

University Senate  
March 10, 2014

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, March 10, 2014 in the Auditorium of W. T. Young Library. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Lee X. Blonder called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:01 pm. She asked for a motion to waive *Senate Rules 1.2.3* to allow consideration of the agenda, because the agenda was not sent out six days in advance. Brion **moved** thusly and Anderson **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Senate Council Chair Blonder introduced President Eli Capilouto, chair of the University Senate (Senate).

1. President Eli Capilouto, University Senate Chair

President Eli Capilouto greeted senators and commented that he talks with students as often as he can and hears positive stories with faculty playing central roles. He spoke to senators in detail for about 40 minutes about a variety of topics.

In February 2014, Standard and Poor's (S&P) offered a positive change to its rating of UK. President Capilouto offered a few facts that were cited by S&P: the number of student applications for new housing, which exceeds the available beds by a considerable amount; the surge in applications for Living Learning Programs, indicating success in maintaining a residential campus; the financial progress (including philanthropy) for ongoing capital projects (Gatton College of Business and Economics Building, Commonwealth Stadium and Academic Science Building); and UK Healthcare admissions that have doubled since 2004. Standard and Poor's upgraded UK's outlook from "stable" to "positive" even while the outlook for higher education in general is rated at "negative." S&P noted some concerns, however: declining state financial support; and flat federal support. (The President clarified that UK's grant revenue from the National Institutes of Health is up more than 12% compared to this time last year.)

UK has a constant presence in Frankfort during the legislative session, particularly when the state budget is being discussed. President Capilouto and University of Louisville President James Ramsey jointly testified before the state's House of Representatives Appropriations and Revenue Subcommittee that oversees university budgets; he and University of Louisville President James Ramsey made a compelling case for why research universities must be properly supported. Additionally, Capilouto explained what effect the proposed 2.5% reduction in state funds (a decrease of approximately \$7.2 million) would mean for UK. UK already endured \$50 million in recurring cuts since 2008. State funds are unrestricted and provide flexibility in how to use those funds, whereas most other fund types are restricted for certain purposes or expenditures. Tuition dollars are somewhat flexible, but tuition is received in return for offering courses and degree programs, which have their own expenses. Although UK's financial numbers at the present time are preliminary, the President stated that on the top of his list is including another round of merit-based salary increases for faculty and staff, which cost approximately \$4.2 million for every 1% increase.

UK achieved considerable cost savings through efficient management practices and partnerships. Although steps in this direction were taken before President Capilouto arrived at UK, there are considerable annual savings, including a decrease in water usage by 37 million gallons and over \$3

million in utility savings. There have been administrative restructurings, institution of integrated business units, and creative partnerships with Education Reality Trust and the Athletics Department.

UK made capital requests for state-bond funding are for a renovated College of Law Building, a new Research Building and another round of Bucks for Brains / Bricks. In addition to those requests, UK made capital requests for self-funded projects through gifts and agency (UK) bonds for a renovated Student Center, fit-up of the Chandler Hospital (funded with clinical revenues) and a new parking structure (funded with parking revenues). When in Frankfort, the President gently reminds those he speaks with that UK's success in earning an "NCI-Cancer Center" designation from the National Cancer Institute began 10 years ago with state bonds for a new College of Pharmacy Building. That project led to a series of deliberate actions over the next 10 years, paid for by state bonds, which led to the NCI-Cancer designation. While the President may not know what UK's next success story will be, he suggests to legislators that UK is the best bet for their money.

When he was finished speaking, President Capilouto offered senators his deepest thanks for all they do; while he shares immense quantities of data with legislators, he said the most powerful moments are when a legislator can talk about the change that a faculty member has made for a farmer in the local community, help offered to a student on hard times or the contribution a student makes to the community. He thanked those present for giving him the great stories that allow him to be a strong and effective advocate on UK's behalf. The President solicited questions from senators.

Brion asked how much the proposed bonds will add to UK's payments on an annual basis. The President introduced Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration Eric Monday, and suggested he provide the response. Guest Monday explained that on the agency bond side, the Student Center is anticipated to be funded through student fees and philanthropy, so UK will not use agency bonds. The Chandler fit-up will be done through healthcare revenues, so UK also will not use agency bonds for that project. The University anticipates that renovations to the College of Law Building will be funded through new agency bonds and philanthropy, similar to the Gatton project. There could also be a call on agency bonds come from the requested new research building, specifically whatever portion UK funds.

