

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
SENATE MEETING

DATE: April 23, 2018

TIME: 3:00 P.M.

♀

MS. MCCORMICK: Welcome and we'll begin with a presentation from our chair of the senate, which is President Eli Capilouto. And then we'll chat President Capilouto and his staff. They have a number of interesting items to share with you. And then we'll move forward beyond that to the senate's academic business.

I would request, if possible, that if we are running close to five, that you hang with us because your colleagues have worked very hard on putting these proposals forward and we don't want to leave anyone without an approval today.

So thanks again, and I think we're ready. Remember these rules as always: Be civil,

04-23-18Uk senate.txt  
participate, return your clickers. And we will do an attendance slide. The slide appears and a question is read, you may vote. So the philosophical question, what is your favorite color.

All right. We are ready, sir.

President CAPILOUTO: Good afternoon and thank you. I know this is a busy time of the year, hearing that you have an agenda that will bring you close to 5:00.

I, along with Vice President Dr. Eric Monday and Provost Dr. David Blackwell will try to

2

♀

be succinct and provide you information on really three items today: The state budget, and the short and long term financial future, which the Provost and Vice President Monday will (inaudible).

Certainly this legislative session addressed tenure and I want to reinforce our belief is this is essential for the University of Kentucky and the responsibilities we hold.

Lastly, Jennifer Bird-Pollan, she graciously chaired a committee that really you appointed, to give advice on the revision on AR 6.2, and I'll talk about that briefly.

But let me say in advance, we will give all of you the entire document and I understand this will be a point of discussion at your next meeting.

So where do I like to start? Let me go back here. I'll start a thank you. My

responsibility is to the represent you to elected officials and other constituents that are appointed to our future.

And I certainly can do so with compelling data about increases, dramatic ones, especially compared to other institutions throughout the state, about the increase in the number of our

3

♀

graduates, the diversity of our graduates, our higher retention and graduation rates, and that is important.

This data matters when we share it. But you also arm me with some very compelling and touching stories that I get to share with these individuals about our work. It's also work I share with students who we're trying to convince to come to the University of Kentucky.

This is the time of year where I'm given a list of students who haven't quite made up their mind about where they want to go to school and these are student who have incredible choices. And depending on what they say to me, I usually have a vignette about a student here that has had a similar experience.

I will say to one of these, I'll say where do you see yourself? I want to be an astrophysicist, but I started a gardening service. I thought, oh, he takes care of gardens. And no, it's urban gardens to help people embrace food security.

04-23-18Uk senate.txt

Now, it's these kind of things that our students want to do, and I usually have a story to tell. So thank you.

I also want to say that these are

4

♀

difficult responsibilities, and I like to say they're partners, the partners we have in the general assembly and executive branch of government. As I tell their stories, I do so with respect and deference for the difficulty of their job.

They have more good ideas and initiatives that are essential to the state than they have money, and I have to think these take these responsibilities seriously.

I speak to them publicly at the beginning of the session, when I'm asked to testify usually at the house and senate. And then I really refrain from public comments after that and reserve my communication to those privately when they grant me the opportunity to meet with them in their offices.

This isn't the first time we visit them. We start way back in the summer to build these relationships. What we hope, and you can anticipate is, at the end of these sessions, usually they go into a conference committee to reconcile our budget produced by the house and the senate.

And you want to be there at that juncture to make any kind of clarifications and to make a pitch for your university. So building trust

♀

all along the way so that at the end when someone turns to you, you can be an honest broker, is important.

So I hope you'll appreciate the communications we've had with the campus and understand that I don't speak publicly a lot during the session because of that trust we're hoping to develop.

So let me give you, in a nutshell, a quick update on what happened to this budget, and I won't go into the house and the senate versions. I'll just start with what the governor proposed and then what was enacted, what really came out of the congressmen.

So the governor in terms of our operating budget, our base budget, there was a 6.25 percent reduction. And this was supposed to be not across our mandated programs. And that amounted to a \$16 million cut for UK. \$54 billion total across all the institutions of higher education.

The governor proposed no performance funding in the first year (inaudible). And then the second year, you're supposed to take one percent of the existing base after you take the mandated programs off and then distribute that through the

♀

04-23-18UK senate.txt  
performance funding formula that we agreed to and was enacted last year.

