

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

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE MEETING

*** * * * ***

*** * * * ***

OCTOBER 9, 2017

*** * * * ***

*** * * * ***

KATHERINE MCCORMICK, CHAIR

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

BRENDA YANKEY, COURT REPORTER

*** * * * ***

*** * * * ***

1 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Remember that we are
2 interested in following Roberts Rules of Order. We
3 have our Parliamentarians here to help us make that
4 happen. We know, of course, that you'll be civil in
5 your conversation, and always be a good citizen in
6 the sense that you are representing your college and
7 make sure that you keep up and think about the
8 issues as part of the discussion.

9 I know that you've all read every point of the
10 agenda and all the supporting documents and you're
11 prepared for a lively and academic voice of debate
12 and that's part of participating. Then finally,
13 please return those wonderful digital devices back
14 to the table so that they'll be ready for the use in
15 our next meeting.

16 So again, remember that we use these slides.
17 So what I'd like for you to do is to remember to
18 wait until the slide appears, and the question is
19 (coughing) and you may vote. Are you having a great
20 day? Yes? No? Seriously this is the way you're
21 starting the meeting? Please vote now. It looks
22 like most of you are ready to start the meeting.

23 All right. We have one editorial change. We
24 made that change. So, unless I hear objections now
25 the minutes from September 11th will stand approved

1 as amended with unanimous consent. All right.
2 First, I would urge you to share with your
3 colleagues in your college that we have a timeline
4 for receiving curricular items. So, it's pretty
5 quick and so just make sure that folks are prepared
6 to move quickly as they think about new programs,
7 changes to programs, organizations, new departments,
8 new degrees. All of that needs to get to us by
9 February 5th.

10 If you have less critical in terms of their
11 substitutive merit than April 15th for just those
12 small courses where the changes are minor. So,
13 Margaret Schroeder, in the back of the room, would
14 very much appreciate not having the end of the year
15 panic when folks really want to move these forward
16 and they haven't done so already. The reason this
17 appears to be a little truncated; February 5th is
18 the early part of our spring semester is it -- we
19 have to get things on the Board of Trustees calendar
20 and then we have to get these on CPE before CPE
21 stops for their summer break.

22 So, last year we really pushed this. We
23 appreciated the support of the Provost because we
24 had two programs that were approved and would not
25 have them started until a full Academic Year later

1 because of CPE. So again, please just make sure
2 that your colleagues are aware that moving forward
3 requires some timing effort, but that calendar, I
4 think, is available in the back and just take that
5 back and refer it to or with your colleagues.

6 So, midterm grades -- is Anna Bosch here today?
7 So, Anna was actually very helpful in moving this
8 work forward. I know many of you were as well. The
9 math department took a yeoman's task in spearheading
10 this and so last spring you voted to allow midterm
11 grades to be due the evening of a Monday rather than
12 a Friday. So, you get to spend your weekend grading
13 midterms. So I know you're quite happy about that.
14 But again, this was the change that we made and we
15 hope that it will allow you plenty of time to get
16 the grading done and then to get the students those
17 grades so that they can make decisions around their
18 matriculation.

19 So it gives you the weekend to grade and that
20 the midterm activities can be included in the
21 midterm grade. This is also helpful to us as we
22 think about retention because we have some students
23 who do make this decision very wisely because they
24 didn't have data upon which to make the decision and
25 so again this is a good thing. All right. I

1 invited Provost Tracy here today just to see if you
2 had any questions for him. He's prepared to take
3 your questions as well as have a moment to share his
4 own thoughts as well.

5 PROVOST TRACY: Thank you Katherine. Can
6 you hear in the back?

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

8 PROVOST TRACY: I try not to echo too much.
9 I can tell it's turned on. So, thank you for the
10 opportunity to be here today. First, I want to
11 share a few things with you and then open it up for
12 questions. One, I want to tell you a bit about the
13 great work that you all have been doing and that is
14 related to retention and graduation.

15 At the Board of Trustees in just about a week
16 and a half, The Board of Trustees Retreat we are
17 going to be reporting some preliminary numbers for
18 retention for fall of 17 and it looks like we're
19 going to have about 83.4 percent.

20 For those of you who follow those things know
21 that that is about 1.7 percentage points above last
22 year and the highest retention we've had here at the
23 University of Kentucky. Now I'm not saying that
24 we're done. We have a goal of 90 per cent but
25 that's a significant movement in one year and so I

1 want to thank all of you for the work that you do on
2 that. The other is graduation rate. A 6-year
3 graduation rate it looks like it's going to come in
4 somewhere about 64.6 percent.

5 Again, the highest we've ever had here at the
6 University of Kentucky and we're not done yet but
7 that's to your hard work and so I'm tremendously
8 appreciative of that and the work that you're doing
9 with our students because those are two key metrics
10 that we talk about a lot and hopefully we live by.

11 We want to see more students walking across that
12 stage at Rupp Arena. That's really the end result
13 and so we want to do that very effectively and your
14 work is helping to make that happen. So, that's
15 some good news that I wanted to share with you and
16 really I think that's putting us on a nice
17 trajectory. We have gone up about four percentage
18 points in graduation rates in the last three years
19 or so. So, it's some real strides in that
20 particular respect. It is a busy time of year for
21 all of you as you prepare for midterms and those
22 types of assessments and those are so vital for our
23 students.

24 This first eight weeks, I know it sounds cliché
25 but this first eight weeks really sets the tone for

1 students college career. It really does. We know
2 that if they can get through these first eight weeks
3 very successfully, that they have a great chance of
4 finishing. And if they don't, it's an uphill
5 battle.

6 So, as you go through this remember that there
7 are students who making that fifteen hours a week
8 that they thought we're going to have in class and
9 they'd have twenty-five extra hours to do as they
10 wish, you know some come in that unfortunate
11 mindset. You know, help them along the path and
12 help them to make those adjustments and to be
13 successful because as I think I've told you before,
14 the things that are reported by the Gallup poll that
15 make a difference in students lives the top three
16 involve faculty: Faculty engagement; a faculty
17 member reached out to me and cared about me; a
18 faculty member involved me in some of their
19 research; it's those things that you do.

20 So, I want to thank you for that but also say
21 keep up the good work and let's help those students
22 succeed here at the University of Kentucky. So with
23 that I'm going to open up for questions. I always,
24 I like to pace back and forth and I realize that I
25 end up in front of Sheila. And so I'm going to try

1 not to do that at least not to stay in front of them
2 but I'd like to have a chance for a dialogue.

3 Trustee Grossman?

4 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Board of
5 Trustees. Just to be clear the retention rate
6 you're talking about is the first to second year?

7 PROVOST TRACY: Correct.

8 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Retention rate?

9 PROVOST TRACY: Uh-huh. First to second
10 retention rate. Yeah.

11 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: We have numbers for --

12 PROVOST TRACY: We do. I don't remember
13 them.

14 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Are they also moving up?

15 PROVOST TRACY: They're starting to.
16 Remember because they follow, right? They follow
17 and we have been flat to actually a slight dip last
18 year so they look pretty much consistent if I
19 remember right, Annie? They're getting there but we
20 need to start following. Everything builds upon
21 itself.

22 LEE BLONDER: Lee Blonder, Medicine. I
23 wonder if you could address the recent rankings that
24 came out. U.s. News & World Report, puts us at 133.
25 We are 63 in public by contrast University of

1 Florida just moved in the top 10 and Wall Street
2 Journal put us at 360. So, this is troubling to
3 faculty, families, etc and I'm wondering if you
4 could address that?

5 PROVOST TRACY: I'll do my best. There's
6 a ranking for every magazine that wants to sell
7 their magazines. Forbes has one, Money has one,
8 Wall Street Journal has one, US News and Report has
9 quite an empire built upon that and they all use
10 different characteristics. They really do measure
11 different things.

12 So, for instance, US News & World Report,
13 part of the rankings are peer comparisons and so
14 what we get is a list of all the universities in the
15 United States and you're supposed to rank them on a
16 one to five scale. I'm sorry, but I don't feel
17 qualified to do that. That's pretty difficult to do
18 but that's part of it.

19 What I will say is that Wall Street Journal,
20 and I've looked briefly at that, and I've looked at
21 the u.s. News & World Report through the most recent
22 ones, we have not change very many percentage points
23 over the past ten years. I little up, a little down
24 maybe, 10 percent movement if you take the ranking.
25 We've been between 117-118 and 133 both in US News &

1 World Report. Wall Street Journal we've been
2 somewhere in the 330 to 360 range. Those have
3 stayed pretty consistent.

