

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE

* * * * *

Special Session

May 7, 2007

3:00 p.m.

Lexmark Public Room of the Main Building

Lexington, Kentucky

Dr. Kaveh Tagavi, Chair

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

* * * * *

KAVEH TAGAVI, CHAIR

BRAD CANON, PARLIAMENTARIAN

SHEILA BROTHERS, SECRETARY TO SENATE COUNCIL

ROBYN BARRETT, COURT REPORTER

* * * * *

1 regarding the March 19 minutes?
2 Hearing none, the minutes stand
3 approved. The minutes from April
4 9th, same story. Any questions,
5 comments? Okay. Those minutes are
6 considered approved too. A couple
7 of announcements: Election for the
8 Board of Trustees faculty
9 representative concluded, and Ernie
10 Yanarella -- is Ernie here? -- was
11 reelected. My congratulations to
12 Ernie, and I also sent to all
13 senators a scanned copy of the memo
14 that I sent to the President
15 regarding the election report. The
16 next item is I need -- I wrote to
17 you on 4-20 asking you for input on
18 President Todd's evaluation. I
19 would like to have input from each
20 and every one of you. I'd like to
21 have a quorum when it comes to
22 that. I know where you are. I know
23 your offices. I know your phone
24 numbers, and I have your e-mail, so
25 please help us to have a meaningful

1 evaluation. You should have the
2 agenda. We decided to put some
3 curricular items posted as
4 transmittals, which by the way are
5 actually the way the Senate Rules
6 allow or even dictates; but over the
7 years, the tradition has been to
8 bring those items to the Senate
9 floor. But because this is the last
10 Senate meeting and our colleagues
11 expect us to approve their
12 curricular items, we put it in a
13 ten-day approval transmittal to be
14 approved. By May 10, they will be
15 approved. It's early enough to be
16 included in the bulletin, pending
17 resolution of any objections or
18 comments that would come to us. Any
19 comments on those? By the way, the
20 ones that we put on transmittal
21 are -- the lists are here, and I
22 know some of the guests are here, if
23 you have any questions. And right
24 after this -- I apologize to them --
25 they could leave if they want to.

1 So is this okay with everybody? All
2 right. Then we are done with those
3 ten items, and I already feel good.
4 We're on item number 11. I think we
5 should always start with agenda item
6 11, for next year. Okay. This is a
7 very important item number, Clinical
8 Title Series Revision. Let me give
9 you background, and then I will ask
10 the Provost to come to the podium,
11 and he will introduce more fully the
12 topic. This effort started about
13 two years ago with then Provost
14 Nietzel and Associate Provost David
15 Watt. The goal was to improve the
16 CTS series and achieve compliance
17 with the ARs, and I will talk about
18 that a little bit more later on.
19 There were eight recommendations,
20 such as sabbatical for CTS faculty,
21 to remove the 25-percent cap which
22 is imposed by the Board of Trustees,
23 and discuss the presentation,
24 governance, and the fact that the
25 CTS faculty is on a one-year

1 contract, if I'm not mistaken. This
2 issue was brought to Senate Council
3 about six months ago. Much
4 discussion ensued. The idea of
5 sabbatical was dropped by the
6 Provost after Senate Council raised
7 funding questions and concerns. The
8 remaining three issues were
9 25-percent cap, funding sources, and
10 area of activity, for example, where
11 the CTS faculty are associated with
12 clinic, patients, client, practice,
13 studio, experiential training, and
14 you're going to see some of that
15 language later on. Provost later
16 requested that the Senate Council
17 and the Senate give our input by the
18 end of the academic year in order to
19 have the revised AR effective July
20 1st. A revised AR was presented to
21 and discussed by the Senate Council.
22 Senate Council recommended sending
23 the revised AR to the Senate for
24 input and recommended that continued
25 discussion between the Senate

1 Council and Provost for final Senate
2 recommendation by September. There
3 are a couple of more opportunities
4 for discussions; of course, we are
5 going to -- hopefully Senate is
6 going to give its input to the
7 Provost today, but Senate Council
8 will have a couple more
9 opportunities, including May 14
10 meeting and a Senate retreat during
11 summer to continue the discussion
12 with the Provost and so that most
13 desire of the Provost for July 1st
14 and desire of the Senate Council to
15 have more discussion could be
16 accommodated. You have the language
17 in your handout. There is just one
18 thing I'd like to add. Even the
19 Senate Council members haven't seen
20 this language, although I mentioned
21 to them that on Friday or on Monday
22 morning or Friday morning I had a
23 brief meeting with the Provost and
24 the yellow language was added under
25 area of activity. I don't want to

1 go into too much detail (inaudible)
2 to discuss it with you, but a waiver
3 would only be requested or approved
4 by the Provost under -- if those two
5 conditions are met. Having said
6 that, then, I'd like to ask the
7 Provost to join me here and explain
8 the rationale and maybe answer any
9 questions that might be.

10 SUBBASWAMY: Okay. Thank you very much
11 for being here. Thank you for the
12 opportunity to speak to this issue.
13 I believe this is more a time for
14 discussion and answering questions.
15 I don't want to say a lot other than
16 to tell you that I bring a national
17 perspective to this. I'm an
18 outsider coming in. I haven't been
19 involved in the earlier
20 discussions. So one of the things I
21 did preparing for taking on this job
22 was to try to learn a little bit
23 more about how an academic medical
24 center is run. Although I had close
25 proximity to an academic medical

1 center at Indiana University,
2 medical campuses in Indianapolis,
3 I'm very close friends with the dean
4 there -- we are very good friends,
5 but I didn't have any formal
6 arrangement or administrative
7 responsibilities for that. So I
8 needed to learn, so I asked them to
9 bring me up to faculty affairs kinds
10 of issues. And they gave me a ton
11 of literature on clinician educators
12 and what the profession has been
13 going through in terms of trying to
14 accommodate the changes in the
15 academy, changes in managed care,
16 and in that general context having
17 clinical education and (inaudible
18 due to cell phone.) So it was very
19 educational, and so when I came
20 here, I thought I was going to show
21 off my knowledge and say, "So how
22 are we handling this?" The answer I
23 got was, "It's funny you should
24 ask. Here's a report that Dave Watt
25 and the group of medical council

1 faculty of medical college -- health
2 center colleges have been working
3 on, and all you need to do is take
4 it from here." And indeed, most of
5 the issues that were being addressed
6 and talked about were already being
7 addressed in this particular
8 report. And I said, "So what do we
9 do with this?" The next step is you
10 have to -- there are about eight of
11 these that really do not require
12 Senate action, and there are a
13 couple of items that actually -- not
14 Senate action, but Senate
15 consultation, and so you just need
16 to take it to the Senate. And
17 that's where we started, and I gave
18 the -- brought this forward.
19 Actually Heidi Anderson has been at
20 the forefront of this, working with
21 the Senate Council. So there's a
22 couple of things that are going on
23 in the academy that require some of
24 these changes. One is, as I've
25 said, academic medical centers and

1 this notion of triple-threat faculty
2 members who are outstanding
3 clinicians and spend a lot of time,
4 24 hours a day in clinic, 24 hours a
5 day teaching residents and fellows
6 and medical students, and 24 hours a
7 day doing research. It's something
8 that I don't think ever was
9 possible, and certainly under
10 current practice conditions and so
11 forth, that's really not feasible.
12 So we have a system in place here
13 that is trying to put a square peg
14 in a round hole. It simply just
15 doesn't work, and this is true of
16 all of academic medical centers, so
17 nothing unusual here. But leaving
18 that aside, in other fields as well
19 there has been change. When I was
20 here last, I think the best bachelor
21 of science in pharmacy was still the
22 degree that was the initial degree.
23 I don't remember when the Pharm.D.
24 transition took place, but the field
25 has gone to the first professional

1 degree, a doctor of pharmacy, as the
2 entry credential into the field of
3 pharmacy practice. And that in fact
4 requires about 30 percent of the
5 education to take place in the
6 practice context. And certainly, in
7 order to remain an accredited
8 program, you've got to do that. And
9 the definition that currently exists
10 in the ARs for clinical faculty in a
11 clinical setting doesn't apply to
12 that particular model, for example.
13 They're not actually earning money
14 in the clinic, and people are just
15 observing. That's not the model
16 that works there. And if you then
17 look at some other professions, and
18 this is true to a much smaller
19 extent, but for example if you're
20 getting a degree in
21 telecommunications and there's a
22 production element to it, the
23 production classes are taught in a
24 TV studio context. And it's
25 essentially experiential-based

1 training that is a very different
2 beast. It's a small component,
3 admittedly, of the entire
4 educational package, but a different
5 beast. So really what universities
6 have been trying to do is to
7 accommodate that and say the field
8 is changing. Especially when it
9 comes to professional education,
10 there are pieces that are expected
11 to be taught from practitioners in
12 the field. And the academic medical
13 center is one special case where in
14 fact the revenue for that is
15 generated in a clinical context, but
16 that's not true for all fields. And
17 so to try to accommodate the changed
18 circumstances, educational
19 circumstances of the academy, these
20 changes that are proposed here are
21 absolutely essential. I started
22 this academic year, my first job as
23 Provost, by taking one
24 administrative regulation that had
25 to do with chief administrative

1 office review, that is, dean's
2 review, which we worked very
3 collaboratively. And I think that
4 some of the changes that came out of
5 the discussions with the Senate
6 Council were very helpful, and they
7 are being incorporated into
8 administrative regulations. And
9 likewise, the discussions of the
10 past several months with the Senate
11 Council have been very fruitful, and
12 many of the changes that are
13 (inaudible due to coughing) yellows
14 and reds and so forth reflect that
15 back and forth where some issues
16 were brought up and then Kaveh
17 Tagavi and I would speak and say,
18 yeah, I think we can change the
19 language in such a way that we can
20 address those concerns. Bottom
21 line, we're a research university,
22 so wherever we can, wherever it's
23 meaningful, we're going to hire
24 regular tenure track faculty who do
25 both research and teaching and

1 everything else. But we're a very
2 diverse campus with a lot of
3 professional schools, and in that
4 context, not every faculty member
5 can be in that mold. And that's
6 (inaudible) what we're trying to
7 address. So I think the changes
8 there have all the language and
9 necessary ifs and buts that came out
10 of serious concerns on the part of
11 Senate Council, so this is the last
12 step in the process of soliciting
13 input from the Senate as a whole. I
14 would be happy to answer any
15 questions, or how do you want to
16 handle this?

17 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Sure. I forgot to
18 ask -- to say that we have too
19 many -- still we have a lot of
20 agenda items, and it's the last
21 meeting, so I'm going to ask you to
22 be to the point, focused, and
23 brief. If not the first two, at
24 least be brief. I forgot to do that
25 before Swamy's talk. I don't get

1 too many times to tell the Provost
2 what to do, but I lost that
3 opportunity. Let me first go to the
4 Senate Council members. Do any of
5 the Senate Council members want to
6 make a comment (inaudible) with
7 discussions with the Provost and
8 with the Associate Provost?

9 YANARELLA: Less a comment than a
10 question, and the question is: What
11 has changed between the last Senate
12 Council meeting and today in regard
13 to this -- in regard to the
14 language?

15 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: The only thing that
16 has changed is the yellow that you
17 see right now.

18 YANARELLA: We don't have yellow here.

19 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: You don't have yellow?

20 SUBBASWAMY: Well, not in the handout.

21 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Not in the handout.

22 YANARELLA: Yeah. Now I can see.

23 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: And it's a change in
24 the sense that you have not seen the
25 actual language of the Senate

1 Council members because I just
2 didn't have it in time. But I did
3 mention through e-mail to the Senate
4 Council members that I have had this
5 discussion with the Provost, and I
6 asked him, would you ever use your
7 waiver authority to waive when a
8 line is for an area where fees are
9 collected, and he said absolutely
10 not. Then I asked the second
11 question, and he said absolutely
12 not. Then I asked, can I put it in
13 writing, and he said of course. But
14 I didn't have enough time to bring
15 it to the Senate Council.

16 SUBBASWAMY: I think the primary concern
17 that we have addressed in the most
18 recent conversation was would you
19 take a Regular Title Series position
20 and convert it into a Clinical Title
21 Series position. In other words, if
22 there were a position that could be
23 filled by a Regular Title Series,
24 would you do away with tenure, in
25 effect, and the answer is absolutely

1 not. And that's why I said that, as
2 a research university, the operating
3 model is that we're going to have
4 special title series faculty
5 whenever we can, where it's
6 appropriate, and the Clinical Title
7 only when it's the only model that
8 would work in the modern academic
9 environment.

