1	UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
2	SENATE COUNCIL MEETING
3	
4	* * * * * *
5	
6	MARCH 19, 2018
7	
8	* * * * *
9	
10	KATHERINE MCCORMICK, CHAIR
11	SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR
12	AL CROSS, PARLIAMENTARIAN
13	BRENDA YANKEY, COURT REPORTER
14	
15	
16	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
17	
18	
19	
20	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CHAIR MCCORMICK: Good afternoon. Welcome to the March 19, March Senate Meeting and hopefully everyone signed in and picked up their digital voting device. Can you hear me?

GROUP: No.

1.3

2.1

2.2

CHAIR MCCORMICK: We're on a roll. So remember we're going to follow Robert's Rules of Order, and Al has an opportunity to chat with us a little bit more about that later. I want us to be civil as possible and be a good citizen and participate. And make sure you return those devices before we leave. And so here we have an attendance slide. When the slide appears and the question is read, please vote. And so will we ever run out of questions to respond to? Yes, no or you already did? Everyone voted? Hello Dean Brayden.

DEAN BRAYDEN: Thanks for allowing me the subtle entrance.

CHAIR MCCORMICK: Well, otherwise they
wouldn't have known you were here. All right. So
yes most of you are here. For the minutes from
February 12th, we have one editorial change. I
think Erica Whitaker reminded us that the change or
the comment was made from Mark Whitaker and so other
than that, we have no elections or no editorial

changes and so unless other objections are heard now, the minutes from February 12 will stand approved as amended under a unanimous consent. So just a few reminders, and I think I share some of these with you every meeting but I again, just to stay consistent our meeting date for April has changed. Make sure that's on your calendar and that we will have our meeting on April 23rd.

1.3

2.1

2.2

It will still be from 3:00-5:00 but it is going to be in a different place because we were unable to schedule this room. And then the May Senate Meeting is still scheduled for May 7th. Remember that these changes were necessary in order to get your vote on the degree list which again is one of your most important roles and to get that before the Board of Trustees in a timely manner.

One of the things I wanted to share with you was the office of legal counsel is reorganizing a little bit and that affects us a little bit as to ways in which regulation review occurs and so that will be kind of probably ironed out fairly quickly and on that we will continue to move forward. The, we're at the Bloomberg Committee, I'll share just a couple of remarks here and then I'm sure that Provost Blackwell will have more to share with you regarding

that, but our next meeting which is not this week but next week, we'll review the comments from the forums. We'll discuss the action of that report and how we'll move forward.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

The spring semester deadlines to receive curriculum items again, we've already missed one but the April 15th is yours or still available to you for course program changes and -- and all that information is still available. The Chair and Senate Council have the authority to write a side Senate rules as long as those records are reported to you. We have just a few of those. The first is on March the 9th we approved a change to the university calendar proposed by the Graduate School and that really just added some deadlines and then changed -- removed an unnecessary entry that wasn't needed and then added another entry for July or excuse me for June 25th, the deadline to apply for a late August list.

We also changed the university calendar, removed some references to the pharmacy that were in error and changed the pharmacy 2018-19 calendar. We also approved, on behalf of the Senate, a waiver of a rule change for health science student PM01. So an oversight that wasn't reported in February was mine

that after discussions with the RA6.2 the Senate Council deliberated on the ramification of a degrees as function for a non-academic offense. And it was their sentiment with six in favor and four opposed that we endorse a policy change that would prevent U of K from revoking a degree for non-academic reasons. We've never yet revoked a degree but should that occur, this is their —

2.

1.3

2.2

So, the next set is for the Blue Ribbon Committee on Graduate Education. We'll review the comments from those forums. We'll help draft a charge for the Blue Ribbon Implementation Team and again the Provost Blackwell will share a little a bit more about that with you. So, here's your opportunity to interact with our new Provost — Provost Blackwell.

PROVOST BLACKWELL: Thank you Katherine.

Thanks, everyone for giving me the time. I guess
I'm still new. I'm waiting to see when the money
moves over. Hopefully not today. Just to
reemphasize, you know, my stance on working with the
University Senate, I'm going to continue to do my
best to collaborate and work actively with the
Senate Chair, with the Senate Council, and try to be
more proactive in general. And again, I'll just
reiterate my remarks from last time about how much

respect I have for your work and thanks again for all that you're doing. The -- Katherine mentioned a couple of issues about the Graduate, the Blue Ribbon Panel on Graduate Education. We, you know, of course received a report from the panel and went through two open forums. Those were, I think the -- certainly the first one was very well attended. The second one was also well attended. We had some good discussion. We, of course, recorded those.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

We took extensive notes on the comments that were received and as I understand those will be shared with the Senate Council for their reaction and next The other issue is how do we move forward steps. with implementation? So Katherine and I have met to discuss the elements of possible charge to a implementation team. I think our intent is to polish up a draft of a charge and discuss that with the Senate Council next week. We've also been soliciting ideas from Senate Council and others for membership on a Implementation Committee that will not, will not be as expansive as the Blue Ribbon Panel, but a group of maybe six to seven faculty members representing different constituencies around the campus to both go through the report as a detail and develop recommendations and priorities based on

the report for implementation.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

So, we have, hopefully we have the structure of that committee in place so that after the charge is approved we can get that committee and they can begin their work to get that to us with a proposed implementation plan. We have a goal of getting that done before graduation. We'll see how that time table holds up but that is the goal. Next on Dean searches, we have three searches going on right now. Engineering; we've had three of four Dean finalists on campus. The fourth finalist, I believe, comes at the end of this week and then —

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Tomorrow.

PROVOST BLACKWELL: Tomorrow. Tomorrow? I don't have my calendar. Yeah, I think -- so if it's tomorrow then I think later in the week or next week. Again I don't have my calendar in front of me. After I've had an opportunity to read all the online comments, to view each of the forums on my own and adjust all of that information, go back for another meeting with the search committee to get their final input and at that point I will, after that input I will dwindle down to one or perhaps two preferred finalists for that position and then have a discussion with the President about those

finalists and then make a decision on who to bring back to campus for further discussion.

2.

2.1

2.2

So, that search seems to be going along well but the candidates I've seen so far have been very strong. Just today we had the first of the Dean candidates on campus for the University of Kentucky Libraries. Those candidates will be coming in over the next couple of weeks and I will follow a similar process for those, for that search. And then on, I believe, today it's either Friday or today, the applications for the Gatton Dean, Gatton College Dean were released to the search committee for review.

So, I believe the search firm, Search Consultants are coming in to town tomorrow or Wednesday to meet with the Search Committee and get, make a first cut on those applications. So those searches are all progressing well.

A quick review on Enrollment Management. We're all anxious to know how many new freshman were going to have next fall and that process is moving along well. Our applications and our admissions, that includes our completed applications and our admits are running slightly ahead of last year.

Confirmations are slightly behind but the gap is

closing and we continue to see more confirmations around the different deadlines and in particular in the merit weekends have been very -- very well attended and that we've had two of three of the merit weekends. Those have been very well attended and that tends to give us a pretty strong prediction of what the class will look like next fall. should also know that the academic Profile of the admitted students is slightly above, well what it was last year. It's still too early in the process to determine how the profile will look at the end and our out of state versus in state mix is about the same as last year and underrepresented minorities is running about the same as last year. So, this is the yield season so to speak where the team is working very hard and really trying to shape a fine class. Finally, on the University Press of Kentucky,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Finally, on the University Press of Kentucky, that seems to have been an issue about the budget that's been getting a lot of press, shall we say, and, you know, unfortunately because legislature is in session and, you know, we have to be unified in our approach to the legislature about the budget, theres not been much we could say publicly about the press. But I want to say to you and some of it be

in confidence that as Provost, I totally appreciate the mission of the University Press. I support it and I tend to find the solution to continue with it. You should know that its roughly \$670,000.00 of state appropriation that has been cut. The entire budget for the press is roughly \$2.7 million. I mean, they are very close to being, you know, sustainable on their own.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

So the plan right now is that the Interim Dean of Libraries and the Director of the Press charge them to work together to 1: Make sure that the press is operating as efficiently as possible. Are we taking advantage of all, you know, of all available technology and are we running and efficient operation? And 2: Are there some ways to enhance the method? And I gave them until the end of this month to come back to me with some proposals about how to make the press run more efficiently and it can generate more revenue. I'm hopeful that will close a significant part of the \$672,000.00 gap and then when that, when I know what that gap, what gap is left for us to fill my intention is to analyze the data on how the press is being used by the other institutions in Kentucky.

University Press is actually a consortium of all public universities and many of the public -- many of the private universities in Kentucky and I believe a couple of private foundations that utilize the services of the press and so once I know what the number is that we need to come up with, I will devise a plan for approaching Provosts from all of the other entities to fill that gap.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

And I don't think it will be a significant amount of money when it's divided among the fourteen institutions that are involved. I haven't called any of the provosts yet so don't let that leak out because then they'll be holding on to their wallets when they see my phone number coming across the screen of their cell phone, but I think this is a lift if we can — it will be a challenge for us to manage but our intent is to manage it.

And I'd just like to set that to rest with this group. And then at the end I had budget issues there. It turns out that Dr. Monday is not going to be able to be with us today but at the end of the agenda, I will fill in for Dr. Monday and discuss the budget in more detail. Any questions?

Comments? Yes, Bob?