4 What I think that we're doing that will make a
5 difference in those, because it accounts for 25-30
6 percent of its rankings is graduation and retention
7 rate and so we look pretty good in many of those
8 others and that's the one we're probably lagging a
9 little behind. If you look at University of Florida
10 they do in fact have a higher retention and
11 graduation rates than we do and so I believe that
12 our strategic plan guides us in that direction which
13 will produce results from that.

14 I don't say I don't pay any attention to the
15 rankings. But I try to -- I hope we're doing the
16 right things. And the right things should lead to
17 an increase in those particularly related to
18 retention and graduation rates. Our student to
19 faculty ratio has been pretty constant somewhere in
20 the 17 to 18 to 1 for the past 10 years or so and it
21 stayed. That's something that's in those rankings.
22 Some of them look at what they define as outcomes
23 and I don't know how they necessarily define those
24 outcomes whether it's the salary of a student after
25 they get a job or whether it's if they find a job.

1 There are different criteria that they use for
2 that. So we do, we look at those but, you know,
3 we've got a strategic plan that I think is bold and
4 ambitious. If we get to 90 percent for a second
5 year retention and a 70 percent six-year graduation
6 rate, it will produce changes in those rankings, but
7 that's, I mean, I haven't dug into them deep and
8 deep and deep but it's, they've stay relatively
9 constant over the last ten years.

10 GAIL BRYANT: Gail Bryant, College of
11 Engineering. There are a bunch of different ways to
12 help improve retention rate. One is to bring in
13 better students and the other is to help students
14 that are struggling. Can you tell me what the
15 Provost initiatives will be in the future to help
16 those struggling students whom we deal with a lot of
17 first gen, and their issues.

18 PROVOST TRACY: Well, I say there's no magic
19 bullet to retention. There's no magic bullet and
20 certainly financial stability is a key one. We know
21 that unmet need is actually the number one factor in
22 retention here at the University of Kentucky and
23 obviously were taking steps with the U of K Leads
24 Program to try to address that and I'm going to
25 tangent for just a moment because I think I told

1 this truth before.

2 But I want to say it again, we took a group of
3 200 and we did a one time pilot with them to see the
4 effect of addressing an unmet need and for those 200
5 they were predicted to have a fall to fall retention
6 of 56 percent and we're pretty good at predicting
7 retention and they came back at 76 percent.

8 Now that's 200 and we're going to expand that to
9 400 this year and address that, but that's one
10 piece. So, related to the students who need a
11 little help, one of the things were doing and I
12 think he'll come in and speak about this at some
13 point, Dr. Greg Heilman is leading an effort around
14 the first year experience.

15 The first year experience going from the day you
16 were admitted to the day you take your first class
17 the second year. So think about the first year
18 experience being from the day you were admitted to
19 the day you take your first class of the second year
20 because there's so many points in there where things
21 can happen.

22 So, helping them with that transition to
23 understand that that fifteen hours a week of classes
24 is more than fifteen hours. To making sure that
25 they are prepared for the courses that they're

1 taking and they're in the right courses but also
2 making sure that we have those support programs
3 around them. So the study, for instance, which is a
4 peer tutoring, we're working to coordinate that
5 across the colleges and the central system. What we
6 found is we didn't have good coordination.

7 Just being very frank, they were operating as
8 two independent systems. So, how do we get that
9 coordinated around that and we've had great
10 cooperation from the colleges. Now where even the
11 central tutors are attending the classes. I mean,
12 that sounds simplistic right but it's just what it
13 was.

14 We had them tutoring for a class that they had
15 taken but they weren't attending the class that they
16 were tutoring for, so putting that together. Some
17 of the other things, again the emotional stability
18 and financial stability were trying to address and
19 just making that experience so they get that
20 support. The other is, again, meaningful
21 assessments by all of you in the first eight weeks
22 and then working together with you to help that
23 student get the help they need and also understand
24 and de-stigmatize that.

25 One of the things that we find is that students

1 have a stigma that I must be the only one having
2 trouble. There can;t be anyone else in my class
3 having trouble so I don't want to reach out because
4 I'll single myself out as not being capable and in
5 fact they're not the only one.

6 So, how do we help them understand that were
7 here for them. There's not a stigma to it and were
8 here to help them. So those are just some of the
9 initiatives were undertaking.

10 MR. WASILKOVSKI: Wasilkovski, Engineering:
11 There's a trade in the number of accepted students
12 and their retention and also their graduation rate.
13 I want to know if they are close to optimal have
14 this college maybe we admit too many students among
15 them those that are struggling.

16 PROVOST TRACY: Yeah, so the question is how
17 many students do we take and what qualifications,
18 right?. And, you know, that's just being very frank
19 that's something that we always, it's a struggle for
20 us because were the flagship and were the land grant
21 and it's something you're always having to struggle
22 with is being the flagship institution of the state
23 and the land grant institution of the state.
24 Balancing those two things.

25 What is opportunity? You know how do you select

1 that student from a test score and a grade or maybe
2 an essay? And know their true abilities? So the
3 student who went to one of the Lexington high
4 schools versus a student that went to one of the
5 high schools in Owsley County. They may have had
6 very different experiences and very different
7 opportunities but to get to the core of that then
8 you have very similar things.

9 So were trying to get more sophisticated and
10 also understanding a students true ability. I think
11 the High School Readiness Index is beginning to get
12 us there. That's where we take a combination of the
13 GPA and the ACT, weighted more towards the GPA. We
14 find that some students, in particularly students
15 who don't come from wealthier areas don't have
16 KAPLAN test prep.

17 You know, I'm going to tell you a true story. I
18 had a student in my office talking about their ACT
19 and some changes we've made and they said, Well I
20 took the ACT eight times to get my 28. Now that
21 tells me that they already had substantial
22 opportunity as they could one, afford to pay for the
23 ACT eight times because it's not cheap. And because
24 they probably had test prep in between those eight
25 times, and contrast that with a student who comes in

1 with a 25 or 26 who literally walked in a Saturday
2 morning and took it with no prep and no study.

3 Hmm, they might have. They may be a raw
4 talented diamond in the rough but how do you judge
5 that? So those are difficult things that we look at
6 and how we balance that? It's tough and I'll tell
7 you that a lot of times we get right and sometimes
8 we don't. But, you know, just as you, when you hire
9 a faculty member you hope that everyone is a
10 superstar but sometimes we don't always turn out
11 exactly that way and how the same way for students.

12 So predicting for that individual is whats
13 tough. Predicting for a group is a lot easier.
14 Predicting for an individual is hard and so that's
15 the, it's that paradox between a flagship and a land
16 grant and were walking that line and sometimes we
17 probably lean on one side and sometimes we lean on
18 the other side and we try to find that right
19 balance.

20 CONNIE WOOD: We're just talking about the
21 ACT.

22 SECRETARY BROTHERS: Name please?

23 CONNIE WOOD: Connie Wood, Arts and
24 Sciences. It's interesting you were just talking
25 about the ACTs but the difference between 25, 26 and

1 28. Last year close to a quarter of the entering
2 class was at a score of 22 or below. What -- this
3 is the statistic that concerns me and how are we
4 doing this year?

5 PROVOST TRACY: Sure, about the same.
6 About the same. So let me quote you a couple of
7 other statistics. Already with 22 being the 25th
8 percentile, 28 being the 75th percentile. We have a
9 retention rate of 83.4 this fall and a six year
10 graduation rate of 64.6 percent for 2017. Florida
11 State University, one that I've looked at very
12 closely, you must like this school. Are you an
13 alum?

14 CONNIE WOOD: Yes.

15 PROVOST TRACY: Okay. Has an ACT band of
16 22 and 28.

17 CONNIE WOOD: I went to graduate school
18 there. (Laughter.)

19 PROVOST TRACY: I didn't say that, you
20 did. I won't ask you your ACT score. But do you
21 know what their first to second year retention rate
22 is? 92 percent, you know, what their six year
23 graduation rate is? It's over 80 percent. So, I
24 will challenge you and say that it's not just that.
25 They, over the course of about ten years, made a

1 committed effort to change processes, paths to
2 degrees, support, that's where we got the idea for
3 the SWOT team every week was Florida State. I'd
4 like to say we were the first to do it and we
5 weren't but we meet every week to talk about
6 retention and graduation and go through numbers and
7 so I believe, no offense to your institution, but if
8 Florida State can do it, the University of Kentucky
9 can do it.

10 If were the same ACT band that can have above a
11 90 percent first to second year retention and in
12 their case above an 80 percent graduation rate, we
13 can do it too with the students that we have.

