval or we're asking for  
24 your endorsement. So the Senate  
25 will be asked -- you will be asked

43

0

1 to hold two votes after the  
2 discussion. So we're going to ask  
3 now our guests to come forward:  
4 Julia Costich from Public Health,  
5 Dr. Bill Hoyt, the Martin School  
6 Director, Steve Wyatt, Dean of the  
7 College of Public Health, and  
8 Jeannine Blackwell, Dean of the  
9 Graduate School. There she is.  
10 Please, if you would come forward,  
11 and I think you're going to carry  
12 the freight here, aren't you?

13 BLACKWELL: Right, yes. Thank you for  
Page 35

14 your time today. What we are  
15 proposing and that is I, as Dean of  
16 the Graduate School who has  
17 responsibility for, among other  
18 units, the Martin School of Public  
19 Policy and Administration, I have  
20 put forward a proposal as the donor  
21 dean to move the master of health  
22 administration degree program from  
23 the Martin School of Public Policy  
24 and Administration to the College of  
25 Public Health and its Department of

0

44

1 Health Services Management. So that  
2 is the proposal. And before I get  
3 to the rationale, I'd just like to  
4 say a bit about the process. There  
5 was a committee appointed, a work  
6 group appointed by the Provost to  
7 examine the best location for the  
8 MHA degree program. That was a  
9 broadbased committee that started  
10 its work about a year and a half  
11 ago -- I think I'm remembering  
12 right -- to look at resources, to  
13 look at faculty resources, to see  
14 accessibility to practica and other  
15 kinds of things that were necessary  
16 for the efficient functioning of the  
17 MHA program and to give the Provost  
18 an assessment about the best

02-08-10 UK Senate.txt  
location for this degree program.

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0  
1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

In the process of that work group, there were a lot of actions and investigations and discussions that transpired. And at the end of that process, I as the Dean of the Martin School put forward the proposal to

45

relocate to the College of Public Health. And this has gone through an approval process that involves both faculties, the Graduate Faculty proper of the MHA, which is an interdisciplinary faculty, Graduate Faculty for that degree program, Graduate Council, the college councils of the College of Public Health and the graduate school of the constituent units under the graduate school, and that was -- then I'll forward to Graduate Council, which I also chair as Dean of the Graduate School, and with a recommendation from the Graduate School to Senate Council. So it's been through those various stages up till this point. The rationale was somewhat triggered by concerns about reaccreditation by CAHME, and CAHME is the accrediting unit, the Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Management Education.

25

The Martin School had successfully

□

46

1

had its program in the MHA

2

accredited in the last ten years or

3

so, but it was time for a

4

reaccreditation. And CAHME had

5

changed its accreditation standards

6

significantly since the last review

7

process here at the University of

8

Kentucky. There were concerns from

9

some faculty members about the

10

ability of the MHA to become

11

reaccredited, given the resource

12

issues, the strength of faculty, the

13

number of faculty, particularly,

14

that were primary and core in the

15

program and other resource

16

questions. There were -- there are

17

three dedicated lines to the MHA and

18

the Martin School at this time, and

19

I'm talking about full-time lines

20

that have primary interest in the

21

discipline, in health policy and

22

health administration, and two of

23

those lines were filled. One

24

remains unfilled after several

25

unsuccessful attempts and a lot of

□

47

1

very, very hard recruiting by the

2

Martin School faculty to replace

3

those lines. And of those three

4 lines, the two that are filled, one  
5 was tenured, one untenured. And the  
6 tenured faculty member of the Martin  
7 School, who was also the DGS, the  
8 Director of Graduate Studies of the  
9 MHA, requested in 2008 to transfer  
10 her tenure home from the Martin  
11 School to the College of Public  
12 Health because of, among other  
13 reasons, more collaborative research  
14 opportunities. After extensive  
15 discussions with the Dean of the  
16 College of Public Health, me, and  
17 the Provost, we allowed that  
18 transfer of tenure of that faculty  
19 member; and that triggered more  
20 activity and more concern about the  
21 location since there was now only  
22 one untenured faculty member who was  
23 left with main tenure home in the  
24 Martin School who was associated  
25 with the MHA. I also need to tell

48

0  
1 you that the rule of thumb for  
2 CAHME about the minimum number of  
3 core faculty associated with a  
4 program, that that sort of rule of  
5 thumb was five faculty members. So  
6 we had a significantly smaller  
7 number of faculty located in the  
8 unit that owned the degree program  
9 than was the rule of thumb for that

10 organization. Now, there is an  
11 argument to be made to CAHME that it  
12 does not have to be an actual tenure  
13 home in the actual unit owning the  
14 degree or running the degree, but  
15 you have to have a fairly  
16 substantial presence and you need to  
17 have a very, very close tie between  
18 those faculty members, the program,  
19 and the unit that manages it  
20 fiscally and academically. So this  
21 committee that the Provost appointed  
22 had membership from the Martin  
23 School, UK HealthCare, the Martin  
24 School's external board of advisors,  
25 the Colleges of Public Health,

0

49

1 Health Sciences and Pharmacy were  
2 represented on that committee; and  
3 they were charged to investigate  
4 campus resources, access to health  
5 care professionals for internships  
6 and faculty expertise. We hired  
7 Dr. Larry Prybil to serve as a  
8 consultant to lead this committee.  
9 He is the previous head -- he's the  
10 head of the previous team that did  
11 the site visit of CAHME to the  
12 University of Kentucky for the  
13 previous reviews, so he was very  
14 closely aware of the MHA here at the



15 university. His findings were that  
16 there was inadequate Martin School  
17 core faculty dedicated to the MHA,  
18 although I do have to point out that  
19 we have several people who have  
20 expertise in some aspect of health  
21 policy who are also faculty members  
22 in the Martin School. It is just  
23 not their major job responsibility  
24 and their major research area.  
25 There is a strength in health

50

0  
1 policy, research health policy in  
2 the Martin School, among other  
3 faculty members. There was lack of  
4 practice-based experience in health  
5 care settings among the faculty of  
6 the Martin School, and there was  
7 heavy reliance on not just the  
8 College of Public Health but other  
9 health care experts around campus  
10 for the teaching of the courses.  
11 And we brought in many different  
12 types of expertise for staffing of  
13 the courses every semester and also  
14 for the -- now I'm phasing out --

15 WYATT: Practica?

16 BLACKWELL: -- for the practica and the  
17 end of the degree projects. He  
18 continued with lack of connection to  
19 the UK HealthCare for student  
20 experiences and above all in the

21 curriculum, which now was going to  
22 be required to be a competency-  
23 based, competency-driven curriculum,  
24 that that was missing in the MHA  
25 curriculum and needed to be

0

51

1 addressed and was not actually being  
2 addressed in a timely fashion in  
3 order to have completed the  
4 self-study. And Dr. Prybil also  
5 noted a lack of follow-up to  
6 previous remarks of the  
7 accreditation site visit, although  
8 they were reaffirmed. So that was  
9 the Prybil report, the Prybil  
10 assessment. The committee itself  
11 noted that there were substantial  
12 contributions by the faculty of the  
13 College of Public Health to the  
14 current MHA, which everybody  
15 acknowledges, and that there were  
16 potentials for efficiencies by  
17 having the program located in the  
18 Department of Health Services  
19 Management with linkage to the  
20 Martin School, but there would still  
21 be collaboration. We have already a  
22 joint appointment and probably  
23 anticipate having more joint  
24 appointments. We definitely need to  
25 have the course work of the MHA

