

Senate Council Meeting
January 22, 2007

The Senate Council met at 3 pm on Monday, January 22, 2007 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

The meeting was called to order at 3:12 pm. (The meeting began late due to another group in the room whose meeting lasted longer than scheduled.) All those present introduced themselves. The Chair asked Guest Janet Roccanova if she objected to reviewing her agenda addition later during the meeting, to accommodate other guests present with schedule conflicts; she concurred. Senate Council (SC) members agreed to rearrange the agenda.

The Chair mentioned that Thelin and Grabau had let the Office of the Senate Council know that they could be late to the meeting.

3. Clinical Title Series Discussion – Colleges of Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing & Pharmacy

The Chair referred SC members to the list of questions handed out. He said that while those questions had been distributed in advance, he would also entertain other questions. The Chair asked Guest Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Heidi Anderson to offer background information on the agenda item.

Anderson explained that in 2005, then-Provost Nietzel asked then-Associate Provost for Academic Affairs David Watt to begin a study of clinical title series (CTS) faculty. A proposal with eight recommendations, after input from discussions with faculty, councils, etc., was subsequently sent to interim Provost Smith in November 2005. Provost Subbaswamy then requested that Anderson continue to work on possible revisions to policy regarding CTS faculty. After Anderson performed some research of her own, she came to the SC on November 27, 2006 to continue the discussion on the eight recommendations regarding CTS faculty. Anderson shared that three of the eight specifically required Senate approval; the other five required a decision by the Provost. Because Anderson chose not to answer all the questions posed during the discussion on the 27th, she returned on December 4th to discuss a strategy for fact-finding. SC members decided to engage in a dialogue with the deans of colleges; at the meeting on the 4th SC members composed questions to ask to help guide the discussion.

Anderson explained that College of Dentistry Dean Sharon Turner and College of Nursing Dean Kirschling could not be present but had sent representatives and offered written responses to the questions. Anderson distributed those documents (Benchmark Information from Dentistry Colleges, Senate Council Questions about the Clinical Title Series Faculty Appointments (January 22, 2007), Benchmark Information for Nursing Colleges). She added that she could

provide SC members with College of Medicine and College of Pharmacy information in a similar hard copy format in the near future.

Referring to the current 25% cap on CTS faculty, Anderson said that the cap was surpassed in some colleges. SC members had expressed interest in learning about the typical situation with CTS faculty at institutions around the country and the issues associated with faculty governance and sabbatical for CTS faculty. Anderson spoke about the large role CTS faculty play in the service and teaching missions of the university and of the importance in holding a serious discussion on the recommendations.

The Chair invited guests to offer comments. Guest College of Pharmacy Dean Kenneth Roberts said that over the past 10-15 years, the alteration of standards and guidelines from pharmacy accreditation bodies required that approximately 35% of the College of Pharmacy's (COP) four-year curriculum to be in experiential format.

Guest College of Medicine Dean Jay Perman said that it was important to question the rationale behind the cap on CTS faculty. The cap made a value statement or a statement regarding a lack of value placed on CTS faculty. As long as adequate funding was available, there would be no adequate discharge of the missions in research and teaching without robust and numerically unfettered CTS faculty in the College of Medicine (COM). Other faculty with appropriate and significant research obligations could not provide clinical care, the venue of medical education. Perman said that one could not try to explain to patients that the number of physicians was limited due to administrative caps; patients have free will and would go where health care would be provided comprehensively by competent individuals. If patients were to go elsewhere, there would then be no population from which to draw volunteers for clinical trials. Limiting CTS faculty was in opposition to a robust education and research enterprise.

Dean Perman went on to explain that he recently called an education retreat for COM faculty, course directors, those responsible for clerkships, basic scientists and clinicians; he challenged them to address integrating basic science with clinical care. A majority of a student's medical education was delivered in two parts: basic science was taught primarily during the first two years and the bulk of the clinical education was offered in the following two years in a clinical setting. It was ultimately decided at the retreat to pair up basic scientists in the fourth year of medical education with clinicians. Perman said that he knew of no other medical school in the country with a cap on clinical faculty.

Guest College of Dentistry Executive Associate Dean Richard Haug offered his agreement with Dean Perman's comments. Haug referred to the College of Dentistry (COD) information showing that imposing a cap seemed to be an outlier from other benchmarks. Guest College of Nursing Associate Dean for

Academic Affairs Brockopp said that that the College of Nursing (CON) was currently at the 25% cap, but that strictly enforcing the cap would negatively affect the doctor of nursing practice program. Brockopp said the CON agreed with the COD, COM and COP in objecting to caps on CTS faculty.