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Board of

How is international enrollment coming? 1 2. International Enroll --3 PROVOST BLACKWELL: Yeah, I heard you. I 4 don't know specifically. 5 We had 152 admits last year and MS. TURNER: 6 we have 130 this year. It's slightly behind this 7 year. PROVOST BLACKWELL: Yeah, I knew we were 9 behind but not a lot. 10 Marilyn Lawson, College of MS. LAWSON: 11 Medicine. Why is there a P in --12 PROVOST BLACKWELL: Let me ask Kirstin. 1.3 am not --It covers a lot of the 14 MS. TURNER: logistics from what I understand of seating and 15 16 mounting it and some of the committee control into 17 the See Blue. It fits into their Sea Blue warning 18 stations they won't come back to do advisement in 19 the summer so they are first on the orientation 20 committee. 2.1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And 50 percent of 2.2 it goes on to, goes toward their fall bill so it's 23 not, it doesn't just go way. It's not just for 24 orientation. 50 percent of it goes toward their

25

fall bill.

PROVOST BLACKWELL: Thank you very much.

Oh, sorry, Davey?

2.1

2.2

MR. JONES: Davey Jones, Toxicology. I've seen it in Enrollment Management there was -- Don Witt asked this question. Don Witt wore several hats. Where have those responsibilities been distributed now? He was the Registrar. He was the Associate Provost to Enrollment Management. There were several hats he wore. And I've kind of lost track of where is that now in the current organization.

PROVOST BLACKWELL: We have a new

Registrar, I know that. Yes, Kim Taylor is now

serving as Registrar. We have a Dean of Admissions,

Scott McDonald and in the interim while we wait to

fill the Associate Provost for Enrollment Management

position, the Enrollment Management function since

Dons departure has been overseen by a team from the

main building; Lisa Wilson, Kirstin Turner, Bill

Swinford and Eric Monday and so that's whose been

doing the work in transition.

MR. JONES: Is that entity as a whole or someone from that entity interacting with the Senate Admissions Advisory Committee? It used to be Don Witt was the person who was Ex Officio on the Senate

and Admissions Advisory Committee but so hows that interim position being handled now?

2.

2.1

2.2

PROVOST BLACKWELL: Kirstin tells me that

Scott McDonald, as the Dean of Admissions is serving that role. And there is a, currently a broad plan to fill the Associate Provost for Enrollment

Management position that will be — theres a few more conversations I need to have, but we'll be implementing that probably within a few weeks.

CHAIR MCCORMICK: Any other questions?

PROVOST BLACKWELL: All right. Thank you.

CHAIR MCCORMICK: And I know I would share with Provost Blackwell our thanks to the Graduate Education Blue Ribbon Panel because the amazing work that they do over a year and so if you hadn't had a chance to read that report please do so and the recommendations and the ways in which they believe that we should think about the Graduate Education experience. So, Jennifer? Jennifer Bird-Pollan is our Vice Presi — Vice Chair.

MS. BIRD-POLLAN: Hi. I am here in my capacity as Vice Chair to solicit your nominations for our Outstanding Senator Award. So, I'll chair a committee of members of the Senate Council to choose the winner of this years award but we need your

nominations in order to do that. So, we have the criteria listed up here. I'm not going to read them out. There's also a handout that reflects this on the back table that you can take home with you to review the important criteria for this award.

Self-nominations are also encouraged. We don't know about everything that you've been doing for the Senate, the university or faculty government so if you could tell us about that or tell us about your colleagues who have been doing important work that would be extremely helpful.

2.

2.1

2.2

So go to the next page. My email address is down there at the bottom, also on the handout. Id love to have your nominations by March 30th so that we can have a robust pool of candidates for the award. Thank you.

CHAIR MCCORMICK: Any questions? I'd like to invite Al Cross to talk with you a little bit about Parliamentary procedure and we appreciate Al's work and his willingness to chair this or fulfill this opportunity to keep us in line in terms of the Senate rules as well as the Robert's Rules of Order. We did receive some comments from some of you following our last Senate meeting and so I asked Al and Jennifer to sit with me and wed talk a little

bit about how we might resolve some of the procedural issues that had been stalling our work on the Senate floor. Again, thank you to those of you who made comments and gentle reminders and please know that Al is here to tell you a strategy that we'd like to employ.

2.

1.3

2.2

PARLIAMENTARIAN CROSS: At least to start with, but thank you Katherine. Before I give my report I want to use the privilege of the microphone and hope you don't think I'm abusing it by thanking the Provost for his statements about the University Press of Kentucky which is an important part of not just of this institution but the Commonwealth as a whole and I speak as someone who has never published with the EPK but hopes to one day. So we really appreciate what you had to say.

In recent weeks some senators have raised issues regarding procedure at our meetings and as

Parliamentarian, I feel a responsibility to address those concerns, which I have discussed with the parties involved. The principle question has been the role of Committee Chairs who present a committee recommendation that will become a motion for the Senate to consider. We have informally allowed Committee Chairs to act as Chair during Senate

presentations since it facilitates answering questions of fact from you all. However, that does not follow the procedure specified by Robert's Rules of Order, and as one senator has pointed out such discussions have at time migrated into debate which is more about opinion than about fact.

2.

2.1

2.2

So in the interest in using our limited meeting time in an efficient and expeditious manner, I suggest that we continue to allow Committee Chairs to allow questions of fact, to answer questions of fact but reserve debate and opinions until after the motion to adopt the recommendation which the Rules say should come at the end of the report. This may be a little hard to enforce but I will accept the responsibility if the Senate agrees to this course of action.

Now Robert's Rules might make this little
procedurally complex but we can keep it simple.
Roberts says that if a Chair needs to vacate the
Chair, the first Vice President, in our case the
Vice Chair, should preside. While we want the
Committee Chair to effectively have the Chair while
giving a report, I believe that appointment of
anyone else as temporary Chair or presiding officer
must be made only with the agreement of the Senate

and in order to do that efficiently I suggest that the Chair say the following at the start of the first committee presentation that will lead to a motion.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

Without objection, presenters will serve as acting Chair for purposes of answering questions of fact only. If there is no objection, the Senate has thus agreed to this arrangement. If there is an objection, someone would need to move to suspend the rules and allow the presenter to act as presiding officer. That requires two thirds vote. Hopefully we wont come to that but I think we are bound to follow Roberts Rules because our own rules are silent on this point. The Senate Rules and Elections Committee may need to consider a proposal of a rule on this point.

So following the presentation and the motion of Chair would resume presiding over the meeting.

Committee Chairs who make a presentation should sit down because they have no special rights in the debate that follows unless the Senate agrees to let them do so for the sake of being expeditious.

One way to do that is to allow the colloquy between the Committee Chair and our member who wants to ask questions and debate the motion OR to allow

that Chair to answer any questions of fact. Again, either can be done with agreement of the Senate, without objection but the Chair must get the 4 agreement of the Senate, at least asking them to give a Committee Chair special privileges in debate. Of course all this presumes that the Senate wishes 7 to adopt it's current practice as policy. 8 That is open to debate here in the Senate Council or in the SREC and we have a special council 10 committee to consider such issues. I also feel 11 obliged to note that if a Chair wishes to express an 12 opinion on a motion, she should appoint an acting 1.3 Chair to preside while she does that. The Vice 14 Chair would be the person according to the rules. 15 My view is that such expressions of opinion by the 16 Chair should not be made from the lectern or the 17 microphone but from the side of the room herein the 18 senators and lesson the appearance of a court. 19 Finally we need to keep in mind that Roberts Rules 20 say the Chair has the duty To assist and expedite 2.1 the business in every way compatible with the rights 2.2 of the members. I consider that to be a primary 23 duty of the Parliamentarian and I hope you consider 24 that to be part of your duties too. Any questions? 25 Thank you very much.

1

2.

3

5

6

9

I had the pleasure of 1 CHAIR MCCORMICK: 2 traveling last week to India to a small community in 3 India with a number of students from the Behavior 4 College in Health Science, Agriculture and Medicine 5 so if I am all right, due to a mechanical failure in 6 Paris on ground, on the ground late last night. 7 so if for some reason I don't get these completely 8 right please give me a little margin of error on 9 that. All right. So what we'll do then is when 10 Margaret and Herman come forward, I'll say to you 11 Without objection, presenters will serve as the 12 acting Chair for purposes of answering questions of 13 fact only. You'll ask questions regarding fact. 14 They'll answer them. I'll stand at the side and 15 when the motion is made, I'll resume the authority 16 of the Chairmanship, person-ship and you'll ask or 17 well debate if there are other debate. 18 We tried this once at Senate Council where we 19 typically have a lot of debate following the 20 questions of fact but again, this is the way we'll 2.1 try to move forward and hopefully it won't be 2.2 cumbersome and if it is please send me your 23 comments. Again, we want to make this an efficient 24 We believe strongly that the work of the

Senate is important and we want to make sure that we

25

spend our time and use these two hours really doing 1 2. the work of the Senate. 3 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Trustee. 4 I'm a little bit confused about the statement that 5 once the motion is put on the floor because 6 traditionally the motion is put up on the screen and 7 then theres discussion on the presentation and discussion on it while it's already on the screen. 8 9 So, will we -- how will the mech -- what will be the 10 mechanism of actually putting it on the floor for 11 debate? 12 PARLIAMENTARIAN CROSS: Once the report is 13 completed, that's the motion. The screen doesn't 14 really matter. It's what's --15 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: So once the -- say I've 16 completed my report then it's automatically on the 17 floor at that time? 18 PARLIAMENTARIAN CROSS: Yeah, and typically we 19 want to say I move to approval. 20 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Who does that? 21 PARLIAMENTARIAN CROSS: The presenter on 2.2 behalf of the committee. 23 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Okay. Thank you. 24 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Margaret? 25 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, I was just going to say

what we had talked about was after I finished the report or whoever was presenting finished their report, at the close of the report the motion is read and then you review.

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: And accept.

1.3

2.1

2.2

MS. SCHROEDER: The motion is from the committee.

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Thank you.

CHAIR MCCORMICK: So, Lee is absent today.

She had a conference. So, we'll have a solo trustee report today.

