

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE

---

Regular Session

December 9, 2002  
3:00 p.m.

W.T. Young Library  
First Floor Auditorium  
Lexington, Kentucky

Dr. Jeffrey Dembo, Chair

\*\*\*\*\*

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**

FREELANCE COURT REPORTERS & VIDEO SERVICES

STEPHANIE K. SCHLOEMER, PRESIDENT

10 NORTH UPPER STREET

P. O. BOX 85, LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40588

**(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197**

**UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE**  
**December 9, 2002**

e-mail: [ctreport@aol.com](mailto:ctreport@aol.com)

\*\*\*\*\*

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**  
**Stephanie Schloemer, President**  
**(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197**

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE  
December 9, 2002

***JEFFREY DEMBO, CHAIR***

***GIFFORD BLYTON, PARLIAMENTARIAN***

***CELINDA TODD, SECRETARY TO SENATE COUNCIL***

***STEPHANIE K. SCHLOEMER, COURT REPORTER***

-----

***Votes Taken***

**40**

ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.  
Stephanie Schloemer, President  
(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 CHAIR DEMBO: The first order  
2 of business is I'd like to announce a new person we  
3 have working with us in the Senate Council office, Ms.  
4 Angelique Clark. "Angel," she goes by. Raise your  
5 hand, Angel. Angel has had experience working with  
6 this kind of activity and we really welcome her. It's  
7 really nice to have you with us, Angel. We look  
8 forward to you helping us out. And what this means now  
9 is that there will be much less of a workload problem  
10 in the Senate Council office.

11 To that end, I think that all of the  
12 transcripts from Stephanie have been posted on line  
13 now. And I suppose, theoretically, having minutes is  
14 not as critical anymore considering there's a full  
15 transcript, but still it's important to have an  
16 abbreviated version. So, I think that, Cindy,  
17 electronically, the Senators received--

18 MS. TODD: Just from me they  
19 got the October minutes.

20 CHAIR DEMBO: October minutes.  
21 Okay.

22 MS. TODD: Because the  
23 September and November transcripts were already up and  
24 so I wanted to be sure to fill in that gap first.

25 CHAIR DEMBO: Okay, so since  
26 September and November transcripts were on line, the  
27 October minutes were the only things that were  
28 remaining--

29 MS. TODD: Are up. I sent  
30 those to the members of the Senate, last week, I think.

31 CHAIR DEMBO: Okay.

32 MS. TODD: Yeah, I did.

33 CHAIR DEMBO: So we could work  
34 this one of several ways. We could approve the October  
35 minutes now. You could wait until you have a packet of  
36 a whole bunch of minutes in front of you and we could  
37 do that at the next Senate meeting. Any thoughts about  
38 that?

39 MR. TAGAVI: I have not seen  
40 the Senate minutes.

41 CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Why don't  
42 we do this, then. To give everybody a fair chance to  
43 have your say in approving the minutes, why don't we do  
44 them all at the first session of next year. Meanwhile,  
45 the transcripts are up and you can, at your leisure,  
46 review every word that was said by everybody important  
47 here.

48 Next order of business, there are no

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**

**Stephanie Schloemer, President**

**(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197**

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 resolutions, I believe, at this time.

2 Several announcements, the first of  
3 which is related to various ongoing elections, and for  
4 that I'd like to call on the Chair of the Rules and  
5 Elections Committee, Brad Canon.

6 MR. CANON: Well, I think you  
7 all know this. You got the e-mail from Jeff and I, and  
8 maybe you've already voted, but the three candidates  
9 for the faculty seat on the Board of Trustees vacated  
10 by Claire Pomeroy's resignation are Glen Collins in the  
11 College of Agriculture, Brad Devere of the College of  
12 Medicine and Davy Jones of Toxicology and Graduate  
13 School. And the polls are open until a week from  
14 Wednesday, Wednesday the 18th, and at that time we will  
15 count the ballots. There is a -- on the electronic  
16 voting and on the paper ballot, there's room for a  
17 second choice. So the second-choice votes of the  
18 candidate coming in third will then be added to the  
19 first-choice votes of the candidates coming in first  
20 and second. And so we will have a winner. And we'll  
21 send out an announcement about the winner by e-mail, I  
22 presume, the next day or Friday, so that -- and I'm  
23 sure you will all be anxiously waiting.

24 CHAIR DEMBO: Are there any  
25 questions for Brad about how the votes will be tallied  
26 and what the role of picking a second choice is? Has  
27 anybody encountered any difficulty with the second  
28 round of voting?

29 MR. EDGERTON: Jeff, I heard  
30 some comments this noon that suggested that others  
31 besides myself had not been quite sure what to do after  
32 you click that first vote. It's not immediately  
33 obvious how to get to the second vote, and I think I  
34 was hearing comments that some people may have just hit  
35 the little close button after they cast their first  
36 vote, which I think would not have cast a vote.

37 CHAIR DEMBO: That's correct.

38 MR. EDGERTON: So I wonder if  
39 we ought to send out another e-mail just asking people  
40 to check and if there's any question in their mind as  
41 to whether or not they've cast a ballot.

42 CHAIR DEMBO: I queried John  
43 Soherd about that, and he didn't think that there were  
44 many people caught in that problem. So after you click  
45 the button that says "Vote for me" then that takes you  
46 to the second screen where it says in big letters,  
47 "CHOOSE YOUR SECOND-CHOICE CANDIDATE." And then at  
48 that point, you're taken to a third screen where either

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**

**Stephanie Schloemer, President**

**(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197**

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 you have two pictures of different candidates or one  
2 picture and then a sentence that says, I've chosen to  
3 not select a second choice, or something like that.

4 If there are any of your constituents  
5 who are not certain if their votes have registered, all  
6 they need to do is go back to the site, re-enter, and  
7 it will clearly say, you have already voted at such-  
8 and-such a time and date. And if it does let you into  
9 the site, then the vote wasn't recorded properly. So  
10 you may wish to -- and I think what I'll do -- Brad and  
11 I sent out an e-mail, a reminder e-mail last time  
12 several days before the polls were due to close, and it  
13 resulted actually in a flurry of votes. Maybe we  
14 should send out two e-mails and then everybody will  
15 vote.

16 (LAUGHTER)

17 So, perhaps, first thing Monday morning,  
18 I think we'll send that out, and I'll include that  
19 reminder, Lee, just in case there's any uncertainty  
20 about a vote being registered, double check.

21 Thanks.

22 MR. CANON: I've had a couple  
23 of people call or e-mail me who think that their  
24 second-choice vote is going to be counted regardless of  
25 the outcome. And so if somebody asks you about this,  
26 this is not so. The second-choice vote is counted only  
27 if your first choice ends up in third place.

28 MR. TAGAVI: What?

29 MR. CANON: If your candidate  
30 comes in first or second, you don't have a second-  
31 choice vote.

32 CHAIR DEMBO: Did that help?

33 (LAUGHTER)

34 Okay. We have a second election issue.  
35 Professor Canon, if you could help us out with this,  
36 too?

37 MR. CANON: Okay. Well,  
38 there's not too much to say. The ballots haven't gone  
39 out yet.

40 Angel, when do you think they will get  
41 out?

42 MS. CLARK: What do you think?  
43 By tomorrow morning?

44 MS. TODD: Yeah. They're in  
45 the envelopes. They should be out by tomorrow morning.

46 MR. CANON: They're in the  
47 envelopes, probably will go out tomorrow, maybe get  
48 them Wednesday, Wednesday or Thursday?

ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

Stephanie Schloemer, President

(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 CHAIR DEMBO: Before the end  
2 of the week.

3 MR. CANON: These are the  
4 seven people who have been nominated for the Senate  
5 Council. As you know, the first ballot went out before  
6 Thanksgiving, and the deadline is going to be Friday,  
7 the 20th, and we will count the ballots Monday, the  
8 23rd, and e-mail the winners, if they're still in town.  
9 And it is possible -- You have to get a majority to  
10 win, so it is possible that there could be a run-off in  
11 January. I hope not, but we will see.

12 There are three people on the ballot  
13 from Arts & Sciences: Grossman, Lesnaw and Ernie  
14 Yanerella. And only one person from Arts & Sciences  
15 can be elected because A&S already has two people on  
16 the Council, but there was a tie and that's why we have  
17 three people from there.

18 Do you want me to read the votes off?  
19 Kavi got 23 votes; Ernie got 12; Judith Lesnaw got six;  
20 Bob Grossman got six; Pat DeLuca, five; and Mike Cibull  
21 and George Blandford, four. And, once again, you'll  
22 get the paper ballots; you'll have to mail them back.  
23 They'll be due 4:30 on Friday the 20th of December.

24 CHAIR DEMBO: Since this is a  
25 diverse group and you may not know everybody, let's  
26 just take one minute so you can do some face  
27 recognition.

28 Is Professor Blandford here? George?

29 MR. GESUND: He's out of town.

30 CHAIR DEMBO: Is he? Okay.  
31 Professor Cibull, would you please stand up for a  
32 second?

33 (Professor Cibull stands.)

34 CHAIR DEMO: Thanks.

35 Professor DeLuca? Pat, are you here? In the back.

36 (Professor DeLuca stands.)

37 CHAIR DEMBO: Professor  
38 Grossman?

39 (Professor Grossman stands.)

40 CHAIR DEMBO: Professor

41 Lesnaw? Judy?

42 (Not present.)

43 CHAIR DEMBO: Okay.

44 Professor Tagavi?

45 (Professor Tagavi stands.)

46 CHAIR DEMBO: And Professor  
47 Yanerella.

48 (Professor Yanerella stands.)

ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

Stephanie Schloemer, President

(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 CHAIR DEMBO: Excellent.  
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Any reason this  
3 is not being done electronically, also?  
4 CHAIR DEMBO: Trying to juggle  
5 several different things at one time, and it is a much  
6 smaller group so it's a lot easier to do it by hand.  
7 But that's something, perhaps, on our list of things to  
8 do for next time.  
9 I want to make this meeting short and  
10 sweet. The next thing we can do is to have a report  
11 from several different committees. Before we do that,  
12 just one order of helpful information from me. Oh,  
13 announcements -- Sorry.  
14 There's two things I need to announce.  
15 I'm glad I have this. There's a traditional reception  
16 every year held -- sponsored by the Senate to be  
17 arranged at a time after a Board of Trustees meeting.  
18 This is going to be tomorrow at 3:00 in the Alumni --  
19 at 4:00 in the Alumni House. The Board of Trustees is  
20 meeting at 3:00. It's a good time to chat informally  
21 with the Board, even amongst each other. And I think,  
22 I'd like to submit to you that it's also a very good  
23 time to enjoy the holiday spirit together as we look  
24 forward to the next year. So everybody that can make  
25 it, I think it would be well worth your while.  
26 Also, as we discussed last time, now  
27 that Provost Nietzel has been formally appointed, you  
28 felt that it was important to have a session with him  
29 some time before the start of next year. So we've  
30 scheduled an all-faculty forum to be held with Mike on  
31 December 18th here in the Young Library Auditorium.  
32 You should have gotten an e-mail in your boxes by now.  
33 It was sent out to all faculty. It's just going to be  
34 a conversation. We had a very -- the Senate Council  
35 had a very nice breakfast with him several weeks ago.  
36 He has a lot of ideas that he wants to put on the  
37 table. We will no doubt be working with him closely  
38 along the way -- "we," the Senate and, of course, the  
39 Senate Council. So it's a good idea to try to get  
40 together and just to speak informally before we proceed  
41 forward with any new initiatives, plans, changes, what  
42 have you. So if there is a chance to make it, that  
43 would be wonderful. Knowing that it's during finals  
44 week -- which on one hand may be a busy time for some,  
45 but at least you don't have your usual class schedules,  
46 more than likely, and not as much work, perhaps. Or  
47 there may be a whole lot more work. So that's the  
48 other announcement. An e-mail went out for everybody.