The Chair suggested the discussion begin with questions on sabbatical leave. Wood requested background information for clarification. In response to her, Dean Perman said that there were significant numbers of basic scientists in the CTS, which was an untenurable line, although there were many special title series (STS) faculty in clinical departments. He confirmed that CTS faculty were ranked but not eligible for tenure. Haug offered the COD's tenure and promotion document to the Chair for distribution.

Finkel asked if CTS faculty had a Distribution of Effort (DOE) responsibility for anything other than service. Dean Perman replied that basic scientists taught in lecture halls and classrooms. They were not expected to perform research but generally participated in clinical trials. Finkel wondered if increased numbers of CTS faculty could erode the tenure system, but said the question could be answered at a later time.

Randall asked if CTS faculty had a vote in COM faculty affairs. Dean Perman read from the COM Faculty Rules and summed up by saying that CTS faculty in the COM were eligible to serve on the faculty council and committees. Dean Roberts said that faculty voted to approve rules that stated that CTS faculty would not vote on matters related to college governance or position structure. Haug added that in the COD, CTS faculty could vote and participate in any committee, except for those addressing matters dealing with promotion and tenure. The CoD rules reflected the same guidelines as about half of UK's benchmarks. Brockopp said that CON rules regarding participation of CTS faculty were the same as the COD.

The Chair clarified that Finkel's question was intended to get at concerns from faculty (at the time when the 25% cap was imposed) that tenure systems could be diluted if there were large numbers of untenured faculty involved in governance. He said the question could be discussed later.

Brockopp said that CTS faculty were similar to research title series (ReTS) faculty in that both CTS and ReTS faculty were not tenurable. The expectation of ReTS faculty members was that they would be largely funded by research. CTS faculty differ, however, in that they brought in large amounts of funding. CTS faculty spent the majority of their time on clinical activities, but also were a part of academia and were involved in scholarship and some teaching. Brockopp said that their special skills enabled the university to be stronger and more diverse.

Finkel asked about the DOE for teaching. Brockopp replied that in CON, CTS faculty were nurse practitioners who taught in the nurse practitioner program,

with about 20% of effort dedicated to teaching. The largest block of time was spent with patients and in teaching those who want to care for patients.

Haug stated that in the past 20 years, the COD had not lost any CTS faculty member, even though the CTS positions were reappointed every seven years. He said that no one had used CTS faculty to get rid of tenured faculty. The Chair suggested discussion center around issues regarding sabbatical.

Lesnaw wondered who would pay for sabbatical for CTS faculty and thought that the 25% cap was originally set to keep costs down. Haug responded that in the COD, CTS faculty were funded completely by clinical revenue – 100% of salary and benefits was supported through clinical activities. He said that since there was no provision currently for CTS faculty to take sabbaticals, he thought questions about sabbatical were primarily philosophical. Lesnaw followed up by asking how sabbatical would be paid for if it were allowed. Haug said that with the exception of one grant-funded sabbatical, the work load of the college had not permitted any RTS or special title series (STS) faculty to take a sabbatical in the past seven years. If the prohibition on sabbaticals for CTS faculty was lifted, Haug said clinical revenues would fund sabbaticals.

Wood wondered if Haug's comments meant that sabbaticals were currently not funded. Haug replied that since CTS faculty were not permitted to take them, there was no reason to fund them.

Dean Perman said that while a discussion of sabbatical for CTS faculty was appropriate, he added that it was a rare event; clinical faculty rarely took sabbaticals due to clinical responsibilities. While there could be a reason, such as learning a specific technique, for a CTS faculty member to take a sabbatical, it would come from clinical dollars. With the exception of some dollars awarded for teaching, virtually all income required to cover salaries and benefits came from clinical revenue.

Wood, explaining that RTS faculty salaries were set by the dean and modified through evaluations, wondered how CTS faculty salaries were determined. Dean Perman replied that the compensation for CTS faculty was set by the market and reflected the physician's field. For example, a heart surgeon would be compensated differently from a pediatrician. Haug said that for the 73 CTS faculty in COD, there were 73 different methods of compensation. He said the funding source was important, not the salary level.

The Chair requested Dean Roberts explain how CTS faculty in the COP were funded. Dean Roberts said that there were currently 11 CTS faculty and four lecturers, with the hope of moving the lecturers into the CTS. With 68 faculty total, the number of CTS faculty was at 22%. Many CTS faculty were co-funded with other entities or institutions, due to a CTS faculty member's responsibilities with another entity, although the other entity would have a contractual obligation

to UK. Dean Roberts said that in the past seven years, one tenured faculty member applied for sabbatical; he said that reflected the lack of demand for sabbaticals in the COP. It was not a large issue, nor was the funding of sabbaticals an issue.