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: I will try to live up to these high standards. Hello! We had a Board Meeting not too long ago and there wasn't too much in the academic arena that was discussed at that meeting but I did want to alert you to some changes around campus that will affect us or have already affected us.

You might have read in the newspaper about the land swap that is planned between the university and the city in which we give the university land up near the interstate on what is currently a farm, the university farm and the city will use that for economic development to recruit new business, new businesses especially manufacturers. In return for

the city giving us a lot of the roads around campus and most importantly Bruce Street and Woodland Avenue which are currently city roads that go through our campus and we have no control over them.

2.

2.1

2.2

In fact until a few months ago it looked like the city was going to force us to reopen Rose Street even though there's a huge amount of pedestrian across that road, but Rose Street is part of the plan to be given to the university. And so we will be able to keep Rose Street closed permanently. Of course, it is still partly open for handicap parking and certain kinds of parking spaces and so there may be some modifications to exactly how Rose Street is opened but it will be largely closed like it is now.

So that's one big change. And then another -oh, that process by the way, that land exchange, if
I am correct, has not been completed yet. It's been
proposed. It's been agreed to in principle but I
think there's a lot of bureaucratic stuff that needs
to be happened.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think the trustees approved but the City Council hasn't.

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: The City Council needs to approve it. I think the Mayor has negotiated it and is in favor of it but the City Council still has to

approve it. The other thing is the, there's been a series of land acquisitions and swaps on Jersey

Street where there used to be the University Parking

Lot and the corner of Virginia and Limestone, on

the, I guess its the Northwest corner there across

Virginia from BBSRB2 and then the Fazoli's/Kennedys

lot at the corner of Lime and Winslow/Avenue

Champions. So what's happening there is we owned

the Jersey Street parking lot.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

We were originally planning to put up a mixed use development there which would include parking. We would have some — we then had the opportunity to purchase the property at the corner of Limestone and Virginia and we were told it was really, really important that we acquire that because it's a gateway to campus, but then Kennedys announced that it was closing and the Fazolis I think was already closed and so the university wanted to acquire that property because its even closer to the heart of campus but someone else had already negotiated to acquire that property.

So, we arranged for a swap where we gave them the Jersey Street lot and we bought the corner of Limestone and Virginia that we were told is so important to the university's future and then we

acquired the Kennedys and Fazolis lot which we are now told is even more important to the university's future. So, there's been some fencing put up.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

If you ever go by there, there's some fencing put up around the property at the corner of Winslow and Lime and currently there are — no decisions have been made about how to use that property. I mean, a lot of ideas have been bounced around. Additional parking is one, of course, that's always being bounced around. Possibly an academic building could be put up there. If you have any ideas, if you'd like a skate park or an outdoor movie theater or whatever, anything like that, please send your suggestions to Dave. Not to me.

MR. JONES: I would replace the skate park with President Patterson's statue.

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Oh, yeah. So mining and minerals steps there — skate park there. But anyway if you have any ideas or suggestions about what we might do. From what I understand all the decisions about the property would be postponed until after the university's budget is set this year by the legislature because one of the big questions is how much of the authority will the legislature give us and that will determine then what we can do

with that property. Yes?

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

MS. BLACKMUN-VISONA: Monica Blackmun-Visona, College of Fine Arts. My colleagues and the school of art visual studies are concerned about who will buy that lot which is — or that property which is upper which its our understanding that that is currently a state road and not a city road.

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: I've heard it's a state road.

MS. BLACKMUN-VISONA: And it's extremely dangerous for students to cross that at the moment. You may note there was a fatality there last year. Do you -- are there any plans to make that a little bit more, I guess --

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: I do not know that there are such plans. I know if you have specific — what would be great is if you contacted, I guess transportation or — I'll talk to David Blackwell is right here. He'll find out who — I usually call Eric Monday on such issues and then he knows who to give it to, but that's a concern. That's certainly something that should be brought to their attention and then as plans are made for that part of campus that can be — that aspect of it can certainly be considered. Yeah.

MR. JONES: David Jones, Toxicology. At the last Board Meeting, watching in real time when the information was released, it seemed like Bill Thro and some others were talking to the Board about what does academic freedom mean at the university. Was there any policy around that or what was that about?

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: I don't think there was discussion of Academic Freedom. There was discussion of free speech.

2.1

2.2

MR. JONES: Yes, that's what I mean.

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Right. So, a few days before the Board Meeting there was a campus forum on free speech versus hate speech over in the Jacob Science Building and it was very well attended and there was a very, I thought, was a really valuable discussion between some various administrators. It was Bill Thro was there and so was Sonja Feist-Price was there and --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Cathy Kern?

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Cathy Kern and then --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- Dean of Students?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Nick Kehrwald.

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Nick Kehrwald. Thank

you. That's whose name I was trying to come up

with. Nick Kehrwald and then there was also some

students. What I found so interesting about it was there seemed to be a bit of a disconnect. The students were talking about hate speeches directed to them when they're not in class, when they're walking down the street, when they're walking across campus, things like that. Whereas the administrators were mostly wanting to talk about free speech in the classroom.

2.

1.3

2.2

So there's a bit of this going on but the bottom line is the university is a government institution as such it must abide by what the Supreme Court has ruled the government can and cant do and that includes almost any restrictions on free speech. I mean there are, I mean, you've heard you cant yell fire in a crowded movie theater and so there are restrictions on free speech but they are very — very limited and Supreme Court has also decided that hate speech is protected is under the First Amendment.

Other countries have gone different routes with that, but our country, where we live it's, you know, it has to be allowed, but nevertheless there are things that the university has done to, in recent years, help support students who have faced ethnic slurs and other kinds of slurs being directed as

they walk across campus and even though the university cant prohibit someone from yelling the N word at someone, it can bring that person in and give them a good talking to essentially and say do you really want this to be how people perceive you when you go out looking for jobs or making your life. So, that was the discussion and then there was a little bit more of that kind of discussion at the Board Meeting. Thanks for asking that.

2.2

MR. MILLER: Chris Miller, Arts and Sciences.

Going back to the land swap discussion for a second.

In the land swap discussion, did they print out

what the plans are for Avenue --

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Yeah, I don't know. I doubt there are any plans at all honestly. But you are aware of the Scott Street extension that's still being planned, you know, now that the -- I forget the name of the route -- Pine Street has been expanded and now meets up with Broadway and there's further plans to punch through there and make it reach all the way to Limestone and I think with that everything, you know, everything is going to change. I think any plans we may have now are going to have to be made in the context of that Scott Street Extension. Okay. Thank you very much.

Spring meetings are really around academic issues. I know that Margaret and Herman are prob — you know, have their plates full regarding bringing items to you but if you're interested in more information it might be that we could persuade Jennifer as our next Senate Council Chair to put on our agenda for the fall, a discussion about issues around parking and the ways in which the landscape on campus or the campus landscape is changing. Would that be helpful Senator?

MR. MILLER: Yes, thank you.

1.3

2.2

CHAIR MCCORMICK: Because I think that we certainly are interested in that. You know, always when you interview new faculty what's the first question they want to know or the second question after how much you'll pay me is, where do I park? So you know we'll work on that. So I'm going to invite Margaret Schroeder to the podium and I'm going to read this from Al's presentation. Without objection, this presenter will serve as acting Chair for purposes of answering your questions of fact only.

MS. SCHROEDER: So this is a report for the establishment of a new BA in US Culture and Business

Practices. This is an Interdisciplinary Degree

Program between the College of Arts and Sciences and the Gatton College of Business and Economics. The Home Educational Unit would be the College of Arts and Sciences. The degree program will allow students to complete an interdisciplinary program of study that draws together arts training and history, politics, arts and culture of the United States with significant training in business.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

The proposed course work will be split between classes in the College of Arts and Sciences, Humanities and Social Sciences Departments and classes in the Gatton College of Business and Economics. Through the program coursework students will enhance critical thinking and writing skills, develop communication and other soft skills and learn problem solving strategies while integrating key aspects of the Business degree including management, marketing, finance and economics. This is an innovative and collaborative cross-disciplinary program that is not available at U of K benchmark institutions but this type of degree is rising in popularity across the United They expect to start with around thirty majors the first year and over the next four years

rising to an average of ninety majors each year thereafter. Are there any questions about the proposal?

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

The recommendation from the committee is that the university Senate approve for submission to the Board of Trustees the establishment of a new BA degree US Culture and Business Practices an interdisciplinary degree program between the College of Arts and Sciences and Gatton College of Business and Economics. The home educational unit will be the College of Arts and Sciences.

MS. MCCORMICK: Thank you. Any questions?

Issues to debate? This motion comes from our committee. It needs no second. I'll ask you to vote. The motion in abbreviated form is to approve a new BA in US Culture and Business Practices an interdisciplinary degree program between the College of Arts and Sciences and the Gatton College of Business and Economics. The home-educational unit will be the College of Arts and Sciences. Voting? The BA is in favor. Margaret?

MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. This is a longer report. Sorry. Okay. So SAPC, two years ago was asked to do those three things; craft a definition for professional degrees; describe what should be

included in a proposal for professional degrees and then make the appropriate SR, Senate Rules changes towards that. So, after a lot of work and three committee iterations of SAPC and lots and lots of extra meetings with lots of fun people we have a result. So, we decided as a committee to adopt a modified version of the CPE definition of professional degrees and they are found bulleted on the first page there.

2.

2.1

2.2

Please note that CPEs professional Masters

Degree, they call a Professional Science Masters

Degree. The committees and the people we met with

felt like this was limiting to the university of our

scope and size and to our mission so we stripped

Science from the definition and broadened it to make

sure it would capture all possible majors in

colleges within the university if they were

interested in pursuing a Professional Masters

Degree.

