

Senate Council Meeting
April 23, 2007

The Senate Council met at 3 pm on Monday, April 23, 2007 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Kaveh A. Tagavi called the meeting to order at 3:03 pm. The Chair offered his apologies for there being no minutes ready for approval; he explained that the conduction of the faculty trustee election was taking up a lot of time. He added that the three finalists were Richard Clayton, Ernie Yanarella and Dave Watt. A brief discussion on the election followed.

The Chair reported that Piascik let the Office of the Senate Council know that she would be absent; Wood and Yanarella would be late; and Dembo might be late or absent. In order to accommodate an invited guest, the Chair proposed that agenda item number two be addressed before additional announcements. There were no objections.

All those present introduced themselves.

2. Change to Engineering Standing Requirement

The Chair said that when the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SA&ASC) reviewed the proposal to revise the requirements for Engineering or Computer Science (CS) standing, it raised a question about the existing requirements for individual programs in the College of Engineering (CoE); the SA&ASC wondered if the differences in individual programs' requirements were part of the proposal. The Chair verified that the individual requirements were not. He invited College of Engineering Associate Dean for Administration and Academic Affairs Donn Hancher to offer additional information.

Guest Hancher said that during a recent accreditation visit, some criticisms were leveled at the CoE's lack of consistency among programs on their requirements for lower level students to qualify for upper division standing earlier in their career. He said that there were several meetings with CoE faculty and it was ultimately decided that a 2.5 GPA would be the maximum required for Engineering standing, in all CoE programs. The Chair added that the proposal was approved by all relevant councils and committee.

The Chair clarified for Finkel that the descriptions of the Engineering standing requirements were the implementation of the changes that were being proposed. Hancher said that specific requirements were needed for each program. Randall asked if a 2.5 GPA was too low – he asked how it compared to other schools. Hancher said that it was not all that low; he noted that the GPA was a reflection of only three semesters of such subjects as math, chemistry, physics and a few

engineering courses. He said the proposal was a response to a desire for more successful engineering students. The Chair added that the GPA was for those courses only, not any electives.

Grabau asked about the maximum GPA. He said that the end of section b. in Item 2 implied that a higher GPA could be requested, but said he thought the problem had been fluctuating (higher) GPA requirements in the programs. Hancher clarified that currently, only Mechanical Engineering (ME) (due to very large enrollments) could request a higher GPA requirement. If the dean allowed, ME could require a 2.6, etc. Other programs were looking for students, so the 2.5 GPA was sufficient for their purposes. He confirmed for Grabau that it was a sort of balancing act within the college. Hancher said that a student might have to switch to their second choice for a program; he said it was also an effort to encourage students to go to where they were likely to be successful. While the GPA could be raised, it could also be lowered if the number of students admitted was decreasing.

Finkel and Michael offered suggestions for clarifying the intent of the proposal, all of which Hancher accepted:

1. Change the second sentence of Item 2, section b. to read: "...request a raise in the GPA requirement¹ with....";
2. Change the last ("Note") sentence of the first paragraph of the Bulletin description to read, "...average includes all listed college-level....," and
3. Change the first sentence of the Civil Engineering description in the Bulletin description to read, "...of 2.5 in these ~~core~~ classes and a C or better in each of them listed courses as well as 45...."

Finkel confirmed for Lesnaw that the intent of "cumulative" as it pertained to the discussion had switched from being a reference to all courses taken thus far, to being for a set of courses unique to each department. None of the references to cumulative GPAs were to imply a true GPA, which included foreign languages and other electives. In response to Lesnaw, the Chair said that the first and second sentences of the description of the GPAs required by Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering were for the GPA for the first 35 hours of course work and the GPA for the listed courses, respectively.

There being no further substantial discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion to send the proposal for revising the Engineering standing requirements (with the three (3) suggestions, above) to the Senate with a positive recommendation, to be effective in fall 2007. The motion **passed** with six in favor and one abstaining.

4. [Open Engineering Major](#)

Hancher said that many students disliked having to make an immediate choice of which program in CoE to enter immediately upon arriving on campus as freshmen; many wanted a semester or a year in which to think about it because

¹ Underline formatting used to show inserted text.

once a program was chosen, the student's curricular plan was cemented. After discussions with CoE faculty, it was decided that freshmen students could put off choosing a program for one semester, after which a student had to decide. Currently, students were required to be immediately assigned to a department/program in CoE.

In response to Lesnaw, Hancher confirmed that the curriculum of the first semester was such that a student utilizing the open major would be able to move into any department, although it was possible a class might have been missed and would need to be taken later.