Grossman asked for clarification about the student fees money that will pay for part of the renovations to the Student Center. President Capilouto replied that the goal was to greatly temper any increases in student fees with philanthropic gifts.

Wood asked the President to break down the numbers for undergraduate and graduate scholarships. The President said that \$9.7 million of the increase was for undergraduates and \$1.3 million was for graduate students; those numbers were tuition and did not include stipend support.

There being no further questions for the President, senators thanked him with a round of applause and he departed.

The Chair reminded senators to:

- Sign in upon arrival;
- Give name and affiliation when speaking;
- Attend meetings;
- Respond to emails and web postings as appropriate;
- Acknowledge and respect others;

- Silence all electronic devices; and
- Communicate with their constituencies.

## 2. Minutes from February 10, 2014 and Announcements

The Chair said that one correction was received for the minutes from February 10, 2014. There being **no objection**, the minutes from February 10 were **approved** as amended, by **unanimous consent**. The Chair reported a number of announcements, described below.

The SC approved a minor change to the 2013-2014 Academic Calendar to correct the dates for summer advising conferences.

The SC approved the use of a special form to facilitate an expedited process to change undergrad programs to accommodate the new Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement (GCCR). The form only allows for GCCR-related changes. The expedited process moves the program change from the college to the GCCR Advisory Committee, bypasses the Undergraduate Council, and goes directly to the Senate Council office for approval by lack of objection on a 10-day posting. In order to guarantee that SC has program changes in time to post them prior to the end of the semester, expedited forms must be received by GCCR Advisory Committee by March 24 in order to be sent to SC by April 7. New GCCR course proposals to be approved for a fall effective date must be received by the GCCR Advisory Committee by Monday, March 24.

The Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) continues to receive proposals without appropriate documentation. As a result, the SC passed a motion that prior to review by the SAOSC, a proposal intended for SAOSC review must include answers to the SAOSC questions posted on the Senate site (<http://www.uky.edu/Faculty/Senate/forms.htm>).

The SC will again conduct a campuswide survey of faculty, to evaluate President Eli Capilouto and provide input to the Board of Trustees.

The National Conference on Undergraduate Research (NCUR) will take place on campus April 3 – 5. Many individuals from across the entire campus have been involved in the creation of this event. More information can be found at its UK website: <http://www.uky.edu/academy/NCUR>. Classes scheduled in impacted classrooms are being redirected to attend the conference; all other classes are invited to attend NCUR at the discretion of the instructor. For additional information, please contact David Timoney in the Registrar's office. The Chair encouraged faculty colleagues to release their classes, with an assignment, to participate in NCUR 2014. She offered some facts about the upcoming event, as well as noted that it was the largest NCUR to date, topping the number of NCUR's 2013 registrants by about 800 more participants.

The soft roll out of "Presentation U!" is underway. Over 50 faculty applied for the first cohort of Faculty Fellows, which includes 27 faculty who represent 11 different colleges and 22 disciplines. Over the next three semesters, the first cohort will attend workshops on topics focused on visual communication, written communication and oral communication, all delivered via flat print, face-to-face, and technology-enhanced channels. The second Faculty Fellows cohort will begin in fall 2014, with calls for applications widely distributed in April 2014.

## 3. Officer and Other Reports

### a. Chair Report: Lee X. Blonder – Medicine

The Chair reminded senators that the SC meets with President Capilouto once or twice a year. The SC met with President Capilouto on February 25; topics discussed included:

- Budget efforts in Frankfort.
- Undergraduate population, and resources for same.
- Entrepreneurship.
- Campus infrastructure, historical buildings and the campus master plan.
- Participation of the Senate's Academic Facilities Committee in the process to hire a replacement for Vice President for Facilities Management Bob Wiseman, who will retire in a few months.

b. Vice Chair Report: Connie Wood – Arts and Sciences

Wood reported that nominations were being accepted for the Outstanding Senator Award (OSA), the plaque for which will be presented at the May Senate meeting. The OSA Committee members are Connie Wood (chair), Debra Anderson and Katherine McCormick. SC members are not eligible and nominees need not be currently serving a term in the Senate. Wood asked senators to forward their nominations to her via email by 5 pm on Tuesday, April 15.