10 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. Then let's go
11 to the Senators.

12 LOCK: Sharon Lock, College of Nursing.
13 I just have a question about the
14 ability to generate practice funds,
15 just a clarification, I guess. Like
16 in the College of Nursing, some of
17 us work, say, in internal medicine
18 and we generate funds basically for
19 College of Medicine, but they
20 contract with College of Nursing for
21 our services. Would that be the
22 same thing as generating practice
23 funds under this?

24 SUBBASWAMY: The generating the practice
25 funds only where it's appropriate is

1 really what is being used. In other
2 words, the question really becomes,
3 for example, in the dental context,
4 it's very different from the nursing
5 context and Department of Medicine.
6 So it really very much depends on
7 the context of what is the
8 expectation there. And so, no, it's
9 not one slice, which is the way the
10 current AR is written. By the
11 current AR, most of the existing
12 Clinical Title Series positions
13 outside the College of Medicine are
14 in violation of the AR.

15 PIASCIK: Peggy Piascik from Pharmacy.

16 I'd just like to speak in favor of
17 the revisions to the Clinical Title
18 Series, some of what the Provost has
19 already said. I don't think the
20 original regulations foresaw the
21 changes in health care. And we've
22 gone from providing about 150
23 rotation months of clinical training
24 to about 1,300. And because our
25 faculty do not generate directly

1 clinical funds, we handle that by
2 co-funded positions with the places
3 where our faculty work. And we're
4 now in a position where our faculty
5 don't qualify for Regular Title
6 Series because they're partly soft
7 money, and they don't qualify for
8 CTS because, you know, they're
9 co-funded, so it's not all generated
10 fees. So we have people who
11 can't -- we can't really give a
12 faculty position to. You'd almost
13 have to call them staff, which is
14 not fair to them either. So we
15 really do need this change in order
16 to be able to provide our clinical
17 training.

18 SUBBASWAMY: And comply with the
19 accreditation rules.

20 PIASCIK: Right. And the accreditation
21 standards, as you said, have us
22 pushed to about 30 percent and
23 rising in our clinical training. As
24 far as the issue of governments,
25 which is another issue I think

1 that's been important to the Senate
2 Council and to the Senators, the
3 fact that you've got a lot of
4 Clinical Title Series faculty who
5 might have governance over issues
6 that are really more the purview of
7 tenure track faculty. We've dealt
8 with that by allowing our Clinical
9 Title Series faculty voting rights
10 on certain items, but not on those
11 items of governance that we feel are
12 the -- really the purview of our
13 tenure track faculty. So we felt
14 that has provided some protection in
15 that area where there's been some
16 concern.

17 SAWAYA: Also I want to voice my support
18 to the change of the language
19 here -- Sawaya from the College of
20 Medicine -- but for the reason that
21 everybody is saying. I mean, the
22 growth is unbelievable. I'll tell
23 you, the survival of our division is
24 dependent a lot on our clinical
25 revenue, and we have to keep

1 generating that. And my question to
2 you, would you have enough time for
3 the stack of paper that I expect to
4 be coming to your office asking for
5 those positions? And all of them
6 are going to be very legitimate
7 reasons and with good, thought-out
8 (inaudible).

9 SUBBASWAMY: The exceptions as written
10 are really exceptions for those
11 areas where there is not clinical
12 revenue associated with the
13 position. So the College of
14 Medicine really is not where the
15 exceptions come in, but it's in the
16 other colleges where the exceptions
17 come in.

18 SAWAYA: But the 25 percent --

19 SUBBASWAMY: No, the 25-percent rule is
20 within the college. That is, the
21 College Faculty Council within the
22 College of Medicine would have to
23 waive that.

24 SAWAYA: I see.

25 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: If I could add to

1 that, the way that will be handled,
2 the Provost would approve 50 percent
3 for College of Medicine, not for
4 everything that's in here, so there
5 is not going to be a lot of
6 requests, just one.

7 SUBBASWAMY: The point is basically
8 there will be a vote within the
9 Faculty Council of the college and
10 then to the Provost. And I would
11 report it to the Senate annually so
12 they know what's going on, so it's
13 all very (inaudible).

14 SWANSON: Hollie Swanson, College of
15 Medicine. One of the problems we're
16 seeing with these positions is the
17 ability to promote the Clinical
18 Title Series. Can any of these
19 changes address that problem?

20 SUBBASWAMY: That should be, in fact,
21 covered in terms of the standard
22 process. Do you want to speak to
23 that, Heidi?

24 ANDERSON: Yes, Hollie. It is covered
25 in the current guidelines, and we've

1 added language in there that also
2 mentions that the individual who is
3 moving from an instructor level must
4 have a terminal degree as determined
5 by that particular college, and the
6 guidelines are spelled out. You
7 want to make sure you tie them back
8 to Regular Title Series P & T
9 guidelines as far as criteria is
10 concerned. But it really is
11 scripted in such a way the colleges
12 have to make sure they define those
13 criteria based on their college
14 departmental needs. Does that speak
15 to what you asked?

16 SUBBASWAMY: For example, if patient
17 care is involved, clearly patient
18 care -- assessment of patient care
19 abilities is an element in that
20 promotional process.

21 LOCK: Sharon Lock, College of Nursing
22 again. Heidi brought up this thing
23 about the terminal degree, and I
24 know in nursing some of our clinical
25 faculty right now have master's

1 degrees. And, you know, I'm just
2 wondering, is that something that,
3 within the College of Nursing, we
4 would be able to decide ourselves
5 whether or not that person would be,
6 well, either reappointed or
7 promoted? That was just one concern
8 we had because right now not
9 everybody is going to have a
10 doctorate.

11 SUBBASWAMY: Again, I know that in your
12 field the DNP degree is sort of the
13 degree towards which the field is
14 moving, so I expect that this is an
15 evolving process where eventually,
16 just like pharmacy, we're going to
17 get to an expectation of a doctoral
18 degree. Dean Perman, would you like
19 to address --

20 KIRSCHLING: I saw earlier language that
21 was more comfortable for a college.
22 I do think the language which ties
23 the master's degree to the national
24 reputation really sets the bar
25 fairly high for assistant

1 professor --

2 SUBBASWAMY: (Inaudible.)

3 KIRSCHLING: -- so it does raise a few

4 concerns from our side of the

5 (inaudible) because we do see the

6 terminal degree as the doctorate.

7 But we'll just have to go through

8 the tension, and I assume there's

9 some grandfathering window or

10 grandmothering window.

11 SUBBASWAMY: This is what I'm talking

12 about. I think the fields are

13 really moving in directions where

14 all universities are going to have

15 to work through the transition. The

16 transitional issues are going to be

17 one where wisdom will have to

18 reign.

19 MOLITERNO: David Moliterno, College of

20 Medicine. I read through some of

21 this and maybe missed this, but a

22 concern comes about the tenure of a

23 Clinical Title Series, and that is

24 we compete on a national level for

25 faculty of the highest caliber. One

1 of our concerns has been attracting
2 people and then trying to get them
3 into a tenure track, regardless of
4 where the funding is going to come
5 for that backup or base salary. Has
6 there been any discussion at the
7 council or provost level about
8 that?

9 SUBBASWAMY: The idea is that, I mean at
10 least as I understand your question,
11 and certainly Dr. Karpf and I have
12 had some conversations about it, is
13 the idea that if there are those who
14 are hired into Clinical Title Series
15 but who manage to actually also
16 develop a research portfolio along
17 with all the other things they do --
18 and we do have such people, as you
19 said, as you go through (inaudible)
20 process -- the answer is yes; they
21 can then be considered for a tenure
22 track appoint -- a tenure track
23 position, and that transition can
24 take place at the point where, if
25 there is an expectation that they

1 would like to be in a Regular Title
2 Series position and the position
3 exists, that they can compete for
4 that.

5 MOLITERNO: But the Clinical Title
6 Series, in and of itself, will never
7 be considered a possibility to
8 become tenured someday? I guess
9 that's my question. That will still
10 continue to be a distinguishing
11 characteristic, from clinical to the
12 regular. What's happened, to my
13 understanding, before me and before
14 you is that people got pushed into
15 the so-called Special Title Series
16 but then really carried no serious
17 academic pursuit. They were just
18 revenue generators but were given an
19 honorary Special Title Series
20 (inaudible). If you go back and
21 look at the CV's, it's very difficult
22 to promote these people because they
23 really don't have any research or
24 academic substance that would
25 promote them.

1 SUBBASWAMY: The way currently things
2 stand and what's being proposed is
3 that there will be parallel Clinical
4 Title Series positions with
5 multiyear contracts and other things
6 that the colleges can work out, but
7 it would not be tenure track, so we
8 don't go into this question of
9 having to put them into a particular
10 profile that doesn't necessarily
11 apply.

12 PERMAN: I think David brings up a very
13 important point, and I'm not sure
14 that it's appropriate to raise the
15 tenure issue at this point. But I
16 think embedded in what David is
17 saying is that the Clinical Title
18 Series faculty are so critical to
19 the function of the progress of the
20 medical school and the other health
21 profession schools that we must find
22 ways to value them and keep them in
23 an academic setting. If it's not
24 tenure, then it's got to be other
25 things that we're discussing. And

1 that's what this discussion is all
2 about. When you put a cap on how
3 many of a certain kind of folk can
4 be in a medical school or a nursing
5 school, it seems to me that by
6 definition you're devaluing them.
7 When you give them a year-to-year
8 contract, as Dr. Tagavi pointed out,
9 you devalue them. So if it's not
10 tenure, there's got to be a
11 statement about their value.

12 SUBBASWAMY: And I think that's what
13 we're trying to address outside of
14 the tenure issue.

15 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. David.

16 RANDALL: Randall, Physiology. We
17 really ought to be discussing a
18 motion, and so if you think it
19 appropriate, I'd like to move that
20 we endorse the language of the -- as
21 presented here and for that
22 endorsement to the Provost.

23 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. We have a
24 motion on the floor. Are there any
25 second?

1 THELIN: I second the motion.

2 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Thelin, second.

3 Okay. If we could focus and discuss
4 the changes that are being
5 discussed.

6 SUBBASWAMY: I have another meeting to
7 go to, so is it okay?

8 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. Thank you. Are
9 there any further discussions? Yes.

10 CAUDILL: For clarification --

11 BROTHERS: I'm sorry; your name, please?

12 CAUDILL: College of Medicine, John
13 Caudill. These changes, will they
14 apply to the current Clinical Title
15 faculty, or are they just going to
16 be on new faculty appointments? How
17 is that going to work? Is this
18 retroactive?

19 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Heidi.

20 ANDERSON: Good question. What we're
21 going to do is apply these forward,
22 and we'll look at some kind of
23 grandfathering or grandparenting or
24 whatever the right term is for
25 existing CTS faculty.

1 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. I'm hoping that
2 we are going to have all of our ten
3 items covered today, so are there
4 any other questions or comments that
5 anybody wants to make? Mike Cibull.

6 CIBULL: I move we accept this
7 discussion and the transcript that
8 will be made of this discussion as
9 our official input to the Provost on
10 this issue. Since we're required to
11 input, not to vote, a discussion
12 would satisfy that requirement.

13 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. We already have
14 a motion, but the two could be
15 combined. And let me clarify: We
16 don't have the power of voting to
17 approve or disapprove this; but
18 rather, it's a little bit playing
19 semantics. We could vote what is
20 our opinion, and this is what we are
21 giving, our opinion input to the
22 Provost. So, David, would you
23 accept that as --

24 RANDALL: That's why I said endorse.

25 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Endorse.

1 RANDALL: But I think also endorse and
2 forward a transcript of the
3 discussion to the Provost.

4 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: It would be perfect.
5 And the person who gives the second,
6 is it okay with you?

7 THELIN: (Inaudible.)

8 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. Any other
9 discussion? Then we are going to go
10 ahead and vote. All those in favor
11 of the motion, please indicate so by
12 raising your hand. Opposed?
13 Abstain? It's unanimous, motion
14 carries. Thank you.

15 YANARELLA: Kaveh.

16 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Yes.