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**  
**Stephanie Schloemer, President**  
**(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197**



UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 I just wanted to review one more thing.  
2 I wanted to see if there's general support -- by now,  
3 we've had four Senate meetings and reminders have been  
4 sent to Senators about what the Senate attendance  
5 policies are in the Senate Rules. They're the same,  
6 essentially, for the elected faculty and for the  
7 elected students.

8 And the rules say that a notice will be  
9 sent to the administrative heads of the departments  
10 asking that a new Senator be elected to fill the slot.

11 Is there any major objection to us following the  
12 Senate rules?

13 (LAUGHTER)

14 The only exception that I could think is  
15 that in a number of cases, we have ex-officio members  
16 who are either voting or non-voting, such as the Deans.

17 So they are not truly elected members of the Senate.  
18 Of the faculty and students, we don't have any ex-  
19 officio members, although the President of SGA is  
20 listed in the Senate rules as being an elected Senator.

21 Any comments about this?

22 MR. GROSSMAN: Can we get rid  
23 of a Dean for not coming to Senate meetings?

24 (LAUGHTER)

25 CHAIR DEMBO: Well, if you  
26 will empower me in such a way so that -- it's because  
27 they're ex-officio members.

28 Okay. We have a few committee reports  
29 just to let you know what your colleagues are involved  
30 with these days. The first one is Tony Stoeppel.  
31 Tony, are you here?

32 Tony is co-chair of the Graduation  
33 Contract Committee. I wanted to bring you up to date  
34 with where we are.

35 MR. STOEPPEL: Thank you, Mr.  
36 Chairman.

37 It is with great joy that I can come to  
38 the Senate and talk to you all about the progress that  
39 we've made on the Graduation Contract Committee.

40 First of all, I recently read a book  
41 called Good to Great by Jim Collins, and he talks about  
42 how to make a good business become a great business.  
43 And he said the first thing that you have to do is you  
44 have to have great people. And that's one thing this  
45 Graduation Contract Committee is composed of, really  
46 great people.

47 It is a joy, I know for me and Chairman  
48 Dembo to come to our meetings and talk to the other

ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

Stephanie Schloemer, President

(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 people, and I'd just like to recognize them briefly.  
2 First of all, we have Dr. Ray Forgue; and we have Dr.  
3 Enid Waldhart, Michele Soner, Dr. Jake Gibbs, Dr. Bill  
4 Thom and, of course, Dr. Dembo. Our meetings are very  
5 productive each and every time, and I really learn a  
6 lot myself.

7 Just to give you a brief update of what  
8 we've done since April of last year. Over the summer,  
9 Dr. Dembo and I met with nearly all of the Deans or an  
10 Associate Dean of student instruction for each college  
11 here at UK. We first of all introduced them to the  
12 idea of a Graduation Contract, found out if they had  
13 any questions and tried to resolve any issues that they  
14 might have, and also gain information from them. What  
15 aspects of a Graduation Contract are good for them,  
16 what aspects are not good for them, and maybe we can  
17 tailor to those specific needs. Since that time, the  
18 Committee has drafted a rough draft; and last week we  
19 worked on finalizing it. And I think we're pretty  
20 close to that.

21 The next thing that we are going to do  
22 is take a student survey. Beginning at the first day  
23 of the spring semester, this student survey should be  
24 up on the internet. It's a Web site where students can  
25 go, they can enter their student I.D. in, and then they  
26 can fill out the survey. But folks, this survey is not  
27 just any survey. The survey has 19 questions on it,  
28 and it gets into very specific information where we can  
29 pinpoint problems at this University almost down to the  
30 department or a particular class. The students -- like  
31 I said, there's just so many questions; we can learn so  
32 much information. What we learn from this survey will  
33 not only help the Graduation Contract Committee, but we  
34 can then turn around and use that information to help  
35 the University as a whole.

36 We're attracting students to come and  
37 take the survey by offering prizes. Like I said,  
38 they'll have to give their student I.D. Now, the way  
39 the form is set up, their student I.D. will be on one  
40 side, answers will be on the other; but their student  
41 I.D. and their answers will not be on the same line.  
42 So, there's no way to be able to know what a student  
43 answered for a particular question or set of questions.

44 And so I encourage the faculty, here  
45 particularly, at the beginning of next semester when  
46 you see notices for this around -- and I'm sure  
47 Chairman Dembo wouldn't mind sending an e-mail out.  
48 Encourage your students to take this survey because if

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**

**Stephanie Schloemer, President**

**(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197**

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 a couple of hundred students take this survey, okay, we  
2 can get a lot of good information. But imagine if  
3 several thousand took it. Then we could learn a lot of  
4 things. I hear a lot of administrators and a lot of  
5 faculty say, well, you know the problem on this campus  
6 is this or it's that, but no one has any data about it.

7 We will have data after this survey is taken. So I  
8 encourage the faculty here to please consider that in  
9 the spring semester, to let your students about this  
10 survey. And also remind them of the fact that they  
11 will be eligible for prizes: a digital camera, MP3  
12 player, possibly some tickets, really good tickets to a  
13 UK basketball game.

14 Are there any questions?

15 MR. KRAEMER: Phil Kraemer,  
16 Associate Provost.

17 Tony, there's a rather sobering piece of  
18 news out there from Indiana University about their  
19 inability, with Peoplesoft, to monitor their Graduate  
20 Contract. Will your group consider that issue?

21 MR. STOEPPEL: Yes, we will.  
22 I'm not intimately familiar with that situation, but  
23 when I was briefed about it, I will tell you the  
24 thought that came to my mind was it's pretty sad when  
25 that University has to bend to what the computer can do  
26 instead of the University making the computer bend to  
27 what it wants to do. But, certainly, yes. That was  
28 something that was brought up at our last meeting and  
29 we're going study that more exhaustively before our  
30 next meeting.

31 Any other questions? Yes, sir?

32 MR. STEINER: What is the  
33 charge of your Committee?

34 MR. STOEPPEL: The charge is  
35 to look to see if a graduation contract is conceivable  
36 here at the University of Kentucky, draft such a  
37 proposal, and then bring it before this Senate to  
38 determine if that's something that this body would like  
39 to see at this University.

40 MR. STEINER: What is a  
41 graduation contract?

42 MR. STOEPPEL: A graduation  
43 contract is an agreement between the students and the  
44 University. The student agrees to certain provisions,  
45 such as seeing their advisor once a semester,  
46 completing courses in a specified manner directed by  
47 that department. And if the student follows all of the  
48 provisions of the contract the University has,

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**

**Stephanie Schloemer, President**

**(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197**

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 theoretically, three options. If a student cannot  
2 graduate because courses were not available, the  
3 student can either -- or the department can either  
4 change one particular requirement and allow another  
5 course to fulfill that requirement; they can waive that  
6 requirement entirely; or the department can suggest  
7 that that requirement is so necessary that the  
8 University will pay for that student's tuition for any  
9 semesters longer than what the contract would specify  
10 in order to fulfill that requirement.

11 COURT REPORTER: May I have  
12 your name, please, sir?

13 MR. STEINER: I'm sorry.  
14 Shelly Steiner in Biology.

15 COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

16 MR. YATES: Steve Yates,  
17 Chemistry Department. Obviously, there are going to be  
18 disputes in terms of whether a contract has been  
19 fulfilled by the University or the student.  
20 Presumably, there will be some arbitrary board set up  
21 as part of this?

22 MR. STOEPPEL: We've talked  
23 about that--

24 MR. YATES: Arbitration Board.

25 (LAUGHTER)

26 MR. STOEPPEL: That is one of  
27 the items that the committee still has to resolve.  
28 There are several options there. One, you can make it  
29 the Dean is in control and they say, yes, you're on,  
30 and, no, you're not. And that's the end of it.

31 You could have it set up to where the  
32 Dean or the Department Chair says, yes, you're on, no,  
33 you're not if I say you're not. Then there is this  
34 Appeals Committee that you can go to. That's one of  
35 the things that the committee has to work out in its  
36 final preparation.

37 All right. Thank you all.

38 CHAIR DEMBO: Thank you, Mr.  
39 Stoeppel. Appreciate it. The next item of business,  
40 we have a report also from Professor Chard from the  
41 Academic Organization and Structure Committee.

42 Come on down.

43 (PowerPoint presentation:)

44 MS. CHARD: As many of you  
45 know, we were a little bit concerned with some of the  
46 guideline parameters that the committee was operating  
47 under and so we proposed a couple of changes to the  
48 guidelines for you all to consider.

ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

Stephanie Schloemer, President

(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1                   The first is not here. The first is  
2 actually a time frame. We would like to meet the last  
3 Wednesday, excuse me, Monday of every month prior to  
4 the Senate meeting so that we can review all proposals  
5 and have enough time to get them over to the governing  
6 body to look at, and then over to you. We would then  
7 like to have all proposals coming to us a week prior to  
8 our meeting, which would give us enough time to talk to  
9 Chairs, Deans, faculty members if there were problems  
10 that we saw in those proposals. So those two are not  
11 on this slide.

12                   But this one is the big one. We would  
13 like to strike two sentences out of the guidelines that  
14 were ambiguous, that talked about letters going to  
15 Deans or to Chairs and that those formal letters being  
16 supplied to our committee. We thought that was too  
17 structured, too stringent in terms of forming feedback.

18                   And so this is our proposal, and you can read it. But  
19 it's each faculty member, staff member -- and we  
20 included students here, representative students --  
21 should be invited but not required to provide written  
22 or oral expression of his or her opinion to a  
23 representative source. And we went further here to  
24 define that. We're going to look for evidence of  
25 effective consultation with all impacted faculty, staff  
26 and students, preferably conducted by an elected  
27 official.

28                   We noticed that one of the problems were  
29 a lot of these proposals came through Chairs or they  
30 came through Deans. We're suggesting, actually, that  
31 this information be gathered by a University Senator, a  
32 faculty council, if there is one in that department or  
33 that college, whoever the unit is that's being operated  
34 under, and that they gather the information and provide  
35 us with the feedback. So how do they gather that  
36 information? We really didn't care, other than that  
37 it's obviously comprehensive and, to some extent,  
38 confidential. So it could be through a vote; it could  
39 be through open forums; it could be through e-mails;  
40 however they felt was representative for that  
41 particular guideline proposal.