So what happened? At the end of the day, 31 million of the 54 million on the 6.25 percent was really retrieved and run through the performance funding. And next year that one percent will come out of the entire base and go through that formula again.

I think we did well in that \$31 million; we performed well. The way the model is built the first year or two, though, made equity adjustments.

So I think now that the playing field has been leveled, what will we be competing on? The things that we've been trying to do the last several years: Our graduation rates, more diversity, the higher weights for the STEM fields, higher rates for low income students. All the things we care about. So that leaves me optimistic (inaudible).

So next there were these programs, many of them were referred to in the state as the mandated programs. We have more of these than any other university, I think it totals the sum of about \$80 million. And you can see in the governor's proposal, many of these were to be -- when you say

7

♀

eliminated, it doesn't mean the program, it meant the funding. 1.8 million, for instance, for Agriculture, public service, all the things they do, everything from creamery and milk production to other things

associated with agriculture. Our Center for Applied Energy Research, 2.6 million. You can go on down the list.

And then on the right side you see what was enacted. Most of this was restored at similar amounts. Some slightly more, slightly less.

The one item that was not restored was the University Press. In the original language the way this was written, I don't know if it's necessarily intended, it really said you couldn't use any other general or state funds to fill this gap.

But we worked to get that language removed, and although it wasn't restored here, the provost and I started conversations with our fellow Presidents across the state, the provost has had conversations with other provosts. We certainly have a commitment to sustain on the University Press.

And then there are a whole host of what we call pass through programs. They go to another agency and then that agency may direct them to the University of Kentucky. So what are those?

8

♀

Kentucky Transportation Center, restored, ovarian cancer screening, partially restored.

And many of these go to CPE, the Council on Post-Secondary Education, and they're responsible for the distribution, exactly how many of them work. And then Collaborative Center for Literacy Development, (inaudible) restored.

04-23-18UK senate.txt

And then I'm going to mention this long list (inaudible) cancer and colon screening, increased, and then starting with the Kentucky Teacher internship, scholarships in coal county college completion scholarships. Many of those we're still studying on which ones most impact the University of Kentucky and in what way, do they affect students, do they require support for continuing education programs. Also the provost is going to be working in particular with the College of Education.

There was a new program introduced, Advocates for Pediatric Cancer Research, many outside of our university pushed for this program, and it was included in the final budget, \$2.5 million to be divided between the University of Kentucky and University of Louisville.

So what about the capital

9

♀

authorization; what we use to build our infrastructure at the University of Kentucky. In the governor's original proposal, we have a long list of capital projects we put in every year.

That list is not necessarily something we're going to be able to do within the biennium and I don't know if you (inaudible) for other financing, but in Kentucky you have to have authorization by the state legislature, so you want that list in the legislation. I don't think there's an intentional omission. But anyway, it's been restored. So we



have those lists of programs.

Then I want to drop down to the asset preservation pool. We had great hopes, the governor was deeply committed to this one, it was going to be \$150 million each year that the state would pay the bonds. And it was going to be a matching program. So if the University of Kentucky put up a \$100 million in funds, the state would match it.

And you can see how cuts your costs in half that you have to bear, but it also could give you opportunity for matching funds from donors and so forth. So I'm somewhat disappointed that that wasn't included in the final bill.

But there one's that I'm deeply

10

♀

appreciate this consideration made to the University of Kentucky alone, \$20 million in state bonds. The state will assume the debt for this, to complete more of our research building that's coming up on Virginia Avenue.

And was why is this important? We built this research building with the expectation that one of the things you see in the US congress, despite all their divisiveness, is a continued commitment to research, especially research conducted by NIH.

You want to be able to enter for these funds and this is merit based system of awards, you really need to two things: You need infrastructure,

04-23-18Uk senate.txt  
the facilities in which you conduct the research, and talent. People to be able to compete.

So the legislative budget in a nonbudget year three years ago, paid for \$135 million of this building. We're responsible for the other 135. So this is another \$40 million in the investment. Our vice President Cassis is here. This is the target, as we originally said when we got the funding for that building: Health disparities that plague Kentucky.