The Chair asked if there were any further comments on the sabbatical issue. Randall said that any offering of sabbatical to CTS faculty would need to be defined very carefully. As a RTS faculty member, Randall thought he was eligible for sabbatical once every seven years by applying to his chair. If the university were to fund the six-month leave, it could become an issue over time. Dean Roberts said that there was no problem when the one COP CTS faculty member requested a sabbatical. Anderson said that in her 30 years as a pharmacist academician, she had never taken a sabbatical; it was also uncommon among her colleagues at other institutions. She said that while she knew she could, she had never chosen to do so. Brockopp said that in the CON, grants and research funding were available for CTS faculty who apply for a sabbatical, but none ever had.

Liaison Greissman clarified for the Chair that funding for sabbatical would come from the college, but money for a promotion would come from the Office of the Provost. Haug added that in the COD, only the base salary for STS or RTS faculty on sabbatical would be available. Dean Perman added that it would be very hard for someone with clinical responsibilities to take a sabbatical.

Lesnaw requested clarification from the college representatives present; she said that after taking part in the discussion, it seemed that allowing CTS faculty to take a sabbatical might not be the best way to show CTS faculty the proper level of involvement and respect. Anderson replied that if sabbatical were allowed, it would require a change to the *Administrative Regulations* but sabbatical leave was only one recommendation. She said the bigger question would be how it would be offered to CTS faculty, when CTS faculty were unlikely to take sabbaticals due to clinical and student involvement. Dean Perman opined that the sabbatical discussion was perhaps a distraction from the issue of sending a message to CTS faculty that shored up their critical importance to the university. He thought that having the ability to take a sabbatical would send a good message. It was agreed that currently, non-tenure track faculty are not eligible for sabbatical.

Michael asked if there was something other than a sabbatical, yet similar, that would be of benefit to CTS faculty. Brockopp said that both she and CON Dean Kirschling thought that offering sabbatical to CTS faculty would send an important message about being part of a group and would send a message of equality.

Randall commented on the issue of allowing CTS faculty to serve in the Senate. He wondered if CTS faculty would even have the time available to serve in the

Senate if clinical responsibilities were of such importance. The Chair noted that discussions about sabbatical seemed to be ending, so it was appropriate to move to governance issues.

Dean Perman explained that when it was said that CTS faculty supported themselves, it was used to reflect the support of CTS faculty as a whole, not about individual faculty members. He cited the Department of Pediatrics as an example: there were neonatologists and cardiologist faculty in Pediatrics who were high earners as it related to the department and the entity as a whole. There were also equally important faculty in the fields of endocrine and infectious diseases who could not support their salary on their own but were extremely valuable to the group as a whole. The dollars generated by high earners would support lower earners. Dean Perman opined that CTS faculty would value being able to serve in the Senate; there would not be any administrative bias against a CTS faculty member taking time from clinical service to serve the university through Senate membership. Perman also said there would also be no salary adjustment to reflect time spent on Senate duties.

Haug added that just because someone provided a service, it was not just that one person generating income; as long as the clinical enterprise as a whole was in the black, the individual would be paid for time spent on Senate-related duties. Dean Roberts thought that CTS faculty, like other faculty members, would want to be represented by the person who could best represent them without regard to title.

The Chair asked SC members to comment. Dembo stated that a differentiation should be made between governance at the university level and at the college level. He said that comments made at Senate meetings were not likely to result in any retaliation, but he wondered about comments made by non-tenurable CTS faculty at the college level, perhaps comments in opposition to a dean, the dean being the individual making hiring and contract decisions. Dembo acknowledged the chance of such intimidation from current deans was not an issue, but wondered about future circumstances if a new dean attempted to stack the faculty for or against certain issues. He said he was discussing a worst-case scenario regarding academic freedom.

Haug said he appreciated Dembo's concern. Haug related that he had done research in anticipation of the SC meeting and over the period of three different deans and a 25-year time frame, no COD faculty member had ever lost their position for stating their opinion. Haug added that all CTS faculty appointed over the years remained in the college.

Grabau opined that the issue was a role in faculty governance at the college or university level; he asked if CTS faculty were awarded such responsibilities, would it make CTS faculty feel more valuable and at what level should the involvement be? Brockopp replied that CTS faculty wanted the rights other

faculty members had. Dean Roberts agreed. Dean Perman said that CTS faculty were like any other faculty member in that they wanted a say in the environment in which they worked.

Randall asked to move the discussion to limits of numbers of CTS faculty; the Chair agreed, hearing no objections from other SC members. He asked for comments from the deans.