42                   And then, finally, that that  
43 representative would be asked to supply the committee  
44 with the feedback of was this a unanimous, or  
45 potentially unanimous, approval for this proposal?  
46 Okay?

47                   Any questions on that? Kavi?

48                   MR. TAGAVI: Kavi Tagavi. I

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 just want to make a friendly suggestion.

2 As a Senator for several years and  
3 Senate Council member for several weeks, I often come  
4 to a situation where a proposal is in front of me and I  
5 don't know who has approved this. Sometimes I assume  
6 the worst; sometimes I assume the best. But why should  
7 we assume.

8 What I'd like to suggest is if we could  
9 have a routing sheet of who has approved this and by  
10 that I'm not even implying any faculty should approve  
11 it or not, but rather who approved it, you know, and  
12 where it went through the chain of command. So, if I  
13 -- that's my suggestion, if we could ask for a routing  
14 sheet for each proposal that comes to the Senate.

15 MS. CHARD: Well, I think, you  
16 know, we could go ahead and deal with that now if you  
17 want to deal with that because we wouldn't have to wait  
18 for the committee to meet. If you want to--

19 CHAIR DEMBO: Well, this is at  
20 discussion stage, and so what we can do is have a  
21 formal proposal to the Senate that we can send out as a  
22 formal agenda item and to include that as one of the  
23 items.

24 MS. CHARD: Okay. Are you  
25 okay with that?

26 MR. TAGAVI: Yeah.

27 MS. CHARD: So, we'll add in  
28 a line that perhaps suggests, if the committee agrees,  
29 we'll have a meeting in January. If they agree to add  
30 a line that says a routing sheet -- And I'll throw in  
31 my two cents here: I think that would be helpful  
32 because one of the biggest things that we've had to  
33 deal with -- and we're going to get to this later with  
34 the Pain and Palliative Care -- is that we often don't  
35 know who's been involved and who should have been  
36 involved. And that would probably help out my  
37 committee quite a bit.

38 MR. CIBULL: Mike Cibull. I  
39 guess I have a problem with counting on elected  
40 officials to monitor this process or instigate this  
41 process. There is no staff available to most of us to  
42 do these things; they're time consuming. And it's  
43 really the responsibility of the administrative  
44 supervisor of the unit to document that this has been  
45 done. I think that they should be responsible for  
46 doing it and for documenting that they're doing it.

47 MS. CHARD: I hear you loud  
48 and clear, and I think that was something that took up

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**

**Stephanie Schloemer, President**

**(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197**

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 a great part of our discussion.

2 Our concern was that there are instances  
3 when the administrative official may not have the same  
4 agenda as the faculty members. And that has come up  
5 recently where there may be a Chair or a Dean that  
6 perhaps wants something different than where the large  
7 body is going. And there was concern, especially among  
8 the untenured professors, that they did not feel safe  
9 in talking to that person, submitting e-mails, or even  
10 verbal dialog -- that dissension opinion from where  
11 that Chair or that Dean was going. And that's why we  
12 didn't say it had be an elected official, but we'd at  
13 least like -- if there is something coming from a Dean  
14 or a Chair, we would like to hear that one of the  
15 unbiased elected officials, hopefully, could provide us  
16 with a greater opinion, and maybe it could be both  
17 people.

18 MR. CIBULL: How about the  
19 Senate Council taking on, I mean, taking on this  
20 responsibility. They have the staff; is that correct?  
21 That would be independent of the Dean or Chair.

22 MS. CHARD: We did talk about  
23 putting it back to the Senate. It would slow things  
24 down a little bit because we did mention that in the  
25 committee meeting, that we could require the Senate to.  
26 But what that will do is that will force a vote, and  
27 we did not want to force a vote. There were several  
28 people that felt that voting was only one way to get an  
29 opinion and maybe not the only way. And that by  
30 keeping it this way, you could have open forums for  
31 discussion.

32 And if there's any committee members  
33 that want to jump in here, please feel free to jump in.  
34 I'm summarizing from two months ago here. But we felt  
35 like this would get at different ways and for some of  
36 these areas, there are huge bodies of people where they  
37 don't come together often at all for a vote. Or in  
38 other cases, they are very small bodies of people that  
39 could very quickly be screened through a faculty  
40 Senator to find out if everyone's in unanimity. So we  
41 wanted to be able to sway, depending on whether this  
42 was the creation of a center or the disbanding of an  
43 entire college.

44 MR. TAGAVI: This doesn't come  
45 to -- this doesn't -- there is a happy medium. For  
46 example, in our college, we have an elected council,  
47 but that doesn't mean the college staff is not  
48 available to help the elected council. So there's a

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**

**Stephanie Schloemer, President**

**(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197**

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 happy medium. It could be elected faculty, and it  
2 could be with the help of the college staff.

3 MS. CHARD: That's a good  
4 point.

5 There was somebody else?

6 MS. HARRISON: Anne Harrison,  
7 Health Sciences. I was going to make a similar  
8 statement in that it seems like a key phrase is there  
9 is the representative faculty group. And it seems that  
10 most of us have a group that we could, as the  
11 representative faculty person, go to and say, could you  
12 please take this on because I'm only one person and the  
13 group really needs, you know, a representative group  
14 needs to have a voice here.

15 MS. CHARD: Ernie, did you  
16 want to clarify something?

17 MR. YANERELLA: No, I think it  
18 has been covered.

19 MS. CHARD: Okay.

20 MS. CIBULL: I guess what's  
21 concerning me is that it's certainly not -- it's very  
22 open ended. For instance, for the College of Medicine,  
23 there may be -- I don't know how many Senators there  
24 are in the College of Medicine. Who's to say which one  
25 of those people is expected to do this? They may all  
26 think that the next guy is going to do it, and nobody's  
27 going to do it.

28 MS. CHARD: Good point.

29 MR. YANERALLA: It would be --  
30 I think it is a requirement of making these decisions  
31 to have this process gone through. I think that it  
32 should be the responsibility of that college or unit to  
33 assure that confidentiality and privacy are assured to  
34 the individual faculties members. It's up to them to  
35 design a system that allows a junior faculty to feel  
36 that they can interact. I don't think that this will  
37 be very effective, to be honest with you.

38 MS. CHARD: Ernie?

39 MR. BAILEY: I mean, the issue  
40 is that there's a proposal that's going to be developed  
41 by the administrators, and what this is is addressing  
42 their need to provide faculty input. How do that  
43 represent that? And, so, this is just advising what  
44 they should -- this is a suggestion for them.  
45 Presumably, the faculty would have effective council  
46 who will ask to put this in the lap of the faculty  
47 council to investigate. If there is no faculty  
48 council, then they should ask their Senators that

ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

Stephanie Schloemer, President

(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197



UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 they've got to provide them with some documentation and  
2 they can discuss how to do it. But, it certainly --  
3 this isn't very specific about precisely what has to be  
4 given, but it's a step up because some of the proposals  
5 that come to the group simply have a bald statement.  
6 This has been improved by the faculty of the College  
7 and you have absolutely no idea or confidence that this  
8 actually is true.

9 MS. CHARD: And when we'd go  
10 back and check, we'd find out there was no vote. There  
11 was an open forum that you could e-mail a person, and  
12 then when I talked to individuals I would find that  
13 they said, I didn't feel safe e-mailing that person.  
14 So we hope this is an improvement, by forcing there to  
15 be a representative Senator.

16 MS. WALDHART: I think the  
17 routing statement -- the routing sheet will help a  
18 whole lot because the routing sheet will say which of  
19 these has been used, and the administrator is  
20 responsible for sending the whole thing forward and if  
21 there's a check list that says which of the following  
22 have been used, that's going to answer it.

23 MS. CHARD: Anybody?

24 MR. EDGERTON: It seems to me  
25 most of the conversation deals with alterations to  
26 status, but I notice your guidelines are also for  
27 creation where there might not be an administrative  
28 unit to handle these things. Have you thought about  
29 wording to suggest how the creation of a new unit takes  
30 place in terms of identifying who the faculty members,  
31 staff members and representative students might be in  
32 that case?

33 MS. CHARD: I'm glad you  
34 brought that up, because that's actually something that  
35 I will mention with the Pain and Palliative Care issue,  
36 that that was another problem we had with our committee  
37 is that we don't feel like we even get an opportunity  
38 to look at some of the things we should. And the next  
39 recommendation we have is that the creation of all  
40 centers and institutes run through our committee. That  
41 is currently not in the guidelines anywhere. Centers  
42 and institutes can be created at any time without the  
43 Senate or our committee looking at them. And so we  
44 would like to recommend in these regs that we get to  
45 look at all centers and institutes. And, yes, that  
46 will change a little bit our wording. We'll have to --  
47 if you approve the idea of us doing that, we'll have to  
48 go back into our wording and add that a little bit and

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**

**Stephanie Schloemer, President**

**(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197**

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 suggest that all representative faculty who could be  
2 affected by the creation of the center or institute  
3 need to be contacted. And they'll have to make the  
4 decision about what that means, of course.

5 So, yes, thank you. We agree.

6 CHAIR DEMBO: So this was  
7 presented just as a discussion item. You'll see it as  
8 a formal action item in the spring semester.

9 And since we're talking about this now,  
10 it probably is a good segue to discuss the proposal  
11 that was--

12 Oh, Kate, you had two other activities  
13 that your committees was involved in?

14 MS. CHARD: Yes. These were  
15 very brief and I didn't bring the formal names, but we  
16 did have a suggestion for a name change. We  
17 unanimously approved the name change for the Department  
18 of Family Practice and the Department of Military  
19 Science and forwarded those on.

20 CHAIR DEMBO: And now the  
21 Secretary of the Senate, Professor Waldhart, will  
22 introduce this item for action.  
23 (PowerPoint presentation:)

24 MS. WALDHART: The best thing  
25 with all of the PowerPoint is that I don't have to say  
26 a whole lot. So this is cool.

27 One of the things that has been proposed  
28 here is a new institute, and they followed the  
29 guidelines for centers and institutes in terms of  
30 procedures.

31 This is to focus particularly on  
32 management of acute and chronic pain in both teaching  
33 and clinical service and research programs that are  
34 associated with it. It is to be a multi-disciplinary  
35 center with various connections in the Med Center and  
36 across the University, and it has been approved by the  
37 Senate Council for your consideration.

38 CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Chard?

39 MS. CHARD: We also gave  
40 unanimous approval of this center, but we did have one  
41 -- I don't want to call it a stipulation, but a  
42 comment. We did notice that all of the individuals  
43 that we thought maybe could be involved in this were  
44 not contacted. For example, Oral-Facial Pain, which is  
45 a significant pain center here on campus, from what we  
46 could tell was not contacted in the creation of this  
47 center. And they may have opted out not to be  
48 involved. But I think for something as large as a Pain

ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

Stephanie Schloemer, President

(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 and Palliative Care Center, we probably should have  
2 made sure that this group had been contacted and  
3 involved.