Finkel offered some suggestions for changing the wording to Item 1, section a., all of which Hancher accepted:

- Change the first sentence to read, "or Pre-SC Students are ~~would be~~ allowed to choose....;" and
- Removal of the last sentence. ("Many new....a program.")

Hancher confirmed for Grabau that every Engineering program had a unique UK 101-type course, for the same number of credits, except that ME offered their 101 course for three credits, due to the required laboratory. Grabau asked about the benefit in trying more than one CoE 101 course. Hancher said that he thought it was very beneficial and he preferred the one-credit-hour 101 courses.

Provost's Liaison Greissman suggested that if the numbers of general engineering students swelled, it could be beneficial to offer a 101 course that would be a composite of CoE programs. Hancher replied that the dean was considering a general 101 course for all CoE students.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion to send the proposal for creating a general Engineering major (with the two (2) suggestions, above) to the Senate with a positive recommendation, to be effective in fall 2007. The motion **passed** unanimously.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair then turned to the announcements. He said that a nomination was needed for a Senate Council (SC) representative to the President's Commission on Women (PCW), who would serve a term of July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2009. He added that Mitzi Schumacher (from the College of Medicine, Department of Behavioral Science) had been elected as the new chair. The Chair also said the PCW met on the third Friday of the month. Two nominations were offered and it was decided that a final decision would be made on the SC listserv.

With regard to the Academic Ombud, the Chair explained that the current Ombud, Joel Lee, was interested in being reappointed. He shared an email from the University Appeals Board Chair Joe Fink in support of Lee's reappointment.

Randall **moved** to endorse the reappointment of Joel Lee. Lesnaw **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

4. [Three-Year Pilot for Change to Course Withdrawal Deadline \(freshmen only\)](#)

The Chair offered some background information on the proposal to create a three-year pilot to change the course withdrawal deadline for freshmen. The College of Arts and Sciences (A&S) put through a proposal to increase (for all undergraduates) the time to the withdrawal date from eight weeks and three days to 11 weeks and three days, an increase of three weeks. The proposal passed through most of the necessary bodies, but would not likely be approved by a committee review prior to the May 7 special Senate meeting. The presentation by Provost Subbaswamy at the April 9 Senate meeting touched on the Provost's concentration on the six-year graduation rate; as a result of his attention to the matter, he believed the proposal would be beneficial. After a query about approving the proposal outside of the normal approval processes and his reply that such a proposal required full and patient review, the Chair then suggested to the Provost that there be a three-year pilot for extending by three weeks the course withdrawal deadlines for freshmen. The Chair explained that the supporting documentation from A&S included a description of a benchmark's practice of having different withdrawal dates for freshmen. (Wood arrived at this point.)

The Chair added that the proposal also included a requirement that a withdrawal at the later date had to be preceded by advising from a professional advisor. If the SC approved, it would go to the Senate on May 7. He said it would be a three-year pilot for freshmen only. The proposal came from Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Phil Kraemer and through consultation with Chair Tagavi.

Lesnaw said that if approved, an effort would need to be made to prevent professors and advisors from advising students to sign up for extra courses just in case one or another course was not to the student's liking. The Chair replied that in those situations, the suggestion was for the student to drop the course during add/drop, not wait until dropping the course meant earning a W grade.

In response to Grabau, the Chair explained that the language in the memorandum from Kraemer suggesting the Chair could approve a rule change was an inadvertent inaccuracy. Grabau noted that the memorandum did not include any reference to how it would help with six-year graduation rates to allow freshmen to withdraw later in the course. He expressed concern that the proposal was being rushed through without all aspects having been thought out.

The Chair said that he would request a revised rationale from Kraemer. Greissman commented that the current *SR* state that faculty who taught lower division courses must provide formal feedback before the deadline to withdraw, but the language was vague enough that many students did not receive

substantial feedback. The practice in the College of Arts and Sciences (A&S) of giving midterm grades was great feedback to students. Greissman also supported consultation with an advisor so the student could sit down with someone and have an honest talk about a low grade and what could be done.

Thelin shared that the University of California, Berkeley's solution was firmer advising so students would not make unreasonable aspirations in their course choices. He noted that an extended withdrawal deadline would also prevent other students from enrolling or adding. Although the proposal could positively affect retention and good self-selection, he cautioned about some unintended consequences.