17 YANARELLA: Could I say just a word or
18 two on behalf of those of us who
19 have been slogging through this
20 issue for a good many months? I
21 have found that in the discussion
22 today we have been provided with a
23 brief, fairly explicit framework
24 within which we could have -- the
25 Senate Council could have discussed

1 and deliberated this issue. And I
2 would urge Heidi to communicate to
3 the Provost our wish that, in terms
4 of the succeeding issues that will
5 come up and, seem to be the case,
6 inevitably will come up relating to
7 this, that those issues be -- those
8 issues be discussed and a framework
9 be provided that is as clear as the
10 one that we were given an
11 opportunity to deal with today. It
12 has been my sense, as a part
13 observer on the Senate Council, that
14 this issue which began discussion in
15 October suffered from the fact that,
16 in our effort to achieve a good deal
17 of light on the situation, we also
18 found that we needed to produce a
19 good deal of heat in order to elicit
20 that light. And I think that in the
21 future, on an issue as complex as
22 this, it's really important for the
23 Provost's office to provide us with
24 as much information as necessary for
25 us to provide legitimate input and

1 that the rationale be as clearly
2 stated as possible. I don't believe
3 that that was the case, and I think
4 that the reason why the Senate
5 Council discussed so long and hard
6 on this issue was because some
7 elements of the complexity of this
8 issue were simply not provided to us
9 at the outset.

10 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. Let's move on.
11 Next item is the move of Graduate
12 Center for Nutritional Sciences from
13 Graduate School to College of
14 Medicine. This proposal has been --
15 by the way, it's not unprecedented.
16 Maybe some of you remember the
17 Graduate Center of Toxicology made
18 an almost identical move in the
19 recent years. This proposal has
20 been approved by the College of
21 Medicine, by the Graduate School
22 faculty, by HCCC, and now it's in
23 front of you. Let me ask Dean
24 Perman if he would like to say a few
25 brief words, and we also have Lisa

1 Cassis here if -- right over there,
2 if need be.

3 PERMAN: Thank you, Dr. Tagavi, and
4 thank you for letting me address
5 you. And I will be brief because I
6 think Dr. Cassis, who directs the
7 center, can give you the information
8 that you most need. From the
9 perspective of health care and
10 medicine, there is virtually no
11 chronic disease that I can think of
12 in which nutrition doesn't play a
13 part, either in etiology or a
14 portion of the etiology or in
15 treatment. Nutrition now is very
16 central to understanding a disease
17 and the treatment of disease.
18 That's on the one hand. On the
19 other hand, apart from any personal
20 experiences that people in this room
21 may have, it's been well-
22 established, I think, within medical
23 education and in fact by the federal
24 government that physicians in
25 training, physicians of the future

1 that are being educated, are
2 notoriously poor in what they have
3 in the way of understanding of
4 nutrition, both in the way it
5 affects disease and in the way
6 nutritional elements might be used
7 to treat disease. So nutrition
8 needs, in many people's opinion,
9 including the NIH, to be very much a
10 part of medical education, medical
11 research. We have in this
12 university a Graduate Center for
13 Nutritional Sciences that has been
14 created within the Graduate School
15 and has made some progress. It
16 really is a more appropriate home,
17 for reasons that I think Dr. Cassis
18 will elaborate to you, to have that
19 center within the College of
20 Nutrition -- I'm sorry, within the
21 College of Medicine, which I think
22 will burnish the research that's
23 going on. And in addition, we'll be
24 able to build medical education
25 around this entity. So if it's all

1 right with the president [sic], I
2 wonder if Lisa might comment.

3 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: You notice I never
4 correct people when they call me
5 president.

6 CASSIS: Thank you. Thank you, Chair,
7 and thank you, Senate, for letting
8 us come before you today to discuss
9 this proposal to move the Graduate
10 Center for Nutritional Sciences from
11 the Graduate School to the College
12 of Medicine. So the GCNS, as I'll
13 refer to it, was established by the
14 Board of Trustees in 1998, and it
15 was established as a multi-
16 disciplinary research and graduate
17 training program within the Graduate
18 School so that it would encourage
19 faculty participation from various
20 departments and colleges to
21 contribute towards graduate
22 education and nutritional sciences
23 with minimal cross-college or
24 departmental boundaries. The
25 center -- and I'll try to keep this

1 very brief -- is currently composed
2 of seven core faculty, three of whom
3 are cost-shared with the College of
4 Agriculture, primarily because of
5 the undergraduate dietetics program
6 within Agriculture. And the center
7 also consists of approximately 50
8 members who participate from various
9 colleges and departments, including
10 the College of Agriculture, College
11 of Health Sciences, Pharmacy,
12 Nursing, and a large contingent of
13 faculty from the College of
14 Medicine. The center actually has
15 two different types of terminal
16 degree programs. We have a terminal
17 degree master's program. And this
18 program, which is currently
19 approximately 20 to 25 students, has
20 a major emphasis in applied
21 nutrition, and it offers specialties
22 in sports, community nutrition,
23 clinical nutrition, and molecular
24 nutrition. We also offer a doctoral
25 degree in nutritional sciences

1 where, again, we have approximately
2 20 to 25 students in the program.
3 And these students, through both
4 programs, matriculate primarily
5 through a common core curriculum in
6 nutritional sciences that serves the
7 needs of all of our students. So
8 I'm going to talk to you very
9 briefly about some major reasons why
10 we have deliberated over this
11 proposal and bring it to you today,
12 and that starts in 2002 with a
13 recommendation by the Futures
14 Committee, which designated
15 Nutritional Science as a program
16 with potential future growth and
17 development towards the goal of a
18 Top 20 research institution and
19 recommended that this program
20 relocate to the College of
21 Medicine. But I believe the
22 collective wisdom at the time was
23 that the center actually needed to
24 evolve more in its growth and
25 development and perhaps that it was

1 premature that the Senate consider
2 this. Then some landmark things
3 happened in the evolution of the
4 center. First, in 2003, the center
5 was relocated to the fifth floor of
6 the Wethington Building, which is
7 now the home of the center, where
8 core faculty and our members work
9 side by side in research and
10 graduate training. And with that
11 evolution, a lot of things
12 happened. For one, we developed an
13 area of strength and focus in
14 nutrition and chronic disease. This
15 was a natural and logical evolution
16 because nutrition, as we all know
17 with epidemics of obesity, is very
18 important in the Commonwealth of
19 Kentucky and the nation and became
20 an area of strength for the center.
21 Other things that positively
22 impacted the center were some new
23 T-32 training grants, a new USDA
24 training grant, and a pending COBRE
25 grant to create a Center of

1 Biomedical Research Excellence as a
2 partnership with the College of
3 Medicine. So for various reasons,
4 the faculty of the center in 2005
5 began to deliberate over potential
6 relocation of the center, and we
7 quickly came to a unanimous
8 conclusion that the College of
9 Medicine for several reasons was a
10 good fit for the center and for
11 medicine. Our fit in research is in
12 the areas of nutrition and chronic
13 disease, which as Dean Perman has
14 already discussed is of major
15 importance to the medical profession
16 and to the basic science programs
17 within medicine. Our fits in
18 education are both in our doctoral
19 program where our students were
20 already matriculating through the
21 integrated biomedical sciences
22 curriculum as part of their training
23 and where we hope to now be able to
24 contribute our course offerings to
25 the IBS program as part of their

1 training, and of course, as Dean
2 Perman has described, to the
3 professional medical program where I
4 think nutrition needs to be in place
5 to assure that physicians are
6 getting information on how to use
7 nutrition, both in preventive
8 medicine as well as lifestyle
9 modifications for treatment. And I
10 guess one of the major reasons for
11 the center, in considering this
12 relocation, was the potential for
13 the future growth of the center.
14 While we very much have enjoyed and
15 benefited from our location within
16 the Graduate School, there were
17 limitations on our growth as a
18 center within the Graduate School.
19 So what we are proposing here is to
20 join the College of Medicine while
21 remaining a multidisciplinary center
22 as a basic science department,
23 similar to the other basic science
24 departments and similar to the
25 toxicology model when they moved it

1 to medicine. And with that, we have
2 some proposed changes within our own
3 graduate program. We propose to
4 merge with the IBS, or Integrated
5 Biomedical Sciences program, for our
6 doctoral part of our program.
7 However, because we want to continue
8 our ties with the College of
9 Agriculture, primarily the dietetics
10 program as a feeder program into
11 Nutritional Sciences, we also
12 propose, as a mechanism to recruit
13 students outside of IBS to work with
14 faculty who are non-College of
15 Medicine faculty in their training.
16 And we also propose to continue our
17 terminal master's degree program and
18 potentially to have positive impacts
19 on that program through more
20 physician-related clinical nutrition
21 research as one of our emphasis
22 areas. And our curriculum -- I'm
23 not going to go through this. I
24 guess basically to describe it to
25 you, and I'm sorry it's so small,

1 what we basically have done in our
2 curriculum committee is move a lot
3 of our nutritional sciences courses
4 into the second year of our program,
5 have our students take the first
6 year of IBS as part of their
7 matriculation into the program, and
8 for our students that enter the
9 center outside of IBS, we've moved
10 some of the IBS courses into our
11 common core. We think that it's
12 actually a move that we were going
13 to do anyway in this program because
14 the students needed that
15 information. And we've added more
16 flexibility to our elective
17 offerings to allow students, for
18 example, that may want to get their
19 Ph.D. with an Agricultural Animal
20 Sciences person, to have flexibility
21 in where they got their
22 specialization in nutrition. And
23 that's the summary or overview of
24 what I had today.

25 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. Are there any

1 questions for our presenters, Dean
2 Perman and Professor Cassis? Okay.
3 Then it seems we are ready to vote
4 on this proposition. Will you help
5 me get this? Let me see if I could
6 do it. Okay. I can read it from
7 here: That the Senate move the
8 Graduate Center for Nutritional
9 Sciences from Graduate School to
10 College of Medicine effective July
11 1st, 2007. All those in favor of
12 this recommendation, please raise
13 your hand. Any opposed? Any
14 abstain? Okay. It's unanimous;
15 motion carries. Thank you. Moving
16 along, we had this -- we're
17 revisiting the proposal to change
18 fall break. I'm sure you remember
19 it was either the previous Senate
20 meeting or the one before that when
21 the Calendar Committee made the
22 recommendation to bring it for
23 discussion to the Senate. Based on
24 those discussions, Senate Council
25 considered the item again and came

1 up with this smaller version of the
2 original recommendation. And the
3 recommendation, very briefly, is
4 that the Senate approve changing the
5 fall break date from the first
6 Friday in October to the Wednesday
7 immediately before Thanksgiving.
8 And I'll discuss the question mark
9 regarding that in a second. Are
10 there any discussion on that? I
11 don't want to go through the whole
12 background of the original
13 recommendation. This has been
14 sought to some degree by students.
15 I have never seen a faculty who
16 liked fall break and -- on a Friday,
17 and here we are with this
18 recommendation. If there are no
19 questions, then the question mark
20 is -- and Jacquie's here; she could
21 perhaps back me up on that -- I had
22 a long discussion with her, pros and
23 cons of doing this starting fall
24 2008, which would be a year and
25 couple of months from now, the

1 disadvantage of changing things
2 perhaps a little bit too early.
3 Some courses are only Monday/
4 Wednesday. For them this is going
5 to be a loss of one instructional
6 day, so I leave that up to this
7 body. Jacquie Hager, who represents
8 the Registrar, says it is possible;
9 there is not going to be any major
10 problems. So that part of it is our
11 prerogative, and I leave it up to
12 whoever makes a motion to make it
13 effective fall 2007 or fall 2008, if
14 somebody is to amend it, but not
15 many more than two amendments; how
16 about that? So are there any
17 discussion on that? Yes.

18 VOSS: I just wanted to ask that you
19 repeat what you said about the loss
20 of the instructional day.

21 BROTHERS: I'm sorry; your name, please?

22 VOSS: Steve Voss.

23 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Some classes are
24 Monday/Wednesday only, so if you
25 switch from Friday to a Wednesday as

1 a holiday, that particular course is
2 going to lose one instructional day.

3 VOSS: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Yes.

5 SAWAYA: Sawaya, College of Medicine.

6 Have we asked the students? Do we
7 know what the students would like to
8 do?

9 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Originally, actually
10 if I'm not mistaken, I was
11 approached by two student Senators
12 when I was Ombud. They came to me
13 and said, "How can we request some
14 changes?" Now, granted, this is not
15 everything they asked for, but this
16 was part of what they asked for.
17 And this has been publicized enough,
18 so we have a student member of
19 Senate Council, and we have gotten
20 their input. Here and then over
21 there.

22 YANARELLA: As the chair of the Calendar
23 Committee, let me just add a few
24 pieces of information. Students in
25 general preferred the entire week

1 for the fall break. There was also
2 some interest in reshaping the dead
3 week that had some interest within
4 the Calendar Committee but not
5 sufficient to emerge out of our
6 final recommendation. I have -- we
7 have heard from the Registrar's
8 office, from the Student Affairs
9 office, and also from the incoming
10 SGA President. All of them either
11 indicate that there'll be no
12 insuperable problems to implementing
13 this, or they have indicated that
14 they support this. In the case of
15 Nick Phelps, the incoming SGA
16 President, he endorses this.