4 And this gets back to Kavi's suggestion,  
5 is that a routing sheet, perhaps, when somebody's  
6 putting forth a proposal would help us a bit because  
7 maybe there are other people in medicine that I'm not  
8 aware of -- or even other disciplines -- that could  
9 have been involved in this center and it would have  
10 helped us to have a routing sheet.

11 CHAIR DEMBO: Chuck, if you  
12 can hold your question one second. With Professor Bill  
13 Witt here, Professor of Anesthesiology, who would be  
14 the Director of this institute once it's established.  
15 And, Bill, would you like to add anything to what's  
16 been said?

17 MR. WITT: Not particularly,  
18 except that Dr. Okeson runs the Facial Pain Clinic, and  
19 he and I have talked on several occasions. And, of  
20 course, you and I have talked about the -- one of the  
21 difficulties and perhaps -- what a great opportunity,  
22 it is also one of the great difficulties in a Pain and  
23 Palliative Institute, and that is that whereas  
24 universities function in a hierarchical fashion going  
25 through departments and so on, the best analogy for  
26 this is that this is a relational database as opposed  
27 to hierarchical. So when you're talking about end-of-  
28 life care, it may be anything from deep brain  
29 stimulation to music therapy. That's a pretty broad  
30 spectrum. And so when it comes to contacting everyone  
31 who could conceivably be involved, this really is the  
32 logical forum with which to do that because it goes  
33 across virtually every area of the University or has  
34 the potential to go across that spectrum, depending  
35 upon levels of interest in different areas.

36 CHAIR DEMBO: Are there any  
37 questions?

38 First, Professor Staben.

39 MR. STABEN: Chuck Staben,  
40 Biology.

41 This is a trivial question, but what's  
42 the difference between an institute and a center? From  
43 one who shepherded a school becoming a department, is  
44 there a difference? Do we have other institutes on  
45 campus?

46 CHAIR DEMBO: We do. And we  
47 have many centers on campus as well. And, in fact,  
48 within this proposal, I think the words were used

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**

**Stephanie Schloemer, President**

**(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197**

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 somewhat interchangeably. So I'm not certain that  
2 there's a difference from what I have seen.

3 If anybody can state further?

4 MS. WALDHART: The regulations  
5 do indicate that they -- it's written for centers or  
6 institutes. So it lumps them together and it doesn't  
7 say particular things for centers and particular things  
8 for institutes. It just seems to be using them  
9 synonymously.

10 MR. STATON: The academic  
11 regulations governing centers?

12 MS. WALDHART: Yeah, the ARs.

13 MR. BAILEY: There's no  
14 definition.

15 MS. WALDHART: Yeah, there  
16 isn't a definition for a "center" or an "institute."  
17 It just uses the words synonymously, so I assume that  
18 one chooses to use one or the other.

19 MR. STATON: Okay.

20 CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Chard?

21 MS. CHARD: We looked into  
22 this because of that exact same issue on the committee  
23 and pulled the ARs, and what we found is that there are  
24 some mild suggestions, though, that institutes perhaps  
25 are broader. They go across perhaps multi-disciplinary  
26 departments and can obtain external funding. Whereas  
27 centers, although they may obtain external funding,  
28 also may just be an internal working unit within, say,  
29 a department. So it seems, although it's not clearly  
30 stated as such, that there is an implied difference in  
31 terms of wit and perhaps monetary values.

32 CHAIR DEMBO: So to that end,  
33 part of what's written in this proposal involves  
34 external funding specifically.

35 MS. CHARD: Exactly.

36 CHAIR DEMBO: Professor  
37 Cibull?

38 MR. CIBULL: I'm glad you put  
39 up that slide.

40 The clinical revenue that's generated  
41 now probably goes back to the department that the  
42 people are in. For instance, anesthesiology would be  
43 my guess for most of it. Where is it going to go once  
44 this institute is established? Where does the clinical  
45 revenue go?

46 MR. WITT: There would be a  
47 different practice plan written for that. Right now,  
48 the only clinical revenue coming in, at least through

ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

Stephanie Schloemer, President

(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 the department where I am appointed, is through my  
2 department, the Oral-Facial Pain Program. The revenue  
3 goes through that program in the Department of  
4 Medicine. Individuals working in Headache and so on,  
5 it goes through the Department of Medicine.

6 To a certain extent, and I think it's a  
7 fair commentary, is that this is something that is in  
8 the process of being developed, and it is a not a top-  
9 down hierarchical kind of situation where myself or any  
10 other person is in charge in that sense. This has less  
11 to do with a common financial stream than it has to do  
12 with a common educational stream, and a flow for  
13 patients.

14 It may be that there is no need to  
15 change individual financial centers, or it may mean  
16 that there is a need to do that. This is something  
17 that's new, but there is a plan. And in talking this  
18 over with Dr. Wilson, anyway, there is plan to develop  
19 a separate financial plan for revenues that would be  
20 appropriate to track in that fashion and with the  
21 consent of the people involved.

22 MR. CIBULL: Would they go  
23 through KMSF and would they be taxed by the Dean like  
24 all the other clinical revenues?

25 MR. WITT: The Dean had sent  
26 me a note asking me to be here at this meeting to  
27 answer questions. And that's a question that's  
28 probably better asked to the Dean. I don't know how  
29 that would develop.

30 MR. CIBULL: The reason I ask  
31 is, I mean, I don't know that KMSF has discussed this  
32 at all. In fact, I'm sure they haven't because I'm on  
33 the KMSF Board. But the clinical revenue generally  
34 flows in sort of a very defined way. That doesn't seem  
35 to be the case, from what you are saying here. I mean  
36 it goes back to the department that the person is a  
37 member of. I presume that the people in the institute  
38 would retain their memberships in the various  
39 departments. Is that correct?

40 MR. WITT: Yes. And  
41 conceivably what you could do, and it depends to a  
42 certain extent on how much interest people have. But I  
43 have circumstances right now, for example, where  
44 perhaps a neurosurgeon has an interest in pain but it  
45 is not that person's entire career. So I can see, for  
46 example, let's say that Dr. Young wants to bring a  
47 neurosurgeon to town and the neurosurgeon says I've got  
48 an interest in pain and I'd like to do this particular

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**

**Stephanie Schloemer, President**

**(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197**

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 aspect of it, and he may or may not have a need for  
2 that in his department structure. Well, conceivably,  
3 the institute could pick up ten percent of a salary, or  
4 something like, that for time spent in an inter-  
5 disciplinary pain program. So you could have some  
6 revenue sharing in that fashion. But I think that  
7 really can be worked out because, to a large extent,  
8 it's going to depend on who's involved and how much  
9 interest there is in various areas.

10 I obviously hope that it becomes an all-  
11 consuming passion for a whole lot of faculty members as  
12 it is for me.

13 CHAIR DEMBO: Other comments?

14 MR. TAGAVI: Yeah. By no  
15 means I am speaking against this. In fact, this being  
16 the Pain Institute, I might end up with a research  
17 project.

18 (LAUGHTER)

19 But what I'd like to know is if anybody  
20 from the College of Medicine could tell us if this was  
21 approved or discussed by the college faculty. This  
22 relates to the earlier comment.

23 CHAIR DEMBO: Would any  
24 College of Medicine Senators like to respond to that?

25 MR. CIBULL: Yeah. I'm a  
26 Senator and I haven't heard anything about it. But it  
27 would be the faculty council that probably would have  
28 discussed this. And was it brought before the faculty  
29 council?

30 MR. WITT: I don't know if it  
31 was or not. Again, as I mentioned in opening comments,  
32 the nature of this is such that to get all concerned  
33 people to comment would really be most appropriate in  
34 this organization. And I suspect that that is why the  
35 Dean brought it here. I passed this off to the Dean of  
36 the College of Medicine as a proposal and then he asked  
37 me to be here to answer questions.

38 MR. CIBULL: Is this a  
39 discussion item or are we supposed to vote on this?

40 CHAIR DEMBO: This is a  
41 potential action item.

42 MS. DUKE: Mary Duke. I'm  
43 just speaking against -- I'm with the College of  
44 Medicine.

45 This is the first I've heard it, like  
46 with Dr. Cibull, but I'm not on the faculty council so  
47 I might have missed it if it was brought there. I  
48 noticed that there was a comment about student and

ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

Stephanie Schloemer, President

(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 resident education as it pertains to this institute,  
2 somewhere in there. There you go, "provide teaching  
3 and clinical training." There is a Committee for  
4 Medical Education, Graduate Medical Education. As far  
5 as the residents are concerned, there is a body that  
6 wants to see all new educational endeavors, if they  
7 will have any impact on residents' educations. I do  
8 sit on that committee, and they never saw it as well.

9 MR. WITT: Well, I should  
10 actually comment on that because there is a fellowship  
11 program that I direct in which is the only method to  
12 obtain Board certification in pain management, and that  
13 is represented on the Graduate Medical Education  
14 Committee.

15 MS. DUKE: Okay. So it went  
16 through those channels then.

17 MR. WITT: Yeah.

18 MS. DUKE: Okay.

19 MS. NASH: Phyllis Nash.  
20 Medical Center Academic Council has not seen this  
21 proposal and has not approved it.

22 CHAIR DEMBO: Professor  
23 Randall?

24 MR. RANDALL: Yes. I am on  
25 faculty council of the College of Medicine, and I am  
26 virtually certain it has not been seen by faculty  
27 council. I think it would be appropriate to see it.

28 CHAIR DEMBO: Any other  
29 comments? Yes?

30 MS. DWYER: Roberta Dwyer from  
31 the College of Agriculture.

32 Is the motion on the floor to vote on  
33 this, or can we place a motion to have this tabled  
34 until the College of Medicine knows about it?  
35 (LAUGHTER)

36 CHAIR DEMBO: It was placed on  
37 the floor by the Senate Council as an agenda item with  
38 a positive recommendation. But you, the Senate, can  
39 vote to do whatever you want with it.

40 So, yes, that's one of the options, is  
41 to--

42 MS. DWYER: Well, I'd like to  
43 make a **MOTION** to table this action item until we get  
44 some more comprehensive feedback from the College of  
45 Medicine and the College of Dentistry and other allied  
46 professions as to their comments about this as to--

47 MR. GESUND: **SECOND.**

48 CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Do you

ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

Stephanie Schloemer, President

(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 want to be any more specific about the type of input or  
2 feedback you want?

3 MS. DWYER: All input and  
4 feedback.  
5 (LAUGHTER)

6 I can't imagine that it would be that  
7 hard to put this institute information in an e-mail to  
8 all the faculty of the logical places it should go:  
9 the Medical Center, the School of Dentistry, et cetera,  
10 and solicit feedback.

11 CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Comments  
12 about the motion?

13 MR. GESUND: Hans Gesund,  
14 Engineering.

15 I'm Chairman of the Engineering Faculty  
16 Advisory Council. We would want to have this sort of  
17 thing come to us, and we would be perfectly happy and  
18 able to collect faculty information from the entire  
19 college.

20 We do have all the administrative  
21 support we could possibly need. So we could do this if  
22 something like this came up in the College of  
23 Engineering.

