

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

27 April 1993

TO: Members, University Senate

The University Senate will meet in special session on Monday, May 3, 1993, at 3:00 PM in room 115 of the Nursing Building (CON/HSLC).

AGENDA:

1. Minutes: 8 March 1993
2. Chair's Announcements
3. Resolutions
4. Action Items
 - a. Proposal to merge the School of Journalism and the Department of Telecommunications and form the School of Journalism and Telecommunications in the College of Communications. (Circulated under date of 28 April 1993.)
 - b. Proposal to merge the College of Library and Information Science and the College of Communications. (Circulated under date of 27 April 1993.)

Randall Dahl
Secretary

6146C

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, MAY 3, 1993

The University Senate met in a called session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, May 3, 1993, in Room 115 of the Nursing Health Sciences Building.

John J. Piecoro, Jr., Chairperson of the Senate Council, presided.

Members absent were: Debra K. Aaron*, Reginald J. Alston, Richard Anderson, Virginia Atwood, Robert S. Baker*, John R. Ballantine*, Mark C. Berger, John J. Bernardo, Glenn C. Blomquist, Thomas O. Blues*, Peter P. Bosomworth, Carolyn S. Bratt, Joseph T. Burch, Laretta Byars, Rutheford B Campbell, Jr.*, Bradley C. Canon, Ben W. Carr, Chris Carrico, Edward A. Carter, Shea Chaney, G.L. Monty Chappell*, Donald B. Clapp, Charlie Clark, Jordan L. Cohen, Patricia Collins, Audrey L. Companion, Sarah Coursey, Michael P. Connors*, Clifford J. Cremers*, Lance E. DeLong*, Paul DeMesquita*, David Denton, Richard Edwards, Donald T. Frazier, James E. Funk, Richard W. Furst, Stuart Gay, Zakkula Govindarajulu*, Larry J. Grabau*, Todd A. Griffin, Robert D. Guthrie, Derek Gwinn, Lynne A. Hall, Zafar S. Hasan, Christine Havice, Donald L. Hochstrasser, Floyd J. Holler, Richard A. Jensen, Edward J. Kasarskis, James Knoblett*, Gretchen LaGodna*, Carl W. Lee*, Donald C. Leigh*, C. Oran Little, Robert F. Lorch, Jr., Justin Marriott, Jan McCulloch*, Marcus T. McEllistrem*, Peggy Meszaros, Karen A. Mingst, James S. Mosbey, Phyllis J. Nash, Robert C. Noble, Pete November, Clayton P. Omvig, Judith Page, Clyde D. Poe*, Rhoda-Gale Pollack, Deborah E. Powell*, Leigh Ann Poynter, Daniel R. Reedy, Tracy Rogers, Ellen B. Rosenman, Minni Saluja, David Sanford, Michael C. Shannon*, W. Craig Shellhart*, Candi Smith, Crystal Smith, Thomas Stipanowich, Janet Stith*, David H. Stockham, Theodore R. Tauchert*, Michael G. Tearney, Phillip A. Tibbs*, Salvatore J. Turco, Charles T. Wethington*, Tommy E. Whittler, Carolyn A. Williams*, Eugene R. Williams, Emery A. Wilson, Mary L. Witt, Peter Wong.

The Chair thanked everyone for coming to this Special Meeting of the Senate. He said there were a couple of important action items for today.

The Chair stated the Minutes for the March 8, 1993 meeting had been distributed and asked for any corrections. The minutes were approved as circulated.

The Chair made the following announcements.

Professor Raymond Cox of the Department of Mathematics has been elected as the Chair-elect of the Senate Council. He will follow Dan Fulks in that capacity.

There was a question by Professor Jesse Weil at the April 12, 1993 Senate Meeting relative to the number of University Research Professorships. For years there had been four professors, the committee this year recommended two professors and ultimately settled on three. In the future the committee will take a look at the money available and see how far it will go, for two, three, four, or whatever.