Randall **moved** that the SC forward to the Senate the proposal (with a positive recommendation, to be effective fall 2007) that to improve retention and six-year graduation rates, the course withdrawal deadline should be extended by three weeks for freshmen only, with the following four (4) stipulations:

1. The course withdrawal deadline extension will only apply to first-year students who are enrolled full-time for the first time at UK in or after fall 2007;
2. The course withdrawal deadline extension will be for a three-year pilot period;
3. Eligible students must have the approval of an advisor in order to withdraw after the official mid-term date; and
4. Appropriate persons will report back to the Senate Council yearly on the success of this three-year pilot extension of the withdrawal date.

Finkel **seconded**. Finkel clarified that the motion would allow first-year students to withdraw from courses up to the 11th week for a W. Wood asked about the three-week extension – she noted that mid-term grades needed to be submitted before the withdrawal deadline. Wood added that the extension would push the withdrawal period into the second week of November.

Greissman said that part of the rationale was making sure there was sufficient time for the student to see the grade and visit an advisor; he explained that the time period of three weeks was part of the pilot – it might need to be changed. The Chair noted that in the benchmark survey conducted for the original proposal from A&S, almost all benchmarks had a longer withdrawal period than UK's.

After additional comments, the Chair explained that the original proposal from A&S was an extension of the withdrawal deadline for all students, which explained why the Graduate Council also reviewed the proposal. The original proposal still needed to go to the Health Care Colleges Council (HCCC) for

review, but the HCCC review would not be completed until after the May 7 special Senate meeting, hence the revised three-year pilot proposal.

A **vote** was taken on the motion that the SC forward to the Senate the proposal (with a positive recommendation, to be effective fall 2007) that to improve retention and six-year graduation rates, the course withdrawal deadline should be extended by three weeks for freshmen only, with the following four (4) stipulations:

1. The course withdrawal deadline extension will only apply to first-year students who are enrolled full-time for the first time at UK in or after fall 2007;
2. The course withdrawal deadline extension will be for a three-year pilot period;
3. Eligible students must have the approval of an advisor in order to withdraw after the official mid-term date; and
4. Appropriate persons will report back to the Senate Council yearly on the success of this three-year pilot extension of the withdrawal date.

The motion **passed** unanimously.

Those present at the meeting introduced themselves for the benefit of SC members and guests, alike.

[5. Graduate Center for Nutritional Sciences \(Move of the GCNS from Graduate School to College of Medicine\)](#)

The Chair reminded SC members that at the previous meeting, the SC voted to review the move of the Graduate Center for Nutritional Sciences (GCNS) from the Graduate School (GS) to the College of Medicine (COM) without review by the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAO&SC), to hopefully be able to send the move proposal to the Senate for review at the special session on May 7. He noted that the agreement to review the move included the stipulation that at the end of discussion, the SC could vote to accept, reject or send the move proposal to the SAO&SC for review. (Yanarella entered the meeting at this point.) The Chair invited Graduate School Dean Jeannine Blackwell to offer background information on the proposal.

Guest Blackwell said that the proposed move had been under discussion for years, since the beginning of both her and College of Medicine Dean Jay Perman's tenures as deans. It was customary for researchers in the GCNS to collaborate with colleagues in the cardiovascular sciences and other COM individuals. Two other multidisciplinary groups moved from the GS under Dean Blackwell's tenure – Gerontology moved to the College of Public Health and the Graduate Center for Toxicology (GCT) moved to COM. The GCT was still a

multidisciplinary center in COM, but also has the responsibility and structure of a COM department. The GCNS would be part of the academic structure in COM and participate in the integrated biomedical sciences group that had a shared first-year curriculum, in which students rotated through before choosing a doctoral program. Like GCT, GCNS would have a parallel track for admission into Nutritional Sciences for a doctoral track. Dean Blackwell said that changes to the Nutritional Sciences (NS) doctoral degree program would come later, after consideration by the GC. The first discussions on the move began in 2003 – the core faculty in NS and affiliated faculty and active participants had been considering the move actively for over a year. She invited Dean Perman to add to her overview.

Guest Perman thanked the SC for putting the move of the GCNS onto an agenda quickly and expressed appreciation for the willingness to review the proposal without SAO&SC review. Dean Perman related that when he was interviewed for the COM dean position, he understood that the move was a possibility. Today and for probably the last several decades, nutrition was recognized as central to the treatment of chronic diseases and central to health maintenance. On the other hand, American medical schools were notoriously deficient in placing nutrition at the level of other departmental-based areas. Dean Perman said that when physicians and medical students took standardized exams, they tended to do poorly on nutrition issues.