24 MR. CIBULL: Yeah, but we're  
25 not -- hopefully, we won't be sending this to the  
26 College of Engineering -- (laughter) -- although they  
27 may do a better job.

28 At the minimum, I think it ought to go  
29 to the faculty council; it ought to go to KMSF; it  
30 ought to go to the Academic Council of the Medical  
31 Center; it ought to go to the Curriculum Committee of  
32 the Medical Center; it ought to be reviewed by the  
33 Research Advisory Committee. I mean, those are the  
34 kind of people who ought to have input considering  
35 their mission that's stated there.

36 CHAIR DEMBO: Did you have a  
37 comment on that?

38 MS. CHARD: I just want to add  
39 to him, just that when Nietzel in the past has created  
40 centers, he sends them to all centers directors. And  
41 one thing you could to get at that is send, like they  
42 do usually, to all current center directors.

43 MS. STATEN: Ruth Staten,  
44 College of Nursing.

45 I got the impression that, although this  
46 was in the College of Medicine, there was some interest  
47 in it being interdisciplinary. So it might be useful  
48 to at least ask the College of Nursing.

ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

Stephanie Schloemer, President

(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197



UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 MR. BLYTON: The motion is to  
2 lay it on the table. You don't the discuss the motion  
3 to lay on the table; you vote on it.  
4 CHAIRMAN: Okay.  
5 MR. BLYTON: And then what  
6 they're talking about is not relative as to whether it  
7 should be laid on the table. And that doesn't require  
8 any discussion, so I call for a vote.  
9 CHAIR DEMBO: (Uses gavel.)  
10 (LAUGHTER)  
11 CHAIR DEMBO: We shall vote  
12 on the motion to lay this on the table.  
13 All in favor, please raise your hands.  
14 (HAND VOTE TAKEN: MAJORITY)  
15 CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. All  
16 opposed, please raise your hands.  
17 (HAND VOTE TAKEN: ONE "NAY")  
18 CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. There's  
19 one opposed. So, we have correctly laid this on the  
20 table now.  
21 MR. BLYTON: It's the same  
22 thing as postponing it.  
23 CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. But we  
24 have some guidance as to what to do with it.  
25 MR. BLYTON: Yeah.  
26 CHAIR DEMBO: Thank you very  
27 much.  
28 With regards to -- So for now, then, we  
29 will leave this aside.  
30 MR. BLYTON: Right.  
31 MS. TODD: I think the rules,  
32 I know the rules require that you give a date certain  
33 as to when you bring it back. So you need to get a--  
34 CHAIR DEMBO: So to postpone  
35 definitely. So the next Senate meeting is February  
36 10th, I believe, the second Monday of February. So  
37 there should be plenty of time. Do you think that --  
38 Michael, Bill?  
39 MR. CIBULL: I don't think  
40 they would have enough. Bill, do you?  
41 MR. WITT: To be perfectly  
42 honest about it, I don't know. This was something that  
43 I had suggested. The Dean had said that he would take  
44 it forward from here and being that it was  
45 interdisciplinary -- or is interdisciplinary, of  
46 necessity, I'm assuming that that's the reason that he  
47 brought it to this group.  
48 I mean, it would be a -- literally it

ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

Stephanie Schloemer, President  
(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 involves, or potentially involves, every area of the  
2 University so how best to handle that, I don't know,  
3 and in the preamble that was presented on the Senate  
4 Rules, it was clear that that was not clear. (Audience  
5 laughter.) So however you wish to do that is fine with  
6 me. I'm here to answer questions about it

7 CHAIR DEMBO: Bill, is there  
8 any time contingency that you will not be able to get  
9 this approved if we don't do it by a certain date?

10 MR. WITT: I'm not aware that  
11 there's any particular deadline. There is a  
12 substantial amount of industry support. I've had the  
13 chief executive officer of a major corporation visit  
14 Lexington and interview with a number of people that  
15 are currently involved with the pain program with  
16 interest in some ongoing activities. So it's one of  
17 those things where it's an opportunity where the market  
18 is huge, and somebody else can jump in there or we can  
19 jump in there. So I think it should be done as soon as  
20 possible because I think there are tremendous  
21 opportunities here. I don't only think there are; I  
22 know there are. But to give you a date on a calendar,  
23 I'm not aware of any particular deadline.

24 CHAIR DEMBO: Okay.  
25 Ernie did you have a comment?

26 MR. YANERELLA: No.

27 CHAIR DEMBO: Okay.

28 Well, given that it came forward with  
29 Senate Council approval anyway, that means that it  
30 probably would not have to go through the Council  
31 again. We'll probably review it, but it won't hold it  
32 up, so we'll get it back at the first available date.  
33 We can say, probably -- how about by the second Senate  
34 meeting, that's pretty reasonable, the second Senate  
35 meeting of the spring semester.

36 Okay, thanks.

37 Since you reminded me about protocol,  
38 I'm continuing to learn. At the last meeting in  
39 November, there were a few comments made about a vote  
40 that we had on an amendment to the resolution we were  
41 putting forward. And because there was some concern  
42 about whether the vote was eyeballed correctly, then  
43 from now on if there is any vote that's especially  
44 important or controversial, we will do a hand count.  
45 And as a reminder, Professor Blyton, any member of the  
46 Senate is able to request a hand count as well, at any  
47 time?

48 MR. BLYTON: Yes.

ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

Stephanie Schloemer, President

(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 CHAIR DEMBO: Okay, just to  
2 make sure.

3 I have a few pieces of good news for  
4 you; some actually excellent news.

5 The first is that we had a very  
6 productive meeting with President Todd a few Mondays  
7 ago at the Senate Council. One of the things most  
8 notably was his extending to us the notion that we, as  
9 a Senate, will have full power to review anything  
10 coming forward from the Med Center Task Force on the  
11 Provost model, which was a concern in the back of some  
12 minds as to whether it would be something handled  
13 purely by administration or whether we, the faculty,  
14 would have some say in it because it does represent  
15 academic reorganization, five colleges reporting to the  
16 provost instead of to a senior vice president and  
17 Chancellor of the Medical Center. So it was a very  
18 productive conversation, I think, and he, in fact,  
19 emphasized that several times to us. So we all took  
20 that to be very good news and perhaps we're all going  
21 to be walking more closely together now.

22 Also some good news. We had two  
23 meetings with Vice Presidents of the Administration,  
24 Nancy Ray and Connie Ray, to discuss various  
25 administrative regulations. Also very productive  
26 meetings, a lot of give-and-take, and they were very  
27 open in soliciting input from the Senate Council and  
28 some of the ARs. And some of them were not very  
29 controversial: changing names from the Vice President  
30 of Research and Graduate Studies to the Vice President  
31 for Research and things like that.

32 There was one item that came up that we  
33 had a nice discussion about, and that's going to be on  
34 the Board agenda for tomorrow. That is, as a faculty,  
35 you can elect to do phased retirement where essentially  
36 you work half time. And the proposal from  
37 administration was to make the rule more liberal, to  
38 lower the age for somebody who wants to do phased  
39 retirement. And so the proposal is to lower it to age  
40 60 and you can do it for a term of up to five years.

41 The other wording that was changed was  
42 that the final approval will rest with the Provost,  
43 whereas it used to be with the President; and that the  
44 faculty, of course, will still be eligible for post-  
45 retirement appointments. That doesn't affect it at  
46 all. And there were several faculty who actually e-  
47 mailed me wondering where this was going. So, again, I  
48 thought it a very positive conversation.

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**

**Stephanie Schloemer, President**

**(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197**

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1                   Connie Ray also has sent a query for  
2 names of faculty, and I'll send an e-mail out to  
3 everybody as I did before. She's putting together a  
4 committee to review and revise the ARs governing the  
5 evaluation of chief administrative officers, which I  
6 think is a very important one and it will be important  
7 to get good faculty input. So I'll send around an e-  
8 mail to all Senators, as before, asking that you talk  
9 it amongst your colleagues and see whose names you  
10 might want to put forward.

11                   Finally, I think we have Senate Council  
12 members -- Any other announcements that I've left out?

13                   Because our last discussion item is from Associate  
14 Provost Phil Kraemer regarding USP and the writing  
15 requirement. (No response.)

16                   MR. KRAEMER: Thank you. Good  
17 afternoon. I'll be very brief.

18                   I want to talk about a proposal to  
19 change our writing requirement. It's part of a general  
20 education program affectionately referred to as  
21 University Studies Program. This comes to you by  
22 virtue of the University Studies Program Committee, but  
23 I will tell you at the outset that we are introducing  
24 this, really, still as an idea; we're still looking for  
25 much feedback. And as you will see when we talk about  
26 the process, there's going to be much opportunity for  
27 you to review this and to provide that kind of  
28 feedback.

29 (PowerPoint presentation:)

30                   Let me try to put this in a context that  
31 is a little broader. This aphorism has a contemporary  
32 flair to it but, no, it's not President Todd, nor  
33 Gordon Davies, nor even Davy Jones. (Audience  
34 laughter.) This has a little older history to it. And  
35 the point is to encourage us all, as a faculty, to take  
36 advantage of this aspiration that we have and to  
37 consider all of the opportunities to engage in reform;  
38 and certainly to include in that how we've worked with  
39 our undergraduates. The basic point would be that  
40 change is really inherent in certain organizations, and  
41 I think higher education change needs to be a defining  
42 attribute of what we do.

43                   So when we consider this change, as well  
44 as other changes I hope to be bringing to you in the  
45 near future, I would like you to consider the inherent  
46 value in change and how it makes our institution  
47 richer, but also take advantage of this Top 20  
48 aspiration. I think there are two important elements

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**

**Stephanie Schloemer, President**

**(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197**

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 here. One is, I think we have to recognize that if  
2 we're going to be a better research university, we're  
3 going to have to express excellence in all of our  
4 missions. That certainly means we're going to have to  
5 improve what we do with undergraduates and how we  
6 integrate these missions. But I think there's another  
7 side to that Top 20 aspiration, and that is that  
8 there's an opportunity to think of doing things  
9 differently in a way that will actually improve the  
10 undergraduate mission, but also have a positive impact  
11 on scholarship by creating a sense of energy and  
12 perhaps more talent.

13 And the basis for that claim is the  
14 Boyer Report. If you have not seen nor read the Boyer  
15 Report, I encourage you all to look at this document.  
16 I think there's a grand opportunity here, perhaps not  
17 to implement all that this report offers, but to look  
18 at it as a guiding framework. I was at a national  
19 meeting three weeks ago held by the Reinvention Center  
20 that's at Stoneybrook, New York. This organization is  
21 meant to follow up on Boyer. They're looking to see  
22 what research universities are doing; what has been the  
23 response. And this first-ever convention was focused  
24 on undergraduate research. And most of the  
25 universities there are doing something in this area.  
26 But I can tell you that there's great opportunity  
27 because not many of them are doing much else that Boyer  
28 suggested. And I've always thought that for the  
29 University of Kentucky, with this aspiration -- here's  
30 a grand opportunity for us to get out there and make  
31 some national noise by doing something quite  
32 provocative.