0

1 available to those students in the  
2 Martin School who want to have a  
3 special health policy direction in  
4 their degree in public  
5 administration or public policy so  
6 that that course work and faculty  
7 expertise would be available to the  
8 students. So with all of that  
9 information I moved forward with a  
10 recommendation to relocate the MHA,  
11 to put the curriculum in the hands  
12 of the leadership of the newly-  
13 appointed DGS, Julia Costich, who is  
14 also on the Graduate Faculty of the  
15 MHA, and so this comes forward from  
16 me to the various bodies. The  
17 Martin School faculty does not as a  
18 majority support the move of the MHA  
19 to the College of Public Health, and  
20 several of the members of the Martin  
21 School are present today. And so if  
22 you have any questions about that,  
23 you can certainly direct your  
24 questions to them. They feel like  
25 they have put a great investment

0

1 into this degree program, that it  
2 has been successfully accredited in  
3 the past, and that it is an integral  
4 part of their policy -- the palette  
5 of offerings that they have to do

6 with policy and administration.  
7 They are also concerned that the  
8 health policy concentration in the  
9 Ph.D. in public policy remains  
10 strong and vibrant, and that is a  
11 concern of theirs. However, the  
12 Martin School faculty have been  
13 extremely cooperative and  
14 collaborative with the faculty in  
15 the College of Public Health to  
16 ensure that students are not  
17 disenfranchised in the process of  
18 this process right now, that they  
19 continue to be served well, and I  
20 want to thank the Martin School  
21 faculty for their professionalism in  
22 addressing student needs. This was  
23 approved unanimously by the faculty  
24 of the College of Public Health,  
25 approved by the Graduate Faculty of

□

54

1 the MHA not unanimously, approved  
2 unanimously by the Graduate Council,  
3 approved unanimously by the Health  
4 Care Colleges Council and approved  
5 not unanimously for presentation to  
6 you-all today. And so that is my  
7 story, and I would welcome  
8 questions.

9 THE CHAIR: Actually what I'd like to do  
10 is get a motion on the floor and

02-08-10 UK Senate.txt  
then we'll discuss the motion.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
□  
1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

BLACKWELL: Okay.

THE CHAIR: Now, you will notice that we've worded -- I've worded this a little differently than normally. The recommendation is to approve or not approve. As Dr. Blackwell said, the motion was approved but not unanimously by the Senate Council, but it does come to you with a positive recommendation from Senate Council for approval. So if I could have a motion for recommendation number one, please. Bob.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Arts and

55

sciences. I move that the Senate approve the move of the MHA degree.

THE CHAIR: Move to approve. A second, please. Dr. Swanson?

SWANSON: Hollie Swanson, College of Medicine.

THE CHAIR: All right. Now we can discuss the motion. Yes.

HAYES: Jane Hayes, College of Engineering. So I want to direct my question to the Martin people. Listening to that as a total cynic, I want to know do you feel like it's just sour grapes from one tenured employee who was the DGS who said, "I'm out of here, so let's take the

17 whole thing with me"? That's what  
18 it sounds to me as a cynic.

19 HOYT: That was the reason for the move?  
20 I'm Bill Hoyt, Director of Martin  
21 School of Public Policy. No, I  
22 don't think so. That certainly had  
23 a role. Of course, the numbers,  
24 obviously that's a significant  
25 reduction in the core faculty

□

56

1 devoted, right, when you're talking  
2 about that kind of numbers. But I  
3 think, you know, to be fair, I think  
4 there was more to it involved than  
5 that and I think longer term than  
6 that. That certainly precipitated,  
7 I think, the discussion and what  
8 happened last spring in terms of the  
9 committee forming. I certainly  
10 would see that, but I don't think  
11 that's the sole reason.

12 THE CHAIR: Dr. Jones.

13 JONES: Since our first vote here is  
14 based upon the academic merits of  
15 the proposal, and I guess you're  
16 here speaking on behalf of the  
17 program's faculty and maybe there  
18 are some other here for that, can  
19 you give us the best case on its  
20 academic merits, why this should not  
21 be approved in the view of those who

22 were not supportive of this in the  
23 faculty?

24 THE CHAIR: Bill, stand if you don't  
25 mind.

□ 57

1 HOYT: All right. Tell you what; I'll  
2 take that spot. So the best case  
3 for not approving in terms of  
4 academic -- well, I'm an economist  
5 by training, so what I would say the  
6 best case is, is that we place our  
7 students well. I view the market as  
8 a test regardless of -- we have the  
9 credit, I understand, at the  
10 University of Kentucky. But the  
11 fact is I think the most relevant  
12 thing has been we've been successful  
13 in placing our students. Now, so  
14 that's, I guess, I think, the view  
15 of, you know, if we're saying a best  
16 case for not approving, I think  
17 that's where I would put the  
18 evidence. I'm not particularly  
19 pushing that. I will say we've been  
20 moving forward in this direction;  
21 but, you know, as you asked it,  
22 that's what I would respond.

23 NADEL: Point of order. Alan Nadel,  
24 Arts and Sciences. There's a motion  
25 on the floor, and by my

□ 58

1 understanding of Robert's Rules, the  
Page 47

2 only discussion should be arguments  
3 pro and con that motion, not  
4 question and answer. If we're going  
5 to follow Robert's Rules of Order,  
6 we should be debating the motion on  
7 the floor. If we wish to go to a  
8 question and answer period, we  
9 should withdraw the motion, have  
10 questions and answers, and then  
11 place the motion. The business of  
12 this group is to debate the motion  
13 once it is placed on the floor.

14 THE CHAIR: I certainly think we are  
15 debating the motion, but the  
16 motion --

17 NADEL: I asked for a ruling. Are  
18 questions and answers debates for  
19 motions according to Robert's  
20 Rules?

21 PARLIAMENTARIAN SEAGO: Okay. Myself, I  
22 consider in terms of --

23 NADEL: I'm not asking what you  
24 consider; I'm asking what Robert's  
25 Rules says.

□ 59

1 PARLIAMENTARIAN SEAGO: Got it. Okay.  
2 Excuse me a minute. Okay. Directly  
3 from Robert's Rules: "The  
4 distinction between debate and  
5 making suggestions or asking a  
6 question should always be kept in



02-08-10 UK Senate.txt  
7 view; and when the latter will  
8 assist the assembly in determining  
9 the question, it is allowed to a  
10 limited extent, even though the  
11 question before the assembly is  
12 undebatable. Such matters are at  
13 the discretion of the Chair."

14 NADEL: They should be kept to a limited  
15 degree. They should be pro or con.

16 THE CHAIR: I certainly agree to a  
17 limited degree, but certainly I  
18 believe that question is relevant to  
19 making this decision. So further  
20 questions relevant to the motion  
21 about the wisdom or lack thereof of  
22 this move. And direct them -- yes,  
23 Dr. Yanarella.

24 YANARELLA: I'm addressing this to you,  
25 Dave. When last I was involved in

60

0  
1 this and had some concern about  
2 particularly the issue of academic  
3 merits, given the lack of majority  
4 support within the Martin School and  
5 my understanding that this would  
6 have the impact of taking away some  
7 30 or 40 percent of Martin School  
8 students who would either have to  
9 leave or have to transfer to the  
10 College of Public Health, I believe  
11 we had a motion -- I think I framed  
12 it -- to send this to the Academic

13 Organization and Structure Committee  
14 with some very particular questions  
15 that related to issues concerning  
16 academic merits. Can you tell me  
17 what has transpired since that  
18 motion, I believe, was passed? And  
19 also please inform me since I  
20 haven't missed too many of these  
21 Senate Council meetings as an  
22 ex-officio member when this was  
23 formally approved by the Senate  
24 Council or recommended by the Senate  
25 Council.