14 MS. MCCORMICK: The Florida State numbers
15 for the unrepresented minorities?

16 PROVOST TRACY: No difference. Zero
17 difference. They graduate URMs and the general
18 population exactly the same rate. We don't. I'll
19 be honest, we don't. And I think we can do it but
20 it takes commitment. It takes commitment. So yes
21 it is partly who you bring in. But I would pause
22 that there are institutions with the same student
23 body that we have and that's why I believe in you
24 and I believe that the changes were making can get
25 us to the same place.

1 MS. MCCORMICK: Any questions?

2 PROVOST TRACY: Okay. Well, thank you all
3 and thanks again for all your help with our
4 students. (APPLAUSE)

5 MS. MCCORMICK: So we also have present
6 today one of my colleagues, the Staff Senate Chair,
7 Jon Gent who is in the back. Jon is in the
8 Department of our College of Medicine and is a
9 Health Education Specialist. I really have enjoyed
10 the partnership with his staff and in fact I think I
11 am going to visit the staff senate at some point in
12 time. So do you have a comment? Want to say hello?
13 All right. Thank you for being here. Thank you for
14 being a good partner.

15 So we also have two deans. I know that Dr.
16 Shanda is going to be late, but he's actually a
17 voting Dean. He'll be here later and then Christian
18 Brady is our Honors Dean. And I don't see him here
19 so just to remember and we are going to search for,
20 we are searching for two more Deans I think this
21 year, Engineering and,...

22 PROVOST TRACY: Libraries.

23 MS. MCCORMICK: Libraries. And I the
24 Senate Council on your behalf has sent names to the
25 Provost in terms of who will be good representatives

1 of the faculty as a whole on those searches. So we
2 are now ready for the SACs Five Year Report and I'd
3 like to welcome our Assistant Provost for Sachemic
4 Planning and Institutional Effectiveness, Annie
5 Davis Weber. I think she wants to talk with you
6 just a little bit. Thank you for being here.

7 MS. WEBER: Thank you. All right. I've
8 been a little under the weather so I'm sorry if I
9 cough a bit in the middle of all this but I was
10 asked to bring you all up to date with some basic
11 information. We are an institution accredited by
12 SACSCOC and we have also heard it referred to as
13 SACS.

14 SACSCOC stand for the Southern Association of
15 College and Schools Commission on Colleges. They
16 are very insistent that it is SACSCOC and not just
17 SACS so put that in your back pocket for next time
18 if you are out in public, but SACS is fine. So
19 where are we? We are reaffirmed every ten years and
20 in the middle we have to do what's called a
21 fifth-year interim report.

22 So this is an abbreviated compliance report. In
23 addition to make it interesting this time around,
24 SACSCOC is approving new standards at their December
25 meeting. We have seen drafts of them so we are

1 confident and we know what target we are shooting at
2 now. So we've gotten our kind of way but they have
3 done a revision of some of the language,
4 consolidated some standards.

5 I could talk to you all day about different
6 SACS standards but I don't want to bore you with
7 that right now. So, well have to respond to about
8 twenty-two different standards. There are somewhere
9 around sixty that we would have to do during the
10 10-year reports. It occurs midway between the ten
11 year cycle so our next ten year will be in 2022.

12 This is an off-site review only so we prepare
13 our documents, we send it to an off-site team, they
14 read what we send them, give us comments, we have an
15 opportunity to respond. There's no on site visit so
16 there won't be any big hoopla of hosting anybody
17 here on campus and the reviewers will be from our
18 peer Institution.

19 It's not a review by SACSCOC staff members.
20 It's a completely pure review driven process. So we
21 have several people here on this campus who are
22 reviewers for other institutions. That's how the
23 whole thing goes. In addition to responding to the
24 standards we also have to prepare what's called a
25 Community Impact Report. Who knows what the QEP is?

1 Not bad. Good, okay. So the QEP stands for the
2 Quality Enhancement Plan.

3 During our 10-year reaffirmation we developed
4 the QEP that we are currently using which has the
5 Title-fication View Project and for multilevel
6 communication so we have only ten pages with no
7 indexes to document the impact of the presentation
8 you project on student learning and I'm very
9 confident that well have some good results to share
10 there as we move on.

11 I'll stop now for any overall questions. So,
12 how were structuring this is that were going to
13 report to the senior leadership team and their
14 responsibility, which includes Provosts, EUP Eric
15 Lindsey, and Katherine McCormick. Their
16 responsibilities are to empower the staff in the
17 areas to prepare these documents and receive updates
18 and they'll review and approve the final draft.

19 Then we have the support team which is myself as
20 the SACSCOC liaison, members of my staff, from
21 Institutional Research and Advanced Analytics and
22 I've also, as it's highlighted here, I am taking
23 self-nominations and other directive nominations for
24 someone to serve as a faculty editor for this
25 project. I would very much like somebody to join me

1 and help ensure that we have good consistency of
2 tone and argumentation across all of the different
3 standards. When you're managing a large project
4 like this it will run to -- I don't even know how
5 many pages long, but it helps to have somebody else
6 to keep their eye on the ball.

7 So, if you're interested, please let me know. If
8 you know somebody who would be a good victim please
9 send their name and I'll see if I can solicit them.

10 There will be some stipend support especially for
11 next summer to go along with that role. So, we will
12 help coordinate meetings. We will sign the
13 standards to the authors, edit drafts, monitor and
14 enforce deadlines, provide data and just generally
15 facilitate the process and then we have authored a
16 team, put together all the teams that will handle
17 just a select number.

18 So their responsibilities are to build their own
19 teams to get the work done, review the assignments,
20 outlay arguments, gather evidence, draft responses
21 and meet deadlines and work with the editor. So
22 these are the groupings of the standards that I
23 have, that we have come up with. So we have one for
24 Student Learning and Achievement; this is where the
25 assessment of student learning will be SOL reporting

1 on each other. Transparency and Institutional
2 Representation: this yields with policy compliance,
3 how we present ourselves to the world and making
4 sure were consistent with that. Educational Program
5 Structure and Content.

6 Katherine, is leading that team. Educational
7 Policies, Procedures and Practices; Don Witt of
8 Faculty, G.T. Lineberry. Student Affairs and
9 services is Dr. Heilman. Financial and Physical
10 Resources is Angie Martin office and the QEP is
11 Kathy Kern and her team. In terms of timeline,
12 right now what we are doing is reviewing the
13 standards, getting our -- what we did last time.

14 We have to make sure all of that stuff is still
15 true. If not true, were making some adjustments and
16 (coughing) improvements, making policy or procedural
17 changes that we need to make to make sure we are in
18 compliance and then a whole group of us are going to
19 be attending the December meeting in Dallas to get
20 up to speed on the new standards.

21 Then in the spring we are going to be creating
22 our first drafts and then over the summer we will
23 have those drafts with faculty editor and we will
24 work on getting them polished and we are due to have
25 a final draft of all content to the President's

1 office and the Provosts office by November 1st of
2 next year. So, I'm looking for nominations for
3 faculty editor and were going to be developing a
4 website to push out more updates as they become
5 available. So, any questions?

6 DAVY JONES: Davy Jones, Toxicology. You
7 mentioned the new standards that are going to be -
8 the new operational standards that in December are
9 going to be approved. When you look at the ones we
10 have now versus what they're going to vote on, is
11 this just rearranging the chairs or is there
12 something really substantive there? What's the most
13 substantive thing you see there as a change?

14 MS. WEBER: I would say in general it's a
15 housekeeping reorganization. There were several
16 standards that were duplicated because they were
17 considered core requirements but also federal
18 requirements as they were kind of written in two
19 different places. That duplication has been
20 eliminated which I think is going to be good.

21 There is one kind of brand new standard that
22 focuses on the institutional environment and that's
23 going to (coughing) things like our safety
24 statistics and what were doing to ensure that the
25 campus environment is safe and welcoming and that

1 kind of stuff, but other than that theres really not
2 a lot that has changed dramatically. I've done the
3 side by side comparison and tried to pick things
4 out. Unfortunately they really didn't eliminate
5 much but they did the duplicates so in a sense there
6 are probably fewer numbers on the list but it's kind
7 of really the same amount of content.

8 PROVOST TRACY: I think it will actually
9 help the reviewers because you wont have two
10 reviewers conflicting over the same things.

11 MS. WEBER: Yeah.

12 PROVOST TRACY: I mean, part of the
13 problem was that you might have one reviewer
14 reviewing it because they review the standard and
15 they were actually reviewing fundamentally the same
16 thing so then you get these conflicting reviews. So
17 I think its going to clean up some of that a good
18 bit.

19 MS. WEBER: I agree.

20 MS. MCCORMICK: Any other questions for
21 Annie? Monica?

22 MS. VISONA: Monica Visona, College of
23 Fine Arts. With the last review we had there was a
24 great deal of emphasis on everybody in the
25 university, every janitor should be familiar with

1 our QEP which was the multi-promotional benefits of
2 something.