33 The approach that Boyer offers is that  
34 we change the way we teach undergraduates, put an  
35 emphasis on guiding learning rather than continuing to  
36 engage in that passive kind of pedagogy. We have to  
37 look at the way we do lecture and present to our  
38 students and think of changing our curriculum. I think  
39 we have to seriously look at what we're doing within  
40 each of our programs, and ask some important questions.  
41 How much is enough? There are ways, I think, to trim  
42 the general curriculum, decrease the quantity of  
43 courses yet increase the quality of what we do. But I  
44 think that's a conversation that needs to begin to  
45 occur at all levels: colleges and certainly  
46 departments and programs. I think we need to emphasize  
47 our strengths. This is a research university. The  
48 more we can engage our undergraduates in the research

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**

**Stephanie Schloemer, President**

**(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197**

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 enterprise and core-based learning, I think the  
2 stronger off we're going to be.

3 I think we're also a land grant  
4 institution that needs to take greater advantage of  
5 experiential education, ways that we could end up  
6 creating fewer courses to teach and yet still provide  
7 more opportunities for students to learn. I think it  
8 is not a license for dumbing it down. I think what  
9 we're really looking at here is raising the  
10 expectations of our undergraduates; raise the  
11 performance levels; ask more of our students and by so  
12 doing, we actually provide more. Using technology  
13 effectively is something that I think we haven't really  
14 embraced. Grand opportunities here.

15 And the point that really pertains to  
16 the proposal I'm about to describe is that we need to  
17 integrate some of our skill-based objectives,  
18 especially in the undergraduate, general education  
19 curriculum, and integrate general education with our  
20 programs.

21 These are the ten recommendations that  
22 Boyer offers. The bolded recommendation is the one  
23 that's most pertinent to the proposal I want to talk  
24 about, so I will quickly go to that. Here is the  
25 proposal.

26 First of all, in terms of process, this  
27 proposal really emanates from 1998. The Swift Report  
28 had a specific recommendation to consider combining the  
29 writing and oral communication skills course, and when  
30 I first became Dean, I met with Communication and  
31 English, and at that time that did not seem feasible.

32 The second thing that occurred was that  
33 the USP Committee began to look at our benchmarks, and  
34 we noticed that most of our benchmarks were doing more  
35 with respect to writing than we were. So rather than  
36 just accept that inability to combine the two courses,  
37 we needed to do something with respect to writing, so I  
38 formed an ad hoc committee in 2001. I will show you  
39 the committee members in a moment. They worked very  
40 diligently to come up with an alternative to what we  
41 do. They presented that to the USP Committee in 2002,  
42 last spring. The committee voted and approved their  
43 general recommendation, and we vented that proposal  
44 through the English Department this last fall.

45 The plan would actually be to circulate  
46 a formal proposal, perhaps by January, perhaps by  
47 February, to get Senate approval by the spring before  
48 the spring semester ends, and then we would be looking

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**

**Stephanie Schloemer, President**

**(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197**

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 to implement in a realistic fashion no earlier than  
2 fall 2004.

3                   These are members of the Committee. And  
4 Janet is here; I appreciate your presence. Janet was  
5 very instrumental in helping this idea gain momentum.  
6 This Web site -- Will this be on the minutes, Jeff?

7                   CHAIR DEMBO: Yes, we can put  
8 it there.

9                   MR. KRAEMER: --that  
10 circulates, because I encourage you to look at this Web  
11 site. It has a lot of detailed information that's  
12 pertinent to this general idea and much more than I'm  
13 giving you today.

14                   This is what we currently have. Our  
15 first-year students come in and take either 101 and  
16 102, or with a sufficiently high ACT score -- I think  
17 29. Is that right, Janet?

18                   MS. ELDRED: It's on that Web  
19 site.

20                   MR. KRAEMER: Excuse me. I  
21 think it's 29. They go into 105 or they complete the  
22 Honors Program, which is a four-course sequence that  
23 satisfies the writing requirement. There is no upper  
24 division requirement right now.

25                   This is a new proposal, to go from 101  
26 and 102 to a one-course, basic skill, 105. It would be  
27 writing plus; more than we currently include in English  
28 101; four credits. And then the real guts of the  
29 proposal is to add two writing-intensive courses in the  
30 upper curriculum. We would have to deal with the LCC  
31 transfer and the transfer of other students as well.  
32 LCC may want to revise and develop a similar program.  
33 We need support to help faculty better manage this  
34 program. We do expect that there are a lot of courses  
35 already that would count, so we are not talking about  
36 inventing many new courses; most already exist. Any  
37 resource implications would have to be seriously  
38 considered. We cannot threaten the -- I'm dry as a  
39 bone. Sorry. I've got a sore throat, and this is --  
40 Where's that Pain Center when you need it? (Audience  
41 laughter.)

42                   We cannot threaten the English  
43 Department with losing TAs. They may work differently;  
44 they may do different things. We would have to set the  
45 criteria for the new courses. This is up for  
46 consideration. This is where we want your feedback.  
47 We want to hear back from you whether this would be  
48 enough. We probably need a separate committee to

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**

**Stephanie Schloemer, President**

**(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197**

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 actually administer this, perhaps some portion of USP,  
2 or a smaller group.

3 This is what is up for consideration:  
4 number and type of courses -- maybe not two; maybe  
5 three or four. Do we retain English 101 and 102 at all  
6 for some students? Remediation is always a topic, but  
7 I suggest it's one that we not consider here for this.

8 And that is all. I will deal with any  
9 questions you have. Janet is also here.

10 CHAIR DEMBO: Janet, why don't  
11 you stand up and see what you'd like to add to that.

12 COURT REPORTER: May I have  
13 your last name, please?

14 MS. ELDRED: Eldred.

15 E-l-d-r-e-d, and I'm Director of the  
16 writing program right now, and I'm in the English  
17 Department.

18 Okay, where to start? First of all,  
19 what we need to know right now is that we do English  
20 101 and English 102 for most all students. There are  
21 two really interesting parts of that. One is that at  
22 the end we do assessment now as part of the  
23 accreditation, and we've learned some interesting  
24 things through the assessment. One of the things we've  
25 learned through the assessment is that students say  
26 they write differently for English than they write for  
27 other courses. So that when we talk to them about the  
28 process they go through, they say, when I write a paper  
29 for English, that's how I write. When I write for some  
30 place else, I don't worry about that, because they just  
31 want to know about my ideas, which always, you know,  
32 makes my stomach cramp. (Audience laughter.) So while  
33 that's probably not true, you probably do wish you got  
34 papers where they worried more about how they were  
35 writing. Their perception is that that's not the case,  
36 so there's a real separation right now. I hear from  
37 colleagues and they say these people can't write, and I  
38 hear from students, "they don't care if I can write or  
39 not." And I think that comes from having a program  
40 where you have a shot in the arm. Right? You get  
41 through English 101; you get through English 102; they  
42 are taught largely by graduate students, most of whom  
43 who have just graduated with the "A" in English.  
44 Right? They're a little older than the students coming  
45 in. They get their shot in the arm and they go  
46 forward. That's one thing.

47 The other thing we know is that writing  
48 improves with practice, and so they've actually done a

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**

**Stephanie Schloemer, President**

**(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197**



UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 study of Law School students, Law School students who  
2 write fairly well going in. They're History majors;  
3 they're Political Science majors; they're English  
4 majors; they're *better than the average bear* with  
5 language. At the end of their Law School training,  
6 they're ability to write has actually decreased. It's  
7 gotten worse. (Audience laughter.) Because they  
8 spent most of their time reading and they write little  
9 exams at the end, but they haven't practiced. So that  
10 we know that writing improves with practice.

11 We know how well we're doing right now  
12 in English 101 and 102, and we wish it were better.  
13 It's not great by our own assessment, that is by the  
14 people who teach the course. We find that somewhere,  
15 45 percent of the papers are not what we would consider  
16 passing work or competent work. So that's an issue.  
17 So when you are thinking about changing, thinking, "Oh,  
18 My God, if we change the world will fall apart," we  
19 might start by thinking that the world's not all that  
20 put together-- (Audience laughter) --to begin with,  
21 that we need to go somewhere.

22 But I would like to say that grammar  
23 comes to the forefront. Only about ten percent of  
24 those papers fail because of grammar. Something like  
25 48 percent fail because they're not generating a thesis  
26 that's workable. Right? So the idea is stuck, which  
27 is an argument for linking it, two ideas.

28 So for those reasons, I think the change  
29 is necessary. One, to reinforce to students going  
30 through that it's not a shot in the arm that you do as  
31 a freshman taught by a first-year instructor, but that  
32 it's something that you work through your whole college  
33 career, that you have to have a commitment to writing  
34 and to get better at it. You have to care about it.  
35 If you don't care about your writing and your  
36 instructor doesn't care about your writing, it won't  
37 get any better.

38 And I think those are the kinds of  
39 things that we can put in place with a change like  
40 this. I could say that our bench marks are doing it,  
41 but my mother would say, if everyone else is jumping  
42 off a cliff, would you go too? (Audience laughter.)  
43 But our benchmarks are doing it and so we are behind in  
44 that.

45 MR. KRAEMER: One other point  
46 that's -- another reform idea that's being, I think, a  
47 momentum on our campus is the idea of a Capstone  
48 course, some senior-level courses. Courses like that

ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

Stephanie Schloemer, President

(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 would be ideal for writing-intensive. Many programs  
2 have a senior honors thesis, and there may be a modest  
3 course attached to that. That would be another good  
4 example.

5 So I don't think we're looking at the  
6 situation where we have to invent or create a brand new  
7 category, writing-intensive courses. They're already  
8 there. Some programs already naturally do this; but  
9 there are some programs that they don't. And I think  
10 students need much more writing. And you look at what  
11 individuals are telling us about our graduates,  
12 whatever their profession, including graduate school  
13 applicants, it's the need to have more writing  
14 experience.

15 Now, you may look at the 101, 102 -- how  
16 their shrinking that down to one basic-skills course.  
17 But it's not the pure quality of instruction; it's the  
18 kind, the fact that it is distributed temporally, so  
19 you have some instruction early on. But you also have  
20 more instruction within the major or other courses  
21 later on, and I think that opportunity to get students  
22 to write about things that they're learning about is  
23 also an advantage to this. So what may look to be as  
24 shrinking, I think is really, in terms of quality, not.  
25 It's better instruction, potentially.

26 Bob?

27 MR. GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman,  
28 Chemistry.

29 One thing that I would urge you to maybe  
30 look at is that if you are truly serious about  
31 encouraging departments across the University to  
32 introduce more writing into their courses, you also  
33 need ways of getting teaching assistant resources into  
34 those.