0

61

1 BLACKWELL: The questions that Senate  
2 Council sent to the committee were  
3 given to the Martin School and the  
4 sort of team of people who were  
5 representing the Martin School and  
6 the College of Public Health. We  
7 answered those questions, gave them  
8 back to the Academic Standards  
9 Committee, and they returned that to  
10 Senate Council with the answers with  
11 a positive recommendation -- I'm  
12 pretty sure with a positive  
13 recommendation. And then Senate  
14 Council voted on it at that time  
15 after those questions had been  
16 answered. And among other things,  
17 there was also a statement from the

18 Provost reassuring the continuation  
19 of support and resources for the  
20 Martin School. So I think that  
21 those questions were answered by  
22 the -- by the members of the team,  
23 given to the committee, and that was  
24 reported back out to the Senate  
25 Council.

0

62

1 THE CHAIR: Dr. Snow.

2 SNOW: Diane Snow, Medical School. Was  
3 there any mechanism in place for the  
4 students themselves to voice their  
5 opinion about this change and how it  
6 affects their academic merit and  
7 their experience or even that of  
8 incoming students from their  
9 perspective? We've heard about the  
10 faculty. What about the students?

11 HOYT: Well, I'm not sure I -- we did  
12 meet with the students. We  
13 discussed this possibility. Now,  
14 was that a session in which we  
15 ascertained their views upon this?  
16 That's not my recollection of the  
17 session. It was more this has been  
18 put forward. One of the things that  
19 we did want to do in terms of if we  
20 were to move forward, we wanted to  
21 ensure that students would not have  
22 a disruption in their training, and  
23 I think we've succeeded in that with

24 both of us. But, no, we didn't  
25 elicit their viewpoints on this.

□

63

1 THE CHAIR: Dr. Swanson.

2 SWANSON: Hollie Swanson, College of  
3 Medicine. I thought it might be  
4 helpful for the Senate to be more  
5 aware of -- as we consider the  
6 academic merits to be more aware of  
7 what we are trying to train these  
8 students to do. Where are they  
9 being placed? Could somebody  
10 address that, please?

11 HOYT: Okay. All right. So this is a  
12 Master of Health Administration and  
13 maybe a little discussion, brief, on  
14 kind of the Martin School. We have  
15 a Master of Public Administration;  
16 we have a Master's of Public  
17 Policy. And consistent, I think,  
18 with the accreditation in  
19 particular, we are training them to  
20 be in administration and  
21 management. We were training them;  
22 of course, College of Public Health  
23 was there. So they're being placed  
24 primarily, not exclusively, but in  
25 health administration positions in

□

64

1 hospitals for profit, nonprofit  
2 sector. Some of ours are placed in

02-08-10 UK Senate.txt  
3 health agencies, public health  
4 agencies, and at least for initial  
5 positions we have (inaudible)  
6 fellowships.

7 THE CHAIR: Dr. Grossman.

8 GROSSMAN: Yes. In terms of the -- I  
9 don't actually have a question; I  
10 have a statement, so you may sit  
11 down if you like. In terms of the  
12 academic merits of it, one thing I  
13 would like --

14 THE CHAIR: Stand up, Bob.

15 GROSSMAN: One thing I would like to  
16 point out is that past success is no  
17 predictor of future success, and  
18 throughout this whole process it's  
19 been clear to me that no one's  
20 trying to punish the Martin School  
21 and no one's saying they haven't  
22 done a good job in the past. But  
23 there are changes in the  
24 accreditation process, especially  
25 moving away from policy

65

0  
1 considerations to practical  
2 administrative considerations. So  
3 in those respects it does seem to  
4 make sense, looking to the future of  
5 the program, that the academic needs  
6 of the program would fit better  
7 within public health. Not to say  
8 that the Martin School couldn't

9 handle it or couldn't do it, but in  
10 terms of where the most natural home  
11 is, it seems that Public Health in  
12 the future would be the more natural  
13 place.

14 THE CHAIR: Connie.

15 WOOD: Connie Wood, Arts and Sciences.

16 The primary motivation, at least  
17 with regard to the academic merits  
18 for this move, seem to revolve  
19 around the reaccreditation that's to  
20 take place in 2010. The health  
21 administration program is a  
22 multidisciplinary program and has  
23 been a multidisciplinary program for  
24 many decades and has been  
25 reaccredited with the cooperation,

□

66

1 you know, of faculty coming from all  
2 areas of this campus, even before  
3 the College of Public Health was  
4 even in existence. My question is  
5 the following, and it is to Bill  
6 Hoyt. Did you receive any direct  
7 communication from the accrediting  
8 agency that implied that your  
9 accreditation was in jeopardy?

10 HOYT: Okay. I'll go back up. We met  
11 early on, so I was appointed in  
12 January of 2009. Shortly  
13 thereafter, in early March, I met

14 along with Eugenia Toma, who was at  
15 that time director of the Health  
16 Administration program, we met with  
17 John Lloyd, who is the head of the  
18 CAHME, the accrediting agency, and  
19 discussed the case with him. So  
20 that was our direct communication.  
21 We left that meeting in our view,  
22 and I think this is obviously a  
23 point of debate -- in our view  
24 possible, maybe, I think in terms  
25 but challenging but certainly

□

67

1 possible. I mean, we kind of left  
2 optimistically, but we had no  
3 communications that we were -- to my  
4 recollection that we were in peril  
5 in some sense.

6 ESTUS: Steve Estus, Physiology and  
7 Medical School. So I'm actually a  
8 little puzzled because it seems like  
9 I'm hearing we have to have five  
10 lines. I'm hearing there's one line  
11 that's tenured, one line that's not,  
12 and three apparently no lines. So  
13 I'm wondering which school puts most  
14 of the faculty into this program?  
15 It's obviously multidisciplinary,  
16 but could somebody address that  
17 issue about which department  
18 actually puts most of the faculty  
19 into the program?

20 HOYT: Go ahead. I'll correct you if I  
21 disagree.

22 BLACKWELL: Yeah, he'll let me know if  
23 I'm wrong on this. It is a very  
24 interdisciplinary team approach to  
25 the course work in the MHA. The

0

68

1 first year of courses there are  
2 special sections of the course work  
3 that is located in the Martin  
4 School. Am I right on this?

5 HOYT: Uh-huh (affirmative).

6 BLACKWELL: Where there's special  
7 sections of the same type of course  
8 for the public policy and public  
9 administration students on the one  
10 hand and the health administration  
11 students on the other where their  
12 examples, their rules, their  
13 approaches are directed toward  
14 examples from the health  
15 administration world, if you will.  
16 And those courses are taught by the  
17 regular Martin School faculty,  
18 including the faculty member who is  
19 primary in health -- in the health  
20 field. As they move on into other  
21 course work, some of those courses  
22 are taught by faculty from the  
23 College of Public Health, who we  
24 hired on an overload basis or other



25

0

69

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0  
1  
2  
3  
4

Health, from Pharmacy. And for the capstone projects and the master's committees that examine those capstone projects, that drew in faculty from all -- from many of the health care areas but predominately -- am I right in this? -- from the college of Public Health. And so there was deep engagement with the college, the faculty of the College of Public Health, in this process. Also the College of Pharmacy -- I have to say that as well -- and practitioners from the community have also taught those courses, so it really is a big group. The part of the academic challenge that I think was most serious to me had to do with the revision of the entire curriculum to meet the criteria for a practice-based, competency-based curriculum. We were not there. And those of you who are in the medical fields and have seen this kind of

70

tightening up of accreditation standards into competency-based learning know what I'm talking about. This is a rigorous, total

5 overhaul of the way business used to  
6 be transacted in many of our  
7 disciplines. So, yes, and you may  
8 not like it that this very rigorous  
9 competencies-based curricula move is  
10 there; but it is certainly part of  
11 the way that health care education  
12 has been moving on a national level,  
13 so just that on the academic side.