For the second portion, we recommend creating some sort of checklist that would highlight some of the key features that are necessary for a professional degree. The idea is that when programs move to curricula, which is hopefully soon, that this would be an addendum paper that you would be

able to answer these questions and upload them into curricula. And then the third and final item was the proposal of the Senate Rules modifications. We worked closely with the Senate Rules and Elections Committee on these changes and it allowed us to also update some language regarding professional colleges because that was outdated as well. So all of those are included - that -- hopefully you've reviewed over them. Are there questions? Okay. So the motion from the committee is that the University Senate approve the SAPCs three proposed recommendations for professional degree programs.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

MS. MCCORMICK: So you see the motion. It requires no second. The University Senate should approve — or the motion is to approve the SAPCs three proposed recommendations for professional degree programs. There's that motion restated in abbreviated fashion. The motion passes.

MS. SCHROEDER: This committee report pertains to the graduate certificate proposed in the Department of Educational Leadership Studies in the College of Education. The graduate certificate is titled Leadership for Deeper Learning. So the graduate certificate and Deeper Learning examines the systematic changes to teaching and learning

within k-12 schools. The demand for the graduate certificate and Leadership for Deeper Learning stems from a variety of factors both local to Kentucky and global in nature. Let's see. There's a lot in this one. The courses within the certificate focus on inquiry learning, project based learning, performance assessments, competency learning models and a variety of other components of systems of teaching and learning that provide deeper more equitable learning opportunities for students in educational organizations.

This program anticipates a beginning population

2.2

This program anticipates a beginning population of 20 new students in the first year and then 10 new students each year thereafter. It is a non-credit hour graduate certificate offered completely online. Are there questions? Yes.

MS. VISONA: This may have been addressed actually in the PDF, but --

MS. BROTHERS: Name please?

MS. VISONA: I'm sorry. Monica Visona,

College of Fine Arts. Does this allow teachers to
receive credit while approval as to say the
additional professional credits they get from a

Masters?

MS. SCHROEDER: Yes, they would be -- this

would be part of the credits that they could put towards a rank change at the state level.

MS. VISONA: Thank you.

2.

2.1

2.2

MS. SCHROEDER: Any other questions? Okay. the recommendation for the committee is that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate Leadership for Deeper Learning in the Department of Educational Leadership Studies within the College of Education.

CHAIR MCCORMICK: You've heard the motion from the committee. It requires a backup. No debate? No discussion? So, you may vote. The motion passes.

MS. SCHROEDER: This committee report pertains to the Graduate Certificate in Instructional

Coaching from the Department of Educational

Leadership Studies within the College of Education.

The Graduate Certificate Instructional Coaching

prepares veteran educators to lead job embedded

professional development efforts in P12 schools.

The demand for the Graduate Certificate in

Instructional Coaching emerges from local and local demands.

The required and elective courses provide leadership development focus on facilitating teacher

teams, coaching novice and veteran teachers, solving problems creatively and supporting its option of innovative and renewal initiatives. The certificate is one of -- oh, I don't need to read that. This program anticipates a beginning population of 20 new students the first year and then 10 new students each year thereafter. I want to clarify that instructional coaching is a common term in K12 education and is distinctly different from sports coaching so there's no overlap with our other colleges. Questions? Okay. The motion from the committee is that this is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the Graduate Certificate in Instructional Coaching in the Department of Educational Leadership Studies within the College of Education.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIR MCCORMICK: You've heard the recommendation from the committee as a motion to you. Is there debate? You are free to vote on this motion. The motion passes.

MS. SCHROEDER: This report from the committee is around the Graduate Certificate of Professional and Technical Writing. In the Department of Writing Rhetoric and Digital Studies within the College of Arts and Sciences. The

Graduate Certificate in Professional and Technical 1 2 Writing proposes a one year, nine credit hour 3 program all online offering advanced study in the 4 core areas of professional and technical writing. 5 The mission of this certificate is to develop 6 professional competency with a professional and technical writing, documentation and report writing, 7 8 visual argument, presentation software, manuals and 9 handbooks, case studies and related genres. 10 Although open to all eligible students this certificate will target active service military 11 12 personnel who are required to engage in writing on a 1.3 daily basis. The program anticipates a beginning 14 enrollment of 20 students and 10 students per year thereafter. 15 16 SAPC recommended not supporting this program 17 based on the academic merit of the proposal; however 18 when it was presented to Senate Council and when 19 Senate Council consulted with the proposers, Senate 20 Council felt that there was merit for academic 2.1 excellence of this certificate. Questions? 2.2 MR. CARLSON: Public Health. Can you explain why this committee would not want to approve 23

It wasn't that we didn't want

24

25

it.

MS. SCHROEDER:

to. When you -- when we review programs we ask for benchmarking as well and in examining the benchmarking of the other universities the committee noticed that the credit hours ranged from 12 on up for comparable programs and so that was one of the bases that the committee felt like we had ask for a rationale on why keeping it at 9 credit hours and that wasn't provided.

2.

2.1

2.2

However, at Senate Council, one member of Senate Council noted that the difference in credit hours for example was in elective courses so some of the benchmark programs had elective courses whereas this program did not. It has nine core elec -- or nine core hours.

MS. VISONA: Monica Visona, College of Fine Arts. Is this particular Graduate Certificate part of a larger package that the College of Arts and Sciences is delivering to specific military personnel? I know that we have had — there has been some discussion of similar kinds of major crises?

MS. SCHROEDER: I cannot answer that but if Jeff is in the room. Oh, Rich is here.

MR. SCHEIN: Yeah, whose idea, writing -- sorry, Rich Schein, Arts and Science of Deans

Office. I'm actually here because I wrote the American -- US Business Proposal. I think the answer is no, not that I'm aware of.

2.

2.1

2.2

MS. VISONA: Because that might make the difference in terms of its total credit hours if it's already embedded in a larger program perhaps that those short credit hour is addressed elsewhere in the curriculum.

MS. SCHROEDER: We asked a similar question in SAPC and did not receive an answer.

MR. CARLSON: Can I challenge that again? In response to that? So I'm not entirely sure what the objection was. I was in the room for the debate and talked to Jeff Rice who was the Chair of WIT, who moved this proposal forward. I think there was some discrepancy on the benchmarks as Monica indicated. It was one benchmark found that had nine credit hours but it was down to the fact that our rules allow nine credits which contributed to the confusion as to why it needs to be objected to on grounds other than rules that we made up ourselves.

MS. SCHROEDER: Carmen, did you have a -UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This point of order
-- what do you mean often closed in debate? This is
not --

PARLIAMENTARIAN CROSS: I'll blow the whistle if I feel it's necessary.

2.

2.2

MS. SCHROEDER: Are there any other questions of fact? All right. The recommendation from Senate Council is that the University Senate approve based on its -- or approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate Professional and Technical Writing in the Department of Writing Rhetoric and Digital Studies within the College of Arts and Sciences.

CHAIR MCCORMICK: You've heard the motion from the Senate Council. Any debate?

MS. WOOD: Connie Wood, College of Arts and Sciences. I would like to see to the question whether or not other content areas need to be addressed within the certificate. Within the discussion, in Senate Council it was made that there was concern by the Committee that had reviewed this that it was only nine hours, however there was no discussion of any content that was relevant but was missing. And therefore just going on a per hour basis, there were nine content hours at the 700 level that will cure writing required directive courses as there was no mention of anything content—wise that was missing from this curriculum.

And the other -- in comparison with the other programs, what was missing were electives in other areas which would make the difference between nine and twelve.

2.

2.1

2.2

CHAIR MCCORMICK: Any other comments for or against the proposal? Hearing none the motion is that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate Professional and Technical Writing in the Department of Writing Rhetoric and Digital Studies within the College of Arts and Sciences. The motion passes. Thank you Margaret.

So I'm going to invite Herman Farrell to the podium and again without objection this presenter will serve as acting Chair for purposes of answering questions of fact only. Our parliamentarian will tell us if we have moved or deviated from that.

Thanks.

MR. FARRELL: I would like to request if we could just skip the order and begin with the second, with mechanical engineering first. There's a reason for it just because it will be simpler to cover that. Is that?

MS. SCHROEDER: Any objections?

MS. BROTHERS: Which one did you want to

AN/DOR REPORTING & VIDEO TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

start with?

2.

2.2

MR. FARRELL: Just mechanical engineering.

The reason why I've made this change is because

we've got a couple of proposals coming to us from

the College of Engineering and they involve civilian

matters and I thought I'd take care of the one that

involves an isolated issue even though mechanical

engineering would be included in the third proposal

that I'm bringing before you that involves eight

total proposals put together plus fashion.

So this proposal, let's just begin simple. This comes to us from the College of Engineering and it involves a change in Mechanical Engineering program and it involves a decrease in the total number of credit hours from 130 to 127 and this is in compliance with the CPE mandate. CPE amended its credit hours to 120 hours but because this is a STEM discipline they allow them to go up to 128.

And so the change here, and you'll see the change in the next proposal as well, involves in eliminating three credit hours which are for supportive electives and those supportive electives were provided initially by a mechanical engineering program as a way of broadening the horizons of the mechanical engineers and so in order to comply with

the CPE mandate that reduces down the curriculum requirements but still encouraging students to take those electives.

MR. JONES: The acronym CPA?

1.3

2.2

MS. BROTHERS: Name please?

MR. JONES: Davey Jones, Toxicology.

MR. FERRELL: CPE, sorry. So this is a motion from the committee that the Senate approve the proposal from the college of Engineering involving a change in the BSMEE Mechanical Engineering Program.

CHAIR MCCORMICK: Thank you. You've heard the motion from the committee. Do you have any questions or debate? Hearing none, you are free to vote. The motion passes.

MR. FERRELL: So can we go back now to the first proposal.