The OSA is for a senator who:

- Has contributed to the University Senate by showing active and exemplary service on one or more Senate committees during his or her tenure.
- Has made notable substantive contributions in communicating with the Senate and while working with the faculty at large on important issues that impact the faculty as a whole.
- Has given strong voice to faculty issues in Senate meetings, public events, and/or local/regional news media and actively defended the principle of shared governance in University forums.
- Is effective in generating and effecting the Senate's larger agenda and goals.

c. Parliamentarian Report: J.S. Butler – Graduate School/Martin School of Public Policy and Administration

Butler explained the process and purpose of reconsidering a motion. Occasionally a body passes something and wants to revisit it. Perhaps an edit, word, number or something unintended occurs and the body finds it has made a mistake. Repealing is not the appropriate motion in this case, but reconsidering is. Reconsidering means the same as it does in ordinary life – reconsidering means the Senate voted and will go back and look at it again. Reconsidering is an ordinary, neutral, non-negative sentiment. In response to Grossman, Butler said that anyone can move to reconsider if that person voted with the winning side. Anyone who voted to successfully pass or defeat can move to reconsider and it requires a majority vote. All it does is bring the motion on back on the floor, exactly as it was, and undoes the vote. He added that the Senate would be presented with motions to reconsider later in the meeting.

4. Old Business

a. Proposed New BA/BS in Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies

Hippisley, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal for a new BA/BS in Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies.

The Chair said that the recommendation from the SC was that the Senate **move** to approve the establishment of a new BA/BS in Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies, in the Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies, within the College of Arts and Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There being no questions, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 5. Two Honorary Degrees

The Chair noted that at the last meeting, the Senate voted to confer two honorary degrees, for two individuals to receive an Honorary Doctor of Letters. The degree, however, should have been an Honorary Doctor of Humanities because “Letters” is more specific, referring to literature and poetry. The Chair said the Senate would need to go through a series of motions to accomplish the change.

The Chair said the first motion was that the elected faculty senators reconsider the recommendation of an Honorary Doctor of Letters for HW. Wasilkowski **moved** thusly and Brion **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair said the next motion was that the elected faculty senators amend the original motion concerning an honorary degree for HW, to be a Doctor of Humanities instead of a Doctor of Letters. Wasilkowski **moved** thusly and Anderson **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Due to the previous motion, the current motion on the floor was that the elected faculty senators approve HW as the recipient of an Honorary Doctor of Humanities, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended recipient of an honorary degree to be conferred by the Board. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair introduced the next series of motions for the second candidate. The first was that the elected faculty senators reconsider the recommendation of an Honorary Doctor of Letters for PC. Ilahiane **moved** thusly and Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The next motion was that the elected faculty senators amend the original motion concerning an honorary degree for PC, to be a Doctor of Humanities instead of a Doctor of Letters. Christ **moved** thusly and Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Due to the previous motion, the current motion on the floor was that the elected faculty senators approve PC as the recipient of an Honorary Doctor of Humanities, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended recipient of an honorary degree to be conferred by the Board. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The Chair thanked senators for their assistance.

#### 6. Committee Reports

##### a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) - Andrew Hippisley, Chair

##### i. Proposed New JD/MHA Dual Degree Program

Hippisley, SAPC chair, explained the proposed new JD/MHA Dual Degree Program. The Chair noted that the recommendation (positive) from SC was that the Senate **move** to approve the establishment of a new dual degree program between the Juris Doctor's degree, within the College of Law, and the

Master's in Health Administration degree, within the College of Public Health. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There were no comments so a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) – Greg Wasilkowski, Chair

i. Proposed New Department of Urology in the College of Medicine

Wasilkowski, chair of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC), explained the proposal to change the Division of Urology, within the Department of Surgery, into a separate Department of Urology. The Chair noted that the recommendation from the SC was that the Senate **move** to endorse the creation of the Department of Urology in the College of Medicine. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There were no comments so a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

c. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) - Greg Graf, Chair

i. Proposed Change to *Senate Rules 4.2.1.2* for BHS in Medical Laboratory Sciences

Graf, chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), explained the proposal to change *Senate Rules 4.2.1.2* to allow students in the Medical Laboratory Technician to Medical Laboratory Sciences (MLT-MLS) track to transfer in 80 credit hours. This would be an exception to the rule that states a student can only transfer in 67 credits.

The Chair noted that the recommendation (positive) from SC was that the Senate **move** to make an exception in *Senate Rules 4.2.1.2* for the BHS in Medical Laboratory Sciences to allow the transfer of 80 credit hours toward this University of Kentucky degree. The Chair showed to senators via the PowerPoint presentation the proposed edits to *Senate Rules 4.2.1.2*, described below<sup>1</sup>.