The Chair recognized Professor Daniel Fulks, Chair-elect of the Senate Council, for the first action item on the agenda. Professor Fulks referred to agenda item circulated under date of 28 April 1993, the proposal to merge the School of

* Absence Explained

Minutes, University Senate, May 3, 1993

Journalism and the Department of Telecommunications and form the School of Journalism and Telecommunications in the College of Communications. The Department of Telecommunications is too small and below the level of faculty strength required to operate it as a viable department. The College feels this merger will result in a much more efficient and effective academic unit, especially in the area of mediated communication. Faculties in both units unanimously approved the proposal to merge. The Academic Organization and Structure Committee has reviewed the proposal and recommends approval. The Senate Council presents this proposal to the Senate with recommendation for approval.

The Chair stated since the proposal came from the Senate Council it required no second. The floor was opened for discussion relative to the proposal to merge the School of Journalism and the Department of Telecommunications in the College of Communications. The question was called. In a voice vote, the motion unanimously passed and reads as follows:

AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, May 3, 1993.
Proposal to merge the School of Journalism and the Department of Telecommunications and form the School of Journalism and Telecommunications in the College of Communications.

Proposal:

To merge the School of Journalism and the Department of Telecommunications and form the School of Journalism and Telecommunications in the College of Communications.

Background and Rationale:

Presently the Department of Telecommunications is too small and below the level of faculty strength required to operate as a viable department. Both the School of Journalism and the Department of Communications are concerned with the process of mediated communication. The proposed merger would establish a more integrated education in mediated communication. The proposed merger would also promote a more forward-looking curriculum with regard to communication technologies and information services. The administrative structure within the College of Communications would be simplified by the merger.

The faculties in both units unanimously approved the proposal to merge. The Academic Organization and Structure Committee as well as the Senate Council have reviewed the proposal and recommend its approval.

Note: if the proposal is approved by the Senate, a recommendation will be sent to the President for further action.

Minutes, University Senate, May 3, 1993

The Chair recognized Professor Fulks for the second action item. Professor Fulks referred to the action item dated 27 April 1993, concerning the proposal to merge the College of Library and Information Science and the College of Communications and form the College of Communications and Information Studies. The merger of the College of Library and Information Science and the College of Communications would bring together two relatively small colleges to produce an academic unit of increased size, flexibility and influence and, in time, produce cost savings for the University. Faculty members in both colleges have approved this merger with a vote of 8 for, 3 against, and 1 abstaining in the College of Library and Information Science. The College of Communications faculty vote was 18 for, 1 against, and 2 abstaining. After study and deliberation the Academic Organization and Structure Committee has approved the proposal. The committee was concerned with Library Science accreditation and in their feeling this will not jeopardize said accreditation in any way. The Senate Council presents this to the Senate with recommendation for approval. If approved it would be sent forward to the President for further action.

The Chair stated since the Senate Council recommends the approval for the merger of the College of Library and Information Science and the College of Communication it required no second. The floor was opened for discussion.

Professor Jesse Weil, a member of the Committee on Academic Organization and Structure, stated he was involved in approval of both of the items. The committee's opinion of the desirability of this was much weaker than the previous item. The reasons for the merger of the two colleges seems to be based largely in hopes of future cost savings and efficiencies which have not been demonstrated. The proposal was presented to the Committee on Academic Organization and Structure with the plans for program developments not worked out in any detail at all. If the proposal had been based on that it would have been rejected. Taking the point of view that was stated in the letters to the Senate Council that there may be savings in the future and there will not be any overwhelming damages to either of the programs, they were weakly recommending the proposal.

Louise Zegeer (College of Nursing) asked if there were any reasons given for the votes against the proposal. Mike Cibull (College of Medicine) stated that was a valid question, why did the three people vote against the proposal?

Joann Rogers (College of Library and Information Science) said she was one of the three people who was very much against the proposal. She doesn't know that they would be categorically against the idea of a merger and feels other senators are probably breathing a sigh of relief that it isn't happening to them. They are not necessarily against the idea of a merger, but the proposal is an extremely weak one. The letter from the Organization and Structure Committee on the first go round unanimously rejected it, saying it lacked substance, it had not received careful joint consideration by the faculties of the two colleges.