3 COUNCIL: Communication.

4 MS. VISONA: Communication, there we go.
5 So, are we going to have a similar kind of push to
6 make sure everybody is on board and all the freshmen
7 know it and all the faculty

8 MS. WEBER: No, not at this time, no. So
9 this is about reporting on the impact of the QEP so
10 this is going to be looking at measuring learning
11 gains that happened among the students who took
12 classes from the faculty who were trained, and
13 things like that. It's completely a document
14 review. So, nobody's coming here. We don't have to
15 worry about that until the ten year, I'm sorry to
16 say, but we got a little time on that one.

17 MR. GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A&S. So,
18 kind of two related questions. One is in terms of
19 the presentation U, what happens if we find out it
20 didn't have any effect? Any positive effect?

21 MS. WEBER: From accreditation or
22 institutional respect.

23 MR. GROSSMAN: Let's say from an
24 accreditation respect.

25 MS. DAVIS: Nothing happens. So we

1 report honestly what happened and if nothing
2 happened, then we say that and our peers will, you
3 know, judge whether or not we have a good
4 justification for why we think what happened
5 happened.

6 Now, I can say that because we put full faith
7 and effort into developing this QEP and we
8 implemented it in a really great way, I think. So,
9 I can say I've seen some of the preliminary data and
10 we have seen some gains but you know with assessment
11 and student learning theres always a muddy picture.

12 So, it's really more that they want to see
13 that we have a QEP, that we've invested the
14 resources and the time and effort and they want to
15 see what happened. So we will not go on probation
16 or lose accreditation if we don't have spectacular
17 data about our student learning.

18 MR. GROSSMAN: Are there any other
19 potential red flags that they might be looking at or
20 for or recent,...

21 MS. DAVIS: So the good news is the most
22 frequently cited standard is not part of the 5th
23 Year Review and that one relates to faculty
24 credentials. So we don't have to sweat that one
25 right now. The other one that trips up the most

1 people is the assessment of student learning at the
2 program level. So what used to be called 3.3.1.1 --
3 anyone who knows these numbers, you're going to have
4 to learn a new set unfortunately. I think it's now
5 called 8.2.A., but that is the program level
6 assessment of student learning. That one trips up a
7 lot of people. I feel like the place we have, you
8 know, a broad representation and we have a good
9 depth of evidence to back up our efforts there so
10 I'm not too worried.

11 MS. MCCORMICK: Thanks Annie. Annie
12 needs an editor. I know she made that clear. Dean
13 Shanda is here and I've just introduced him and now
14 he's been able to join us and if you'll just stand
15 and say hello.

16 MR. SHANDA: Hi everybody.

17 MS. MCCORMICK: This is one of our new
18 Deans. Welcome. Thank you. He's a voting one.

19 MR. SHANDA: I am. I have my clicker.

20 MS. MCCORMICK: All right. We've had a good
21 bit of work done on the core today. As many of you
22 know, one of the requirements for the Core Committee
23 is not only to approve new courses for the core but
24 also to engage in an assessment of the core and so
25 in collaboration with Annie's work on S-A --

1 S-A-C-C-O-C, SACCOC, we are working toward this task
2 of being very deliberative and intentional in how we
3 look at the core and in the ways at which we
4 evaluate the core as an institution.

5 So, Eric Monday, meet Eric Sandy, who is the
6 Chair of the core, the U of K Core, has it paneled
7 or is working on getting paneled a group of about
8 eight or nine, I think, faculty and administrators
9 who will look at -- will take this task as a
10 subcommittee of the core and really dig deeply into
11 this work.

12 So that will be, they'll run in parallel to the
13 work of the core committee, and again, I appreciate
14 all of you who submitted nominations or encouraged
15 other people to submit their own names and were in
16 pretty good shape in Social Sciences but we need a
17 few more nominations for quantitative methods.

18 So, that's kind of an update on that work.
19 Again, were excited to begin this work and we know
20 that Eric and the committee, as well as this
21 subcommittee will move this forward and have
22 something to you soon. So these are the kinds of
23 activities that they'll engage in.

24 We also have another group of faculty who ve
25 been working on a title series. I think I shared

1 with you last meeting. This charge actually came to
2 Chair Hippisley before he left and were just now
3 getting it done and so we really appreciate all of
4 the faculty who participated in that.

5 So those members for the SAC team members as
6 well as all the area committee Chairs. And they
7 brought forth a draft that suggested that they did
8 believe it was feasible to have a system with only
9 two titles, with breaks in both series and that it
10 was possible that we would also be able to include
11 multiple-year contracts of faculty in the non-tenure
12 track.

13 Remember this is an AR so were collaborating
14 with the Provost and his staff, but one of the
15 things that he'd like to do, and we are happy to
16 support him in this effort, is to begin to have some
17 campus-wide forums about this issue and so we will
18 work with his staff soon so that we can get a
19 broader sense of your concerns, your thoughts, what
20 you think this might look like or how this might be
21 enacted in your own colleges, and then, of course
22 we'll ask that you share this information with your
23 own colleagues. So, our next step is our
24 campus-wide open forums.

25 We also heard from a committee that we charged

1 last year regarding 6.2 which is the policy and
2 procedures for addressing and resolving allegations
3 of sexual assault, stalking, dating violence and
4 domestic violence. This committee has worked very
5 hard. They were -- it was chaired by Jennifer
6 Bird-Pollen and has a number of faculty leaders,
7 people whose scholarship is in the areas touched by
8 this AR.

9 So our initial discussion regarding this was
10 held on the Senate Council on August 25th. The
11 committee went back and looked at some of the
12 questions around the AR and proposed a revision on
13 September 25th, and that was adopted. So we have
14 adopted that report. Remember an AR comes forward to
15 you from the president, provost or the
16 administrative arm of the university and so what wed
17 like to do is present these recommendations to the
18 president and hopefully he will agree with some of
19 those and send those forward.

20 I will say that there was not unanimous
21 agreement around the recommendations provided by the
22 committee and so when we write that letter to the
23 president we will share some of the reservations and
24 concerns expressed by Senate Council and those
25 reports are available. So, Ernie Bailey, do you

1 have a -- well, I guess, we won't have a Vice Chairs
2 Report. Parliamentarian?

3 PARLIAMENTARIAN: Nothing to report.

4 MS. MCCORMICK: Also has nothing to
5 report. Well, I know, or I thought (coughing). So
6 this is, as you know, our Trustee Bob Grossman,
7 College of Medicine.

8 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Sure, I'll start. So,
9 we have a board meeting coming up, actually it's a
10 board retreat next week and at board retreat there
11 are no committee meetings and theres very little
12 business done. The purpose of this retreat is to
13 discuss and brainstorm about some of the challenges
14 that are likely to be facing higher education over
15 the next ten years to the longer term. To that end,
16 the president gave all the board members some
17 homework and I think that homework -- was that
18 homework distributed to you all as well?

19 TRUSTEE BLONDER: I sent that to them via
20 email.

21 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Yeah, we sent that in
22 an email to all the faculty containing links to
23 these, to the reading material. One was a report
24 from the (inaudible) of higher education on some of
25 the trends that higher education is seeing in the

1 immediate or over the next ten, fifteen year
2 timeframe. The other was an excerpt from a book by
3 Tom Freidman called, the book is called Thank You
4 for Being Late. The title of the chapter was from
5 AI to IA. You could read it to figure out, to learn
6 what AI is artificial intelligence but IA means
7 three different things. So, it's Tom Freidman, what
8 can I say. So, anyway I've read it. I think you
9 said you haven't read it yet.

10 TRUSTEE BLONDER: I've read part of this
11 chapter and I skipped over to the end.

12 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: All right. I really do
13 encourage you to read the chronicle document. It's
14 really interesting. A lot of what's in there, they
15 talk about higher education at large and so of
16 course the challenges that are facing flagship
17 universities and land grant universities are not the
18 same as the challenges facing colleges, priv-- small
19 private universities and colleges et-cetera,
20 et-cetera.

21 So there's a lot in there that you might read
22 and say well that's not really us but there are
23 other things in there that I think really are going
24 to be things that you'd interact with over the next
25 few years. The thing that I got out of it was the

1 greatest challenge facing us is the change in the
2 demographics of the college student population both
3 in terms of the numbers of students which are mostly
4 here now and then also an opportunity to mix the
5 ethnicity in the daily classes.