14 THE CHAIR: This is very important, but  
15 we are not halfway through our  
16 agenda and we have other important  
17 issues. Are there additional  
18 questions? Sir.

19 WASILKOWSKI: Wasilkowski, College of  
20 Engineering. Suppose that the  
21 program is moved to public health.  
22 How many faculty will become primary  
23 in the program?

24 HOYT: Was that addressed to me? I  
25 didn't hear it.

0 71

1 WASILKOWSKI: How many faculty from your  
2 college will become primary  
3 (inaudible)?

4 WYATT: We already offer health services  
5 management, offer it in the MDH  
6 program. We have about five faculty  
7 with MHA backgrounds already, so  
8 those folks will be working with the  
9 MHA program. I think that's one of

10 the reasons this was proposed is  
11 from when they did the Campus  
12 Resource Assessment, we happened to  
13 have an aggregation of several  
14 folks, four or five folks, with MHA  
15 background. So all those folks will  
16 be heavily engaged.

17 BLACKWELL: And can you say how many  
18 faculty members you have in Health  
19 Service Management, in the  
20 department?

21 WYATT: It's about 14 or 15 folks.

22 THE CHAIR: Final questions? John.

23 THELIN: John Thelin, Ed Policy  
24 Studies. There's been a lot of  
25 emphasis on competency-based

0  
1 evaluation. I'm pleased that health  
2 administration is moving with  
3 urgency. My recollection is  
4 competency-based evaluation surfaced  
5 around 1972. Things moving pretty  
6 fast in public health?

72

7 WYATT: That's the MHA area, not public  
8 health. Public health has been  
9 there for many years.

10 THELIN: Oh, okay, MHA.

11 WYATT: I think the issue from my  
12 perspective is this has kind of been  
13 at the forefront from the MHA  
14 perspective for several years with  
15 the change in standards for

16 accreditation, and it's not there.  
17 They don't have -- there's a lot of  
18 work to be done in that area. So  
19 public health has had many years of  
20 competency-driven education. So  
21 we've been there for years too, but  
22 MHA has just moved there in the last  
23 three to four years. Does that make  
24 sense?

25 THELIN: It makes sense. Justice moves

□

73

1 slowly.

2 THE CHAIR: Final questions with respect  
3 to the motion? I'm going to try and  
4 do this by voice vote. If there's  
5 any doubt, we'll take a count. All  
6 in favor of approval, aye.

7 SENATORS: Aye.

8 THE CHAIR: Opposed, nay.

9 SENATORS: Nay.

10 THE CHAIR: Motion carries. If we could  
11 have a quick motion on the second.  
12 Someone move to endorse?

13 GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Arts and  
14 Sciences. I move that the Senate  
15 endorse the move of the MHA based on  
16 its nonacademic merits.

17 THE CHAIR: A second?

18 WASILKOWSKI: Second.

19 THE CHAIR: Discussion of the motion.

20 All in favor, aye.

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
□  
1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
□

SENATORS: Aye.  
THE CHAIR: Opposed, nay.  
SENATORS: Nay.  
THE CHAIR: Motion carries. Thank you  
all very much. We are still

74

responsible for approving the  
December 2009 KCTS candidate for  
credentials. The student name is on  
the handout. This is one of the  
last times we'll do this. The  
recommendation has to be worded very  
specifically if someone would so  
move, please.

ESTUS: Steve Estus. So moved.

THE CHAIR: Second?

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, second.

THE CHAIR: Discussion of the motion.

All in favor, aye.

SENATORS: Aye.

THE CHAIR: Opposed, nay. Motion  
carries. We are engaging in a trial  
of TurnItIn. Senator Ruth Beattie  
is going to bring us up-to-date on  
that.

BEATTIE: So I'm actually here  
representing the Instructional  
Computing Committee, which was given  
the charge a little bit over a year  
ago of running a pilot on some  
plagiarism prevention software,

75

1 specifically TurnItIn, to see  
2 whether or not this is something  
3 that the university should purchase  
4 a site license for and utilize. I  
5 do want to acknowledge the great  
6 assistance of Randolph Hollingsworth  
7 and Terri Runyon in Undergraduate  
8 Education who have provided a lot of  
9 assistance in running the pilot and  
10 getting people signed up and  
11 arranging for training sessions and  
12 so on. Some of you may have been a  
13 part of that system. So when you  
14 signed up, you should have received  
15 two handouts. One of them is the  
16 sort of official TurnItIn flyer and  
17 then also a single-page handout that  
18 summarizes some of the results from  
19 our particular pilot. But to get  
20 started, I wanted to just give you a  
21 little bit of information about  
22 TurnItIn. This is a software  
23 package that is widely used  
24 globally, 106 countries, not quite  
25 half a million instructors. They

□

76

1 have billions of pages of web  
2 content in the archives, 70 million  
3 student papers in the archives and  
4 so on, so just a little bit of data  
5 on that. In terms of our

6 benchmarks, the majority of them use  
7 TurnItIn. One used to use it but  
8 has stopped because of the cost.  
9 Three are exploring the possibility  
10 of using it, and three others have  
11 honor codes and feel they don't need  
12 to use TurnItIn. In terms of the  
13 University of Kentucky, there have  
14 been some concerns in recent years  
15 that plagiarism is rife around  
16 campus and so on, so the Office of  
17 the Academic Ombud provided me with  
18 some figures regarding academic  
19 offenses for the last number of  
20 years. You will see that there's  
21 been a huge jump in cases beginning  
22 in 2006/2007, and that was when the  
23 university implemented new academic  
24 offense penalties such that the  
25 minimum penalty was no longer

77

0  
1 failing the course but was a much  
2 lesser penalty, and so it is clear  
3 that faculty are probably pressing  
4 charges more often than they used to  
5 in the past. Now, these figures  
6 include all academic offenses, not  
7 just plagiarism. There was no way  
8 to pull out offenses that might  
9 involve cheating on an exam or  
10 something like that, but just to  
11 give you the numbers as background.

12 So TurnItIn is one component of a  
13 three-component software package  
14 called writeCycle. The other two  
15 components involve an online peer  
16 reviewing software package and also  
17 a paperless grading package. I'm  
18 primarily going to focus on the  
19 TurnItIn part of it, basically the  
20 plagiarism prevention software. So  
21 about basically the role of the  
22 TurnItIn software is to do  
23 originality checking of student work  
24 and hopefully prevent plagiarism  
25 from happening in the first place.