MS. BROTHERS: Yes.

MR. FERRELL: Civil Engineering. So this is a proposed change to the BSCIE Civil Engineering Program and this change involves similarly a decrease in the total number of credit hours from 131 to 128 and also a change in the program specific admissions procedures as well as the adoption of the changes in the Engineering Standard of Admissions

that come in this proposal but also in the eight omni-bust proposals that were filed to review.

2.

1.3

2.2

So, with regard to this, the latter part of it, the changes to the Engineering Standing, let me just go through this a bit. So the Engineering Standards of Admissions is being changed from a pre-major to major and a policy -- there's a policy change from the entire college in order to streamline all the different programs within the college. It involves GPA calculation, the overall GPA requirement for undergraduate engineering programs.

So in this case we are looking at Civil

Engineering and the next proposal we'll be looking

at the eight other programs as well. I just want to

note that the undergraduate council did send to us a

question and a concern about the changes in a two

page memo that they addressed to the SAASC.

Whenever they raised a variety of issues concerning the four and six year graduation percentages for engineering students, communication of a length of study to encumber students and the path forward for those students who were retained in the college for the second fall term. Dr. Anderson, who had put the package together, as well as this part of the civil engineering proposal, basically

provided reasonable responses to these concerns notably, she noted that the graduation rate had actually increased in the second year, in like a 2015 cohort she noted that there was advising that was going all throughout the students experience where they kind of monitor where students were and there was actually also a note that many of these students could retake the engineering courses if they needed to.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

The SAAC took this request coming to us from undergraduate council quite seriously and we wanted to review it. We felt like we vetted it carefully with regard to this proposal but we took note of it and I took note of it as Chair that this may be an issue going forward. Questions about transparency, making it clear to the students what the requirements are going to be, how long their degree program will take, all these things are concerns to us and well be looking at that in the future on sort of a university-wide basis, but we felt that the questions that were raised with regard to this particular program, Civil Engineering, and as well see with the eight other proposals, that those responses were adequately sufficient and we didn't have any concerns.

So the motion from the committee is that the Senate approve the proposal from the College of Engineering involving a change in the BSCIE Civil Engineering Program. Are there any questions of fact?

1.3

2.1

2.2

CHAIR MCCORMICK: You've heard the motion from the committee. Are there any questions?

Here's the abbreviated motion: You're asked to approve the proposal from the College of Engineering for a change in the BSCIE Civil Engineering Program.

The motion passes.

MR. FERRELL: So this is also from the

College of Engineering. You'll see that it involves
the Engineering Standing Admissions Changes. This
also includes the -- in Chemical engineering since
it wasn't included in the last section. In the last
proposal, that was just a change with regard to the
number of courses for the degree but this now is
wrapped into this, what we consider an omnibus
proposal coming to us from College of Engineering
involving Bio-systems Engineering, Chemical
Engineering, Computer Engineering, Computer Science,
Electrical Engineering, Materials Engineering,
Mechanical Engineering, and Mining Engineering.

And basically it's the same thing that you just

voted on with regard to the changes on the Admission Standards for the Engineering Standing. So this is a motion from the committee that the Senate approve the eight proposals from the College of Engineering involving changes to the Engineering Standing Admission from pre-major to major policy for the entire College and specific changes to the course requirements, GPA calculation, and the overall GPA requirements for the eight undergraduate programs. Are there any questions?

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

CHAIR MCCORMICK: You've heard the motion from the committee. Are there any questions for or against? Hearing none, feel free to vote to approve the eight proposals from the College of Engineering involving changes to the Engineering Standing Admission. The motion passes.

MR. FERRELL: So this proposal comes to us from the College of Social Work. It involves changes to the Master of Social Work involving the eliminations of two concentrations; Community and Social Development and Clinical Social Work and the creation of a new concentration Advanced General Social Work. Essentially this is a transformation of the program from two concentrations to one and this will allow students to have more flexibility to

receive training in their chosen areas of specialization and level of practice. Are there any questions about the proposal? Sorry, let's go back. The motion from the committee is that the Senate approve the proposal from the College of Social Work involving changes to the Master of Social Work. Any questions?

1.3

2.1

2.2

CHAIR MCCORMICK: You've heard the motion from the committee. Any questions or debates, issues of debate? Comments for him? Going? Gone. Here's the motion in an abbreviated form: You've heard the proposal from the College of Social Work involving changes to the Master of Social Work. The motion passes.

MR. FERRELL: So this proposal comes to us from the College of Health Sciences, the Department of Rehabilitation involves changes, involving changes to the Master of Science in Athletic Training which includes changes in degree requirements, minor course changes, new courses and changes in admission requirements and prerequisites for the proposed modified degree.

So, this essentially involves a degree modification from a Post-Professional Masters Degree to a Professionals Master Degree that expands

required courses from 42 to 76 credits. The issue of the expansion of those number of credits did come up within the committee. One of our members expressed concern regarding summer courses that are included in the extra package 2 year program. We had some concerns about financial aid.

2.

2.1

2.2

The questions were responded adequately, we felt, by both people who came before us and we voted unanimously in favor of this proposal. So the motion is from the committee that the Senate approve the proposal from the College of Health Sciences, Department of Rehabilitation involving changes to the Master of Science in Athletic Training. Are there any questions?

CHAIR MCCORMICK: You've heard the motion from the committee. Are there any comments? Questions? You're free to vote to approve the proposal from the College of Health Sciences, Department of Rehabilitation involving changes to the Masters of Science in Athletic Training. And that motion passes.

MR. FERRELL: Last but not least, and my favorite. My favorite because I learned a new word. So, this comes to us from the College of Medicine involving a change in the MS, Medical Sciences

Program. The change involves the formal recognition of the Clinical and Translational Science concentration coming from the Art side of the world, translation of Science is new to me. So as noted in the proposal, the CTS concentration seeks to provide rigorous research training to students pursuing research that involves the translation of basic science into clinical applications, testing of clinical interventions in human subjects and efforts to move clinical innovations into routine medical practice.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

Typically the CTS students have already completed a formal and professional degree either an MD, DMD or a PhD, but it was brought before us by Dr. Kellum. He's factored essential elements of a proposal and they involve a waiver of two basic science courses for students who have already completed equivalent coursework in their basic bio-med sciences training.

The required completion of three courses that teach students the core research methodologies of research science, team science and grant writing skills and fundamentals in biostatistics and the required completion of a course that addresses ethical issues in conducting CTS research with human

subjects and it requires completion of a seminar on clinical and translational science. And it came before the committee and it was quickly reviewed and they voted nine in favor, none opposed.

2.

2.1

2.2

So the motion from the committee is that the

Senate approve the proposal from the College of

Medicine involving a change in the MS Medical

Sciences program. Are there any questions? You've

learned about translational science?

CHAIR MCCORMICK: You've heard the motion from the committee. Any other questions or comments? All right. Hearing none, you're free to vote. The committee has asked us to proposal from the College of Medicine involving a change in the MS Medical Sciences program. That passes.

May I have -- Ben Childress is going to come and talk with you about a proposal that was actually discussed on the floor of the Senate, I think at the beginning of the year when we had some time for items from the floor and so Ben has been working on this. It's a little iffy on the overhead but were discussing the an idea for a fall break. This is important enough that were going to do it twice. So, were going to have a first reading today for discussion only. Ben, I know, will appreciate your

feedback and then a second reading for your vote.

So without objection, this presenter will serve as acting Chair for purposes of answering questions of fact.

MR. CHILDRESS: Thank you so much Dr.

McCormick and hello everybody. Like she already
said my name is Ben Childress and I currently serve
I guess now as the outgoing SGA President. I
graduate in May, fortunately, but I --

SENATORS: LAUGHTER.

1.3

2.2

MR. CHILDRESS: I know, let me rephrase that.

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: We can stop that from happening.

MR. CHILDRESS: Fortunately that I'm graduating. Unfortunately because I love this university and it's bittersweet. Yeah, there's always graduate school and there very may well be, but anyway I was talking to you today about a fall break proposal that's coming from Student Government. I hope everyone had a chance to just kind of glance over it and before I kind of open it up for questions I just want to introduce it to you real quickly.

I think the important thing to note here, part of the motivation is this is not just something that we want because we want students to have a day off so they can just kind of like, you know, party and do whatever or they're just trying to be lazy or anything like that. You know, I think there might be some misconceptions when it comes to a fall break proposal and really I think what this comes from and what motivated this was the levels of the mental health and wellness on campus and the levels of anxiety and depression.

2.2

Some of the numbers of Student Government saw when we talked to students and some of the things that came from the counseling center and so we really believe that a mid-October fall break, similar to what we've proposed would go a long way in just helping students just kind of take a step back, get some perspective, visit their family or their home if needed and this is especially important, we think, for first year students.

I'll give a quick tangent. I'm sure many of you can relate to. In school, especially my early years as an undergraduate -- I'm from Lexington so it's very easy for me to visit home or have a home cooked meal or talk to my parents if I just bombed a test and if I just need some perspective on life and school. Many of our students, as you know, do not

have this opportunity and we want to provide that opportunity and provide an opportunity for students midway through October to do any kind of catch up on work things of that nature. So the proposal is essentially would be to start Monday instead of a Wednesday so it would have a Monday and Tuesday of class day and then have a break on a Thursday and Friday eight and a half weeks into the semester so that falls right in the middle of October.

2.1

2.2

We think that the change as far as starting school on Monday is it's perfect timing. I've worked a lot with Dr. Heilman and Nick Kehrwald, the Dean of Students, and we think that this kind of co-arms with their reshaping of first year experience really well.