6 Summary: it's going to be a lot more latino and
7 Hispanic students than we have now and we so far
8 haven't done a very good job of retaining and
9 graduating students from those groups and we are
10 going to need to figure out how to do that because
11 other wise we are going to see our retention -- if
12 we don't change, our retention rates for some of
13 these ethnic groups, we are going to see our overall
14 retention rates, plummet because these groups are
15 going to very -- very rapidly come to be a very
16 large proportion of our student body.

17 So, that was my big take home from the problem
18 at least and theres some other really interesting
19 things particularly around the competency based
20 education and I think that's a legal buzzword but --
21 and I think a lot of what we do already is teach
22 competencies.

23 I know in my department we teach people how to
24 do things so that they're going to graduate and be
25 able to get a job as a chemist but what people are

1 more talking about is taking a little module here, a
2 little module here, a little module here, rather
3 than getting a whole comprehensive -- comprehensive
4 engineering degree. And doing this over a lifetime
5 not just the area you teach when you're twenty-two
6 years old.

7 So, I think, you know, we should also think
8 about how we might enter this area, of course
9 continue to do what we already do well, but
10 considering that a lot of employers and a lot of
11 students, especially adult learners will be
12 demanding this other way of looking at their future.

13 So, anyway I encourage you all to read it,
14 talk about it among your colleagues. Talk about it
15 over the year or coffee or whatever and think about
16 how we might position ourselves in the future in
17 that module.

18 TRUSTEE BLONDER: I'd like to add a little
19 about the chapter in this Freidman book and to give
20 you an idea of the authors point of view I want to
21 read a paragraph where he's always talking about
22 Olin College which is an engineering school in
23 Massachusetts and granted I'm taking this out of
24 context but I think it expresses a view that we need
25 to consider that is held up there. So, can

1 everybody hear me?

2 Olin is a small -- Olin is small and young
3 but this engineering lab school demonstrates a lot
4 of the revolutionary features that eventually will
5 be incorporated into most schools. The end of
6 tenure, post partnership. The working world, a
7 constantly adapting curriculum and no departments
8 and a synthetic teaching approach that blends
9 engineering and humanities such as a course that
10 combines biology and history of pandemics.

11 That's intelligent assistance at it's best.
12 That is the real revolution education and it will be
13 coming to a community near you as more and more
14 workers need and demand intelligent assistance.
15 Miller, who I think is the President of Olin calls
16 it expeditionary learning, creating your own
17 knowledge and inventing your own career.

18 So, I assume were going to be discussing these
19 ideas at the Board meeting but i wanted to give you
20 an idea of what Freidman thinks is going to be
21 happening and those habit falcatations for
22 universities like ours, if it were to be
23 implemented.

24 So, if you have feedback for us about these two
25 documents, please either call or email us and we'll

1 do the best we can to represent the faculty views.

2 MS. VISONA: At the risk of --

3 SECRETARY HOLLAND: Name please?

4 MS. VISONA: -- Monica Visona, College of Fine
5 Arts. At the risk of cluttering up our in-boxes,
6 I'm unable to find the documents that you suggested
7 we read. Would it be possible to send them out
8 again to the senators?

9 TRUSTEE BLONDER: Do you want me to send it
10 -- Ill send it to you then. Does everybody else
11 have them?

12 MS. MCCORMICK: We can include them on the
13 Senate Website.

14 MS. VISONA: That would be even better.
15 Thank you.

16 TRUSTEE BLONDER: Yeah, that would be
17 great.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think the email
19 came from Katherine, not from you.

20 TRUSTEE BLONDER: Well, I sent an email to
21 all faculty from me and Bob. You did not get that?

22 MULTIPLE UNKNOWN PEOPLE: No.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But Katherine sent
24 one to the senate.

25 TRUSTEE BLONDER: Who got it? Who got our

1 email? Okay. So maybe it went to another spam box.
2 I don't know why not everybody got it. The list was
3 given as the Listserv of all faculty including Deans
4 that we -- Dave Blanton's Office basically.

5 MS. MCCORMICK: Well, get it up. Herman?

6 MR. FARRELL: I just wanted to publicly
7 thank the both of you for your letters in response
8 to Governor Bevin's commentary about interpreted
9 dance. I'm sorry Herman Farrell, Department of
10 Theater and Dance and I appreciated it as did our
11 department and our college mostly because it was
12 allies.

13 You were standing up for us instead of us doing
14 it on our own and so that part of it I appreciated.
15 I also appreciated all the ideas that you
16 articulated in both the articles in the Herald
17 Leader and the Chronicle of Higher of Education. So,
18 thank you very much. (APPLAUSE)

19 TRUSTEE BLONDER: I should probably mention
20 that the board just recently elected officers so
21 Britt Brockman was re-elected Chair, Mark Bryant is
22 the new Vice Chair, C.T. is replace C.B. Akins.
23 Kelly Holland is the Secretary and Bill Thro is the
24 Assistant Secretary. As Bob and I were assigned to
25 committees so were both on Academic Programs and

1 Student and Academic Affairs and I'm on Finance
2 Committee and Bobs on the Healthcare Committee.

3 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: I got the better one of
4 those.

5 TRUSTEE BLONDER: And the Human Area
6 Relations Committee.

7 MS. MCCORMICK: I think the gentleman in
8 the back first. Did you?

9 MR. CHENG: I teach engineering. I also
10 read the book but I thought the message was rather
11 alarming than you mentioned. For example, it talked
12 about services such as Forsea, they can put on the
13 course so quickly that no university can put on the
14 course so fast because of the (coughing). It also
15 mentioned that GE works with some universities.
16 They were able to write Masters

17 At a cost of \$6,000.00 a person and I think
18 that's a great challenge to the universities like
19 us. We cannot put out courses so quickly, refresh
20 our courses and provide a low cost education to
21 people who are trying to get advanced degrees.

22 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: There are definitely some
23 real challenges there and theres some very
24 interesting innovations around the country and that
25 was one. Both of those that you mentioned were very

1 interesting. Before we all start panicking, I would
2 just say first of all let's not figure how many of
3 those can be duplicated and how well they can be
4 scaled. You know, GE is working with Georgia Tech
5 and Georgia Tech is a pretty special place so will a
6 place like U of K be able to -- but will replace --
7 will that sort of experiment be able to expand to
8 put a lot more students or will there still be
9 places or a place in the world for places likes us
10 and our engineering department?

11 So, I would say that and also recall Tom
12 Freidman is advocating a particular point of view
13 that he's been advocating for the past twenty years
14 or so and some of his predictions have panned out
15 and some have not. So, it's very interesting but
16 you know, is Olin College how U of K needs to look
17 in, you know, twenty years? I really -- really
18 doubt it. You know we've gone from the end of
19 tenure to no departments. Can you imagine a school
20 this big without departments?

21 MS. MCCORMICK: Chris, you have a comment?

22 MR. BLOOM: Yeah, I just wanted to say,...

23 SECRETARY HOLLAND: Staff name, please.

24 CHRIS BLOOM: Oh, I'm sorry, Chris Bloom,
25 Arts and Science. The PDFs that you sent were at

1 the bottom of your September 28th email. So, if
2 anybody needs them.

3 MS. MCCORMICK: Thank you. Any other? Yes.

4 MR. PAKATH: Can you post the PDFs on the
5 Senate website?

6 MS. MCCORMICK: Yes.

7 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: She said, yes. We just
8 mailed -- I think you just mailed the links to them.
9 You didn't actually mail the documents.

10 TRUSTEE BLONDER: Yeah, Dave Blanton put
11 them on the U of K PR Website for us so that people
12 could access them because we cant send the PDF
13 attachment to 2000+ people.

14 MS. MCCORMICK: Davy?

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, Annie can
16 correct me if I'm wrong here. I think I remember
17 that in the new SAT Standards there's going to be
18 done in December, there's a real clear elaboration
19 assessed that how well the Lord of the institution
20 is functioning. I don't rem -- I've watched for
21 this coming and I don't recall the board very often
22 talking about how are we going to assess how well we
23 are functioning as a board. You've got a retreat
24 coming up?

25 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Yes.

1 MR. JONES: Maybe scratch the board a bit
2 to think about that.

3 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Sure, I can mention it.
4 I can assure you that the board is very satisfied
5 with the way it operates. (LAUGHTER)

6 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: And comparing us to
7 certain other extensions, which shall remain
8 nameless, that self assessment is not unwarranted.
9 So, ...

10 MS. DAVIS: That's in there. It's not
11 part of our 5th year.

12 MS. MCCORMICK: Thank you guys.

13 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Again, if you have any
14 problems or issues or anything email or pick up the
15 phone and call us.