Dean Perman said he thought that the cap seemed to be contrary to an egalitarian approach to valuing all faculty. Haug referred SC members to the COD handout; with the exception of the University of Michigan, no other institutions listed utilized caps. The Chair wondered about caps on the number of CTS faculty in the Senate.

Randall wondered if there could be a loss of institutional memory if larger numbers of CTS faculty were involved in the Senate, since RTS faculty, who were tenurable, did enjoy more historical knowledge. He asked if having larger numbers of faculty with little Senate institutional knowledge would negatively impact the Senate. Dean Perman asked for clarification – was Randall assuming CTS faculty turn over more often than RTS faculty? Randall replied that his assumption was that there would be more longevity with respect to the security of a tenured position. It would likely be nearly impossible to make all faculty series' exactly equal, but thought that if there was no cap on CTS faculty, it would endanger an aspect of shared faculty governance.

Dean Perman said that the issue of CTS faculty membership in the Senate was solely under the auspices of the Senate, not any other entity. He said that concerns about a dean acting maliciously with regard to expectations of support by non-tenurable faculty would definitely be unadmirable; he found it difficult to respond to such concerns, but said he did not believe that faculty were punished for their opinions. Randall said that his concern was mainly about how some aspects of faculty governance were, in some respects, dependent on the memory of the institution. Dean Perman replied that if CTS faculty were allowed membership in the Senate, it would behoove college faculty members to keep institutional memory in mind when electing senators. He added that there were many CTS faculty members who had been at UK for long periods of time.

Dembo, acknowledging a contradiction to his previous question, opined that the face of the academe was changing; despite any worst-case scenarios that could be imagined, it would be short-sighted not to see the future. Dembo spoke in favor of making the Senate more heterogeneous.

Lesnaw expressed concern with any distinction made between RTS and CTS faculty. She said that if any additional opportunities were available for CTS faculty, they should also be extended to RTS faculty.

Michael said that if there were all of a sudden many CTS faculty positions available for seating in the Senate, the Senate could become awash in clinical issues, which might not be a bad thing; Michael opined that if there were issues in the general campus community, those same issues should be discussed in the Senate. He said that being represented by CTS faculty members would be fine; everyone should be counted, although increasing CTS faculty in the Senate could double the membership.

Thelein asked about Haug's statements that no faculty member had ever lost a job due to stating opinions and that there would never be a threat to CTS faculties' academic freedom. Haug replied that practically speaking, no CTS faculty member ever bore the consequences of not siding with the dean. Although he said there could be a worst-case scenario of coercion, he said he knew it had never happened.

Wood asked if the deans present could clarify if the removal of the cap was the primary issue or if sabbatical and governance issues were also important to them. Dean Perman responded that the concept of a cap was at variance with virtually any other medical school that he had been involved with. He said he did not understand how the percentage of the cap was arrived at but that any type of cap on CTS faculty would not work in today's medical school. Perman said his primary concern was the cap; the issue of sabbatical was not a truly practical issue and the issue of Senate membership for CTS faculty was up to senators.

Dean Roberts said that he was initially concerned that CTS faculty discussions would focus on removing the series; he said he was delighted to learn that was not the issue. Roberts said the cap was not helpful to the COP. The more that CTS faculty could be recognized with respect to institutional benefits in keeping with RTS counterparts, the better performance would be. For the benefit of new SC members, Lesnaw noted that some colleges were already well over the 25% cap.

Due to the time and other agenda items, the Chair asked if there were any additional questions or comments. There being none, he asked Anderson if she had any comments. Anderson thanked the deans for attending and acknowledged that the meeting date/time had been set without consulting the deans. She said she would continue working with everyone and after the next SC meeting with deans she would continue to move forward. The Chair thanked the deans for attending, after which they and Anderson departed.

The Chair thanked Janet Roccanova for patiently waiting through the CTS discussion. He explained to SC members that the request regarding study abroad courses came to the Office of the Senate Council after the agenda had already been distributed. He said that changes were being requested to non-credit bearing courses for students participating in the Education Abroad program and referred SC members to the additional handout. He invited Roccanova to

explain the change and the urgent nature that could require the SC to approve the changes on behalf of the Senate.