35 I say this from experience. I have been  
36 requiring an essay in my organic chemistry class, and  
37 many of the students get very upset because you're not  
38 supposed to write in chemistry classes. But, I do it  
39 anyway, and I end up grading them all myself because I  
40 don't trust the TAs, most of whom are Indian or  
41 Chinese, to grade them, and I don't think it's fair to  
42 the students. I also have no training in this. I  
43 mean, I wrote a lot when I was an undergraduate, and  
44 that was it. But I think this is the sort of thing you  
45 have in mind, is getting more of these things -- this  
46 idea of mine has been incorporated into one other  
47 chemistry course that I know of. But none of my other  
48 organic chemistry colleagues are doing this either and

ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

Stephanie Schloemer, President

(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 in large part, it is the work-load issue. So--  
2 MR. KRAEMER: We've talked  
3 about this support a lot. I mean, we have something  
4 running across the curriculum here. I think we need to  
5 reinstate that, and then expand upon what it once was  
6 for just that reason. And I think that's where, if  
7 there was any kind of savings with TA support in the  
8 English department, those TAs may do something  
9 different.

10 Janet, you're shaking your head no  
11 because they're already overworked.

12 MS. ELDRED: No, well, it's  
13 adjuncts too. Right? We employ, I think it's  
14 something like 40 adjunct instructors, who each teach  
15 three courses. So just shrinking it down really cuts  
16 your adjunct pool, but it doesn't cut your teaching  
17 assistant pool.

18 MR. KRAEMER: So we would have  
19 to really upgrade the support for writing across the  
20 curriculum, and that's almost necessary as part of  
21 this, as far as I see it.

22 MS. STATON: This is just for  
23 clarification. Ruth Staton, College of Nursing.

24 The upper-division writing-intensive  
25 courses, are you seeing that many of those would  
26 already be in courses taught by a particular college  
27 and there would be some kind of--

28 MR. KRAEMER: Well, I think  
29 there would be an opportunity for them to be in any of  
30 the undergraduate colleges, but many of the courses  
31 that already exist -- I think the history department  
32 has many courses in the upper level. So--

33 MS. ELDRED: The  
34 recommendation has -- actually, right now, it's a two-  
35 and-two; one inside the major and one outside. I think  
36 that's right now what it is.

37 CHAIR DEMBO: Jim?

38 MR. ALBISETTI: Jim Albisetti,  
39 History department.

40 Since when were 200 level courses upper  
41 division?

42 MR. KRAEMER: So you'd like  
43 them 300 and 400?

44 MR. ALBISETTI: Or you're  
45 simply saying sophomore year, but upper division has  
46 usually been considered 300 level and above.

47 MS. ELDRED: 200 and above is  
48 what we put, in part, I think, so that there's

ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

Stephanie Schloemer, President

(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 Political Science and History courses and English  
2 courses at the 200 level that are very writing-  
3 intensive, but that once you get to the 300 level in  
4 History or Political Science or English, it might  
5 require specialized training in those fields to do well  
6 in those courses. So I think that was the reason for  
7 the 200 level.

8 MR. KRAEMER: That's where  
9 we'd like to get feedback on these issues. There was  
10 some suggestion that we include other 100-level  
11 courses. One idea pertained to the Freshman Discovery  
12 Seminar. Some individuals have spoken to me about  
13 wanting to make some of those courses more writing-  
14 intensive, and we had some debate about the 200 level,  
15 in fact, originally thinking that it should only be 300  
16 and 400 levels. That's where we'd like to get the  
17 feedback, and the goal would be to take whatever  
18 feedback we get back to the USP Committee, hopefully  
19 the first meeting in February, and then be able to  
20 bring to the Senate a very explicit proposal and to  
21 provide that in written form to all members of the  
22 Senate so that we could make a decision this next  
23 spring.

24 MS. PRIDE-WELLS: Michaele  
25 Pride-Wells in Architecture.

26 I just wanted to know how we get those  
27 comments to you. I know our History and Theory faculty  
28 will be very interested.

29 MR. KRAEMER: That's a good  
30 one. I will somehow work with Jeff to send out an  
31 address -- We'll try to put this on the undergraduate  
32 education Web site, and I think we can do that. And if  
33 I can then send that notice to all the Senators... So  
34 I will have to tell you how to send me comments.

35 I'm inspired that you are looking for a  
36 way, so I will find a way to do that.

37 MR. BAXTER: Tony Baxter,  
38 Computer Science.

39 I noticed this is another example of a  
40 trend of increasing credit hours, and I'm wondering  
41 what the impact of that is. Mathematics' first course  
42 is now five hours, Chemistry is five hours, and English  
43 is now four; so we're at a three-course load for an  
44 incoming freshman. Is this trend continuing elsewhere  
45 or have you seen that and how's that going to impact  
46 the whole number of courses that kids take? Is it  
47 going to push them down into the three-course, three-  
48 or four-course scenario? Is that ...

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**

**Stephanie Schloemer, President**

**(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197**

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 MR. KRAEMER: I mean, that's a  
2 good question, and I don't know.

3 MR. BAXTER: I'm not against  
4 the proposal. It's just is an observation that over  
5 time, these things seem to having been expanded.

6 MR. KRAEMER: I think the  
7 thought in terms of Janet's committee, it was necessary  
8 to expand that course a bit and, therefore, it could do  
9 more things. I don't know what it really could mean.  
10 And as you raise that question, it's also important for  
11 us to consider if we talk about tuition differently,  
12 per credit. Tuition is a topic the Provost might talk  
13 about. There are real implications to that. What  
14 defines a full-time student? I, personally, would  
15 rather have them take fewer courses and focus on the  
16 quality within the programs, as well as just the first  
17 year.

18 MS. ARTHUR: Mary Arthur,  
19 Forestry.

20 I have what I think is a related  
21 question, and maybe I'm just not quite understanding  
22 the implementation here. But it seems to me that what  
23 we need, at least in Forestry, is for writing to occur  
24 throughout our curriculum. So I'm sort of wondering if  
25 there's some way that this could be implemented such  
26 that we look at, you know, each major may look at the  
27 curriculum that they have and ask, okay, do we have  
28 some courses that are already doing this and can we  
29 make this more official and provide support to faculty  
30 for doing it better. I would sure be happy to see  
31 that. But, also, what would be preferable to me, as  
32 someone who instructs a junior-level course with a ton  
33 of writing in it that the students really resent --  
34 (audience laughter) -- is if they saw, you know, if  
35 they already had a requirement for writing truly across  
36 the curriculum, so they'd already been doing some  
37 writing-intensive in their junior year in the  
38 curriculum and now this wasn't a big surprise, and  
39 they're in their sophomore year and it wasn't a big  
40 surprise when it came to their junior year, and they  
41 would get to the Capstone already having those skills.

42 I don't want to teach Capstone courses to write. I  
43 want them to already have those skills.

44 MR. KRAEMER: Well, your point  
45 is well taken. I would hope that all of the  
46 departments would look at this. And I think the  
47 challenge is different. I'm looking at my Biology  
48 colleagues here with a number of majors and the kind of

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**

**Stephanie Schloemer, President**

**(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197**

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 curriculum. It isn't an even problem, so I think for  
2 departments to work through those discussions and to  
3 see where possible to really exploit this idea. I  
4 think those will enrich those programs and that is the  
5 "sell" to students.

6 Surprisingly, there was a modest  
7 endorsement to this idea that came through the Kernel  
8 editorial. I saw that a couple of months ago. They  
9 had heard of this proposal and the idea that we're  
10 asking them to write more and they like that. I think  
11 they're seeing that this helps them with the challenges  
12 they face when they graduate. That's a very  
13 encouraging sign.

14 (Crowd outcry and laughter)

15 CHAIR DEMBO: Just as an  
16 aside, there's an already existing Senate Rule in  
17 Section 4 that's called "Acceptable Standards in  
18 English," so that any instructor on campus has the  
19 right to grade somebody on their use of English. It  
20 has to be in the syllabus, of course, if that's one of  
21 expectations. But I think we're talking  
22 philosophically about how to really implement this.

23 MS. ELDEREN: That's just  
24 urging people to really raise the bar. And when you  
25 get something that's a mess, just to say it's a mess,  
26 you know, this isn't it and, you know, to pull up that  
27 Senate Rule and to say you've got to do this  
28 differently.

29 MS. NEAL: Rebecca Neal with  
30 the Kernel.

31 I took English 105, and I have to admit  
32 that no paper I ever wrote for that class ties into  
33 either of my majors. I did not learn anything from  
34 there that I could take into my professional field or  
35 my academic field. So I wanted to ask if these  
36 writing-intensive classes, are they going to be geared  
37 toward a career field so the student can say, oh, look,  
38 I can use this in other classes as well, or is it just  
39 going to be more general writing that they feel is a  
40 time waste?

41 MR. KRAEMER: No. I would  
42 think and hope that we're talking about meaningful  
43 writing within the program. So imagine that it's a  
44 Sociology program and there is a writing-intensive  
45 course that department's going to sponsor, that that  
46 writing is pertinent to what it means to be trained as  
47 a sociologist. I think that's partly the real  
48 advantage of putting writing out as not just a basic

ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

Stephanie Schloemer, President

(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 skill that you conquer in that first year, but a skill  
2 that you're developing throughout your tenure here as a  
3 student.

4 MR. BRAUN: Michael Braun,  
5 College of Fine Arts.

6 I guess I'm a little bit -- For the  
7 class, if they take 105 and then they have to take at  
8 least two 200-level writing courses, would this be like  
9 with USP where all of these courses would be identified  
10 and they'd all be listed out?

11 MR. KRAEMER: I think we want  
12 to identify the courses that would count and somehow  
13 indicate that in the curriculum. Other universities  
14 that do this simply list all their courses with some  
15 modest symbol identifying them as writing-intensive.  
16 But they would be identified.

17 MR. STATEN: Phil, Chuck  
18 Staten from Biology.

19 You know, I'm all in favor of writing,  
20 but I think we have to be very cautious in how we do  
21 this. I'm hearing the reasonable proposal that you  
22 have a basic writing course and then a writing course  
23 within the major and, perhaps, a writing course outside  
24 the major. That sounds very reasonable. But, you  
25 know, we're looking at 1,000 majors in Biology.  
26 Computer Science has, what, 500 Tony, roughly?

27 MR. BAXTER: Somewhere between  
28 five and six [hundred].

29 MR. STATEN: Okay. And if you  
30 all volunteer to guide the writing in there, then maybe  
31 we can do that. But if not, we are not able to  
32 discharge that burden very readily.

33 I used to do a writing assignment that's  
34 probably something like the Organic Chemistry one Bob  
35 does in my Genetics class, and I probably was crazy --  
36 most of you know that I am -- to do that, and my  
37 colleagues certainly thought I was absolutely out of my  
38 mind to do a two-page term paper assignment for the  
39 students in that core course.

40 It's very difficult.

41 MR. KRAEMER: I don't think  
42 you'd be looking for any requirement that each and  
43 every program develop this. That would be the hope.  
44 But the reality may be that that doesn't happen. So it  
45 wouldn't be the case that all the Biology majors would  
46 need to do that, but there may be some courses that you  
47 teach somewhere along the line.

48 But the other point is that we ought to

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**

**Stephanie Schloemer, President**

**(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197**

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 think about a curriculum that really is good and worthy  
2 of a Top 20 research university and then put that on  
3 the platter for, perhaps, that Provost discussion.