16 MS. MCCORMICK: The Senate Council actually
17 nominated members to have a conversation during
18 this retreat with the board of trustee members
19 around these issues. We partnered with the provost,
20 we submitted things to the presidents office. We
21 don't know how those, you know, whether they
22 accepted them, rejected the, but we did provide
23 names of faculty that we believe could speak to
24 these issues and, all right.

25 So, old business we have a policy that came

1 to us the very last, I think, meeting in May. We,
2 at that time, appeared to be no real concerns
3 regarding it; however, we lost quorum. It was the
4 very last item of business and so we've asked Mr.
5 Kehrwald, our Dean of Students to come back to
6 present this. If this went forward as an interim
7 but now it is fully coming to you to endorse the
8 proposal for this new AR. (coughing) is going to
9 also respond to any questions that you have and
10 (coughing).

11 MR. KEHRWALD: Good afternoon. I'm going
12 to try to be as concise as possible because as
13 Katherine alluded to I've been at the very end of
14 the agenda and so I know what it's like to not have
15 quorum when you're trying to get a vote. I'm going
16 to use the microphone because I think like that may
17 have a bit of a pull. I'm on the front end of this
18 so the joys of little things.

19 As Katherine said some of you have seen this
20 presentation before so again I'm going to try to be
21 brief but AR 12 is our policy for Student
22 Involuntary Medical Withdrawal Policy and
23 Procedures. We have been working on this for a good
24 portion of the academic year 2016-2017 with the help
25 of Marcy having read the committee -- reviewed it

1 multiple times, having present it to the Senate
2 Council. They had an opportunity to review it. For
3 those of you who aren't familiar either with
4 (coughing) concerned policy itself, let me just
5 provide a brief history.

6 We've had a group of individuals on this campus
7 who had sort of formed to talk about students of
8 concern that was sort of just in add of all group
9 of people. As you might imagine, typically in
10 Student Affairs, this would've been post Virginia
11 Tech. Ours was not quite as formalized.

12 We decided to formalize that in 2011 so we had a
13 full time staff person and that was Theresa Smith
14 and since then that has been built out into both an
15 office and a team which again, we formalized that
16 CUSC Team in an Administrative Reg at the end of
17 last year in May.

18 So that has expanded from two staff, full-time
19 staff positions in 2013 and presently we have four
20 full-time staff positions in that office and part of
21 the reason is for this data right here. Part of
22 this is related to once you have a resource on
23 campus and people are familiar with this resource
24 you find that you end up having an increase of
25 referrals and I think this has been shared

1 repeatedly.

2 The University of Kentucky is not alone in
3 seeing student mental health. Our counseling center
4 will be the first to tell you that anxiety is the
5 number one issue that our students are facing. That
6 has flipped. It was depression and anxiety. In the
7 last ten years it has flipped to anxiety and
8 depression.

9 So, we have seen that and students exhibiting
10 that behavior on our campus both outside the
11 classroom but obviously for some of you within the
12 classroom as well. So the last academic year, which
13 we really go by from July 1 to June 30th, we treat
14 it sort of like a fiscal year. We have a thousand
15 different behavioral alerts.

16 The other thing that I put up there is a
17 specific type of alerts: Threat to Self, Threat to
18 Others. That can be an alarming number for a lot of
19 you when you see 166 and you think those are 166
20 students that are a threat to others. The vast
21 majority of those, and when I say vast majority,
22 probably all but two really are threat to self.
23 Right?

24 When you think about suicidal ideations and the
25 rate at which that occurs, not uncommon to have a

1 lot of students who struggle with that. Again,
2 related to depression and other things. The policy
3 itself, we had previously had our policy within our
4 code, it held an interim leave policy. We've only
5 actually had to implement it four times since 2011.
6 So the policy before you all is not something that
7 we have to use on a regular basis.

8 It's something that I hope I will never have to
9 utilize or we institutionally would never like to
10 utilize. That being said, it's pretty important
11 because when the need arises you want to make sure
12 you do have a very clearly articulated policy and
13 procedure for addressing these types of issues. As
14 I had referenced just a moment ago, our previous
15 paragraph within our Student Code of Conduct, again
16 this was our Interim Leave Policy.

17 This was the extent of our policy from 2010 to
18 2016 in our old Student Code of Conduct. So, part
19 of the issue here was we did not have procedures
20 outlining how we would sort of respond and address
21 this and some of the language embed within t hat are
22 things that needed to be updated and addressed. And
23 so, again, no outline process.

24 It covered direct threat with the, you know,
25 phrases like menacing behavior, potentially

1 problematic in terms of how you define that, what
2 that means, the breadth of how someone might
3 interpret that.

4 The other thing that has changed is that our
5 Department of Justice has also changed their
6 definition of direct threat so often times when you
7 were asked to review, you were giving your internal
8 policies you have to take into consideration not
9 only the changing legal landscape from the cords and
10 the cases that come out but from the new guide is
11 from your Federal Government, not unlike were facing
12 right now we're on student issues.

13 So, this was very similar to that. I think our
14 federal government is still trying to decide how to
15 address the threat really as it relates to threat to
16 self and so they have, through a course of different
17 resolution agreements given us, I think, some more
18 clarity from their original guidance in 2011. The
19 National Association for College and University
20 Attorneys outlined, I think, a very clear way to go
21 about thinking about how to write a policy. Through
22 this process obviously benchmarked our peer
23 institutions, but they were pretty clear in the
24 standards that you should have. So, I think with
25 those, a major thing is really conducting individual

1 risk assessments.

2 So, when you're trying to design a policy you
3 want it to be applicable to all students as you can
4 see over there on the top far right, but you need to
5 be addressing every student as a student. So, part
6 of that is to do that having those individualized
7 risk assessments.

8 Obviously one of the issues you get in the --
9 that comes into play when you're dealing with
10 Involuntary Medical Withdrawal is as in thoughts
11 against a students potential disability. Some of
12 these issues have also been protected under ADA and
13 so again you have to avoid disparate treatment which
14 relates to again, assessing observable behavior,
15 making sure that you're addressing sort of the
16 behavior or your concerns and not a diagnosis.

17 So that's really, really important as it relates
18 to these types of policies. The other part that I
19 think universities really came out of this guide was
20 trying to offer students other options before
21 getting to an Involuntary Medical Withdrawal. And
22 so going through that process of trying to create
23 structured plans, offering voluntary leave processes
24 and we obviously have many different processes
25 within our rules that students are allowed to do and

1 ultimately using an Involuntary Withdrawal Removal
2 only in emergency or as a last result.

3 And again, I think based on the University's
4 numbers right four in the last six years, seven
5 years, this is something that we take very
6 seriously. This is not something that we like to
7 utilize or employ and we do like to exhaust all of
8 our options prior to that.

9 Lastly, it's providing reasonable and
10 individualized conditions for a students return.
11 Again, all of these situations are going to be
12 slightly different and so really similar to
13 providing an individualized assessment on the front
14 end, it's providing individualized conditions of
15 return on the back end.

16 So, the goals of the drafted policy again,
17 really in line with a lot of those recommendations
18 that came out of National. The only thing I haven't
19 touched on is providing the POs process. Obviously
20 it should be in the policy but being mindful of our
21 own internal processes, I think one of the things we
22 changed and this came out of the review, is making
23 sure that there was an appeal process linked to our
24 university Apella Board.

25 Obviously under our governing regs that's

1 something that is worthy of PO,...

2 MS. MCCORMICK: This came to the Senate
3 Council. Again it came to the floor of the Senate
4 in the spring and we were unable act on it because
5 of a loss of quorum. So what Id like for you to do
6 now is a motion from the Senate Council and the
7 Senate will endorse or propose a new AR 4.12. Are
8 there any questions? All right. So, motion that
9 senate endorse the proposed new AR 4.12 proposed
10 extensions. Motion passes and we have a policy.
11 Sorry it took place. We have Michael Healy with us
12 today. He is our outgoing Ombud. We really owe him
13 a big thanks. (APPLAUSE)

14 MS. MCCORMICK: Joe McGillis is our new
15 Ombud. There he is. Thank you Joe. We introduced
16 Joe last meeting I think and do you have any words
17 that you want to share Dr. McGillis?

18 MR. MCGILLIS: I'll let Michael go first.

19 MS. MCCORMICK: All right. Michael?

20 MR. HEALY: Thanks very much Dr. McCormick.
21 It's been my honor to serve as the Ombud, Academic
22 Ombud since the fall of 2014. I really enjoyed
23 working with students, faculty, staff and
24 administrators in the position. It's a position
25 that exposes you to a lot of different sides of the

1 university and I hope I was able to help in
2 addressing some of the issues that arose during my
3 time in the position. I did want to welcome Joe as
4 the new Academic Ombud but as Katherine said his
5 position is in the College of Medicine.