17 BURKHART: I was on the Senate when we
18 had some of the original discussion
19 regarding having the whole week off,
20 and it was that, then, the first day
21 of class wouldn't be on a Wednesday
22 but on a Monday so that you wouldn't
23 lose those days. So is that
24 discussion off the table now and
25 this is --

1 YANARELLA: Yes. We came through a
2 second iteration on this in the
3 Calendar Committee because at the
4 Senate Council meeting where the
5 first recommendation was put forth,
6 it would have involved beginning
7 classes on Monday. Student Affairs
8 in particular, but also the
9 Registrar's office, raised some
10 logistical problems that had to do
11 with a lot of noncurricular
12 preparation for the semester
13 activities that would not only be
14 burdensome to students but would be
15 onerous to -- to their parents in
16 terms of when they would need to
17 bring students onto campus. In
18 light of that, the Senate Council
19 requested that the Calendar
20 Committee go back and reconsider
21 that first recommendation. We came
22 forth with the -- with another
23 recommendation that would have
24 preserved the full week. However,
25 there were at least three camps that

1 came forth at the meeting, the
2 Senate meeting before last: Those
3 who did not want to allow the
4 possibility of any erosion of
5 teaching days, those who agreed with
6 the Calendar Committee
7 recommendation, and those who
8 recommended just the Wednesday
9 switch from the Friday.

10 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. Over here.

11 THELIN: John Thelin, Ed Policy. On
12 behalf of the Student Affairs, by a
13 small point of correction, you
14 referred to noncurricular
15 activities. I believe in their
16 parlance they now call that
17 cocurricular.

18 YANARELLA: Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: And while you're
20 contemplating this, I need a motion,
21 but when you make a motion, I need
22 you to make it for either 2007 or
23 2008.

24 WALDHART: Can I ask a question first?

25 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Absolutely.

1 WALDHART: Then I'd be happy to make the
2 move. Is there any reason why it
3 couldn't be effective fall 2007?

4 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: No reason.

5 WALDHART: Then I move that it be
6 effective fall 2007.

7 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Is there a second?

8 VOSS: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. Are there any
10 further discussions?

11 FORGUE: Ray Forgue, (inaudible). You
12 talked about the Monday/Wednesday
13 class losing a day, but there are
14 some Wednesday-only classes that
15 would be without a chance to make a
16 decision and say, well, then I'll do
17 it on Tuesday nights because I don't
18 want to lose that. So if we do that
19 in 2007, we're basically affecting a
20 calendar that's already been
21 responded to in the way people
22 selected the days for their
23 classes. But that being said, we
24 may start to realize that there's
25 nobody there on Wednesday nights

1 anyway.

2 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: If it's going to be a
3 disaster for any particular class, I
4 have a personal suggestion. The
5 Friday of the fall break is
6 available for a makeup class if
7 there is a disaster. Okay? Any
8 other discussion? Then we are ready
9 to vote. All those in favor of this
10 move to be effective fall 2007,
11 please indicate so by raising your
12 hand. Any opposed? There is one --
13 two opposed. Abstain? So it's two
14 opposed, no abstain, and motion
15 carried. Thank you. Next item.
16 Okay. This is a recommendation,
17 I'll need to give you a little bit
18 of background. First, I have to
19 remind you, the Provost was here
20 last time and he had a
21 presentation. And what I got from
22 his presentation was that one of the
23 critical areas that we have to work
24 on regarding the Top 20 is the six-
25 year graduation and retention rate.

1 Parallel to that, Arts & Sciences,
2 which is the biggest college which
3 has most contact with freshmen,
4 started three recommendations at the
5 beginning of the academic year. One
6 of them was related to withdrawal;
7 the other one -- two, I don't recall
8 quite. This went through the
9 system. It was approved by
10 Undergraduate Council, approved by
11 Graduate Council, went to HCCC, and
12 time was simply running out, and I
13 was approached by the Provost's
14 office to see if we could expedite
15 the approval of those three items.
16 I decided against that for at least
17 two reasons. There were more
18 reasons. One of them was items this
19 important should come to the Senate
20 one time for discussion and then for
21 voting. And even more serious than
22 that, we already had schedules of
23 classes out with deadlines and dates
24 and everything, and then the
25 bulletin would be changed and it

1 would confuse all of the students.
2 It would not be a very good
3 situation. So I got an idea from
4 the materials submitted by Arts &
5 Sciences. One of the benchmarks
6 that they referred to had the extra
7 three weeks or extra time for
8 withdrawal only for freshmen, so I
9 proposed to Provost and Associate
10 Provost that perhaps we could do
11 this only for freshmen, since this
12 already 90 percent of the way has
13 already been approved by the Senate
14 (inaudible). We only do it for
15 freshmen; we do it for three years
16 and then evaluate it and see how we
17 want to go with this. So having
18 said that, Associate Provost Phil
19 Kraemer, is there anything extra you
20 want to tell us?

21 KRAEMER: Well, just a couple of
22 points. One, I think it does make
23 sense to do this. If you look at
24 data on our students, the difference
25 in retention rates for students that

1 fail one or more courses versus
2 students who do not fail but
3 withdraw from one or more courses is
4 as high as 17 percentage points. So
5 I think the university has already
6 adopted the philosophy that it is
7 good to allow students to withdraw
8 from courses. This proposal makes
9 sense in that it gives them
10 sufficient time to take into account
11 their midterm grades. The other
12 point of clarification would be I
13 would hope that those proposals from
14 the College of Arts & Sciences would
15 still wind their way through and be
16 available for discussion in the
17 Senate in the fall. And if those
18 proposals would be approved, it
19 would make this proposal moot,
20 correct?

21 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Absolutely, yes. I
22 did not mean to --

23 KRAEMER: His blood pressure was rising.

24 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: No, I did not mean to
25 indicate anything at all regarding

1 those proposals. Probably they're
2 going to come to us in September, my
3 guess is.

4 HOCH: So if I may --

5 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Yes.

6 HOCH: -- so it's really a three-year
7 pilot which we hope will last only a
8 year.

9 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: You would hope, yes.

10 We hope, yes, especially you, yes,
11 Arts & Sciences. I don't want to
12 prejudge what's going to happen when
13 something comes through, but
14 certainly you could. Okay. There
15 are four stipulations, by the way.
16 John.

17 THELIN: I have a question. The comment
18 about the Arts & Sciences is
19 somewhat new to me. Since they will
20 bear a great deal of the impact of
21 this, can we make certain that what
22 we propose is amicable to them?

23 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: I am almost sure that
24 Arts & Sciences would welcome this
25 instead of no proposal at all. Is

1 that not correct, Dean Hoch?

2 HOCH: That statement is correct. This
3 is going to be rather difficult for
4 us to administer, however. I would
5 not -- we weren't consulted on this
6 change, so it's going to be
7 difficult.

8 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: You were or you were
9 not consulted?

10 HOCH: We weren't consulted very much.
11 But, you know, I don't know if
12 (inaudible) is here. He can speak
13 to it better. The notion of having
14 two drop dates for students, I
15 think, is going to be difficult.
16 The definition of who's a freshman
17 is actually not as clear as you
18 would think it is. But with the
19 hope that we'll only have to live
20 with this for a year, I think we
21 just ought to let it go through,
22 because what we really want to do is
23 have a situation where for everyone
24 the drop date is delayed. What we
25 want to be able to do essentially

1 is, when a student gets into
2 trouble, have more time to intervene
3 between the mid-term grades and the
4 11th week. Right now we have about
5 five days to intervene, and you
6 don't realize we have a very
7 significant number of students who
8 really are impacted negatively.
9 They're having a bad semester, and
10 we have about five (inaudible due to
11 coughing) we can't possibly do
12 anything. Right now, if we do it
13 for freshmen, it's a step forward,
14 but if it's simply because it
15 couldn't get through, I guess, the
16 Health Council side of the
17 university that we came up with
18 this -- let's just manage it for
19 this year, but I hope for September
20 we'll have something new to bring to
21 you.

22 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. The four
23 stipulations are: The course
24 withdrawal deadline essentially will
25 only apply to freshmen; the course

1 withdrawal deadline extension would
2 be for a three-year pilot period;
3 individual students must get the
4 approval so that they would have the
5 benefit of talking to an advisor
6 before they could withdraw; and
7 appropriate individuals would report
8 back to the Senate Council yearly,
9 hopefully only once, apparently, but
10 this says of the three-year pilot
11 extension of the withdrawal date.
12 Are there any questions? Over
13 there.

14 RAY: Connie Ray, Institutional
15 Effectiveness. This goes to the
16 point that Steve made about the
17 definition, and I think this is just
18 a technicality, but the first thing
19 up there says it would apply only to
20 first-year students who are enrolled
21 full-time for the first time at UK
22 in or after the fall. So we
23 frequently bring groups of students
24 to campus in the summer for the
25 first time. They could be full-time

1 in the summer, and then if they're
2 full-time in the fall, are they
3 excluded? I don't think we intended
4 to exclude them, but the way I read
5 that, they would be excluded.

6 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: We did ask for the
7 language from the Associate Provost
8 for Undergraduate Education. If he
9 would like or somebody would like to
10 change this slightly so it would
11 include people who start during
12 summer --

13 KRAEMER: No, I think that was an error,
14 Connie. I think it should include
15 students who are first time during
16 the summer -- full-time.

17 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. Since this has
18 already been approved, I would like
19 to get a quick amendment on that,
20 please. Connie?

21 RAY: Shall I propose an amendment?

22 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Yes, please.

23 RAY: So that it would read apply to
24 first-year students who are enrolled
25 full-time for the first time at UK

1 in or after, what, the eight-week
2 summer? How do we label that?

3 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Summer, just summer
4 because there is (inaudible).

5 RAY: Summer 2007.

6 CIBULL: How about enrolling in the fall
7 or preceding summer?

8 RAY: That would be fine.

9 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. I need a second
10 for that motion.

11 CIBULL: Second.

12 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Mike would second
13 that. Are there any further
14 discussion on this?

15 WALDHART: I just have a question. We
16 don't want it limited to 2007, do
17 we?

18 RAY: But it says "or after."

19 WALDHART: Yeah, but that is a
20 retroactive kind of thing. We want
21 something that just says that they
22 have to be in enrolled either in the
23 summer or the fall as full-time
24 students, but if you limit it only
25 to 2007, I guess that would take

1 care of the question that you're
2 asking. I think we don't want a
3 year there. Do you see what I --
4 does that make sense?

5 RAY: No.

6 WALDHART: Okay. What happens in fall
7 of 2008? This is a three-year
8 plan.

9 RAY: They're covered in the "after
10 fall."

11 WALDHART: Okay.

12 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: My assumption is that
13 even if somebody starts in spring,
14 it would apply to them for two
15 semesters, as long as they are
16 freshmen; is that correct, Phil?

17 KRAEMER: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. Over there and
19 then over here.

20 SOTTILE: Joe Sottile, College of
21 Engineering. Why not do this for
22 all students instead of just
23 freshmen?

24 HOCH: That was the health care problem.

25 KRAEMER: There are some issues with

1 that, to my understanding.

2 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: That would come back
3 to the original suggestion, which
4 would then -- we would have a set of
5 dates and a schedule of classes
6 which (inaudible). Then you would
7 have a -- the date in the bulletin,
8 and it would apply to every single
9 student. And it wasn't very clear
10 whether health colleges would like
11 their professional students to have
12 this, so this was so that the clock
13 would not run out on this idea. As
14 I said, I think the three
15 recommendations by the Arts &
16 Sciences will come to us, if not in
17 September, in October, and this
18 might all become a moot point if we
19 approve those. Over there.

20 REMER: Rory Remer, Education. If your
21 intent is that it be freshmen only,
22 then I think you should word it
23 first-year undergraduate students,
24 because as far as I read it, anybody
25 who is a new, first-year student to

1 the university, graduate students
2 would fall under this.

3 BLACKWELL: Right, and Graduate Council
4 came forward with a recommendation
5 that graduate students be excluded
6 from this proposal.

7 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. We already have
8 an amendment. I guess we could
9 amend the amendment.