4.2.1.2 Admission to Advanced Standing [SREC: : 6/8/06]

Applicants for admission must present evidence that they are in good standing in every respect in the institution they last attended. At no time shall college or university records be disregarded to admit an applicant solely on the basis of his/her high school records. Credit hours for courses accepted from a junior college, or other two year colleges or branches, shall be limited to a maximum of 67 semester hours, except for the programs listed below.

1. Students in the RN-BSN (Registered Nurse to Bachelor of Science in Nursing) program, for whom the limit shall be a maximum of 90 semester hours. Applicants must have maintained a grade point average of 2.0 or an average of C in all previous course work. [US: 12/13/82]

2. Students in the MLT to MLS (medical laboratory technician to medical laboratory scientist) track, of the Medical Laboratory Science program, for whom the limit shall be a maximum of 80 semester hours.

All collegiate level work taken at a fully accredited college or university is recognized credit hour for credit hour except that the dean of a college may require validation by appropriate means of course equivalencies or applicability toward degree requirements

---

<sup>1</sup>Underline denotes added text, strikethrough denotes deleted text.

for more specialized courses. In order to be classified as fully accredited, a college or university must be a member of one of the six regional accrediting associations, such as the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Advanced standing from an unaccredited US college or university may be obtained by special subject examinations. [US: 12/13/82; US: 2/11/91]

Brion commented that both exemptions to *SR 4.2.1.2* were for healthcare colleges and wondered if this was setting a precedent that medical programs do not have to follow University regulations. Graf opined that it was not that the medical colleges were working under a separate set of rules, but rather that the training and education associated with the MLT field was a product of an associate's degree. Students who have already earned an MLT degree would be disadvantaged if they were prohibited from transferring in the totality of hours already earned. Brion replied that engineering students also have to take many credit hours; she expressed concern that a precedent was being set that program after program will request exemptions to the point where there is no rule anymore. Graf said that he had consulted with Jones, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) so Jones offered additional information. Jones explained that there was nothing profound about the rule and that he was able to chase its origins back to the 1968-1968 period when President John W. Oswald led UK. The community college system had just begun and there were suspicions on main campus about the quality of instruction in that system. To keep their fingers on the content and quality of a degree, the Senate instituted the 67-hour rule. Brion asked about requirements from the Southern Association on Colleges and Schools - Colleges and Commissions and Jones replied that their requirement was a limit of 90 credits transferred, so UK's numbers were within that range. There were a couple more questions and comments.

The Chair reminded senators that the motion on the floor was that the Senate move to make an exception in *Senate Rules 4.2.1.2* for the BHS in Medical Laboratory Sciences to allow the transfer of 80 credit hours toward this University of Kentucky degree. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and five abstaining.

#### 7. University of Kentucky-University of Louisville Joint Conferral of Executive MBA Degree (One Diploma for Graduates)

The Chair explained that Jones would present the background information for the proposal for the University of Kentucky and the University of Louisville to jointly confer the Joint Executive MBA Degree (i.e. one diploma for graduates). Jones explained the situation in detail, noting that only the UK Board of Trustees (Board) had the authority to enter into an institutional agreement with another institution, so the role of the Senate in this case was to recommend UK's Board enter into an institutional agreement with the University of Louisville's Board of Trustees.

The Chair said that the recommendation from the SC was that the Senate **move** to recommend to the Board of Trustees that the Board approve an institutional agreement with the University of Louisville for joint conferral of the Executive MBA. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. Porter asked about the organization of the institutions' names. Jones said that the content was not part of the day's discussion, but that it would come to the Senate in the near future. There being no further questions or comments, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

#### 8. Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure (SACPT) 2012-13 Annual Report - Stephen Testa, Chair

Guest Testa stated that the Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure (SACPT) hears from faculty who feel their privilege was negatively affected. The SACPT hears cases and makes recommendations to the President. In the past year and a half since Testa has served as chair, the SACPT has had three cases; just four years ago there were nine cases, so it might be a good sign that the number of appeals has decreased. Testa then offered senators a brief overview of the SACPT's 2012-2013 annual report. He ended by saying that the SACPT recommended that the Senate investigate a mechanism for faculty to appeal distribution of effort (DOE) forms, which has become a large problem for junior faculty, in particular.