6 A lot of you will know him already from his work
7 on the University Senate and with the Senate
8 Council. I also wanted to thank Warren Anchel who
9 is in the back of the room as well and who helps
10 with the University Senate. She works full-time in
11 the Ombud's office and in that position she really
12 addresses and resolves a lot of issues that come up
13 just on a day to day basis with students and faculty
14 and administrators and has been sort of able to work
15 out a lot of them in very informal way.

16 She's just very knowledgeable with the rules and
17 of the university to get people to the people they
18 need to talk with to get problems resolved and
19 basically the report that I presented with most of
20 yours help is a summary of the work that we've done
21 over the year from the office. A lot of the work
22 through the Ombud's Office is quite informal and
23 never finds its way into an official appeal
24 proceeding before the University Appeals Board.

25 So, the report tries to categorize a lot of

1 those interactions with students and faculty and the
2 efforts that we make to try to resolve issues that
3 arise. For the formal problems that emerge, the
4 report summarizes the appeals of student academic
5 offenses and also typically the way it feels with
6 the other category of academic right appeals, and
7 you know, we've tried to sort of describe a little
8 bit about what those appeals involve. A lot of that
9 will also be covered in Joe Finks annual report on
10 behalf of the University Appeals Board. I can
11 answer any questions you may have. Thanks, Joe, did
12 you want to say something?

13 MR. MCGILLIS: Just a couple real quick
14 comments. Yes, I'd like to thank Provost Tracy for
15 the opportunity to have this position. It's been
16 interesting but one thing I want to do, to say, was
17 that two things that -- me the newbie about three
18 months ago when I started and that was some of the
19 University Appeals Board members and since then I've
20 also reached out and communicated with a number of
21 associate beings that deal with student issues,
22 other administrative offices and the one thing that
23 I've heard almost universal was what a good job
24 Michael did, both in email. So, I'm hoping I can
25 live up to those standards.

1 (APPLAUSE)

2 MS. MCCORMICK: Then we have another
3 report by another law school. Jim Donovan is going
4 to share with us the report of the Committee. Some
5 of you have heard that this committee is late in
6 starting and that is not Jim's fault. That is my
7 fault. We were very interested in making sure there
8 was a diverse group of faculty with which the
9 students could meet and so we were just this week
10 able to populate this committee and I know they'll
11 start tomorrow.

12 MR. DONOVAN: Wrong.

13 MS. MCCORMICK: Jim?

14 MR. DONOVAN: The only comment I would
15 like to add about the annual reports that have been
16 distributed; you'll see the petitioning for
17 Retroactive Withdrawal is becoming a very popular
18 thing to do and I will say that the infrastructure
19 that you all have created to handle this process is
20 pretty much maxed out and if we continue to see
21 increases in petitions that we've seen over the last
22 few years, there are going to have to be changes
23 because we cannot handle the increasingly large
24 numbers of petitions.

25 It's unlikely we'll be able to meet more often

1 because getting a group together this size in the
2 same out of the same window of availability is
3 pretty -- it took long enough to schedule our
4 monthly meeting October 20th, its the first, but my
5 understanding is that right now we've already had a
6 forty dockets backlogged and you'll see that in some
7 years that was half of what they would normally see
8 on an annual basis.

9 So, on the one hand its a good thing. On the
10 other hand, you know, it's very taxing for the
11 committee to try to do right by the students and to
12 hear their appeals in a timely manner. So, at some
13 point I do predict that you all will need reg-enure
14 the system and when it comes time for that well have
15 some suggestions as to what's working and what's not
16 and without it taking up a lot of our time. So
17 we'll be happy to steer you to the right direction.

18 So, I'm just giving you a notice that that
19 might be something that you'll be seeing at some
20 future point. I will also say that probably the
21 most challenging task we have up from the rules that
22 you all gave us, the charge to deal with is, has
23 been dealing with the partial requests. The rules
24 clearly refer students asking for a complete wipe of
25 the semester but it does not, the rules do not

1 prevent them or tell them that they cannot ask for a
2 course or two out of a semester.

3 So we spent, so a lot of our time is spent in a
4 partial request and trying to handle them in an
5 equitable manner so that we -- so I will say that
6 last year or two we've tried to develop a common law
7 of how to deal with requests like that so that
8 people are treated consistently on those kind of
9 requests.

10 MS. MCCORMICK: Questions from anyone? And
11 actually the number of denials didn't change much,
12 right? I think we saw one hundred and twenty-eight
13 cases?

14 MR. DONOVAN: We're nice people.

15 (LAUGHTER)

16 MS. MCCORMICK: Any other questions?

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: College of Engineering.
18 What percentage of partials do you approve? Give us
19 some number, please.

20 MR. DONOVAN: I can make up numbers. I'll
21 say out of ten partial requests we might, we might
22 approve no more than two, especially since once the
23 partial has been denied, they always have the option
24 of coming back and asking for withdrawal from the
25 full semester. So, by denying someone a partial we

1 are not denying them all relieve. They just have
2 to make their choices and say that its important
3 enough for me to wipe out that grade even if you
4 decide to take that course that I did reasonably
5 well in.

6 MS. MCCORMICK: You have both of those
7 documents in your agenda. What wed like to talk to
8 about now is a small, or a change -- it's a change
9 to the Senate Rule 3.2.3 which is new language from
10 minor program changes.

11 So, I'd like to give you a context around this.
12 So we have begun to meet a group of what were
13 calling curriculum stakeholders so these are the
14 Chairs of our principal committees: Undergraduate
15 Council, Graduate Council, HCCC, members of the
16 Registrar's Office, Sheila and staff who staff those
17 councils to think about how we might move curriculum
18 across committees as well as the college of
19 committees or provo committees so making sure that
20 we think a little bit about just improving
21 efficiencies and one of the things that came from
22 that group, so it's a group from about eight to ten
23 stakeholders, is this idea of a change in minor
24 program.

25 So, currently we don't have a way to move minor

1 programs forward and so these move through the
2 councils as major changes and some of them are not
3 very, they're not -- I won't say trivial but they
4 are not substantive and so what we like to have is
5 the opportunity to move these forward in a more
6 expeditious way. We've outlined this in your
7 handout. Sheila's, showed you the changed to that
8 that Senate Rule, and I think she also made handouts
9 at the back of the room, if you would care to see
10 how it's changed. Davy is looking for them right
11 now. So, the idea is if you'd like to keep that
12 change, Dr. Jones will be happy to share t hat.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you please explain
14 the new language? It's very short.

15 MS. MCCORMICK: Yes.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

17 MS. MCCORMICK: And we'll do that as well so
18 you can have it in hand and then Sheila's prepared
19 to show it to you in the Word document. Thanks.
20 So, this is the program as a whole and here we have
21 the exceptions. So this is actually what would help
22 out the kinds of changes that we would look at this
23 and this action.

24 So if we we're going to update this -- so this
25 happens when units change the prefix that's already

1 been approved and so then that means the people who
2 had that course as part of their work than are
3 required to change that in their program document.
4 Substituting one course for a comparable course;
5 again this happens sometimes, not terribly often but
6 the home educational unit offering the courses, no
7 longer offering the course, or their changing the
8 sequence of courses or the course is replacing a
9 course that the home educational unit intends to
10 drop.

11 So again this is for those programs where this
12 affects their program, not necessarily the program
13 that initiated the change (coughing) electives when
14 the courses -- only when the courses are all offered
15 by the home education unit offering the degree
16 program and there is no net decrease in the number
17 of elected courses available in the list.

18 Questions? Tagavi.

19 MR. TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering. I
20 have to confess I am responsible to either give
21 credit or blame for that word comparing them in b.
22 After I mentioned to Senate colleagues that under
23 provision B Mechanical Engineering could replace
24 thermodynamics with art history and that would be
25 considered a minor change which I think is

1 problematic; so we added the word comparable, I
2 think still is problematic. So in order to
3 highlight my point, can I ask how many program
4 change proposals we had last year and how many of
5 those would be considered minor? To see whether or
6 not we even need this. Should we give up live
7 senate oversight over program changes? Is there cost
8 to benefit analysis or not?

9 MS. MCCORMICK: Margaret, do you have an
10 answer to that?

11 MS. MOHR-SCHROEDER: Margaret
12 Mohr-Shroeder, College of Education. SAPC does not
13 process program changes. I will speak in support of
14 this though and say that the number one thing that
15 comes out of our meetings with the Associate Deans
16 for Academic Affairs in each college and then
17 working with all the individual faculty across
18 campus is that they want more streamlined processes
19 when possible and this is directly in response to
20 that.