□

78

1 One of the real pluses with TurnItIn  
2 is you can either use it by logging  
3 in directly to the TurnItIn site or  
4 you can interface with it through  
5 your Blackboard web site. So you  
6 can work it either way, whichever  
7 works best for you. We also did a  
8 little bit of a comparison with  
9 SafeAssign, which is one of the  
10 plagiarism prevention software  
11 packages that is automatically  
12 associated with Blackboard and is  
13 part of the Blackboard package. One  
14 of the big differences between  
15 TurnItIn and SafeAssign is the size  
16 of the database. With SafeAssign



17 you're primarily comparing your  
18 students' papers against each other  
19 and against examples of work  
20 previously submitted by your  
21 students. You're not getting the  
22 level of comparison that you get  
23 with TurnItIn where you've got the  
24 whole web to deal with. When  
25 students submit their work to

□

79

1 TurnItIn, the work is checked for  
2 originality and the instructor and  
3 the student may also receive a copy  
4 of this if the instructor so  
5 chooses. The instructor will get an  
6 originality report. Any areas of  
7 the work that are -- that match with  
8 other work out in the web or the  
9 databases will be color-coded, and  
10 so on this example here each of the  
11 colored sections represent work that  
12 appears to have been lifted from  
13 another source. And the originality  
14 report will give you the reference  
15 for that work, whether it is work  
16 from a paper previously submitted by  
17 a student through TurnItIn, a web  
18 page or a journal article or  
19 whatever. So you can get  
20 originality reports for all of your  
21 student papers. That being said,  
22 there are a few limitations that

23 instructors should be aware of as  
24 they are using this software. One  
25 is that you can get a lot of false

0

80

1 hits. If a student correctly quotes  
2 information in their paper, that  
3 will still show up in the  
4 originality report as having been  
5 plagiarized, so you've got to go in  
6 there and actually read the report  
7 and check what is showing up as  
8 matching to determine whether it is  
9 true plagiarism or whether it's work  
10 that has just been picked up by the  
11 TurnItIn software. The TurnItIn  
12 software tends to look for sequences  
13 of words. It doesn't look for  
14 quotation marks around those  
15 sequences of words. It will also  
16 match up with sort of common  
17 language. So, for example, if a  
18 biology student or several of them  
19 write "based on Darwin's theory of  
20 evolution," then that's all going to  
21 be highlighted as matching up. So  
22 you've got to -- you've got to  
23 really look at your student work.  
24 You can't assume if you get a 75  
25 percent match that they plagiarized

0

81

1 75 percent of their paper. They may

2 not. And false hits may be a real  
3 issue if your students are going to  
4 be quoting a lot of material, if  
5 they're doing some sort of maybe  
6 literature review where they're  
7 quoting a lot of material. It only  
8 matches text, so it will not pick up  
9 numbers or symbols. So, you know,  
10 for the Math Department this may not  
11 be the best type of software for  
12 them to use. It will not pick up on  
13 matched graphs, tables or charts or  
14 if a paper has been translated from  
15 one language to another language.  
16 The other limitation with TurnItIn  
17 is that if a student has plagiarized  
18 from a paper submitted by another  
19 student at another institution, you  
20 don't automatically get a copy of  
21 the original paper that the student  
22 plagiarized from. All you know is  
23 what institution and what course.  
24 So if you were pressing charges  
25 against that student and you wanted

82

0  
1 to have a copy of the original  
2 paper, you would have to contact the  
3 instructor, ask that instructor if  
4 they can track down that paper and  
5 give you a copy of it, which, you  
6 know, most of us probably don't keep  
7 that many archived papers from past

8 students. So, you know, in terms of  
9 pressing charges if you don't have  
10 the original paper, then your  
11 evidence of plagiarism may not be  
12 fully supported. So that's one  
13 issue. Just a very quick note about  
14 the cost. The cost is based on  
15 student enrollment at the  
16 institution. A single-year contract  
17 would be around 48,000 a year. A  
18 five-year contract would work out to  
19 just under 45,000 a year if we go  
20 with a multiyear contract. Several  
21 things that we need to think about  
22 as we are looking at this software  
23 is why do we want to use it? Is the  
24 primary purpose of buying a site  
25 license so that we can catch

□

83

1 plagiarism, or do we have a more  
2 formative function for this, to  
3 encourage good writing, good  
4 practices, to prevent plagiarism, to  
5 teach our students how to write and  
6 so on? I would certainly prefer the  
7 second reason for purchasing  
8 something like this. If we were to  
9 purchase TurnItIn, it would be wise  
10 to have some sort of institutional  
11 policy regarding the use of it,  
12 statements in the syllabus of each

13 course so that students are aware  
14 that this software is being used,  
15 that, you know, we keep everything  
16 very transparent, that we also have  
17 policies for the faculty regarding  
18 what constitutes evidence of  
19 plagiarism based on the limitations  
20 of getting copies of student papers  
21 and that sort of thing. There have  
22 been a number of lawsuits and  
23 queries regarding some copyright  
24 ethical/legal issues. One of them  
25 is the fact that TurnItIn is using

84

0

1 student work in order to make a  
2 profit and to sell its services.  
3 This issue has gone to the courts,  
4 and it has been found that TurnItIn  
5 sort of falls under fair use of  
6 student work, and so this particular  
7 lawsuit was found not to be -- not  
8 supported. There has also been  
9 issues about whether copyright is  
10 being violated. If the students  
11 publish their papers on TurnItIn,  
12 can they not publish them anywhere  
13 else? Issues with invasion of  
14 privacy if an instructor is using  
15 TurnItIn and publishing a student's  
16 paper on TurnItIn without the  
17 student's knowledge and obviously a  
18 statement in the syllabus does away

19 with that issue. And then also  
20 there's been lawsuits about whether  
21 students can opt out of having their  
22 papers put through a TurnItIn  
23 screening. This last issue has also  
24 gone through the courts and a  
25 student from McGill was successful

□

85

1 in his case that he didn't want his  
2 paper to go into TurnItIn and the  
3 courts said he didn't have to. So,  
4 again, this is something that we  
5 need to be thought about if we  
6 develop a policy about how to use  
7 it. The other two components to  
8 this whole WriteCycle thing are the  
9 Peer Review software and the  
10 GradeMark software. The Peer  
11 Review, as the name suggests, allows  
12 you to set up an anonymous peer  
13 review process within a class. This  
14 particular component of the software  
15 has been used quite a lot within our  
16 pilot. Two of my colleagues in  
17 biology have used it a lot and  
18 really like it. GradeMark is a way  
19 for you to do basically paperless  
20 grading. Students submit their  
21 assignments online. You can mark  
22 them up, give them feedback and then  
23 send them back to the students.

24 we've had a number of folks use that  
25 particular aspect of the software.

□

86

1 So getting to the results of the  
2 pilots, we had run pilots spring of  
3 '09, fall of '09, and we're running  
4 sort of a final pilot this  
5 semester. Training was provided for  
6 all instructors who wanted to be  
7 part of the pilot. Some of it was  
8 done as webinars, and some of it was  
9 done by people taking the training  
10 themselves online. In spring we had  
11 31 faculty involved; fall, 84. The  
12 number of students involved, 323  
13 last spring, over 700 this past  
14 fall. And the number of submissions  
15 didn't quite jump as high as the  
16 student numbers, I think mainly  
17 because in the spring of '09 we had  
18 one class. It was a graduate level  
19 class that was actually running some  
20 experiments using the software, and  
21 so they were submitting a lot more  
22 assignments than you would normally  
23 submit within an individual class.  
24 In terms of some of the results that  
25 we've seen and some patterns of

□

87

1 results, we've been able to track  
2 sort of the similarity index for  
3 papers, what percentage of the paper