4 We need resources to do things well.  
5 He'll love me for saying that.  
6 (Audience laughter.)

7 MR. GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman  
8 again.

9 In terms of defining writing, Physical  
10 Chemistry Laboratory requires these very large and  
11 elaborate lab reports. Would that count towards  
12 writing or not?

13 MR. KRAEMER: I wouldn't even  
14 begin to try to answer that kind of question. I think  
15 that we have specified the criteria and that there  
16 would be a committee that would evaluate that. So I  
17 think we'd want it to be serious writing. So the idea  
18 of drafts is important.

19 Janet, you may want to speak more to  
20 that.

21 MS. ELDEREN: Yeah. I mean,  
22 we talked about it being formal writing and I know that  
23 got tied up in the USP -- just trying to decide on that  
24 discussion -- 20 to 25 percent of the courses in formal  
25 writing that went through draft where you got some sort  
26 of feedback.

27 But part of the reason for the one  
28 inside and the one out is that we really do want people  
29 at the end of their careers to be able to write a  
30 chemistry lab report if that's what they're going to be  
31 doing, but also to be able to write something else  
32 under the assumption that they're going to be citizens  
33 of their communities in their worlds. And that was  
34 part of the one reason in or one reason out. I think  
35 it would have to be Chemistry's decision inside the  
36 major to say, this is the most appropriate kind of  
37 writing for our majors. This is the kind of thing they  
38 need to do well. And if that's the kind of writing  
39 your students need to develop, it makes sense that the  
40 course inside the major would be had. Right? But,  
41 you'd also want them to be able to do something else,  
42 but that should be handled somewhere else. Right? On  
43 campus.

44 MS. ROUHIER: Jeanmarie  
45 Rouhier, Russian and Eastern Studies.

46 COURT REPORTER: Pardon?

47 MS. ROUHIER: Jeanmarie  
48 Rouhier, Russian and Eastern Studies. I have two

ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

Stephanie Schloemer, President

(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197



UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 comments.

2 First of all, the issue of credit hours  
3 seems actually lowered because instead of doing two  
4 three-credit sequences, they'd be doing one four-credit  
5 from an English perspective.

6 MS. ELDEREN: First year, but  
7 then there's two others, but that could satisfy--

8 MS. ROUHIER: Yes, but they  
9 could be doing [unintelligible] or whatever. It  
10 doesn't seem to me that it's increased. But I have a  
11 concern here. Yeah. I have a concern about the ten  
12 pages, because I have writing-intensive courses, but I  
13 never have requirements on length, and so it's very  
14 difficult to -- My philosophy is that you can't put  
15 requirements on length. Some people write 15-page  
16 papers easily, some do five pages and do a very  
17 incredible job. So it's tricky if your going to be  
18 saying ten pages, plus I'm really not sure that ten  
19 pages--

20 MS. ELDEREN: I think it was  
21 total and it was trying to get at a notion of, for  
22 example, people said, do journals count? And we said,  
23 no, because they're not formal. You know, would this  
24 count, would that? So we're trying to look at, you  
25 know -- But it would be silly, for example, for  
26 Journalism students to do ten pages, right, because  
27 they don't write -- that's not -- but it might not be  
28 silly for them to do ten columns.

29 MS. ROUHIER: Okay.

30 MR. KRAEMER: That's where we  
31 want the feedback, those kinds of issues.

32 MR. CIBULL: I think several  
33 people touched upon resources. I mean, a lot of this  
34 sounds like an unfunded mandate for a lot of  
35 departments. I think that when you bring this back as  
36 a formal proposal, you really do need to address the  
37 impact on resources and the impact also on the length  
38 of time that the students are going to at the  
39 University of Kentucky.

40 I think they're already having trouble  
41 finishing their major in four years. Any added  
42 requirements -- and I don't know that these are added  
43 requirements -- may prolong that. They may be added in  
44 that they can't do the course that they need to do in  
45 the year they have to do it. So that may be a problem.  
46 And when you have writing-intensive courses, you can't  
47 have 1,000 people in the class. They have to be  
48 smaller classes.

ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

Stephanie Schloemer, President

(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 Do we have the faculty to teach that?  
2 And who's going to grade those papers, as you brought  
3 -- as someone brought up. If you have people who are  
4 not proficient in English grading the papers, it  
5 actually might act in the exact opposite way we think  
6 it's going to act. It may discourage people from  
7 writing rather than encourage them.

8 MS. ELDEREN: I think the  
9 weight of the question is what "proficiency" means.  
10 For example, when you were saying you were grading the  
11 chemistry lab reports, I could argue you're a better  
12 person to grade that report than I am. I mean, I can  
13 do the sentence level.

14 MR. GROSSMAN: I think what  
15 Mike was referring to was the Indian and Chinese TAs.

16 MS. ELDEREN: Although for  
17 many Indian TAs, English is their first language and  
18 they write better than some students. I think you're--

19 MR. CIBULL: I'm not speaking  
20 about any specific group of people. But there are  
21 certainly people who are not very proficient in English  
22 who are very proficient in the profession that they  
23 have chosen.

24 MR. ELDEREN: And you don't  
25 want that. I mean, that's a given.

26 MR. CIBULL: But they may be  
27 the people who are grading.

28 MR. GROSS: Yeah, Don Gross,  
29 Political Science.

30 Yeah, I'd like to go again with the  
31 resources, because I think that's a real fundamental  
32 problem. I mean, I have writing in most of my upper  
33 level classes, and over time I'm actually decreasing it  
34 because as resources decrease, as the class sizes start  
35 going from 20 to 30 to 40 to 50 -- and so, you're own  
36 work level decreases. And I think, in addition, you  
37 really have to have some of these course decisions  
38 before you come up with a proposal because we used to  
39 have this cross-disciplinary requirement, and it died  
40 because students could never find the courses that they  
41 needed. And so you really have to have guaranteed not  
42 only the fact that we want to do it, but there are  
43 going to be enough courses out there that students can  
44 take those other two courses.

45 MR. KRAEMER: Ernie?

46 MR. YANERELLA: Ernie  
47 Yanerella. We've talked about this issue in other  
48 committees. This has to do with faculty workshops and

ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

Stephanie Schloemer, President

(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 faculty development. One of the best padagotchial  
2 experiences I had was when I was involved with the  
3 modern studies program and when people like Janet and  
4 others came in and gave us mini-workshops on how we  
5 could introduce writing assignments more into these  
6 five-credit-hour courses.

7 We learned all kinds of tricks that were  
8 very helpful, and one of the -- some of the things that  
9 have spilled over from that particular experience to my  
10 courses have involved those particular lessons. What  
11 kinds of criteria are appropriate? What sorts of  
12 standards do you communicate to your students? It's  
13 not enough that you know what is good writing; it's  
14 also that they have a clear notion of what's good  
15 writing and what's bad writing and what your  
16 expectations are. I think all of that is going to have  
17 to take place over a period of time through some very  
18 formalized efforts at faculty workshops.

19 MR. STEINER: Have you  
20 evaluated the USP requirements in writing? I mean, do  
21 you have any way of evaluating the impact of these  
22 requirements, the USP requirements, for instance?  
23 We've had them for many years. What is the impact of  
24 that?

25 MR. KRAEMER: We did. We've  
26 been collecting assessment data pretty seriously for  
27 three, four years where we cull our writing samples  
28 from, I think, all the courses, and we've set up a  
29 committee that's going to evaluate those according to  
30 the criteria.

31 Janet, I think, has spoken to that we're  
32 a little disappointed with what we're finding in terms  
33 of how well they're performing. So this is in part  
34 meant to address the need to improve the quality of the  
35 way our students write before they leave.

36 MS. ELDEREN: We also really  
37 talked about integrating the library in, because right  
38 now in English 101 and 102, we try to do -- we're  
39 responsible for doing discipline-specific research.  
40 And as the librarians will tell you, they go through  
41 all those databases and they've read through them, but  
42 the students don't need it at the time. And it's just,  
43 you know, they're kind of like -- This is one of the  
44 things we want to do is have consultations with  
45 librarians, as well, to help people introduce the  
46 library more effectively at a better point in the  
47 student's career.

48 MR. KRAEMER: One last point.

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**

**Stephanie Schloemer, President**

**(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197**

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

December 9, 2002

1 Jeff looks like he's ready to close shop.

2 But this issue of resources, it's  
3 important for us really to look at and not simply,  
4 "give us more resources." We've got to really look at  
5 accountability in what we're doing. I mean, we have a  
6 number of problems that really are a resource drain in  
7 terms of students dropping classes, for example.  
8 That's a waste of a space when a student drops a class  
9 by mid-term. We have huge numbers in some areas where  
10 that occurs. Students engage in course shopping, like  
11 signing up for 21 hours, and knowing that they will  
12 reduce that down.

13 So this resource issue is a very  
14 complicated problem that we really need to look at  
15 broadly and certainly within programs, the number of  
16 courses that we're requiring for some of our majors.  
17 So it's not just that students have -- If a student is  
18 doing the right thing, they get through this  
19 institution in four years in any of our majors.

20 MR. CIBULL: Primarily, by the  
21 time they go through, they do that. But they're  
22 students and they don't know that--

23 MR. KRAEMER: And that's  
24 part-- We have to do a better job of really educating  
25 them on what is necessary to progress through the  
26 institution. But students can even change majors a  
27 couple of times and still get through. But not across  
28 the board.

29 But I encourage -- That's for us all to  
30 deal with, this issue of how we're using our current  
31 set of resources. Thank you.

32 CHAIR DEMBO: Thanks very  
33 much, Phil.

34 I think in the conversation that we have  
35 with Provost Nietzel next Wednesday, he may put this in  
36 the bigger perspective of where we are right now with  
37 resources, and the questions are very good ones.  
38 That's the benefit of having a discussion prior to any  
39 proposal coming onto the floor.

40 So remember, tomorrow is the Board of  
41 Trustees reception.

42 Next Wednesday is the conversation with  
43 the Provost, voting for Senate Council elections.

44 Hardest, happy holidays to you and your  
45 loved ones.

46 Thank you, very much.

=====

(MEETING CONCLUDED AT 4:35 P.M.)

ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

Stephanie Schloemer, President

(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197

**UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE**  
**December 9, 2002**

=====

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**  
**Stephanie Schloemer, President**  
**(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197**

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE  
December 9, 2002

C E R T I F I C A T E

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY     )  
  )  
COUNTY OF FAYETTE            )

I, STEPHANIE K. SCHLOEMER, a Court Reporter and Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Kentucky, whose commission as such will not expire until June 25, 2004, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is a true, complete and accurate transcript of the captioned proceedings, as taken down verbatim by me at the time, place and for the purposes stated herein. I further certify that I am not related to nor employed by any of the participants herein and that I have no personal interest in the outcome of these proceedings.

WITNESS my hand on this the \_\_\_\_ day of  
January 2003.

---

STEPHANIE K. SCHLOEMER

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**  
**Stephanie Schloemer, President**  
**(859) 233-9272   (800) 882-3197**