21 MS. MCCORMICK: I don't have that data. I
22 understand that the difficulty is that these program
23 changes come through the councils and it does slow
24 them. Yes, Connie?

25 MS. WOOD: Speaking in favor of the motion,

1 the Senate Council Chair does have the option of
2 making the decision that a course substitution is
3 not comparable; therefore, that protects changes
4 from thermodynamics to art history or vice versa. I
5 would like to speak in favor of it. Anything we can
6 do to spare programs from going through whole
7 process of a program change when it's something this
8 minor we should do. I don't care how many, if it's
9 only two a year.

10 MS. MCCORMICK: Most recently I think
11 there were like twelve altogether because one
12 program was using courses from another. So again
13 were not asking you to have carte blanche. I mean,
14 this would still go through process. It would just
15 be an abbreviated process.

16 MS. MOHR-SCHROEDER: I was just going to
17 say that I think Sheila mentioned at one of our last
18 curriculum meetings that there might have been close
19 to fifty program change proposals.

20 SECRETARY BROTHERS: Way more.

21 MS. MOHR-SCHROEDER: It's more than that?

22 SECRETARY BROTHERS: I want to say two to
23 three hundred at least. I don't have the numbers in
24 front of me, but --

25 MS. MCCORMICK: Not inconsequential.

1 MS. VISONA: Monica Blackman-Visona. Our
2 history and visual studies, I'm really thrilled my
3 engineering colleagues are considering substituting
4 art history for thermodynamics. They're really
5 going to get a surprise from me by next -- yeah,
6 but I believe I heartily support this.

7 I would actually support a much broader selection
8 of changes that would qualify for streamlining. I
9 think this a great start. I hope we keep on going.
10 I think lots of small picayune changes that should
11 not be going all the way through the system and I
12 believe that curriculum committees at the
13 departmental level will surely say, Oh Art History
14 instead of thermodynamics, what a cool idea. Yes, I
15 think that these things will actually not be a
16 problem.

17 MS. MCCORMICK: Davy?

18 MR. JONES: Davy Jones, Toxicology. I
19 know that this will increase the workload on the
20 Senate Council Chair and I'm wondering if the
21 provost will agree to increase the DOE.

22 (LAUGHTER)

23 MS. WOOD: Because it does streamline the
24 process.

25 MS. MCCORMICK: All right. Any other

1 comments? So we've had comments for. Are there
2 other comments again?

3 MR. FARRELL: I have a question. So, are
4 there other provisions in Senate Rules where Senate
5 Council Chair is granted this authority to make that
6 kind of change like that?

7 MS. MCCORMICK: I don't know. That's a
8 good question.

9 MS. BROTHERS: It mimics the minor
10 question-age process. So there's a caveat in the
11 Senate Rules and it defines -- minor change is not a
12 small change the department to the college to the
13 Senate Council Chair and those are generally things
14 that are a lower bar; changing prerequisites,
15 changing a course number in the same number series
16 like Art History 100 to Art History 102. So, the
17 minor program change line was mimicked largely off
18 of the minor course change language.

19 MR. FARRELL: So I have a follow-up
20 question if that's okay. I apologize if I'm
21 juggling this too much. I have my lawyer hat on
22 here. I'm just curious to know if there's Governing
23 Regulations that, either from the state or our own
24 GRs that grant to the senate the power to make
25 program changes and is there language that

1 distinguishes what has to be passed by the entire
2 senate versus what has to be passed by, or here now,
3 just the Senate Council Chair.

4 MS. MCCORMICK: Connie or Davy, you both
5 could probably answer this question.

6 MR. JONES: Yes, the Governing Regulations,
7 GR4 of the board delegates to the Senate the
8 authority to make -- jurisdiction over these
9 decisions and then theres a paragraph in there that
10 allows the senate to further delegate, sub delegate
11 down various aspects of its jurisdiction.

12 MR. FARRELL: If I could ask one more,
13 but theres no language with regard to program
14 changes within the GR, right? There's no definition
15 of that? Because we were distinguishing major and
16 minor and I understand that's what we do, but I just
17 wonder how --

18 MR. JONES: No, the GRs do not define what
19 the program change can delegates to the senate to
20 make policy about that.

21 MR. TAGAVI: I -- in all fairness, I don't
22 think this allows minor changes to be approved for
23 the subset of senate. This goes on a ten day
24 transmittal. Am I not correct.

25 MS. BROTHERS: Correct.

1 MR. TAGAVI: Which technically is approved
2 by the entire senate so it really doesn't change
3 that.

4 MS. BROTHERS: I'm sorry, what did you ask?
5 Because I think you might have said something that I
6 don't think is correct.

7 MR. TAGAVI: Me?

8 MS. BROTHERS: Yes.

9 MR. TAGAVI: Are minor changes going to go
10 on a ten day web transmittal?

11 MS. BROTHERS: No, the intent is for the
12 approval to lay with the Senate Council Chair, the
13 same as with minor course changes. So, minor course
14 changes are approved at the department, the college
15 level and then the Senate Council Office and then it
16 would be the same process -- well, Senate Council
17 Chair and then the same process for minor program
18 change; department, college, and Senate Council
19 Chair.

20 MR. TAGAVI: I take it back then.

21 MR. MCCORMICK: All right. Ready to vote.
22 So that the motion is that the Senate approve the
23 proposed changes to Senate Rule 3.2.3. You may vote
24 in favor, opposed or,...

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: While we're voting

1 can I just ask Monica to invite me to the meeting
2 where she explains to her history majors that
3 they're going to now be taking thermodynamics.

4 (LAUGHTER)

5 MS. VISONA: They're looking forward to it.
6 I can assure you.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You're out of order
8 but it's funny.

9 MS. MCCORMICK: And the motion passes. We
10 also have another motion for a view that comes from
11 the Senate Council and our 2017 retreat we discussed
12 that we have a committee called the committee on
13 committees.

14 It's been in place since 2007 and it's never
15 had a charge and the charge actually says something
16 like being developed and we thought maybe ten years
17 was time enough to develop it and so during that
18 retreat we did put together a motion or a
19 description of what we wanted this committee to do
20 and if you will -- I'm sorry that it's so lengthy
21 but the idea is that we want to be able to give new
22 committee chairs an opportunity to hear and
23 understand from previous committee chairs what the
24 work of their committee is and so that will also be
25 the committee will be -- the Vice Chair would be a

1 part of that committee.

2 The Chair would chair the committee. It would
3 meet in the beginning of the year, in the fall so
4 that you kind of get off the work and then again in
5 the spring so that you can have an opportunity to
6 report on those activities.

7 And so we are just giving a charge to a
8 committee that we had on our books since 2007 but in
9 fact a charge that the Senate Council felt was
10 important to support with new Senate Council Chairs
11 or Senate Chairs, excuse me. Any questions? All
12 right. And so we ask that you approve the proposed
13 changes to 1.4.2 which is basically giving the
14 committee that's been on our books since 2007 a
15 charge, and we'll vote. Motion passes. So, items
16 from the floor?

17 Remember this is an opportunity for you to talk
18 or raise questions not on the agenda and you cannot
19 vote on these items but we certainly can have a
20 conversation. Yes, Davy.

21 MR. JONES: Davy Jones, that bullet is not
22 correct.

23 MS. MCCORMICK: All right.

24 MS. BROTHERS: I have a note to ask Al what to
25 put up there for the next meeting. See where it

1 says Ask Al.

2 MR. JONES: In the open meetings,
3 especially called meetings we have to follow the
4 agenda but regularly scheduled meetings are not
5 required to even have an agenda open the Open
6 Meetings Law. Roberts Rules may say something else
7 but the state Opens Meeting Law does not require it.

8 MS. MCCORMICK: Thanks. Any other? All
9 right. It's time to vote for adjournment. (No
10 motion made to adjourn, but people voted to adjourn
11 anyway.)

12 (WHEREUPON, the Senate Hearing concludes at 4:20
13 p.m.)

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

CERTIFICATE

STATE OF KENTUCKY)

COUNTY OF OLDHAM)

**I, BRENDA YANKEY, the undersigned Court Reporter and
Notary Public in and for the State of Kentucky At
Large, certify that the facts stated in the caption
hereto are true, that at the time and place stated
in said caption, that said proceedings were taken
down in stenotype by me and later reduced to type
writing, and the foregoing is a true record of the
proceedings given by said parties hereto and that I
have no interest in the outcome of the captioned
matter.**

My commission expires: January 31, 2020.

**IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I hereunto set my hand and
seal of office on this day November 3, 2017.**

Crestwood, Oldham County, Kentucky.

**BRENDA YANKEY, NOTARY PUBLIC
STATE AT LARGE, KENTUCKY
NOTARY ID #546481**