4 is similar to other information.  
5 And for similarity indexes of  
6 greater than 75 percent, in the  
7 spring semester we had a 3.4 percent  
8 result with that; 3.4 percent of  
9 papers had a similarity index of 75  
10 percent or above. In fall that had  
11 dropped to .3 percent, which is the  
12 direction you want it to go in. In  
13 terms of a similarity index of zero  
14 percent, it's gone from just over 10  
15 percent of the papers having a zero  
16 similarity to 19.7 percent, so that  
17 one is going in the right  
18 direction. And this supports the  
19 data nationally and internationally  
20 with the use of this software, that  
21 once instructors start using it, it  
22 seems to make the students more  
23 sensitive to what's going on and  
24 there tends to be a lower similarity  
25 index as a result. And of course

□

88

1 that's one of the purposes of this  
2 software is to teach the students  
3 how to write so that they're not  
4 copying information from a load of  
5 different sources. Other  
6 feedback -- and most of this is  
7 actually summarized on the handout  
8 you received on the way in. There



9 was a lot of concern initially about  
10 the amount of time it might take  
11 faculty to set up assignments and to  
12 learn the software, and the feedback  
13 that we're getting is that that time  
14 investment doesn't seem to be too  
15 great and that people are willing to  
16 use the software again and again. A  
17 lot of people that were in the  
18 initial pilot wanted to use it  
19 again, and we had people from fall  
20 wanting to use it again in the  
21 spring. So that's a good sign. It  
22 doesn't take a huge amount of time  
23 to introduce your students to how to  
24 use the software. For most classes  
25 around about an hour is the amount

89

0  
1 of time it takes to teach them what  
2 they need to do and so on. There  
3 has been a greater increase in the  
4 use of the software by students,  
5 that faculty are having their  
6 students submit their papers to the  
7 software so that the students can do  
8 a self-check on their paper before  
9 they submit it to the instructor for  
10 grading. We've also had a good  
11 response rate in terms of whether  
12 this is a valuable tool in the  
13 classroom with 90 percent of faculty  
14 responding that it was useful and a

15 lot of very positive feedback with  
16 the PeerMark aspect of things. So  
17 our next step is to continue with  
18 our current pilot and then to make a  
19 recommendation to the Provost and  
20 the Senate Council at the end of the  
21 spring semester about purchasing the  
22 software. If you do have any  
23 comments or strong feelings one way  
24 or another about this, please feel  
25 free to e-mail me and let me know

□

90

1 your thoughts.

2 THE CHAIR: Thank you. We have a  
3 proposed change in the admission  
4 requirements for bachelor of science  
5 in nursing. Pat?

6 BURKHART: Hello. I'm Pat Burkhardt, and  
7 I'm the Associate Dean for  
8 Undergraduate Nursing. I'm here  
9 today to ask for your support of  
10 some changes in our admission  
11 requirements. Also here with me are  
12 Joanne Davis, our professional  
13 advisors and four senator  
14 representatives from Nursing that  
15 can also answer questions. It comes  
16 with a positive recommendation from  
17 Undergraduate Faculty in the College  
18 of Nursing, also from the Health  
19 Care Colleges Council as well as the

20 senate Council. Just briefly, the  
21 rationale for the change is to more  
22 accurately reflect our competitive  
23 applicant pool in nursing and the  
24 ability to be successful in the  
25 rigorous nursing curriculum. And

□

91

1 basically there are four changes  
2 that we're recommending, and those  
3 are changes in the GPA, high school  
4 GPA, from 2.5 to 2.75. And the  
5 rationale for that is students with  
6 a 2.5 from high school are typically  
7 nonsuccessful in getting into the  
8 nursing program. Also raising the  
9 GPA from 2.5 to 2.75 for  
10 consideration of entry into the  
11 professional program, and you should  
12 know that the average GPA for those  
13 students that were accepted into the  
14 professional program was a 3.6 for  
15 this academic year. So of course  
16 when we have a minimum requirement  
17 on the web of 2.5, it raises a lot  
18 of questions for applicants and  
19 parents about, you know, why is the  
20 minimum so low when the competition  
21 is so high. Thirdly, we're  
22 recommending a TOEFL for applicants  
23 to the professional program, and I'm  
24 sure you understand that proficiency  
25 in English is critically important

0

1 to patient safety. We vetted this  
2 carefully with Dr. John Yopp and  
3 Dr. Cavallo as well as looked at  
4 benchmarks and TOEFL scoring  
5 rubrics. And the fourth piece is a  
6 slight increase in the ACT composite  
7 for guaranteed admission to the  
8 professional level, and that's from  
9 a 26 to a 28; and that's to be more  
10 consistent with the university's  
11 strategic plan.

12 THE CHAIR: Questions? I need a motion,  
13 please.

14 CHAPPELL: Joe Chappell. I recommend  
15 the proposal as written.

16 THE CHAIR: And a second?

17 WERMELING: Wermeling, Pharmacy.

18 THE CHAIR: Discussion of motion?  
19 Questions for Pat? All in favor,  
20 aye.

21 SENATORS: Aye.

22 THE CHAIR: Opposed, nay.

23 SENATORS: Nay.

24 THE CHAIR: Motion carries. Thank you.  
25 I want to give you a very quick

0

1 update on the progress of General  
2 Education reform. The undergraduate  
3 grading scale will have to be given  
4 on the syllabus for the course when

5 these things are presented for  
6 review and approval. The approval  
7 process mirrors the course approval  
8 process for the USP courses. In  
9 other words, this is a description  
10 of where we're going with respect to  
11 approval for Gen Ed courses. And  
12 the form, we've developed a form for  
13 the Gen Ed, but it basically mirrors  
14 current course requirements; in  
15 other words, it's quite similar to  
16 what we have on board now except  
17 it's designed specifically for the  
18 approval of General Education, so  
19 that's where we are now. Any  
20 objections? Okay. Thank you. It  
21 is our responsibility to name the  
22 awardees for the honorary degrees,  
23 so Dr. Blackwell, again.

24 (SOTTO VOCE DISCUSSION.)

25 THE CHAIR: Oh, thank you. This is

0

94

1 confidential. Please, these names  
2 must not leave the room.

3 BLACKWELL: I would like to thank the  
4 University Joint Committee on  
5 Honorary Degrees, and as you see  
6 here illustrious names.

7 GROSSMAN: Those names can leave the  
8 rooms.

9 BLACKWELL: And here are the honorary  
10 degree nominees that have come to

11 you from that joint committee. They  
12 are Robert Straus, Judith Clabes and  
13 Daniel Libeskind. Judith Clabes,  
14 the former CEO of the Scripps Howard  
15 First Amendment Center, the first  
16 Kentuckian to receive the James  
17 Madison Award for Distinguished  
18 Service to the First Amendment, the  
19 Gerald Sass Distinguished Service  
20 Award from the Association of  
21 Schools of Journalism and Mass  
22 Communication. She was the first  
23 woman editor of the Kentucky Post,  
24 former President of the Kentucky  
25 Press Association, first woman

□

95

1 editor of the Sunday Courier and  
2 Press in Evansville, graduated from  
3 UK in '66 and is in the University  
4 of Kentucky Distinguished Alumni and  
5 Kentucky Journalism Hall of Fame.

6 Daniel Libeskind, architect,  
7 was appointed as the first Cultural  
8 Ambassador for Architecture by the  
9 US Department of State. He is an  
10 honorary member of the Royal Academy  
11 of Arts in London, winner of the  
12 Master Plan Competition for the area  
13 formerly occupied by the World Trade  
14 Center Towers, and he designed the  
15 Jewish Museum in Berlin, Germany.