Perman said that when he was interviewed and hired, he was told that the move of the GCNS was under consideration, but was not expected to occur quickly. He made it clear that if hired, the move of the GCNS would definitely be a future discussion item and that associated, necessary resources were to be put aside for the eventual move. Any cost associated with the move was to be part of Perman's recruitment. Currently, the GCNS remained very competitive for external funding. If the GCNS moved, not only would it be an important research entity, but would also, from the COM perspective, be a department of human nutrition.

Dean Blackwell noted that the GCNS was very interdisciplinary, with extended faculty all over the campus. The proposed move also included a memo of understanding with the College of Agriculture (COA) so that faculty in the COA's Department of Animal and Food Sciences and Department of Nutrition and Food Sciences would retain their roles and participation in the GCNS.

Guest GCNS Director Lisa Cassis explained that there were currently seven core faculty with primary appointments in the GCNS; three faculty cost-shared with COA, who had a secondary appointment in the GCNS; 50 faculty with primary appointments in COM; and about 20-25 students in the terminal master's degree and about the same number in the doctoral program. As time passed, the GCNS began to focus on nutrition and chronic diseases and continued to evolve – the GCNS recently renewed its NIH T-32 training grant in oxidative stress and

received NIH funding for obesity research. In September 2005, the GCNS core faculty deliberated over the long-term future of the GCNS and decided that the COM was the best location for a programmatic fit in terms of the graduate program and contributions to the medical professional curriculum. Nutrition courses were moved into the second year of the doctoral curriculum.

In response to Finkel, Cassis answered that there were no letters from the College of Public Health (CPH) because there were currently no formal relationships with that college. The CPH was considering adding nutrition aspects in the future, but there were no immediate plans on doing so. Dean Blackwell added that the majority of the outreach occurred in the Department of Nutrition and Food Science (School of Human Environmental Sciences, COA), which explained the partnership with COA. Cassis said that the bulk of students being trained were in COM and COA in the clinical nutrition units and with basic science researchers in nutrition. A future collaboration with CPH was possible, but was not overly applicable at the present time.

In response to Thelin, Perman said that future hires would be both MDs and PhDs. Cassis said that if PhDs were hired, they would likely have backgrounds in nutrition and nutrition sciences, perhaps some in the area of endocrinology to accommodate obesity/diabetes aspects. There were thoughts of recruiting physician scientists with an emphasis in clinical nutrition.

In response to Thelin, Dean Blackwell explained that the NS doctoral program change could be considered separately from the move of the entire center. The doctoral program would change so that its first-year requirements paralleled those of integrated basic sciences requirements. In response to Lesnaw, Cassis explained that the GCNS would continue to have outside requirements separate from those of the integrated basic sciences (IBS) because of non-COM faculty in the GCNS. In response to Lesnaw, Cassis said students would be able to attend the same seminars, the same current topics courses and the same journal clubs.

Aken requested patience with the Library and its allocation of resources, as it was still recovering from the two moves made by the GCT. Aken said it would take some time; even though many things were available electronically, it was difficult fund-wise to offer resources when a unit moved. She said that all of a sudden, it would be the Medical Center Library that would be paying for things that the Agriculture Library had been supporting, for some time. It would take time to keep up with the changes.

Cassis confirmed for Wood that the degree program would have two tracks – master's and doctoral. She invited GCNS Director of Graduate Studies Steve Post to add to the discussion.

Guest Post said that there were two routes of entry into the program; the degree requirements for students were essentially identical. A student could enter

through IBS, but would end up being trained in the same courses. Cassis added that students coming directly into the GCNS program wanting a doctoral degree would also take IBS courses. She didn't know if they could be classified as "tracks" but said that they would have the same core curriculum. Flexibility would be monitored in the core curriculum so Nutrition and Food Science students could take related courses.

Lesnaw **moved** to send (with a positive recommendation and effective date of July 1) to the Senate the proposal to move the Graduate Center for Nutritional Sciences from the Graduate School to the College of Medicine. Aken **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

6. [2007 – 2008 Calendar Change: Dentistry](#)

The Chair invited College of Dentistry Professor Karen Novak to explain the proposed changes. Guest Novak explained that in addition to the College of Dentistry (COD) calendar, the COD had also always maintained a pre-doctoral calendar that was approved by all the necessary individuals. The proposed change would add the information for three residency programs into one calendar.

Novak said that the person who processed financial aid in the COD for the federal government needed justification for dispersing aid to students in residency programs. In response to Lesnaw, Novak explained that the program offered specialties – some started in July and others in August. Different start and stop dates had always been the case, based on accreditation requirements.