10 CANON: Well, they're on two
11 separate issues.

12 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. Our
13 parliamentarian says perhaps we
14 should vote on the amendment first
15 and then we could make another
16 amendment. Why don't we vote on the
17 amendment, and then we'll have some
18 more discussion. Are we ready to
19 vote on the amendment? All those in
20 favor of the amendment, please
21 indicate by raising your hand.
22 Opposed? Abstain? It's unanimous;
23 the amendment carries.

24 CANON: Now go to Jeannine's or
25 somebody's proposal.

1 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Over there.

2 REMER: I offer a friendly amendment, I
3 guess it would be, that the wording
4 say "first-year undergraduate
5 students."

6 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Does that go with the
7 spirit of what you intended?

8 KRAEMER: That's the spirit, indeed. I
9 think the use of the words
10 "first-year student," I tried to
11 avoid using "freshmen."

12 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Would this apply to
13 somebody who transfers after three
14 years of college and now they are
15 basically a senior and then they
16 have this extra privilege where
17 other seniors don't have it?

18 KRAEMER: It wouldn't apply to them.

19 VOSS: I'm going to second.

20 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: All right. We have an
21 amendment. We have a second on that
22 amendment. Are there any discussion
23 on the second amendment?

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Would you state
25 the second amendment, please.

1 BROTHERS: Instead of first-year
2 students, it would be first-year
3 undergraduate students.

4 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. Are we ready to
5 vote on that amendment? All those
6 in favor of the amendment, please
7 indicate so by raising your hand.
8 All opposed? Abstain? Unanimous,
9 motion carries. Okay. Now we have
10 a motion that has been amended
11 twice. Yes.

12 VOSS: I want to ask about number three,
13 the requirement that there be
14 approval from the advisor. It
15 strikes me that that adds a lot of
16 work, so I wanted to ask what the
17 justification is for having that
18 extra bureaucratic step for students
19 to be able to get out of a class.

20 KRAEMER: The rationale was the thinking
21 that some might object to pushing
22 this deadline back in general and
23 that it would be -- hopefully the
24 students would actually consult an
25 advisor and be much more

1 deliberative and contemplative about
2 the decision to withdraw or not,
3 especially given that they're
4 further into the semester. And it
5 was an effort to try to make this as
6 palatable as possible for this
7 provisional one-year, hopefully,
8 proposal.

9 MILLER: Joe Miller, College of
10 Communications. Does that mean,
11 then, that an advisor could deny it
12 and that the student would then be
13 unable to withdraw?

14 KRAEMER: As written, it would be, yes.

15 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. Any other
16 comments or questions? Over there.

17 MICHAEL: Doug Michael, College of Law.
18 I have a question (inaudible)
19 because I'm unfamiliar with the
20 summer calendar. Is three weeks
21 still the right --

22 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: What?

23 MICHAEL: Is three weeks still the right
24 time to -- that doesn't do something
25 screwy like go beyond the end of the

1 summer term, does it?

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

3 MICHAEL: So three weeks is okay, even
4 in the compressed summer calendar?

5 KRAEMER: Well, I think the proposal is
6 only dealing with the fall and
7 spring semesters.

8 MICHAEL: I thought we just amended it
9 to include summer.

10 KRAEMER: It would include students who
11 were (inaudible). They would be
12 eligible, is my understanding.

13 MICHAEL: They would be eligible to do
14 this.

15 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Not for the summer
16 itself, but those who start in
17 summer, they would be able in fall
18 and spring. Enid.

19 WALDHART: My question is, could we
20 change the -- I think the question
21 about approval is a very good one if
22 we don't want to allow disapproval,
23 but we could say consultation with
24 an advisor. That seems to me to
25 meet the spirit of the law.

1 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Exactly. If we don't
2 want the power to disapprove, you
3 could say after consultation, so
4 consultation would be required, but
5 I need an amendment for that. I
6 don't think that's a very friendly
7 one.

8 WALDHART: I would move -- make that
9 motion.

10 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: You would move to
11 amend that?

12 WALDHART: To read --

13 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Do we have a second on
14 that?

15 LOCK: Second, Lock.

16 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Dean Hoch.

17 HOCH: How would we monitor consultation
18 with the advisor?

19 WALDHART: Just a signature.

20 MOLITERNO: Well, it would be saying I
21 consulted with a student and this
22 and that, not necessarily approving
23 it.

24 WALDHART: Right.

25 HOCH: Well, it doesn't eliminate any

1 bureaucratic process. It gives the
2 student a little bit more
3 flexibility, but we would have the
4 same bureaucratic process in front
5 of that.

6 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: I can see why we would
7 have problems with that. We faculty
8 are very used to being consulted and
9 always ignored, so we know exactly
10 what it means.

11 WALDHART: I would like to say that I
12 think "consulting with" is
13 important. I think there are a lot
14 of students who might be tempted to
15 withdraw without understanding what
16 the kinds of consequences would be.
17 And so "consulting with," so that
18 somebody just signs off and said,
19 "I've met with this student," it
20 seems to me that that provides the
21 best of both kinds of things and
22 doesn't make it an approve or
23 disapprove kind of decision.

24 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. Let's vote on
25 this third amendment. All those in

1 favor of the amendment, please
2 indicate so by raising your hand.
3 Any opposed? One, two, three, four,
4 five. Abstain? Five opposed, one
5 abstain, motion carries, the
6 amendment. Now we have to vote one
7 more time on the entire proposal.
8 Are we all ready? All those in
9 favor of the entire proposal amended
10 three times, please indicate so by
11 raising your hand. All opposed?
12 One, two. Abstain? Okay. So two
13 opposed, zero abstain. Motion
14 carried. Thank you, again. Okay.
15 Rule change: College of Pharmacy, a
16 professional school, would like to
17 disallow the repeat option for those
18 students who are in College of
19 Pharmacy. The rationale from
20 College of Pharmacy is the academic
21 performance, progress and promotion
22 rules for College of Pharmacy do not
23 address repeat options. The faculty
24 feels repeat options are not
25 appropriate for a professional

1 program. This is a pretty
2 straightforward recommendation. Is
3 Associate Dean Lubawy here? Peggy
4 is here, yes.

5 PIASCIK: Dr. Lubawy couldn't be here
6 today, so I'm representing him.
7 When we moved to the all Pharm.D.
8 program, we rewrote our academic
9 rules, and this was basically an
10 oversight. We're a professional
11 program, but we're undergraduate
12 professional and didn't realize
13 that, by not writing this into our
14 rules, we were subject to the
15 undergraduate rules which would
16 allow the repeat option. And this
17 rule does not mean that a student
18 can't repeat a course; it means that
19 both grades appear on the transcript
20 and both grades are factored into
21 their GPA. They still can repeat.

22 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Any discussion?

23 MICHAEL: Doug Michael, College of Law.
24 I was trying to head off (inaudible)
25 problems, and help me if I don't

1 understand this. A student does not
2 apply as a freshman to the College
3 of Pharmacy. As I read the rules,
4 they have to be here for two years
5 before they apply. In those two
6 years they could, as students
7 wherever they are, exercise the
8 repeat option.

9 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Correct. In fact,
10 this question --

11 MICHAEL: And then when they apply and
12 are admitted to the College of
13 Pharmacy, what happens to those
14 repeat erased grades?

15 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: This very question
16 came up in Senate Council, and the
17 answer was it doesn't apply to
18 them. They retain the repeat
19 option. It only applies to courses
20 while students are in the College of
21 Pharmacy.

22 MICHAEL: Then could I suggest an
23 amendment to the language?

24 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Absolutely.

25 MICHAEL: Is it up there?

1 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: That the Senate
2 approve the addition of language --
3 oh, the exact -- it's in your
4 handout.

5 BROTHERS: It's on page 53 of your
6 handout. There's a memo from
7 Associate Dean Lubawy. There's one
8 line and then a four-line paragraph
9 that is the additional change, or
10 that's the changed language.

11 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Or you could amend the
12 motion and then we ask the Rules
13 Committee to codify it.

14 MICHAEL: Well, I wouldn't want to
15 codify it by changing the language
16 (inaudible).

17 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay.

18 MICHAEL: It says for students enrolled
19 in the college, and the natural
20 meaning of that language would be
21 that you no longer have the repeat
22 option that you exercised as an
23 undergraduate before you came to the
24 College of Pharmacy. It would be a
25 simple matter to change that line to

1 say for courses taken by students
2 after enrolling in the College of
3 Pharmacy, which I think is what you
4 had in mind.

5 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay.

6 BROTHERS: I'm sorry? For courses taken
7 by students --

8 MICHAEL: Remove the language that says
9 "for students enrolled" and replace
10 it with language that says "for
11 courses taken by students after they
12 enroll."

13 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Or while they're
14 enrolled in College of Pharmacy?

15 MICHAEL: After.

16 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: I see. Dean
17 Blackwell?

18 BLACKWELL: Just for clarification, does
19 this apply only to the Pharm.D. or
20 also to the Ph.D. in Pharmaceutical
21 Sciences?

22 PIASCIK: These rules are for the
23 professional program.

24 BLACKWELL: Okay. So this is just for
25 the Pharm.D.

1 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Our understanding was
2 the free repeat option does not
3 apply to graduate students to begin
4 with, so --

5 BLACKWELL: Right.

6 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Yes.

7 VOSS: Again, I'm going to second the
8 motion.

9 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. So that was a
10 friendly amendment, so the motion is
11 seconded. Are we ready to vote on
12 this? Are there any further
13 discussion?

14 CANON: If a pharmacy student takes an
15 English course and wants to repeat
16 it, gets a D, say, and wants to
17 repeat it, is this allowed?

18 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: My son used to be a
19 pharmacy student. Usually if they
20 take an English course, it's before
21 they're admitted to Pharmacy.

22 CANON: Well, my point really is a
23 nonpharmacy course.

24 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Peggy.

25 PIASCIK: I don't think that we would

1 really care. The intent is -- our
2 program is so compact, they only
3 have eight electives anyway, and
4 they're professional electives. I
5 can't envision any of our students
6 taking an English course while
7 they're enrolled in our college. So
8 it is possible and that I don't
9 think would -- I think maybe what
10 we're talking about is our required
11 curriculum.

12 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Dean Blackwell.

13 BLACKWELL: When students are in the
14 professional program, they have a
15 separate transcript from any other
16 thing. If they were, say, admitted
17 into an undergraduate or graduate
18 English program, they would have a
19 separate transcript that would be
20 for the graduate school, and so
21 those GPA's are not intermingled
22 here, and it would not appear at all
23 on the professional transcript.

24 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay.

25 KRAEMER: One more question. Is this in

1 line with the other professional
2 programs? Are there repeat
3 options?

4 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: No. In fact, we're
5 going to have another item you'll
6 see later on. This is the first one
7 that we know of. Are we ready to
8 vote on this motion which has been
9 amended in a friendly fashion? All
10 those in favor of this proposal,
11 please indicate so by raising your
12 hand. Any opposed? Abstain? It's
13 unanimous; motion carries. As a
14 result of that --

15 CANON: (Inaudible.)

16 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: No, I said it was a
17 friendly amendment, so it was
18 accepted, so we only had to vote
19 only once. Is that okay, Brad?

20 CANON: Yeah. I guess I didn't catch
21 that.

22 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: As a result of that,
23 the Senate Council made another
24 recommendation right after this one
25 that the Senate approve the

1 inclusion of the following language
2 at the end of the first paragraph of
3 SR 5.3.1.1: "The Graduate School
4 and professional degree programs may
5 restrict repeat options." The idea
6 was to give a heads-up to students
7 that the repeat option might not
8 necessarily apply to every single
9 program, and in fact Pharmacy was
10 the first one that excluded it. It
11 would be in the Pharmacy section,
12 but we thought it should also be in
13 the section regarding repeat options
14 that say somebody who has
15 (inaudible) Pharmacy and they leave
16 that section, and then it goes in
17 their mind that they have the repeat
18 option. Any question on that? Mike
19 Cibull.

20 CIBULL: Yeah. You -- you're under the
21 catalog you come in on, so if you
22 come in with the repeat option
23 available, is there a repeat option
24 available to you during the course
25 of your (inaudible due to

1 coughing)?

2 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Correct.

3 CIBULL: So what is this? You couldn't
4 take it away from them if the person
5 came in with that option in place;
6 is that not correct?

7 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Yes.

8 MICHAEL: It's superfluous language,
9 from my reading. The whole thing is
10 captioned Undergraduate Colleges,
11 and the problem came up -- again,
12 correct me if I'm wrong (inaudible)
13 this is the only undergraduate
14 professional program that we have.

15 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay.