Grossman commented that a little while ago the Senate recommended the formation of a faculty/staff Ombud and wondered if that would be an effective mechanism to consider DOE issues. In response to Jones, Testa said it was his impression that the problem (of junior faculty and DOEs) was primarily due to junior faculty having little knowledge about the rules that oversee the DOE and promotion and tenure process. That was unfortunate because most rules are pretty thorough and offer very specific instruction for most situations. Jones asked the Provost to comment on the matter. Provost Christine Riordan said that a workshop series had been started, which involved three or four sessions on promotion and tenure and associated regulations. She said she would continue to bring up the issue with college deans and department chairs during her twice-a-semester meetings with deans and chairs. The Provost said that all faculty have an obligation to help colleagues, although it is one's own responsibility to take charge of one's career. She said she was open to ideas on the matter.

Brion asked if the Provost was aware of any reconsideration of a faculty Ombud. The Provost replied that she had not heard that it was recommended by the University Senate, although she saw the recommendation from the Staff Senate. Anderson explained that the report recommending the establishment of an Ombud was a product of a joint faculty/staff committee. Grossman added that the President did not rule out the idea in the future, only saying that it could not be done at that time. Riordan said she was only aware of the issue being raised once and that it was turned down. Testa said he was not speaking for or against an Ombud, but by the time the SACPT sees people with a DOE problem, it is too late. Testa said there needs to be a mechanism for faculty to change or appeal their DOE, but he was not sure what that mechanism should be.

Provost Riordan noted that another initiative involved the review of DOEs by college and the start of drilling down into the department level. The goal is to look for patterns that may be out of the norm; the ability to look at the individual level will be available soon. She said that transparency was important. Jones said that historically a DOE has ended with a dean's signature. He said he was encouraged that the Provost was interested in the matter. Provost Riordan replied that professional development for faculty and staff continues to be regularly mentioned, and wondered how many faculty have professional development on their DOE. She said that more data would become available and it was a good conversation to have.

The Chair asked if the breakdown regarding DOEs was the fault of administrators and senior faculty not giving good guidance or of junior faculty, or both. Testa said that he has seen situations with junior and non-junior faculty, just about every scenario imaginable. Testa opined that it was a matter of education so that when junior faculty arrive and during orientations, they are told to look at the rules and who to talk to if they experience problems. A main issue is that some junior faculty feel the DOE discussion is a one-sided negotiation in which they may not agree with the DOE percentages, or may not have a chance to negotiate, but feel forced to sign the DOE anyway. Schoenberg said that when she served on her college's (Medicine) promotion and tenure committee, their recommendation was to offer better



training to department chairs and division chiefs so those individuals can articulate a clear vision of what DOEs are for. Ilahiane suggested cultivating a mentorship program within units. The Chair commented that some units do have mentor policies, but they vary from unit to unit. Brion suggested a change to the form so that a faculty member can sign to acknowledge receipt, but not have the signature mean the faculty member agrees with the way percentages were assigned. McCormick added that faculty going up for tenure need to understand the relationship between the DOE and the dossier. She served on an area committee and the DOE was reviewed very carefully. If a faculty member is allocated some amount of time for research but only produces two publications, it may be a case of the faculty member needing to be cognizant of the relationship between the two documents.

There being no further comments, the Chair thanked Testa for an inspiring conversation. Wasilkowski **moved** to adjourn and Anderson **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 4:47 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Connie Wood,  
University Senate Secretary

Invited guests present: Michelle Butina, Julia Costich, Eric Monday, Roxanne Mountford, Steve Skinner and Stephen Testa.

Absences: Adams, Andrade, Arthur\*, Atwood, Bailey, E., Bailey, P., Ballard, Bathon, Bishop\*, Brennen, Bugg, Christianson, Cox, Crampton\*, Day, de Beer, Debski\*, Deep, Dickson, Dietz, Durham, Eckman, Evans, Feist-Price, Ferrier, Fox, Galloway, Harrison, Hertog\*, Jackson, Johnson, Kaplan, Kirschling, Kraemer, Larson, Lewis, Martin, McCormick, McCulley\*, Mock, Nagel\*, Noonan, O'Hair, D., O'Hair, MJ., Palli, Prats, Richey, Rieske-Kinney\*, Riordan, Rogers, Smyth, Spradlin, Tracy, T., Tracy, J., Turner, Valentin, Van Wie, Vasconez\*, Voro, Walz, Watkins\*, Webb, Wilson, Wiseman, Withers, Witt, Wyatt.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Monday, April 7, 2014.

---

\* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.