The faculties of the two colleges to this day have not met, except at the meeting which the Organization and Structure Committee provided. The proposal says it anticipates no saving of resources, in the circulation of the item to the Senate it is mentioned that maybe somewhere down the road a way would be found to save a little money, the proposal does not demonstrate or mention that. There was apparently some disagreement on the part of the two deans, the college which is

Minutes, University Senate, May 3, 1993

absorbing Library Science implied they could and Library Science implied nothing could be saved from their end without causing harm to the program, so it remains to be seen. There was not one figure presented in the proposal. The letter goes on to say that not only is there no savings of resources, but its claimed advantages are sketchy and unpersuasive. The new joint program which is mentioned is not supported, the letter says, by any sign of the ground work that serious contemplation of the new program would normally entail. In other words, there wasn't much to the proposal, it was simply, she thinks, a response to the desire of the Chancellor and the administration of the two colleges to bring this about.

Professor Rogers submitted a ten page letter to the Committee on Academic Organization and Structure, which by the way she has yet to talk to a member of the Senate Council who has read any of the documentation accompanying the proposal. She did a one page cover letter and the following are the things she summarized: 1) restructuring was aimed at cost savings and there is no demonstrated cost saving, 2) the new program which is not very well defined or received no joint planning, the program in Management Information Resources originally started out as a proposed masters and PhD level program. She is not sure exactly what the latest version of the proposal says, but finds it difficult to understand if neither unit has the resources to mount a program or programs, how would the combined colleges have more resources together than they do independently, and 3) another advantage, as pointed out in the proposal is a cutting edge computer facility, she wonders how that will be developed without additional resources. She feels there is minimal programmatic affinity between the two colleges and they have just witnessed the demise of one of the three units in communications, namely telecommunications which has become so weakened it apparently can't stand alone as a department. How long would Library Science last before something similar might happen?

Despite the fact that the presenter of the proposal assures that this will not jeopardize their accreditation, there is disagreement on that also. There are two people in the college who have served as accreditation site visitors, herself and Tim Sineath, his opinion is that it will not jeopardize their accreditation, her opinion is that it has the potential in fact to do so. If not tomorrow, she is wondering that in five years down the road when there is a wonderful new library facility, whether there will be a viable, accreditable program to education people to work in that facility. She has served as a sight visitor since 1979 and has visited about five schools, she has visited one of our benchmarks. By the way, all of the benchmarks are independent units. Not all programs in Library Science are independent, but the majority of strong programs are. Professor Rogers thinks the first thing an accrediting team would ask, is how did this come about when the two faculties haven't even talked. There was no consultation of alumni, no consultation with employers, there was not even consultation with people in the library on this campus. She visited one program which was part of a larger unit which had lost its accreditation because of the lack of understanding and support by its parent college, that may make her a little more sensitive than some who haven't seen the effect of that. Also, she understands that the process here seems a little strange, the two deans who favor the merger were invited, after the committee rejected the proposal the first time, by the Senate Council to do a revision. She believes the revision is substantially, if not almost the same as the first. They were invited to make their case before the Senate Council prior to submitting the revision to the Senate Committee on Organization and Structure. If you will remember Professor Rogers has seen no evidence that anyone on the Senate Council read the fact that there were several points of view that even though perhaps out-voted some of their thoughts might be valid. She hopes the Senate will consider them. Thank you.

Minutes, University Senate, May 3, 1993

Tim Sineath (College of Library and Information Science) feels he needs to say a few things about accreditation since Dr. Rogers has already categorized his opinion on it. First of all he too has the experience of site visitor team membership, he also has chaired a number of visits to various institutions, ten in the last six years. Also, he has been a member of the committee on accreditation, which is the body that makes all the decisions. In that capacity he has been involved in the revision of the accreditation standards, which have just gone into effect, revised in 1993. Those standards, very explicitly say that the organizational structure of a program of Library and Information Science may be, and it says explicitly, a department, a college, or a school and furthermore, part of the rationale behind those new accreditation standards was to encourage broad-based programs. As you probably know, this field is becoming very interdisciplinary and he ventures to say most other programs are becoming that way. There was a concerted effort on the part of those who developed those standards to encourage more close ties with other units. Anybody who looks at the literature of the two fields, will certainly conclude that there is increasingly a convergence of knowledge based on their two fields in communication technology and information provision of one kind or another. He feels that there is infinity and that there is no evidence from his perspective to the concern about accreditation.