Finkel **moved** to send the change to the 2007-2008 Dentistry calendar to the Senate, to be effective immediately. Harley **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

7. [Continuing Discussion on Proposed Changes/Combining of Administrative Regulations II-1.0-1 \("Faculty Appt., Reappt., Promotion & Tenure"\)](#)

The Chair said that Greissman appreciated the good input received last time on the proposed changes to *Administrative Regulations II-1.0-1*. There were a few items currently for which Greissman specifically wished for endorsement.

In codifying what has been in Provost's memos, he wanted to make sure all were clear on the additions. The number of required letters changed from three to six and language was added to specify that three of the letters from reviewers would be selected by the unit administrator, independent of the faculty candidate.

Greissman went on to request specific input on the section dealing with the establishment of procedures by the department faculty to guide the selection process of outside evaluators. The section immediately following, pertaining to letters from research-oriented universities was also an area in which he specifically requested input. It would have serious implications regarding how

units went about selecting letters. In response to Randall, Greissman explained that the entities involved in the phrasing of “may be included” were those such as NASA – internationally recognized, but not a university; it allowed input from someone outside the academe. Randall suggested that the “non-academic” be added to be perfectly clear as to the intent. Thelin agreed, saying Margaret Meade and Albert Einstein never held faculty appointments.

Aken requested that the promotion and tenure dossier be defined. She noted that in Libraries, when a faculty member moved from Librarian IV to Librarian III, it was decided by faculty vote without an outside letter and did not go outside the Library system. Greissman requested that she send him an email with suggested phrasing. In a sense, the workgroup assumed readers would go back to the title series information in the *AR*. If promotion had a specific definition, it might not be best to insert it in *AR II-1.0-1*.

Greissman drew everyone’s attention to the added language that external letters received after the submission deadline would not be included in the dossier and would not be used in the evaluation process. The intent was that if a letter arrived late, the Chair could not include the letter unless the faculty agreed to look at it and incorporate it into their review. This was intended to prevent late-arriving external letters from being forwarded without the faculty having seen them. The Chair noted that in his department, another letter had to be written – silence was not considered agreement. Finkel said that with regard to established procedures, it did not say what would happen if the unit faculty had not established a procedure – he wanted to avoid the department chair having full power.

Wood stated that she could not disagree more. As a past department chair for about eight years, she said she had handled numerous promotion dossiers. She opined that the practice in A&S should be copied by UK as a whole. The department chair was required to seek input from all faculty (depending on the level – associate, assistant, etc.) regarding suggestions for names of external reviewers. The chair then made a proposal of external writers to the dean, who negotiated with the department chair, if necessary. Wood stated that the burden of responsibility should rightly fall on the department chair – she firmly believed that faculty should have an advisory role, but as written, the proposed language gave faculty too much latitude. Wood said she opposed allowing the faculty to come up with the procedures.

Finkel said that it was necessary to not only protect the department from the chair, but also to protect the faculty from the chair. Wood noted that the individual faculty member also deserved protection. If too much power were put in the hands of individual faculty members, it could only take one or two bad letters to completely halt a promotion.

Theelin said that it would be most appropriate to have one group of faculty to set procedures and another group to make the appointments. He said that during his experience on an area committee, he saw a department chair with an inordinate role in obtaining outside letters – the chair picked outside candidates who tended to be administrators with faculty appointments, which gave inordinate weight to non-faculty evaluations.

Greissman requested that the discussions continue over the SC listserv – such input was what he needed. He said that when a consensus was reached, the language should be sent to him for review and possible inclusion.

Greissman referred SC members to the section on completeness of the dossier. He said that if something essential came after the dossier left, such as a tentative book contract, etc., as a university a decision had to be made regarding how the information would be used. Wood said that because of the way the section was written, she thought it referred to missing materials, not things that were additional information. She opined that missing materials and additional materials were two entirely different scenarios. If something was left out, the dossier should go back and start again. Theelin suggested that one additional paragraph could solve the problem.

Theelin noted that in the section regarding actions taken by the dean, only one scenario was addressed – that of a dean disapproving an appointment. He said that language should be added to address the situation in which the dean supported promotion but the area committee did not.

After additional comments, the Chair said that while the discussion needed to continue, it would have to wait for another meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh A. Tagavi,
Senate Council Chair

Senate Council members present: Aken, Finkel, Grabau, Harley, Lesnaw, Michael, Randall, Tagavi, Theelin and Yanarella.

Provost's Liaison present: Richard Greissman.

Non-SC members present: Jeannine Blackwell, Geza Bruckner, Lisa Cassis, Donn Hancher, Jay Perman and Steve Post.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on May 11, 2007.