16 CIBULL: What does it do? It doesn't do
17 anything.

18 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: This changes the rule,
19 allowing other professional degrees
20 to do the same thing in the future.
21 This was our understanding.
22 Unfortunately, as the motion is in
23 front of us, somebody could move to
24 table it, send it back for
25 reconsideration, or we could vote

1 against it. Does anybody have -- I
2 saw somebody's hand raise.

3 CIBULL: Move to table.

4 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Any second on that?

5 Liz Debski. Okay. Is that limited
6 discussion or no discussion? No
7 discussion. That's the type I
8 like. All right. We are going to
9 vote on this motion to table this
10 particular language. All those in
11 favor of tabling this
12 recommendation, please indicate so
13 by raising your hand. Opposed? One
14 opposed. Abstain? One, two, three,
15 four, five, six, seven, eight, nine,
16 ten, eleven. Michelle, is that
17 correct? I didn't mean to interfere
18 with your --

19 SOHNER: I have to count them again. I
20 really don't know.

21 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Please raise your
22 right hand again so Michelle --
23 she's our official one. You're
24 abstaining from vote.

25 SOHNER: I had 11.

1 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. Motion
2 carries. Next item. We have come
3 to you --

4 MICHAEL: I have a point of order. You
5 cannot lay something on the table
6 indefinitely. Where is the table,
7 and when does it come back, and what
8 happens?

9 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: I thought I said so
10 that it would go back to the
11 Council.

12 MICHAEL: The Senate Council? Okay.

13 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: I thought that's what
14 I said. Is that acceptable, Brad?

15 CANON: Well, under the Senate Rules,
16 something that is tabled is supposed
17 to be tabled to a date certain.

18 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. Well, it's my
19 fault; I didn't ask a
20 parliamentarian. Who was the
21 tabler?

22 CIBULL: Here.

23 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: We have been told by
24 the parliamentarian --

25 CIBULL: When is the next official

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

Senate meeting?

BROTHERS: September 10th.

CIBULL: Table it until September 10th.

CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. We need a
second on that or another second.
Same second over there. Okay.

We're going to vote one more time.

All those in favor --

VOSS: I'm sorry. I have a point of
order. Are you allowed to table
things over the year? In general,
things that are tabled at the end of
a session --

CANON: Yes, this can be tabled to next
year.

VOSS: The rules allow it?

CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Yes. All those in
favor of the tabling this motion
until September 10th, please
indicate so by raising your hand.
Opposed? One. Abstain? Seven.

SOHNER: Well, I got ten.

CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: That's okay. Motion
to table carries. Next item, number
16, change to Senate Rules 5.1.8.5.

1 We have come to you at least one
2 other time I remember, and there
3 were some other requests which
4 resulted in this further tweaking of
5 the retroactive withdrawal. Is
6 Katherine McCormick here? Okay.
7 Then maybe Sheila could help me to
8 some degree with this. Here is --
9 the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal
10 wanted to know what happens with
11 stops, and they also were interested
12 in making -- modifying the form, and
13 this has been done. The form and
14 the language that has been slightly
15 modified is in your handout. Are
16 there any questions on that?

17 MICHAEL: Doug Michael, College of Law,
18 Interior Rules Committee. I
19 apologize to the Senate for taking
20 time. I did not have time to look
21 at this before it came to the floor,
22 and that's my fault. There are
23 several really, I promise, technical
24 changes that need to be made to
25 this. For starters, the caption is

1 the wrong heading. It should be B
2 and not A. It suggests -- the
3 language in number one there is
4 language that we've already repealed
5 at our last meeting, but it's easy
6 to fix. I would suggest that this
7 be committed to the Rules Committee
8 for modification, and it's just
9 moving things around where they
10 belong, but it really can't be done
11 the way it is.

12 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: I guess I pushed
13 myself too far the first time
14 saying -- without referring to the
15 Rules Committee, so that was my
16 mistake. We'll take that one out so
17 the Rules Committee will have a
18 chance to codify this. Is that the
19 essence of your request, Doug?

20 MICHAEL: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. It has been
22 slightly modified. Is there any
23 other discussion regarding this
24 item? All those in favor of this
25 proposal or recommendation, please

1 indicate so by raising your hand.

2 Any opposed?

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What are we

4 voting on, now?

5 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: On the recommendation.

6 We already voted.

7 (INAUDIBLE.)

8 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Oh, that was a

9 point -- thank you.

10 MICHAEL: Is that an amendment?

11 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: We can certainly

12 codify. There is no too much

13 codification. We can always codify

14 things even further, so we bring

15 this to the Senate Rules Committee.

16 Okay. So no vote is necessary; is

17 that correct? Okay. We'll move on

18 to --

19 WALDHART: We still have to vote.

20 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: It was approved. I am

21 told we already voted on that

22 approval.

23 CANON: But I'm not sure everybody

24 realized that.

25 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. Let's make sure

1 we all understand, and I apologize
2 for the confusion. Why don't we
3 vote one more time.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What are we
5 voting on?

6 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: The original proposal
7 was here, the recommendation,
8 without the part that says and -- it
9 does say "go to." Did you just
10 change this?

11 BROTHERS: No, it's been like that.

12 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. Doug, tell us,
13 what is your recommendation? It
14 says, "to be sent to the SREC for
15 codification."

16 MICHAEL: I don't see where it says
17 that.

18 WALDHART: Right here.

19 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Right at the end, it
20 says, "Effective fall 2007 and send
21 it to the SREC for codification."

22 MICHAEL: Okay.

23 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: So now everybody
24 understands what we have voted on;
25 why don't we vote one more time.

1 Are we ready? Doug, are you okay
2 with this?

3 MICHAEL: Yeah. Where did that come
4 from?

5 BURKHART: It's not on this paper.

6 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Oh, it's not in your
7 handout. I don't know how to
8 explain it.

9 MICHAEL: Okay.

10 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Several things have
11 happened in word processing. But
12 amazingly enough, this is what you
13 intended to amend, so if we could
14 vote one more time so our
15 parliamentarian is sure that we knew
16 what we were voting on. All those
17 in favor of this recommendation,
18 please indicate so by raising your
19 hands. Opposed? The opposed person
20 gave up. Okay. Abstain? One, two,
21 three. Three abstain. Motion
22 carries. Thank you. Okay. We
23 have, I think, three more items to
24 go. Change to Governing Regulations
25 X, or ten, Tenure Clock Delay. This

1 part of the language is new, but
2 Governing Regulation X is not new.
3 Rather than giving any background on
4 this, may I ask Heidi Anderson,
5 please come and go over these key
6 points. I have them ready for you.
7 If you just keep pushing one at a
8 time, it will come up.

9 ANDERSON: Thank you, Kaveh. I have key
10 points that I'm going to cover on
11 GR X, and part of covering that,
12 before I start, let me just give you
13 a little bit of background that is
14 not in your packet, or some of it is
15 there and you may not have had a
16 chance to look at it all. This
17 particular recommendation really
18 comes from a group of women faculty
19 in the College of Arts & Sciences,
20 and there was a committee some time
21 ago that was put together there by
22 the Dean and asked those women to
23 actually look at issues that address
24 women faculty in general. Those
25 women studied quite a few different

1 issues, and they looked around at
2 our benchmarks, and one of the
3 issues that they came forward with
4 was the extension of our
5 probationary period or the tenure
6 clock. And in October of 2006,
7 Judith Lesnaw brought the issue
8 before the Senate Council
9 specifically for their input, and
10 Senate Council came back. They
11 discussed the issue on a number of
12 fronts, but they had a couple of
13 points. Some of those points were
14 things like including language that
15 allowed for guardianship of a child
16 through foster care, the timing of
17 the request, making sure that was
18 clear, including male faculty, not
19 just women, removing the stigma for
20 requesting an extension for
21 probationary clock extension, and
22 making sure that this applied to all
23 of the UK tenure track/tenure title
24 series positions. After that, this
25 was then taken in November and

1 December to another faculty
2 committee chaired by Phil Harling.
3 That committee was the UCAPP, the
4 Strategic Planning and Priorities
5 Committee, the faculty development
6 subcommittee of UCAPP, and those
7 individuals discussed it at some
8 length, again, and continued to add
9 a different -- other language. And
10 finally, we researched benchmarks.
11 Anyone interested can see me
12 afterwards, and I can show you the
13 details from the benchmarks and how
14 they look on all these particular
15 different factors. I don't want to
16 take up Senate time at this time to
17 give you all of that, but if you are
18 curious, I have the information.
19 And the last thing that we did was
20 looked at AAUP and got
21 recommendations from AAUP, and I
22 really want to point these out. The
23 AAUP has a series of recommendations
24 that it puts forth, and if you
25 decide to have an extension of a

1 tenure clock policy, you need to
2 consider these factors. First of
3 all, they recommended strongly that
4 it be an automatic policy, and that
5 is to hopefully alleviate the stigma
6 that's associated with women or men
7 or anyone asking for that
8 extension. Second, AAUP says make
9 sure that you have a clear
10 entitlement under this policy that
11 they fall under the institutional
12 purview and that people do not have
13 to individually bring forth an
14 arrangement or some kind of informal
15 practice. The second, make sure
16 that the individual candidates are
17 reviewed when time for tenure comes
18 up under the existing standards and
19 guidelines, and the last area that
20 AAUP strongly recommends is that
21 administration, and this happens to
22 fall into what I call an
23 institutional culture, that we
24 create a culture where we look at
25 this practice as automatic but that

1 we monitor it to make sure that
2 tenure decisions are not being made
3 any differently than normal -- under
4 normal circumstances, that faculty
5 members are not being penalized for
6 requesting or receiving such
7 extensions, and that before we
8 actually approve such a policy, that
9 we create an implementation strategy
10 to set forth to communicate this to
11 the campus, but also to make sure
12 the faculty are aware of their
13 rights. If this becomes approved,
14 then the next step in this process
15 would be an implementation strategy,
16 which I am kind of working out at
17 this time, anticipating maybe that
18 this may move forward, that it then
19 would go to Senate Council for its
20 input and discussion and then to the
21 deans and then out to all of the
22 faculty. The key points, then, in
23 our particular policy that has been
24 added to GR X, and I want to thank
25 Marcy Deaton for helping me with the

1 GR language from a legal standpoint,
2 includes these factors, and it's in
3 your packet. First of all, it would
4 be available to men and women. They
5 would receive an automatic one-year
6 extension of the tenure clock. They
7 would be available, based on
8 (inaudible) conditions or events.
9 Those events may include becoming a
10 parent because of a birth or an
11 adoption or a foster child or if a
12 relative or someone who is dependent
13 within your family, dependent on you
14 because of illness, that that would
15 be an event. The individual would
16 notify their unit head. The unit
17 head, of course, notifies the Dean,
18 and the Dean would send the Provost
19 a Notice of Academic Appointment.
20 It's a current form that we use.
21 And when would it be effective? The
22 anniversary of the person's start
23 date until the year in which their
24 tenure is schedule to be reviewed.
25 And they need to notify the unit

1 head of the event within six months
2 or no later of the -- no later than
3 the last day of the fifth year.
4 Those are the key points. And then
5 finally, since it is automatic, that
6 we're proposing if someone does not
7 want to follow through with this
8 policy, then they complete a waiver
9 form. And that was one of the
10 caveats; I noticed that one of our
11 benchmarks used that for individuals
12 who didn't want to be under the
13 automatic policy. And I have a
14 draft waiver form ready to share
15 with Senate Council in this regard.
16 I think those are all of the
17 points -- oh, I'm sorry, the last
18 one, of course. Two times an
19 individual could apply within their
20 tenure period for this, two times
21 within the probationary period.
22 Okay? With that, then, I think you
23 have the rest of the language, the
24 other background, and your packet
25 also talks about the Princeton

1 report and some of the other
2 background materials. And then the
3 last thing I'll just point out
4 because I know those of you who work
5 with me regularly know this; I'm a
6 show-and-tell person. I'm sure that
7 if you haven't already read it, you
8 might want to, or reread it again,
9 the ACE report. The American
10 Council on Education really talked
11 about setting an agenda to actually
12 look at creating flexible tenure
13 track policies for faculty, and this
14 is their current 2006 report.

15 Okay?

16 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Yes.

17 WALDHART: I have a question about the
18 two times within the probationary
19 period. If that was something that
20 was going to be up to the person to
21 request it, I can see where two
22 times makes sense, but does this
23 mean that it's automatically waived
24 two times so that every person
25 automatically has two times?

1 go to Senate Council with an
2 implementation strategy at this
3 point if it was not something that
4 wasn't approved yet.