There's a lot of reasons why when I talked to
Nick and he thinks that starting school on Monday
would do a lot for just kind of setting a tone of
academics at this university and especially for
students as they first get here. So, that's kind of
all the basics. I wrote out a few FAQs on the back
page. And I don't have the quite how the semester
would look in fall 2019, which is when this would
start, not until fall 2019 if the university chooses
to adopt this, but I have the numbers for fall 2018

and how that would change class dates and the big change is you would be adding Monday and Tuesday and removing a Thursday and Friday. I think the largest concern talking to faculty so far is in those faculty that might have a one week, one day course a week on Thursdays, but we had hoped that with a year to prepare to account for that, maybe there could be some work around for those cases. But now I'll open up for questions and try to answer any questions you might have.

2.

2.1

2.2

MR. JONES: Davey Jones, Toxicology. Al, you correct me here if I'm -- I know a number of years ago there was something like this and at the time Don Witt explained to the Senate Council that if we backed up to Monday, there are things that happen prior to that that would have to be backed up and then that has implications to the last summer term and there was congestion there but now we've changed the summer term policy as well -- where does this all shake out. Is there a congestion problem or not?

MR. CHILDRESS: I do not think so. That's why I worked closely with Dr. Heilman who kind of oversees res life and a lot of those areas and although I was not at the university at the time,

what I've heard from talking to Dr. Grossman and other folks who have seen this go through is that there was kind of a lot of pushback from res life understandably in the way that K-week works and things like that because of the way that K-week is being reshaped, Greek life is, were changing the way that greek life happens at the beginning of the semester and so we've worked with those offices, with Dr. Heilman.

2.

2.2

We do not believe there would be any congestion issues now because of kind of the timing, how they're reshaping K-week and reshaping first year experience. I can't speak to that specific instance because I'm not quite sure what that's, what he's referring to there but we have been working with the members of the university administration staff and we don't believe that to be an issue now.

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Board of
Trustees. So, it actually just occurred to me a way
of addressing this Thursday, Friday verses Monday,
Tuesday issue which is if you start on a Monday,
Tuesday, it is possible for the Monday, Tuesday of
Thanksgiving week to be converted to Thursday,
Friday schedule.

PARLIAMENTARIAN CROSS: I think that's a

matter for debate, Bob. That's not a question of fact.

2.

2.1

2.2

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Isn't this discussion?

PARLIAMENTARIAN CROSS: Well, you're not asking him a question of fact.

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: When will I be able to make the suggestion?

PARLIAMENTARIAN CROSS: When we get a -- well,
I'm sorry. This is not a motion. We had the
preparatory admonition so I was on that tract but
your in order.

SENATORS: LAUGHTER.

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Anyway, it's an idea that you might consider to compensate for having an extra Monday and Tuesday and expense of a Thursday, Friday, convert the Monday and Tuesday of Thanksgiving week to a Thursday Friday schedule, to a Thursday, Friday schedule. Monday becomes Thursday, Tuesday -- Thanksgiving week, Tuesday of Thanksgiving week becomes Friday and then there's no change in the total numbers of Mondays, Tuesdays etc.

MR. CHILDRESS: Well, I mean, I think, I'm not sure. I think that is something wed be open to although I would prefer a better judgment about --

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: You're in charge of the proposal so it's your job to take this to your -- to considered these things but its an idea to address that concern and it would solve that problem or prevent any changes from happening.

MR. CHILDRESS: Thank you.

2.1

2.2

MR. FERRELL: Herman Ferrell, College of Fine Arts. So, I have a comment since I'm allowed to make a comment and not a question.

PARLIAMENTARIAN CROSS: I think we're free.

MR. FERRELL: I think it's a good idea as someone who forty years ago, I'm counting in my head, or thirty-nine years ago there was an October break at my school. I went running home because I was homesick and frightened of everything I was doing with going from a public school system to suddenly a private college and it just scared me.

I was home within a day and I went back to college because I thought, What am I doing here? I loved school. So, you need -- I think it's a good idea to have that especially in this -- right after -- I think this is going to fall right after midterms so I think its a good thing. From the College of Fine Arts, we do have a bit of an issue with this and I'll raise this issue and ask you to

consider it as you're going forward with the proposal.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

We, in the College of Fine Arts, specifically in theater and I know in music and maybe other programs have requirements for students that go beyond the classroom like clinics and what have you, but because we have rehearsal schedules and we have students that are required to attend our rehearsals. They're getting curricular credit, they are not extracurricular, as far as grades show.

To take out in the middle of the semester, four days, is problematic for us. It sounds like that it may be suggested that you extend the weekend which makes sense, Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday. I'm just wondering if it would be possible to put some language in there so that from the perspective of some of the faculty, especially in theater, that the weekend is still just like any other weekend, its not included within this break period so that we can feel not like the ogres who are making these students come back for Saturday and Sunday rehearsals, which is what we do all the time. that be something that you would consider? And I don't know if there are other folks who have the same concerns with regard to clinics.

MR. CHILDRESS: Yeah, I would say I think
that's the original intention of it to not change
any weekend, make the weekend any different than
what it would originally be and so for that
subsection of students that might have some things
still tying them to campus, you know, maybe it might
be hard to travel home but they can at least still
have a break and time to decompress and I think that
most students who are engaged in extracurriculars
like theater or band who might have rehearsals would
understand that. So I think that is something that
I need to consider for sure.

2.2

DR. BRADY: Christian Brady, Science College. I also sit in support of your motion. I think it's, frankly, I think it's not just the students who need a break. The semester time is pretty intense for all of us, a lot of classes going on and I've been a part of university's that have taken it away and in fact a member, as a junior faculty member we took away the fall break and just pushed all the way through to Thanksgiving and I've never seen that be positive. I think, you know, hearing from our colleagues, these are not insurmountable things. This calendar that we currently have isn't particularly structured because God said so.

There are things that we eventually work on over time. So I just, in support of it, I think it's important for all the reasons that you've mentioned. I think the reasons shouldn't be diminished for the wellness of our students and frankly our faculty also.

MR. CHILDRESS: Thank you.

1.3

2.1

2.2

MS. DURHAM: Emily Durham, College of Arts and Sciences. When you all had first mentioned doing this as a Thanksgiving extension, I understand the reasons for wanting it earlier. My only concern is as soon as we have a break, the students make it a longer break. And now we have two plats in our classroom; to keep our students there for academic days and they are wanting to say well, what does it hurt to extend this one more day and go home? And so I liked it Thanksgiving.

It was just one break they were going to extend and I'm just putting that out as a point of concern that we need to make sure we continue to let those students know that if its academic days, those are academic days and we are not the ogres who want to test the baby for it.

But that's my -- I love having the idea of the week. I mean, and I love having the idea of having

a break earlier. It's just I wish we could move Thanksgiving up. I'll propose that.

MR. CHILDRESS: And I agree I don't want to see students skipping class and so I think that's part of the reason of wanting to do it on Thursday and Friday. Personally I think, you know, I'm not sure how many students do that and I hope not many, but --

MS. DURHAM: Oh, I teach freshmen --

SENATORS: LAUGHTER

2.

2.1

2.2

MR. CHILDRESS: I just, I think that if the break was on Monday and Tuesday maybe the temptation to skip the Friday would be more than the temptation to skip a Wednesday. That was kind of the part of the flow of class reason why we thought Thursday and Friday.

MS. MARTIN: Gia Mudd-Martin from the College of Nursing and I'd just like to point out because there was earlier discussion about maybe using that Thursday and Friday but there's always been an uneven number of classes. So I teach in a program where the meeting of our classes are all on one day. So we want to keep a three hour or four hour classes on one day so if someone loses a Monday, they lose a significant portion of class lecture time but people

who, in our program, teach on Monday, hate having Monday because there are always fewer Mondays in a semester than any other day. So actually I just wanted to point this out because it will probably come up in the discussion about the Monday, Tuesday differential but in reality your proposal is helping that.

MR. CHILDRESS: Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Jack Carney, College of Medicine. MR. CARNEY: So the time is an artificial -- time is an artificial constraint, but having said that you've gotta pay to play. So as an example the University of Florida will take, it's an SEC school in league The University of Florida gave the students the week off at Thanksqiving. Now that seemed to me to be stupid but that was their decision. What they did then was push back or extend classes so they had a shorter Christmas vacation. That's all they did. So they gave the students the illusion that they were getting a week off at Thanksgiving, but they hung onto them closer to the Christmas vacation and then you've got to listen to your children complain about the fact that they're not getting enough time home for Christmas.

MR. CHILDRESS: Thank you.

MS. KELLUM: Becky Kellum, College of Biology.

Ann, I just wonder if you've taken the perspective of the students who are in the sciences and the courses that have labs and weekly labs and some of the teachers have worked really hard to make sure that all — that meet at different times in the week is the same time. And so by taking away more

Mondays and Tuesdays than Thursdays and Fridays or more Thursdays and Fridays than Mondays and Tuesdays as it is, you're making it where you'll need to add some days on Mondays. It just makes it more problematic than it already is. We already have this kind of a feeling toward more Thursday —

Wednesday through Friday days.

2.1

2.2

MR. CHILDRESS: Yeah, we've worked with many of the students in the sciences clinic and -- and I would say all of them are very much in favor of the proposal.

MS. KELLUM: Organize --

MR. CHILDRESS: Proposal.

MS. KELLUM: -- organize a schedule, I mean?

MR. CHILDRESS: Yes, so I am aware that this will change things up and potentially make things a little more complicated but I stand by that I think that if this is something, which I believe it is,

that will legitimately help the student health and wellness on campus that it is worth us, as a university, to try and work to help to see if there is a way that we can make this happen even if it means trying to rearrange some classes.

2.

2.1

2.2

MS. KELLUM: And I don't disagree with that.

Its just a matter of where you'll add and take away

from to try to equalize.