16 He has a Gold Medal for Architecture  
17 from the National Arts Club. He is  
18 in the Royal Institute of British  
19 Architects, the International Award  
20 for the Wohl Centre at Bar-Ilan  
21 University, the RIBA International  
22 Award for the Imperial War Museum  
23 North and for the London  
24 Metropolitan University Graduate  
25 Centre, Man of the Year for the Tel

0

96

1 Aviv Museum of Art and was an  
2 Assistant Professor of Architecture  
3 here at UK from 1973 to '75 and has  
4 worked with the College of  
5 Architecture in supporting many  
6 student projects over the years and  
7 remains in contact with them. He is  
8 also the designer of the Ascent at  
9 Roebing Bridge in Covington,  
10 Kentucky, which won the American  
11 Property Awards for the Best  
12 High-Rise Development in 2008.

13 Robert Straus established the  
14 field of medical behavioral sciences  
15 in colleges of medicine and in  
16 physician training in America. He  
17 was elected as a member of the  
18 National Institute of Medicine at  
19 the National Academy of Sciences in  
20 1975 and has received the Leo G.  
21 Reader Award for Distinguished

22 Scholarship in Medical Sociology  
23 from the American Sociological  
24 Association. He established the  
25 pioneer protocols for evaluating

0

97

1 alcoholism and served as a special  
2 consultant to the Director of the  
3 National Institute of Mental  
4 Health. He received the Lifetime  
5 Achievement Award from the American  
6 Public Health Association and was a  
7 professor -- has been a professor at  
8 UK since 1956, retired in 1987, but  
9 still serves as an advisor, a  
10 trusted advisor, to many people in  
11 UK HealthCare and the College of  
12 Medicine as well as the Department  
13 of Behavioral Sciences, which he  
14 founded. And so those are your  
15 honorary degree candidates/nominees.

16 THE CHAIR: Thank you.

17 BLACKWELL: Do you have the degrees?

18 BROTHERS: Yes.

19 THE CHAIR: Yes.

20 BLACKWELL: Okay.

21 THE CHAIR: So here are the degrees.

22 Degrees must be awarded by the  
23 Senate. They must be approved by  
24 the Senate. If I could have a  
25 recommendation to this effect,

0

98



02-08-10 UK Senate.txt  
please. Dr. Yanarella.

1

2

YANARELLA: So moved.

3

THE CHAIR: Second?

4

CHAPPELL: Joe Chappell, second.

5

THE CHAIR: Any discussion? All in

6

favor, aye.

7

SENATORS: Aye.

8

THE CHAIR: Opposed, nay. Motion

9

carries. There is a question as to

10

whether or not third bachelor's

11

degrees are accepted, so we sent

12

this out to the Senate's Mission and

13

Academic Standards Committee for its

14

opinion and what we are asking is

15

that we accept their report. Their

16

report is in the agenda, and

17

basically it says yes, a third

18

degree may be -- so if I may have a

19

motion, please.

20

CHAPPELL: So moved.

21

THE CHAIR: And second?

22

NIEMAN: Second, Tom Nieman,

23

Architecture.

24

THE CHAIR: Discussion? Dr. Jones.

25

JONES: What does it mean to accept the

0

99

1

report? Does it mean to receive and

2

file it, or we're endorsing this as

3

new policy?

4

THE CHAIR: We're receiving it and

5

filing it. All in favor, aye.

6

SENATORS: Aye.

7 THE CHAIR: Opposed, nay. Thank you.  
8 There's a proposed change to the  
9 graduate school calendar. Again,  
10 Dr. Blackwell.

11 BLACKWELL: I hope this is very quick.  
12 We would like to move the deadlines  
13 back for admission for international  
14 students from February 1 to March 15  
15 for the fall term and from June 15  
16 to August 15 for the spring term.  
17 When these deadlines were  
18 established a little bit less than a  
19 decade ago in the immediate  
20 aftermath of 2001 of the bombing of  
21 the World Trade Center and the  
22 establishment of the new visa system  
23 in the State Department, we were  
24 very concerned that we would not be  
25 able to get all of the documentation

100

□  
1 necessary to have students be issued  
2 visas in a timely fashion for those  
3 upcoming semesters. Now we find  
4 that the wheels of bureaucracy are  
5 moving much more quickly, and so we  
6 think that this will give our  
7 programs more flexibility for  
8 admitting international students in  
9 a longer window. And this is also  
10 part of our attempt to address the  
11 needs of internationalization to the

12 campus to give as much flexibility  
13 to the programs for admission and  
14 time to admission, so that's where  
15 we are.

16 THE CHAIR: Questions for  
17 Dr. Blackwell?

18 JONES: Again, we need less time now  
19 than we did before?

20 BLACKWELL: (Nodding affirmatively.)  
21 For processing documentation, your  
22 graduate school.

23 THE CHAIR: A motion, please.

24 MENDIONDO: Marta Menciondo.

25 THE CHAIR: And a second.

□

101

1 WASILKOWSKI: Second.

2 THE CHAIR: Discussion of the motion.

3 All in favor -- I'm sorry.

4 GROSSMAN: Actually I have a question  
5 for, I guess, the Chair. It seems  
6 like application dates for  
7 admissions are an administrative  
8 matter. I'm just wondering why the  
9 Senate is being asked to vote on  
10 this.

11 BROTHERS: Because academic calendars  
12 are within the purview of the Senate  
13 and you voted to approve this date  
14 at some time in the past.

15 GROSSMAN: Is this really -- okay. I  
16 don't want to waste any more time.

17 THE CHAIR: Further questions? All in  
Page 83

18 favor, aye.

19 SENATORS: Aye.

20 THE CHAIR: Opposed, nay. So this is  
21 another of those important issues  
22 that I wanted to be certain we had  
23 time to discuss. So we are  
24 proposing or it is being proposed  
25 that six positions be moved from the

0

102

1 Library to the College of Law. I  
2 believe these were all tenured track  
3 positions. So we have guests here,  
4 the new dean, David Brennan of the  
5 College of Law. I think this is  
6 your first visit with us.

7 BRENNAN: Yes.

8 THE CHAIR: If you'd care to come up and  
9 present that. We also have the Dean  
10 of the Library School,  
11 Dr. Birdwhistell. So present the  
12 background if you would and --

13 BRENNAN: I'm David Brennan. I've been  
14 here about six months, maybe seven  
15 by now, so greetings and welcome. I  
16 moved from D.C., and I'm glad I  
17 did. One of the first things I  
18 encountered when I came on as Dean  
19 of the Law School is that there was  
20 an administrative structure at our  
21 law library which was really out of  
22 sync with most law schools

23 throughout the country. There are  
24 about 200 law schools in the United  
25 states that are approved by the

□

103

1 American Bar Association, and about  
2 six of them have an administrative  
3 structure similar to ours. And that  
4 structure is such that all of the  
5 law library faculty, staff and half  
6 of the law library director are  
7 housed at the University Library and  
8 not housed at the law school. So it  
9 essentially means that the people in  
10 our building really work for another  
11 unit on campus. The budget is also  
12 housed at the University Libraries  
13 and not at the law schools. This  
14 has impacted us in a couple of ways  
15 which are really important. One is  
16 it affects our ability to attract  
17 and in some cases retain directors  
18 of the law library; and secondly, it  
19 also and most importantly affects  
20 our ability to go through our  
21 accreditation process. Now, don't  
22 get me wrong. It does not prevent  
23 us from being accredited because we  
24 have been accredited for a number of  
25 years under the current system, but