5 FORGUE: Okay. Then the next one on the
6 waiver, I guess I don't understand
7 that. Is that when you come in and
8 you'd say I'm going to waive this
9 forever? I mean, to me, I don't
10 understand how you can have a policy
11 like this without the person wanting
12 to initiate and ask for it. Why
13 would you need a waiver? I mean,
14 it's assumed they waive it if they
15 don't ask.

16 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: I have an
17 understanding of that. This is a
18 delicate way to remove the stigma.

19 ANDERSON: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: So even if the faculty
21 member tells the chair, I had a
22 baby, because the rule doesn't
23 require her to request it formally,
24 then she could say I did not
25 request. And if she doesn't

1 decline, she is given, and therefore
2 the stigma is removed.

3 FORGUE: Okay. So the simple
4 notification that I had a baby would
5 trigger --

6 ANDERSON: It triggers an event -- I'm
7 sorry; it triggers the process.

8 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. I was going to
9 go that way, over there.

10 YATES: J. W. Yates, College of
11 Education. What about -- is this
12 going to be a retroactive policy if
13 it's implemented?

14 ANDERSON: The Provost has discussed
15 this with the deans as recently as
16 two weeks ago, and the answer is
17 yes. If this goes forward and it's
18 approved, then those people that are
19 still within their probationary
20 period, the Provost informed the
21 deans to make it so.

22 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Liz Debski.

23 DEBSKI: Yes, Biology. So I guess it's
24 probably too early for you to answer
25 this, too, but given that you need

1 to define significant and it's going
2 to be automatic, I'm wondering how
3 many faculty members do you think it
4 would affect?

5 ANDERSON: Very good question. I
6 haven't researched it that far to be
7 able to answer definitively at this
8 time. I can bring that information
9 to Senate Council if that's
10 something you're interested in.

11 DEBSKI: Yeah, I would be very much
12 interested in that because I'm
13 wondering if the overall effect of
14 the policy might be just to raise
15 the bar higher for a lot of people,
16 basically. Again, that will depend
17 on how you define significant and
18 how it's implemented.

19 ANDERSON: I was going to say, just to
20 answer the question, Sheila is
21 taking notes and I'll get the
22 information from Sheila. I also
23 have someone else, a couple of other
24 people taking notes. If you see me
25 not writing, I do have people

1 capturing the points.

2 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Dean Hoch.

3 HOCH: I think we're going to have to
4 leave some latitudes to chairs and
5 to deans regarding the definition of
6 significant. If your mother is in a
7 nursing home and you are the legal
8 guardian of the person, but really
9 you're doing nothing other than
10 signing checks for them, that may
11 not be interpreted as significant.
12 On the other hand, if that person is
13 living with you and you're providing
14 daily care, and of course the
15 institution doesn't want to be
16 overly intrusive into the personal
17 lives of an individual, either, so I
18 think we're going to need some
19 latitude in that. I don't think we
20 can provide wording or legislation
21 that will deal with every case that
22 comes up. And I think most faculty
23 in my experience, you know, in
24 circumstances like this would
25 exercise good faith and good

1 judgment. I think we'll just have
2 to deal with it that way.

3 BLACKWELL: Heidi, you might want to say
4 about the circumstances, when you
5 have two full-time professors who
6 are spouses, do they both get --

7 ANDERSON: Yeah, they both get it. The
8 Provost was very clear on that. He
9 says if we have dual faculty members
10 here, they both get this option.

11 MILLER: Joe Miller, College of
12 Communications. In the packet on
13 page 60, in the language it strikes
14 the word "guardianship" at the
15 beginning of that and replaces it
16 with "assumes significant
17 responsibilities," but then later in
18 that paragraph it sort of looks like
19 it again goes back to "adoption
20 and/or guardianship." Is
21 guardianship a requirement?

22 ANDERSON: No, it's not. We'll change
23 the wording there. (Inaudible)
24 change the wording to make sure it
25 fits that line that talks about

1 assume significant responsibilities.
2 Part of what you see as stricken is
3 I met with Senate Council this past
4 Monday to get their assistance with
5 the word "guardianship," and that's
6 the language we came up with and we
7 weren't (inaudible) the rest of the
8 paragraph. Thank you.

9 SAWAYA: Sawaya, College of Medicine.
10 If the faculty changes their mind
11 and they want to go for early
12 promotion, there's nothing to
13 prevent them?

14 ANDERSON: That's correct; nothing
15 prevents it.

16 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Any other questions?

17 MICHAEL: Doug Michael, College of Law.
18 Just to make sure I understand,
19 although you've characterized this
20 as automatic, it still requires
21 affirmative action on the part of
22 the person who has experienced the
23 event, at least by the end of the
24 fifth year of their probationary
25 period, to say, "Oh, by the way,

1 three years ago I had a kid."

2 ANDERSON: Six months, it says.

3 MICHAEL: It says "or by the end of the
4 fifth year."

5 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Whichever comes --

6 ANDERSON: Yeah, whichever comes first,
7 in the language in your packet.
8 These are just key points I've put
9 up here. I didn't copy the exact
10 language from the packet.

11 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. Any other
12 comments?

13 ANDERSON: We tried to put this up
14 there, and we ended up being too
15 small.

16 MICHAEL: But it still requires
17 notification.

18 ANDERSON: It requires the person to say
19 something to the unit head. I hope
20 that's something -- a dialogue they
21 would be doing on a regular basis.

22 MICHAEL: You would hope so.

23 HOCH: Again, the reason for that, the
24 reason for making it automatic is
25 the research has found that women,

1 particularly in the bench sciences,
2 are often very reluctant to make an
3 application if they have to take an
4 affirmative step because the culture
5 of the department often is not
6 supportive. So what we really want
7 to do, in thinking about changing
8 the fundamental culture of the
9 university, we want to put the --
10 the individual has no burden
11 whatsoever. I mean, I suppose if
12 they decide to not tell anyone that
13 they had a kid, you know, and were
14 not, you know, plainly or visibly
15 pregnant at any point in time, they
16 could secrete it. But normally the
17 goal was not to --

18 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: It's my understanding
19 that that part is actually
20 recommended by AAUP.

21 ANDERSON: That's correct. AAUP
22 strongly recommends that, and our
23 Provost is going to follow with
24 that.

25 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: We have one more or

1 maybe two more items. Please, last
2 comment.

3 MICHAEL: I will be as brief as
4 possible. I want to make sure this
5 doesn't (inaudible) opportunistic
6 use by people simply saying, "I had
7 a significant event," and
8 unfortunately it becomes a fact that
9 everybody (inaudible), it doesn't
10 have any effect.

11 ANDERSON: That's why I really want to
12 work with Senate Council in
13 particular, if the Senators are
14 comfortable with that, I think, you
15 know, working with Senate Council as
16 your voice.

17 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. We should go
18 ahead and vote on this.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We don't vote.

20 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: It was discussion and
21 input, correct.

22 CANON: You can vote or not vote,
23 depending on whether you have a
24 motion to endorse.

25 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Correct. I mean, you

1 could have a motion to endorse. We
2 are not in a position to approve or
3 disapprove this as a final approval
4 or disapproval, but we are entitled
5 to our own opinions. So we could
6 have a motion to endorse like the
7 other one.

8 LESNAW: I so move.

9 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: To endorse the
10 recommendations.

11 DWOSKIN: Second, Linda Dwoskin,
12 Pharmacy.

13 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. Any last
14 discussion?

15 DEBSKI: Could I just ask for a
16 clarification of what we're going to
17 endorse just a little bit more,
18 since there's actually no real --
19 there's a lot of details to be
20 figured out yet and they're not
21 specified.

22 ANDERSON: There is no details to be
23 figured out except the
24 implementation strategy. The actual
25 AR is in your packet.

1 DEBSKI: I understand that, but I'm
2 talking about in the motion that it
3 hasn't been specified what we're
4 endorsing.

5 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: What are we
6 endorsing? Judith.

7 LESNAW: We are endorsing this
8 alteration to the AR as it appears
9 in our packet.

10 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. And second.
11 All those in favor of endorsing this
12 language, please indicate so by
13 raising your hand. Any opposed?
14 One. Abstain? One opposed, zero
15 abstain, motion carries. Next
16 item: Proposed Changes/Combining of
17 Administrative Regulations II-1.0-1,
18 Faculty Appointment, Reappointment,
19 Promotion and Tenure. I'm going to
20 give this quickly to Richard
21 Greissman, but only I would say that
22 we have right now several different
23 ARs regarding different title
24 series. And a suggestion was made
25 to put this all together in one AR.

1 This has been approved by AR
2 Committee, which has faculty
3 representation on it. As the Senate
4 Council Chair, I'm on that
5 committee. Mostly changes are
6 editorial. We did a few substantive
7 changes, which I'm sure Richard
8 Greissman will bring it to our
9 attention to get the proper input.
10 Having said that, Richard, will you
11 please help us?

12 GREISSMAN: Sure. As Kaveh suggested,
13 this has been, I don't know, an
14 eight- or nine-year experience, it
15 feels like, actually done this over
16 several years. It's gone through
17 several, several committee
18 iterations. It's an attempt more
19 than anything else to help make -- I
20 know this will sound foolish -- help
21 make the administrative regulations
22 more intelligible. With that naive
23 assumption, you can reject
24 everything else I've said -- I will
25 say, but the attempt, quite frankly,

1 is to put in one place the
2 chronology of events that attends a
3 promotion or tenured review. So
4 you'll see the language, really, is
5 a reordering such that things start
6 at the unit level: Department,
7 school, division, moved then to the
8 college level, and finally to the
9 university level with the Provost
10 and the President. The substantive
11 changes are few. Those have been
12 vetted first with the Provost and
13 then with Senate Council. The deans
14 have not had a chance to weigh on
15 this. There were several other
16 things more pressing. What we
17 promise is that when the deans have
18 a chance to look at this, we'll
19 bring it back to Senate Council and
20 the University Senate for another
21 look, especially if there's some
22 change the deans suggest. This is
23 meant to be iterative. We don't
24 want to do this too quickly, but I'd
25 like to get it done before my

1 retirement, which is coming up in
2 about ten years.

3 (INAUDIBLE.)

4 GREISSMAN: I know. Again, naive
5 statement number two, but the intent
6 is to make these essential faculty
7 ARs more useful than they might be
8 otherwise, especially to the
9 candidate and those who review a
10 candidate for either tenure or
11 promotion. Finally, I'd like to
12 thank the Senate Council Committee
13 on Privilege and Tenure. Lee
14 Blonder invited me to present, and
15 I'll present again. It seemed like
16 an especially good committee to
17 present to because they see us, if
18 you will, at our worst. When a
19 faculty person appeals the review,
20 their insights have been especially
21 helpful. I'm going to thank that
22 committee. Again, the intention is
23 to move with deliberation and speed
24 but to make sure that the Senate
25 Council, the University Senate, and

1 the deans are comfortable with the
2 changes before they're implemented.
3 And the Provost, of course, and the
4 Associate Provost of Faculty Affairs
5 have been intimate partners as
6 well. So having said that, I'll
7 certainly entertain questions you
8 might have, again, knowing that it
9 will probably come back again, but
10 let's at least get this discussion
11 going if we could.

12 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. The language is
13 in front of you. Are there any
14 questions?

15 GONZALEZ: Lori Gonzalez, College of
16 Health Sciences.

17 GREISSMAN: I'm sorry; I couldn't hear.

18 GONZALEZ: I was just saying Lori
19 Gonzalez, College of Health
20 Sciences.

21 GREISSMAN: I finally get to meet you.
22 Hi, Lori.

23 GONZALEZ: I have a question on the
24 consultation with the faculty, and
25 it talks about the promotion or

1 tenure dossier, and it changed from
2 a minimum of three letters to six.

3 GREISSMAN: Yes.

4 GONZALEZ: And one of the issues that
5 that seems to bring up is sort of
6 the expedited review, when you have
7 an associate or full professor that
8 you're trying to appoint in a faster
9 way.

10 GREISSMAN: Yes. It would not affect
11 that.

12 GONZALEZ: Okay.

13 GREISSMAN: I think we could -- let me
14 always be careful. It doesn't have
15 to affect that situation.

16 GONZALEZ: Okay.

17 GREISSMAN: This was an attempt in an
18 ordinary review to make sure that
19 what was codified in the AR that has
20 been a statement in probably three
21 years' worth of provost opening of
22 term memos and a bunch of chancellor
23 memos before that. For some time
24 now, the opening of term memo that a
25 chancellor, now provost, has put out

1 has said let's have at least six
2 letters. So we simply wanted to
3 codify practice. But you're right;
4 the expedited review already takes
5 exception to the ordinary process,
6 and so I think that's something we
7 could take up. I should not have
8 answered as quickly as I did. It's
9 a reasonable thing. I think it's
10 where the provost can weigh in and
11 say let's go with the typical three
12 letters. Heidi, does that make
13 sense?