Mike Harris (College of Library and Information Science) has been a professor in the college since 1969 and would like to point out they have been apprized of this proposal not just recently but over the last decade. Some who have been in the Senate know it was brought up four years ago. Secondly, the vast majority of the faculty of both colleges are in favor of this proposal. As far as weakening the College of Library Science, you may know they just appointed two new assistant professors, the University has shown no sign of attempting to weaken the college. He personally is in favor of the proposal.

The question was called. The proposal passed with a voice vote and reads as follows:

AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, May 3, 1993.
Proposal to merge the College of Library and Information Science and the College of Communications and form the College of Communications and Information Studies.

Background and Rationale:

The merger of the College of Library and Information Science and the College of Communications would bring together two relatively small colleges to produce an academic unit of increased size, flexibility and influence and, in time, produce cost savings for the University. The merged College would have a strong commitment to integrating communication and information technology into its instructional, research and service programs. The merger would provide a focus for a strong programmatic base for the development of an information resources management program, since neither college has the resources or expertise to deliver the program alone.

Faculty members of both colleges supported the merger proposal with a vote in the College of Library and Information Science of: 8 for, 3 against, 1 abstaining; in the College of

Minutes, University Senate, May 3, 1993

Communications: 18 for, 1 against, 2 abstaining. The Academic Organization and Structure Committee reviewed the original and subsequent revised proposal for the merger and then held a meeting with open discussion with faculty from the two colleges. Following the meeting, the Academic Organization and Structure Committee approved the proposal. The Senate Council subsequently approved the proposal for the merger of the two colleges.

Note: If the Senate approves the proposal for the merger, it will be sent to the President for further action.

The Chair stated the action was concluded for today. There was a motion for adjournment. The Chair thanked everyone for coming to the meeting.

Randall W. Dahl
Secretary, University Senate

BIRDWHISTELL TERRY L
LIB-SP COLLECTIONS
0000112 KING LIBRARY ANNEX
2 0039

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

28 April 1993

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, May 3, 1993.
Proposal to merge the School of Journalism and the Department of Telecommunications and form the School of Journalism and Telecommunications in the College of Communications.

Proposal:

To merge the School of Journalism and the Department of Telecommunications and form the School of Journalism and Telecommunications in the College of Communications.

Background and Rationale:

Presently the Department of Telecommunications is too small and below the level of faculty strength required to operate as a viable department. Both the School of Journalism and the Department of Communications are concerned with the process of mediated communication. The proposed merger would establish a more integrated education in mediated communication. The proposed merger would also promote a more forward-looking curriculum with regard to communication technologies and information services. The administrative structure within the College of Communications would be simplified by the merger.

The faculties in both units unanimously approved the proposal to merge. The Academic Organization and Structure Committee as well as the Senate Council have reviewed the proposal and recommend its approval.

Note: if the proposal is approved by the Senate, a recommendation will be sent to the President for further action.

6147C

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

27 April 1993

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, May 3, 1993.
Proposal to merge the College of Library and Information Science and the College of Communications and form the College of Communications and Information Studies.

Background and Rationale:

The merger of the College of Library and Information Science and the College of Communications would bring together two relatively small colleges to produce an academic unit of increased size, flexibility and influence and, in time, produce cost savings for the University. The merged College would have a strong commitment to integrating communication and information technology into its instructional, research and service programs. The merger would provide a focus for a strong programmatic base for the development of an information resources management program, since neither college has the resources or expertise to deliver the program alone.

Faculty members of both colleges supported the merger proposal with a vote in the College of Library and Information Science of: 8 for, 3 against, 1 abstaining; in the College of Communications: 18 for, 1 against, 2 abstaining. The Academic Organization and Structure Committee reviewed the original and subsequent revised proposal for the merger and then held a meeting with open discussion with faculty from the two colleges. Following the meeting, the Academic Organization and Structure Committee approved the proposal. The Senate Council subsequently approved the proposal for the merger of the two colleges.

Note: If the Senate approves the proposal for the merger, it will be sent to the President for further action.

6149C