MS. VISONA: Monica Blacknum-Visona, College of Fine Arts. I commend the fact that you are looking at student wellness. There was an article in the New York Times recently about hunger during spring break. About the number of students who are unable to find a place to eat and who don't have a meal plan and some parents of two students who were not able to go home during most vacations because they were on the other side of the country.

I encourage to think of this as a chance for students to take some time for reflection, but maybe its not good or healthy for many students to be told they can go home because that is an impossibility for international students, for students who have financial needs. Visiting time if you could make sure there is sufficient support for students who stay.

MR. CHILDRESS: Yes, absolutely and I think the intention is not to tell students how to use this time but more to provide an opportunity for them to use it however they best see fit. Dorms will stay open, facilities are staying open but I appreciate your comment and I totally agree that students caring an issue surrounding that is something that we need to keep our eye on 100

2.

2.2

percent.

MR. MOREY: Dan Morey, A&S. So the faculty I spoke with, they wanted to reinforce the idea of the Thanksgiving slot as well that break starts to go — the other thing for programming is any talk of trying to coordinate it with the local school system so that students doing their student teaching break, because they have fall break for the schools that would be during their student teaching and then they, you know, they never get an actual break and then of course were back.

MR. CHILDRESS: Yeah, we tried. We kind of looked at the fall break for Fayette County Public Schools but we didn't think that it, unfortunately, it just didn't fit. Just within what we were trying to accomplish — again something like this I think will be tough for students like I have friends who

are student teaching right now and had to miss all of spring break because they were teaching.

Unfortunately I think there are going to be some situations like that where students might have special programs that prohibit them from participating but we certainly looked into the possibility. Unfortunately we just didn't think we could make it work logistically.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIR MCCORMICK: Jennifer, Joe and this gentleman.

MS. BIRD-POLLAN: Jennifer Bird-Pollan, College of Law. I just wanted to speak in response to Trustee Grossman's comment in the beginning about changing the days schedule. We did that in the college of Law and it only worked when we had our entire building to ourselves and could schedule every classroom. The problem with having a Monday be a Thursday late in the year or anytime really, especially since, you know, as you and I discussed and we talked to the council that this is a proposal for the university calendar but there are schools on campus that don't have the university calendar and therefore wont have a fall break.

It will be pretty complicated I think to have classrooms consistently used by different colleges

but we need to be on the same schedule. So I think that's -- and unfortunately I like it in principle just doing it in the law school - I just don't think it will work unless the fall break is adopted by every college on campus -- by every calendar.

MR. MCGILLIS: Joe McGillis, can I comment?

And I don't know, this may need to be redirected to the Provost. Is that legal?

PARLIAMENTARIAN CROSS: Sure

2.2

MR. MCGILLIS: Okay. My question is especially the 9-month appointments is you would be backing that up two days and basically bringing people back earlier. So I'm wondering if there's a budgetary impact of doing this.

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: August 16th is when we start our normal --

MR. MCGILLIS: But would you need to start earlier than that?

MR. CARPENTER: On the subject of Fayette

County Public Schools. Oh, yeah. Aaron Carpenter,

Engineering. You missed it by a week. One week is

all you missed it by and that creates all sorts of,

not just for faculty, faculty usually have a little

bit of flexibility and can handle the childcare and

difficulties that that causes but staff really can't

-- you see them like trying to hide kids under their desk and that causes significant problems when they have to hire individuals and things like that. I just think that by one week is all that missed this year. Anyway I don't know if that is something that would happen every year but this year it would've been one week.

1.3

2.1

2.2

MR. CHILDRESS: Yeah, and I can go back and look at it. I think that maybe partially the problem was is that it wasn't a consistent time that Fayette County would change their calendars around so trying to match that ultimately we thought just wouldn't work in the long run and so we thought it better to kind of work around our own issue rather than theirs. I do agree it's unfortunate problem and in a perfect world wed be able to address that.

CHAIR MCCORMICK: Staff would be here anyway.

I'm sorry David is next.

MR. HULSE: David Husle, College of

Economics. Many years ago -- I want to speak to the

point about treating a Monday and Tuesday as a

Thursday and Friday.

MR. GROSSMAN: It was just a suggestion.

MR. HULSE: Many years ago I was at a university that tried that, did something like that,

and it just created a lot of confusion. Ideally all faculty would be on the same page. Some faculty did follow that and some did not and students often got caught in the middle of when one faculty member saying You know it really is a Monday when it appeared as a Monday and another faculty member saying No, you'll do what well say and students often got caught in the middle. So, I'd recommend doing some looking at —

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

MS. BOLT: Allison Bolt, Arts and Sciences.

Have you actually reached out to Fayette County

Schools to see if they would be amenable to like

working with UK? If UK says that we're going to do

it this week that they would actually work with the

university to make sure the fall breaks match?

Because there are people that want to do things and

travel and it might be worthwhile just to reach out

to them and discuss the issue with them as well.

MR. CHILDRESS: Yeah, I've not currently reached out to anybody who works for Fayette County Public Schools. We can try to give them a call before the next meeting.

MS. BOLT: And if you contact Superintendent Caulk, he's pretty good about responding to a meeting request.

MR. CHILDRESS: I guess the only concern is I guess, I have to take vacation days maybe it would be a little bit easier but I imagine this fall break is mostly only for students so faculty would technically, would have to be on campus.

2.1

2.2

MS. BOLT: Yeah, but some of our staff might want to take vacation days and then they could correlate, they could take a vacation day and go on a trip with their children and things like that and use that time a little more --

MR. CHILDRESS: Yeah, I'll reach out to somebody and just see, from Fayette County, but again I think our priority is still to work with the University Admissions but again if we can make it work, I'm definitely all for it.

CHAIR MCCORMICK: One final question.

MR. CARSON: Burt Carson, Public Health.

First you're using the start date in the fall the Monday. Have you talked to administrators about being consistent and then starting the spring semester on a Monday also?

MR. CHILDRESS: Not currently no. That's something that we can do. We can just talk to, but I just don't know if we have a plan of what we would do with the other days.

MR. CARSON: I'm just looking at consistencies just speaking of the calendar and school and vacations. There are a lot of calendars, I think.

1.3

2.1

2.2

MR. CHILDRESS: Any more questions?

MS. WHITAKER: Just as small one. Erica
Whitaker, Arts and Sciences, I counted very
carefully when you said the eight weeks because I
teach a course that has common hours and some
Thursday evenings and so I think it's the 9th week.
So I just wanted to point out that if we start
moving stuff around we might come into issues with
common hour exams. I just want to be sure that we
take care of them.

MR. CHILDRESS: Yeah, no, that's a good point and that's part of the reason as why its past us now but not enacting it for about a year to try to give faculty and the university some time to prepare and adjust for a change in the academic calendar. Any questions? Thank you all so much for your time. If you have any other questions or concerns, please just reach out. I'll also -- we'll see it as -- thank you all very much.

CHAIR MCCORMICK: All right. You can change the slide but instead of Eric Monday we have Provost Blackwell and he's going to talk to us a little bit

about the budget process, where we are in terms of the budget. We have about fifteen minutes and so hopefully this will be a rich discussion and you will, I hope have, you've seen some information from the President regarding the idea of how might we meet budget shortfalls and Provost Blackwell will share even more with you. It's called Our Path Forward. If you haven't seen it you can go find that or at least I would suspect it's on our web page somewhere.

1.3

2.1

2.2

PROVOST BLACKWELL: I'm not Eric, but I do have a PhD in Finance. I may be able to handle this. Thank you. I just want to really give a broad picture of the budget first of all and before I get into the actual process, there are different components: \$1.6 billion UK Healthcare Operation, \$466 million, Tuition; \$386 million, Research; \$416 million, I'm not sure what that one is. I don't know his symbols.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is there an extension?

PROVOST BLACKWELL: What's that?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Extension?

PROVOST BLACKWELL: No. But I do know that the exten -- no not extension is much less than that, but these two, this is the state appropriation

and this is tuition and these are the main two elements over which we have any -- well state appropriation we have no control. Tuition we do have some control. We also have auxiliaries in here and I'm not sure which of these symbols represent auxiliaries but you know tuition, state appropriation really cover the bulk of the academic operation. This, we have little flexibility over because of the way healthcare is funded. The total budget is \$3.7 billion.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

So if you add up all the little boxes its \$3.7 billion: \$1.6 billion U of K Healthcare, \$466 million, Tuition; \$267 million, state appropriation, and so what -- at the first stage of the Governors budget what was proposed was a 6.25 percent across the board cut on the state appropriations. that's minus 6.25 percent on a the \$267 million. addition to that, there were statewide for about 70 programs that were eliminated. A number of those programs were mandated at UK. So, for example the Veterinary Diagnostic Lab was one of those things that -- the University Press of Kentucky was one of those things and when you added up all of those mandated programs that we were asked to eliminate that ended up being another 3.55 percent cut. So

were now almost facing a 10 percent cut in the state appropriation. Another piece of the puzzle is, which was unknown, if you think about that 3.5, minus 3.55 percent cut there were other programs that were cut in other agencies of state government so a lot of those affected the College of Education for example. So there would be funds flowing through one of the cabinets that would fund a program in the College of Education or in some cases in the College of Ag and there were other situations like that and those were indirect in facts and it was uncertain what those dollar amounts were.