14 ANDERSON: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Over here.

16 KIRSCHLING: I'm Jane Kirschling from
17 the College of Nursing. Would you
18 prefer that the deans save it for
19 you for later?

20 GREISSMAN: Only if it's a tough
21 question, absolutely, yes, save it
22 for later.

23 KIRSCHLING: Well, I think that six may
24 be a high bar in terms of the some
25 of the specialties, disciplines in

1 which they're highly specialized.

2 Six seems like a very high bar.

3 GREISSMAN: Okay. Sure. And since it
4 was the Provost who felt strongly
5 about that, my suggestion is at the
6 next dean meeting, take it up with
7 him, please. That's a good point.

8 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Again, we are not,
9 per se, approving or disproving
10 this; therefore, any comment will be
11 used by the Provost to slightly,
12 maybe, change. Over here.

13 MICHAEL: Doug Michael, College of Law.
14 Who is the AR Committee? Is that
15 different from the -- different from
16 the provost area Administrative
17 Regulation?

18 GREISSMAN: Yes. There's a steering
19 committee that has the lofty title
20 you just uttered, and then within
21 that are two subcommittees: One
22 looking at provost area ARs, the
23 other looking at the Executive Vice
24 President for Fiscal Affairs' ARs.

25 MICHAEL: What is this work group a

1 committee of?

2 GREISSMAN: It's a joint committee of
3 the President and Senate Council.

4 MICHAEL: Are those people willing to
5 identify themselves?

6 GREISSMAN: No. In fact, they wear bags
7 over their heads at all the
8 meetings.

9 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. Are there any
10 other questions? All the way over
11 there.

12 DEEM: Jody Deem, College of Health
13 Sciences. Just a couple of
14 questions. My hunch is some of this
15 is already -- not having read all of
16 the ARs last night before I went to
17 bed, I'm guessing a lot of this
18 language is not changed.

19 GREISSMAN: Exactly, right.

20 DEEM: As I remember reading some
21 version of the AR on promotion and
22 tenure a while back, there used to
23 be a committee like the executive
24 committee of the board or something
25 like that, that when a faculty

1 member was appealing the decision of
2 the President, there was a right of
3 the faculty member to take that
4 appeal right to the executive
5 committee of the board. I don't see
6 even a mention of an executive
7 committee of the board in this
8 language now.

9 GREISSMAN: Yeah, that's not where it
10 is. That was taken up this year.
11 It's a GR. Forgive me for not
12 remembering where, but that was a
13 hotly contested issue this year.

14 DEEM: So it's gone?

15 GREISSMAN: I don't think it was ever in
16 the ARs. It was not in the ARs. I
17 think it's GR X.

18 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: There's no change.

19 ANDERSON: No, no change has been made.

20 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: There was some
21 discussion, but no change has been
22 made.

23 GREISSMAN: But it was not expunged from
24 this AR; that's what I wanted to
25 say.

1 DEEM: Okay. Gotcha. The other thing
2 that strikes me, and I'm sure this
3 is not changed language at all, and
4 I guess one of those things I'm
5 saying out into the air so my ears
6 can say I said it, you know, I went
7 through the ARs and I counted no
8 less than 11 times where someone is
9 obligated to make a recommendation,
10 some committee, some person.

11 GREISSMAN: Yes.

12 DEEM: Until you get to a negative
13 recommendation, and then suddenly
14 the wording is it is not university
15 policy to provide written reasons.
16 It just strikes me as an interesting
17 conflict between the rights of the
18 faculty member and the rights of the
19 university.

20 GREISSMAN: You're right; it is an
21 interesting observation.

22 DEEM: Thank you.

23 GREISSMAN: Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. Let me go to
25 (inaudible) and then I'll come to

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

you.

HERTOG: Jim Hertog, College of
Communications. We had a case that
kind of jumps out at me. We had a
situation where someone put forward
their recommendations for external
letters and so on, and the portfolio
went forward without him knowing
that his letters had not come in.
And then he was actually denied
tenure, and it was found to be
noncompliant, and the decision was
reversed. So this kind of jumps out
at me, a couple of things in here.
It says at least three of the
letters shall come from reviewers
selected by the educational -- I
mean the administrator, and then it
says later that any additional,
after the portfolio has gone
forward, can't be added. It also
says that if the portfolio is
noncompliant when it goes forward,
then additional information has to
be brought in by the unit

1 administrator. So I think those
2 things can put you in a bind when
3 the portfolio goes forward under
4 those circumstances when external
5 reviewers simply don't get their
6 stuff to you in time, because that
7 puts you up against that rule that
8 you've already laid there. The
9 other thing that it says here is
10 letters from scholars at
11 research-oriented universities shall
12 be given most serious conversation.
13 He's a special title. Most of the
14 people that would be appropriate to
15 evaluate such a candidate for tenure
16 don't reside at research-oriented
17 universities.

18 GREISSMAN: Right.

19 HERTOOG: So I think if you want to
20 combine the rules for regular title
21 people with special title people,
22 you may actually run up against a
23 problem with privileging input from
24 research universities. You may have
25 to set a separate rule for that.

1 GREISSMAN: And that's why we're
2 requesting this feedback. Heidi, do
3 you want to comment on that?

4 ANDERSON: Please remind me. I was in
5 another conversation. I apologize.

6 GREISSMAN: Excuse me. Sorry. We'll
7 take it under advisement. We tried
8 to take from the Provost's opening
9 of term memo all of the language
10 that seemed to be really significant
11 to the point where a provost would
12 say, look at this, and yet it wasn't
13 in the AR itself. It seemed
14 inappropriate to have directive
15 information in a memo and not in the
16 AR. But this doesn't (inaudible due
17 to coughing). Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Quick comment.

19 BLACKWELL: If I could just add a little
20 bit to that, about your question,
21 and that is about late-arriving
22 materials. I think that what we
23 want to see happen is that if there
24 are missing documents and items come
25 in late or are re-requested, the

1 dossier goes back to the original
2 people to reassess it, and then it
3 starts continuing again because that
4 problem of having late-arriving
5 documents that the faculty have not
6 seen is one of the procedural
7 problems that sometimes occurs.

8 GREISSMAN: Right.

9 THELIN: Call to question.

10 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. We have a call
11 for the question.

12 CANON: But there's no motion.

13 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: There is no motion on
14 the floor. One more quick comment
15 and I would like to do the last item
16 before it's 5:05. Doug.

17 MICHAEL: Doug Michael, College of Law.
18 Is the intention to eliminate the
19 substance from this provost's annual
20 letter and to have it in, as you
21 said, a more appropriate place? I
22 have had to deal, as chair of
23 (inaudible) every year with trying
24 to explain to new faculty where they
25 find the rules, and they're darn

1 hard to find.

2 GREISSMAN: Sure. A provost's opening
3 term memo often reminds and
4 underscores.

5 MICHAEL: Well, it's got a lot of
6 substance in it by itself.

7 GREISSMAN: Right, right. But it's an
8 attempt to ensure that those things
9 that should be in an AR are there,
10 not to preclude the provost from
11 (inaudible).

12 ANDERSON: I can answer that he will not
13 be eliminating the opening memo that
14 you get in the fall. It will not be
15 eliminated, but we will take what
16 you're saying in consideration and
17 make sure these are aligned properly
18 (inaudible).

19 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: So we're at the point,
20 Senators, that we again could leave
21 our input as it is or we could have
22 a motion to endorse. It's up to
23 you.

24 THELIN: I move we endorse the materials
25 as provided in our packet.

1 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Are there any seconds?
2 VOSS: Second.
3 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Second over here.
4 Name?
5 VOSS: Steve Voss.
6 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. Ready to vote?
7 All those in favor of endorsing this
8 language of the combined AR, please
9 indicate so by raising your hand.
10 All opposed? One, two, three, four,
11 five. Abstain? One, two, three,
12 four, five. The motion carried.
13 GREISSMAN: Can I make one last
14 comment? If those who voted in
15 opposition would send an e-mail to
16 Heidi or me with your objections, at
17 the end of the day, we really want
18 to address them to the extent we
19 can. Thank you.
20 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Also, any Senators
21 could send me comments. I will take
22 away your identification and forward
23 it to people who are in charge.
24 This goes for any other subject. If
25 you indulge me, we have one more AR,

1 much less in scope and content, and
2 that is proposed changes to
3 Governing Regulation I regarding
4 finances, ethics, and solicitation
5 of funds. You have the language in
6 front of you. The changes are
7 mostly in item I, item E, item M and
8 item N. Marcy is here to answer
9 your questions. Marcy, do you want
10 to say anything very brief, other
11 than what I just said?

12 DEATON: If you would like me to.

13 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Yes.

14 DEATON: I'll tell you, the reason for
15 these changes are three, actually,
16 that are separate. The first one is
17 financial advantage. There's been a
18 state law since actually 1942 that
19 prohibited faculty and staff from
20 doing business with the university,
21 and this created problems only in a
22 couple of rare instances where we
23 have a faculty member -- typically I
24 think it's both times been faculty
25 rather than staff -- maybe have a

1 startup company and they can't do
2 business with the university. There
3 are no exceptions. They have to
4 choose between remaining on the
5 faculty or quitting their business,
6 so both times we've lost those
7 faculty members. So this past
8 legislative session in Frankfort, in
9 January and February, they passed a
10 bill that will now allow
11 universities to enact their own
12 regulation to give a procedure and
13 criteria for how we would approve
14 one of those rare instances. It has
15 to go to the Board of Trustees for
16 approval, so that's the first
17 change. That's involved with
18 (inaudible), so they're kind of the
19 same. Then M and N, if you were
20 familiar with the GR's up until
21 about two years ago, there was a
22 committee appointed to revise all of
23 our GR's. They inadvertently left
24 these two sections out. The
25 solicitation of funds was the

1 section that allowed only the
2 President to approve a campus-wide
3 solicitation such as United Way
4 using our e-mail, mail, passing out
5 things. So we continued in the
6 Legal Office to say that's our
7 policy, if people want to do these
8 things and say, no, we have to get
9 presidential approval, so we need it
10 back in. Same thing for campus
11 sales. They have to be approved by
12 the Dean of Students; otherwise, we
13 would have thousands of salespeople
14 all over campus all of the time. An
15 example of that is we allowed the
16 Lexington-Herald the first week of
17 school to solicit students for
18 subscriptions, and then it ends. We
19 like to keep that (inaudible due to
20 coughing). That's where we are, and
21 I'm here for questions.

22 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Are there any
23 questions? John Thelin.

24 THELIN: A few weeks ago there was a
25 university-wide e-mail from the

1 Executive Vice President of the
2 Medical Center exhorting people to
3 contribute to, I guess, a favorite
4 charity. Would that be permissible
5 under that proposal?

6 DEATON: Under M, he would have to have
7 approval from the President.

8 THELIN: Yeah. I think there's a real
9 problem with that being abused.

10 DEATON: That's why we want to get this
11 back in writing. It was on our
12 books for years and years and just
13 somehow accidentally was left out
14 about two years ago.

15 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Any other questions?
16 Any other comments? Okay. Then we
17 are almost there. All those in
18 favor?

19 CANON: There's no motion.

20 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: No, there is no
21 motion.

22 VOSS: I'll move to endorse.

23 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Move to endorse the
24 language.

25 BURKHART: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Second here. All
2 those in favor of this motion,
3 please indicate so by raising your
4 hands. Opposed? One. Abstain?
5 One. One abstained; one opposed.
6 The motion carries. We had a great
7 year. Give me 30 seconds. I'd
8 really like to thank Sheila for
9 stopping me from making many, many
10 mistakes. And thanks to Robyn
11 Barrett, the transcriber, who
12 permanently documented the ones that
13 I did make. Thank you, Brad, for
14 agreeing to be next to me here
15 regarding being parliamentarian. I
16 really appreciate it. And most of
17 all, thank you, Senate and Senate
18 Council, for giving me the pleasure
19 of serving you. I really liked it a
20 lot. Have a nice day.

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF KENTUCKY)

2 COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

3

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

13 I further certify that I am not employed by nor
14 related to any member of the **University of Kentucky**
15 Senate and I have no personal interest in any
16 matter before this Council.

17 My Commission Expires: November 24, 2007.

18 IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
19 hand and seal of office on this the 7th day of
20 June, 2007.

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