Roccanova explained that there were currently two courses before the SC that were tied to fee charges. The first course needing to be changed (IES 333) was used when a student enrolled in the course; the exchange-related fees were billed and when received, held in a holding account. When an incoming exchange student arrived, those funds were used to pay that student's fees. The primary change was the prefix change, which reflected a change to the name from Study Abroad to Education Abroad. Roccanova explained she had worked with the Office of the Provost and IRIS Project staff to make the changes. Although the forms showed variable credit, the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils suggested that the course should be for 0 credits and carry a grade of "S." The change to ISP 499, also a fee calculation course, was used for students embarking on UK faculty-led programs. She said that while there was not so much urgency to approve IES 333, the exchange student course, she said that there were 12 UK faculty-led programs that would be offered during summer 2007. The change was needed to allow students sufficient time to enroll and be charged the program fee. The Office of the Provost and the IRIS Project wanted the fees to be submitted through the Office of Student Billing Services, not the Office of Education Abroad. The student taking courses at a host institution would register at that institution.

The Chair said that because the courses were not on the agenda, he needed approval from the SC to continue the discussion. If the SC could not unanimously accept the addition to the agenda, it would require a two-thirds vote to add it. No SC member objected to the addition.

Roccanova added that she had been told that SAP could not process a 0-credit course, but that the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils said it was possible, resulting in the change to a 0 credit course. In response to Lesnaw's question about why a student would go abroad for 0 credits, Roccanova explained that the courses were for fee calculation and would allow the student to be billed through the Office of Student Billing Services instead of the college. She said that the student would still sign up for courses that would carry credit that would also appear on the transcript. Roccanova added that using a fee calculation course would allow a student to use financial aid for education abroad.

Greissman said that the course was to cover fees not covered by tuition. Michael asked about how it would appear on the students' transcript. Roccanova replied that other special course credits would be present and it would be obvious that the student was studying abroad. In response to Finkel, Roccanova said that a student would not be able to not enroll in the course – a student going abroad would be enrolled by the office, which controlled course enrollment. In response to Randall, Roccanova said that the only changes were to the title and to the courses being valued at 0 credits.

Michael **moved** to approve the course changes for ISP 499 and IES 333 as amended to reflect 0 credit hours and also approve on behalf of the Senate. Piascik **seconded**.

In response to Randall's question about the need for urgency, Rocanova replied that the deadline by which applications for faculty-led programs had to be submitted to Education Abroad was March 1. There needed to be sufficient time prior to that deadline for students to be given the correct course information. In response to Finkel, Rocanova explained that there was one ISP-prefixed course remaining that needed to be changed. Because it involved a change in content and did not affect offering an opportunity to study abroad, it was going to be approved through customary channels.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to approve the changes to ISP 499 and IES 333 as amended to reflect 0 credit hours on behalf of the Senate. The motion **passed** unanimously.

[2. New Program: UnivSchIPgm b/w BS in Electrical Engineering & MS in Biomedical Engineering](#)

The Chair shared that the proposal would create a joint University Scholars Program between a BS in Electrical Engineering and an MS in Biomedical Engineering. He invited Regina Hannemann (College of Engineering, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering) to offer background information on the proposal.

Guest Hannemann said that a similar proposal from the Department of Mechanical Engineering had already been approved by the Senate. She said there was a move in the College of Engineering to have many such University Scholars Programs (USP). Hannemann said that the University of Louisville (UofL) offered a BS in biomedical engineering; there was a concern that students could be lost to UofL. Lesnaw wondered what the connection was between electrical engineering and biomedical engineering. Hannemann said that many biomedical engineers developed devices used in clinical settings. She said that the level of expertise necessary to work with such devices required electrical engineering knowledge. She said that there were many electrical engineering courses available for the MS student and that a student who wanted to focus more on the biomedical engineering aspect would take more biology courses.

Piascik, referring to the background information for the proposal, wondered why a BS degree in biomedical engineering was not pursued. Hannemann said that she was not sure why, because such decisions were already made before she became involved with the proposal. The Chair said that he could offer an explanation – because the MS program in biomedical engineering was already offered, the creation of this USP would not require additional resources the way a

new undergraduate degree program would. In response to Aken, Hannemann said there were definitely jobs available at the MS level.

A brief discussion on the definition of the USP took place. Mrs. Brothers confirmed for Lesnaw that Center for Biomedical Engineering Director David Puleo submitted confirmation of approval by that center.

Randall **moved** to approve the proposed new University Scholars Program between a BS in Electrical Engineering and an MS in Biomedical Engineering. Harley **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

There being no further business to attend to, the meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh Tagavi,
Chair, Senate Council

SC members present: Aken, Dembo, Finkel, Harley, Lesnaw, Michael, Piascik, Randall, Tagavi, Thelin and Wood.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Non-SC members present: Heidi Anderson, Dorothy Brockopp, Regina Hannemann, Richard Haug, Jay Perman, Ken Roberts and Janet Roccanova.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on January 25, 2007.