2.1

2.2

The gold block there represents the House budget proposal that dropped, I think the week before Thanksgiving and that proposal eliminated the cut of 6.25 percent across the board and it restored all of the mandated program cuts. So, for example the Veterinary Diagnostic Lab that I mentioned, I think Center for Applied Energy Research was restored. Everything was restored in the House budget except the University Press of Kentucky. Don't ask me that logic but — and so that's currently where we stand. So what happens next is that the Senate will propose its budget. I am told that the Senate budget bill will drop tomorrow and after that happens they will,

the Senate will, as I understand it, the Senate bill is going to be have a departure from the House bill. For one thing the Senate leadership has been on the record as an opposition to the tax reforms that came out of the House. In particular it has concerns about the tax on cigarettes and the tax on opioid prescriptions. The reason for the opposition in those two tax increases, as I understand it, is that they are based on what are viewed as declining sources of revenue so that the revenue increases from those two sources would not necessarily be sustainable over time.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

In addition there's still been no action on the Governors pension proposals. So, that's still up in the air. After the Senate bill drops, it goes into the Conference Committee. They resolve, you know, the budget between the two chambers and it goes to the Governors desk. So there's still a lot of uncertainty. We were, of course, you know, very happy to see that that was restored when we saw the mandated cuts restored in the House budget, but given the rhetoric there's still a lot of uncertainty about what comes next. Then after the Conference Committee then it goes to the Governors desk and between these last weeks, among these last

weeks steps, its anyones guess where we'll end up.

I'm guessing that across the board we'll end up

somewhere between 0 and 6.25 percent cuts. That may

be safe. So, anyway, that's pretty much the best

available information at the time, at the time that

we have now. I'm sorry I'm losing my voice. I

think the purple martins are here and my allergies

are here, something like that.

2.

2.2

I think I mentioned at the last Senate meeting that we had embarked on this five year financial planning process now referred to as our Path Forward. We engaged first last fall with a group of Deans and higher level administrators to develop a list of — really brainstorm ideas of how we close the gap of \$200 million dollars in the budget and so this model assumes a cut in state appropriations by 6.25 percent. It also assumes a 0 percent tuition increase.

So, bare in mind these are just base level assumptions. They're, you know, it doesn't necessarily mean that we wouldn't increase tuition but were establishing this plan assuming we don't raise tuition. It also assumes that we continue funds for teaching priorities for the university. So, over five years we would, in this plan, increase

faculty and staff salaries by 3 percent. We would allow for additional debt service on bonds that we would issue to continue to modernize campus, a \$10 billion dollar college incentive program to reinvest back in the academic units and then another component that just addresses the inflation area increases associated with merely keeping the lights turned on and fundamental maintenance.

2.

1.3

2.2

If you add up all of these pieces it amounts to a total of about \$200 million dollars over five years. So, if you look at it, you know, we — you know the — this — you know think about the compounding effect with the salary increases for example and adding an additional \$10 million dollars a year each of the next five years for the college incentive fund and the compounding effect of the inflation area increases, it averages about \$40 million dollars per year increment on top of the previous years budget.

So, by the end of the five years we need to have a recurring \$200 million dollars in our budget to cover all of these items. Let me pause there and see if theres questions about that piece. Does it make sense? Okay. So, we, as we mentioned, we had in excess of 30 brainstorm plans with ballpark

figures of savings or new revenues that came out just before the holiday break and then right after the holiday break we triaged those 30 proposals down That seemed to be the most promising in terms of generating immediate or near term revenues or reductions and expenses. These are the 8 programs -- proposals that we worked on. Just before spring break we got business plans, very detailed business plans with realistic assumptions behind them for each of these projects: Project Graduate is to find potential students who have a lot of credits from U of K already and create an opportunity for them to complete their degrees online; Addressing new markets and new programs that would help us increase our first time freshman enrollment programs to improve first and second year retention; considering a number of proposals for Professional Masters Degrees in a particular online Professional Masters Degrees.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Larry Holloway, Interim Dean of Engineering was one of the leaders of the group by the way that focused on this. They sent proposals, or sent out requests for proposals out to the colleges. The colleges responded with I think about seventy-five different ideas for new programs. So there are a

lot of great ideas there. How do we more creatively make use of our summer resources? So this, you know, you've got this huge valuable fixed asset in place that's hardly utilized in the summer. There are certainly some faculty that would welcome an opportunity to teach in the summer and certainly there are some students that would love having the flexibility of taking courses in the summer and coming in to graduate on time. There's this notion of how we could better commercialize our intellectual property.

2.

2.1

2.2

Procure to Pay is an online contracting and purchasing system that would be implemented at the university level that would generate, you know, at least \$6 million dollars in savings on our purchases and our contracts within a few years and then the last is a carbon reduction plan. Basically, the idea is to sell carbon credits that we own because of the Robinson Forest. So we don't intend to cut down the trees in Robinson Forest, nor do we intend to mine the coal that we own underneath the Robinson Forest. So given that, we can sell those credits to airlines who need them, who need carbon and that can be a way for us to generate revenue from that forest.

So where we are today with all of this is that were, and this is part of the process, we are going through a process of vetting these eight ideas and step one was this morning or actually over lunch a meeting with the senior leadership team including the President, Eric Monday, myself, Lisa Cassis and Sonja Feist-Price and we went through the eight projects and we got input from them.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

I think at the end of the week we are meeting with the staff work group that I kind of think of them as sort of the brains and technology behind the project and Eric and I have been going through each of those eight projects. We've got lots of questions about assumptions and how the models work and really dig in to those questions with that group. Then next week we are putting these proposals in front of the Deans and vetting them with the Deans and based on all of that, we will modify the proposals as needed and then start thinking about implementation. will mention that there are some issues that we need to address here that are going to require collaboration with the Senate. You know in particular, I was, you know, I'm still in the learning mode and I was thinking about all these great new programs and new innovations to programs

and I'm wondering with CPE shut down this summer how do we get these things done by next year? And then how we back that up into a schedule in the Senate so we can implement some of these things to generate the resources we need to fill that \$200.00, not \$200.00, \$200 million dollar gap.

2.

2.2

Anyway, there are a lot of logistics behind getting these things implemented. On the Professional Masters and online program side, we, you know, there's still a question of how we execute those. We do have some infrastructure on campus for online delivery but it's not fully built out and do we build that ourselves or do we outsource them? Those are some fundamental questions. We will continue to get input on these ideas. Certainly as we move into implementation. After we've completed this vetting we will determine which of these we move forward with and when and there will be opportunity to weigh in, in the future, of course.

CHAIR MCCORMICK: So, on the 3 percent salary increases, how many years have we received the 3 percent increase?

PROVOST BLACKWELL: I think the average over the last five and six years has been between 2.5 percent and 3 percent. Just a little over 2.5

percent I believe. I think we have one year of 0 percent and that was off since I've been here and it's either been 2 percent or 2.5 percent, maybe a little over 2.5 percent at one point. So this is, again for modeling purposes.

2.2

CHAIR MCCORMICK: And that's 3 percent annually not 3 percent across five years?

PROVOST BLACKWELL: No, that's a 3 percent raise pool every year for faculty and staff. That's how it builds up to \$200 million very quickly.

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Just very quickly something

SECRETARY BROTHERS: Name please?

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Trustee.

The under the improved retention framework, your predecessor started a program called UK Leads and at the Board Meeting we heard reports from the initial year of implementation of that program and the results were amazing. Could you say something about that?

PROVOST BLACKWELL: Yeah, basically the pilot programs were what we were talking about and so UK Leads involves identifying students who are kind of a critical level of unmet financial need and based on the modeling that we did we found a threshold

that if we address it at that threshold, we greatly increase our retention. So, you know, we've done it, we've done a couple of pilots with you know, relatively small amounts of money but the cohorts in which we tested those pilots 1: We say a great increase in our retention numbers but 2: The actual retention numbers turned out to be greater than what was predicted by our model which is maybe our model is wrong but — it's not. So it is very promising and were going to be continuing the program and that's — I don't know if that's involved in that particular business plan but —

2.2

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: It went something like 30 percent retention to 80 percent or 75 percent?

MS. TURNER: It wasn't quite that.

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Wasn't that dramatic?

MS. TURNER: We think when we implement it overall it will be about a 5 to 5.5 percent bump for the entire retention — the cohorts we started with 200, well, actually 177 kids and some of those went from a 47 percent to a 75 percent so it wasn't quite to 80 but and then we expanded it this year to another 200 to 400 total on the pilot project. \$1 million of that came from a private foundation that we wrote a grant for that they funded another

million and then another came from a private donor 1 2. that we had worked with. So we've been able to 3 expand it not with university money but with private 4 donations. 5 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Maybe I can remind myself 6 that maybe we can put this on the Provosts report 7 for the next Senate Session in maybe more details 8 for those results. PROVOST BLACKWELL: Thank you. 10 CHAIR MCCORMICK: And the Provost will be here 11 hopefully in April but it's, I think, the 10th? 12 PROVOST BLACKWELL: Oh, yeah. I'll be here. 13 I don't know where I am. I'm ready for --14 CHAIR MCCORMICK: All right. So I think that might be our last one. And we asked our questions 15 16 and I think we're done. Do I have a motion to 17 adjourn? 18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second. 19 (WHEREUPON, the Senate Council meeting concludes at 20 5:05 p.m.) 2.1 2.2 23 24 25

1	CERTIFICATE
2	STATE OF KENTUCKY)
3	COUNTY OF OLDHAM)
4	
5	I, BRENDA YANKEY, the undersigned Court Reporter and
6	Notary Public in and for the State of Kentucky At
7	Large, certify that the facts stated in the caption
8	hereto are true, that at the time and place stated
9	in said caption, that said proceedings were taken
10	down in stenotype by me and later reduced to type
11	writing, and the foregoing is a true record of the
12	proceedings given by said parties hereto and that I
13	have no interest in the outcome of the captioned
14	matter.
15	My commission expires: January 31, 2020.
16	IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I hereunto set my hand and
17	seal of office on this day April 9, 2018.
18	Crestwood, Oldham County, Kentucky.
19	
20	
21	
22	BRENDA YANKEY, NOTARY PUBLIC STATE AT LARGE, KENTUCKY
23	NOTARY ID #546481
24	
25	