□

104

1 what it does is it causes us to go  
2 through an extra round of questions

3 and processes that would be  
4 unnecessary if we had what the law  
5 library world refers to as autonomy  
6 at our law school library. And so  
7 I've spoken with a number of people  
8 both at the law school and at the  
9 University Libraries. I spoke to  
10 Carol Diedrichs before she left as  
11 head of the University Libraries,  
12 and I've also spoken with Terry  
13 Birdwhistell. I've spoken with our  
14 current director of the law  
15 library. I've spoken with each  
16 member of the law library faculty  
17 one on one, and I've also spoken  
18 with all of the staff members of the  
19 law library. And finally we had a  
20 faculty meeting with all of our  
21 tenured and tenured track faculty  
22 and contract faculty at the law  
23 school. Every single person I've  
24 spoken to has told me that they're  
25 completely in favor of this, and all

105

0  
1 of the voting on this matter at the  
2 law school has been unanimous in  
3 terms of supporting this transfer.  
4 The transfer will be effective on  
5 July 1 of 2010. And I have my  
6 Associate Dean Mary Davis, who's  
7 here, who will probably be able to

02-08-10 UK Senate.txt  
8 answer any detail questions if you  
9 have them; otherwise, I can speak to  
10 any general questions.

11 THE CHAIR: Actually, if you'd remain  
12 right here. Terry, do you have any  
13 statements to make from the library  
14 perspective?

15 BIRDWHISTELL: Only a positive  
16 statement. The letters in the  
17 packet are support for this move.

18 THE CHAIR: Thank you. Questions for  
19 either individual? Need a motion,  
20 please.

21 ESTUS: Steve Estus, Physiology. So  
22 moved.

23 THE CHAIR: And a second?

24 ENGLISH: Tony English, Health Sciences.

25 THE CHAIR: Discussion of the motion?

□

106

1 ESTUS: Estus, Physiology. So the  
2 faculty involved are for the move?

3 BRENNAN: Yes.

4 THE CHAIR: Dr. Jones.

5 JONES: Forgive me if I was distracted  
6 while you said all this in your  
7 introduction. So the faculty we're  
8 moving over, their tenure promotion  
9 comes out of the law college rather  
10 than the libraries as a college.

11 BRENNAN: Well, prior -- right now it  
12 comes down to the university  
13 college. After the move it will

14 . come out of the law school college.  
15 so currently all of our law library  
16 faculty are tenured at the  
17 university Libraries, not at the law  
18 school, and so the proposal is to  
19 change that to have them be tenured  
20 at the law school. And what we've  
21 set up is basically a dual track  
22 system so that the law library  
23 faculty will be tenured under  
24 essentially almost identical  
25 policies to what they had been used

107

0  
1 to over the years as university  
2 librarians, and we're just bringing  
3 that over into the law school.

4 JONES: And for educational policy  
5 making and whatnot, they're now  
6 voting members of the law faculty  
7 and no longer voting members of the  
8 libraries?

9 BRENNAN: Well, I can't speak to whether  
10 they can vote on certain matters as  
11 members of committees with the  
12 University Library possibly; but in  
13 terms of their faculty status, they  
14 have certain governance rights as  
15 faculty of the law school. And we  
16 kind of laid all that out and spoke  
17 to both the law librarians and the  
18 law faculty members, and all are in



19 agreement that the governance issues  
20 are appropriate.

21 THE CHAIR: Further questions,  
22 discussion? All in favor, aye.

23 SENATORS: Aye.

24 THE CHAIR: Opposed, nay. Motion  
25 carries.

0

108

1 BRENNAN: Thank you.

2 THE CHAIR: Thank you. There's a  
3 document in your agenda regarding  
4 the Senate Institutional Finances  
5 and Resources Allocation Committee.  
6 There has been a great deal of  
7 effort both on the Staff Senate and  
8 the Faculty Senate to reword this  
9 document, and we're simply asking  
10 that you approve the change in the  
11 language. Do I have a motion to  
12 that effect? Dr. Jones.

13 JONES: Can the language be put up  
14 there? Do we have that language?

15 THE CHAIR: I don't think we have it,  
16 but it's in your --

17 BROTHERS: Yeah, I can.

18 THE CHAIR: Yes. Okay.

19 CHAPPELL: Man, are we lucky with Sheila  
20 Brothers.

21 THE CHAIR: I think the Chair has noted  
22 on a number of occasions the  
23 importance of Ms. Brothers.

24 BROTHERS: Do you want the track changes

25 version or the easy to read

0

109

1 language?

2 JONES: Let's see (inaudible). After

3 this is the language, right?

4 BROTHERS: Yes. The language "the

5 committee shall be routinely

6 offered," this is the section you're

7 looking for.

8 JONES: Yes. As the Rules Committee

9 Chair, I see this language, "The

10 Senate Committee shall analyze

11 budget documents published, et

12 cetera, and shall be routinely

13 offered in informational session by

14 a university financial officer." We

15 can't compel that. (Inaudible) some

16 language in front of the Senate

17 Council about that. It should say

18 something -- maybe "shall routinely

19 solicit" or something, but we can't

20 by Senate rule compel a financial

21 officer to come here.

22 BROTHERS: Would it be helpful if this

23 returns to the Rules Committee for

24 codification?

25 JONES: That's for the Chair to decide.

0

110

1 THE CHAIR: I think we can make this

2 change, can't we? Could we simply

3 say "shall solicit information"?

02-08-10 UK Senate.txt  
The word will be "and shall" --

4  
5 JONES: "Routinely solicit an  
6 informational session."

7 THE CHAIR: Have you got that? So that  
8 is the wording that we're voting  
9 on. Thank you. Yes, you did send  
10 me an e-mail.

11 NADEL: That would be an amendment to  
12 the motion, so we vote on the  
13 amendment first and then the motion.

14 THE CHAIR: Would you do that for us,  
15 please?

16 NADEL: Would I vote on the amendment  
17 first?

18 THE CHAIR: No, would you propose an  
19 amendment?

20 NADEL: You just did.

21 JONES: Okay. I propose that  
22 amendment.

23 NADEL: Okay. I second.

24 THE CHAIR: Thank you. Was there a  
25 second to the amendment?

111

0  
1 GROSSMAN: He just did.

2 THE CHAIR: All right. I didn't hear.  
3 Any discussion? All in favor, aye.

4 SENATORS: Aye.

5 THE CHAIR: Proposed, nay. So we're  
6 voting on the amended reading. Any  
7 further discussion? All in favor,  
8 aye.

9 SENATORS: Aye.

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0

THE CHAIR: Opposed, nay. Thank you. I think the last page of this thing is simply that we're adjourned.

112

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

STATE OF KENTUCKY)  
COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

I, ROBYN BARRETT, CSR, the undersigned Notary Public in and for the State of Kentucky at Large, certify that the foregoing transcript of the captioned meeting of the University of Kentucky Senate is a true, complete, and accurate transcript of said proceedings as taken down in stenotype by me and later reduced to computer-aided transcription under my direction, and the foregoing is a true record of these proceedings.

I further certify that I am not employed by nor

14 related to any member of the University of Kentucky  
15 Senate and I have no personal interest in any  
16 matter before this Council.

17 My Commission Expires: January 14, 2011.

18 IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my  
19 hand and seal of office on this the 24th day of  
20 March, 2010.

21

22

23

24

25

---

ROBYN BARRETT, CERTIFIED SHORTHAND  
REPORTER, NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE AT  
LARGE, KENTUCKY