And in particular, I have to say I

11

♀

didn't expect this: This last year, congress increased NIH's funding in total by \$3 billion, and in opioid research alone, \$500 million dollar. And I know everybody in front of me knows somebody, somebody's family that is being ravished, especially by opioids.

And the numbers have been unabated. And when we were in Atlanta at a drug summit that Congressman Rogers has held now for seven years, it's an opportunity for our investigators to meet in small groups, or privately, with the leaders of NIH and the leaders of the National Institute on Drug Abuse.

And you can see their expectation is that we have got to fund projects quickly and be able to demonstrate that research and intervention can make a difference. So our legislation has invested in us. They believe in us.

This should better position us to  
Page 10

compete for these funds, and more importantly, hopefully, make a difference in Kentucky against these horrible scourges.

So I want to turn this over now to Vice President Monday and Provost Blackwell. I think you've been briefed before on our five year financial plan. It was important to us to not look so short

12

♀

term, to start looking out into the future to position ourselves for further success. So I applaud them in their efforts, and I'll turn it over whoever wants to go first.

MR. MONDAY: Welcome. So as the President stated and up on the screen in front of you are the details around the five year financial plan or our path forward.

You've seen this document before. It is now been updated to reflect this legislative session and how we ended and where we think we're going to be for fiscal year '19, and then it builds for the next four years after that.

So let me quickly go over this document. The sum of the challenge over the next five years is \$191 million. So this was built based on the collaborative process, with the deans, in various conversations that started back in October and November.

And if you look at those assumptions near the bottom of the page, those are the most

important. So this is built on no tuition and fee increases. This is built on a freshman cohort of 4900 students. The same number that we received as freshman last year.

13

♀

It's built on the 2.9 percent. Effectively, that's what we believe the net reduction will be for fiscal year '19 in the state appropriation. A 3 percent faculty and staff salary merit pool for each year of the next 5 years. \$10 million per year in a college incentive fund.

Those are funds that move to the colleges based on productivity and other metrics as the deans were involved in determining, as well as inflationary increases and as well as continuation of modernization funds, or capital, that would be dollars to support \$30 million of bonds per year for the next five years.

So that was collectively what we heard from the deans that would help us to achieve the strategic plan. And that's important, a five year financial plan. Our path forward is completely focused on how do we best position the university to achieve this strategic plan. It's a means to achieve that.

And then if we look at each year, '20 all the way to '23, you see the increase in incremental expenses based on those assumptions, any net incremental revenue sources. And then you see what the net, and let's move to the right,

♀

\$191 million is what we would need based on these assumptions.

So that's how we started the process. And then we worked with the deans, and this started back when Provost Tim Tracy was here, and has of course continued with Provost Blackwell, to determine five concept teams.

And these concept teams have now expanded to include over 60 different individuals across the campus: Faculty, staff, students, many of you who are in this room have been involved in this process.

These teams were asked to identify various concepts, generated over 30 of them, that would help us to generate 8 to \$10 million in net recurring new university-wide revenues per team per year.

We also had a ten member work group that supported these teams. And that process has been ongoing since November. Dave is now going to walk us through where we are in that process.

MR. BLACKWELL: Thank you, Eric. And before I update on where we are in the process, I just want to thank everyone in the room who has participated in one of the concept teams. There has

♀

been a lot of work there. I won't ask you to raise your hands, but, I don't know, countless hours since last November.

And we really appreciate it and it has really sharpened our focus on how we not just replace the funds that we are losing in state appropriation, but really funding our way towards fulfilling our strategic plan in a very positive frame of mind.

So the concept teams focus on these questions: Enrollment growth and how do we grow our enrollment in a manner consistent with our strategic plan. Are there other ways to improve student success? And by improving student success, we not only make ourselves more efficient, but we also are generating additional revenue.

And then, are there places to save money in how we operate? Can we be more efficient and more effective and at the same time reduce our expenses?

Finally, is there work that takes place across campus, administrative work that can be focused more efficiently, perhaps shared, and generate not only savings, but also effectiveness.

And then making sure that all these efforts align with the strategic plan.

With those things in mind, the five concept teams focused on new revenues, new structures in staffing, other types of revenue, efficiency and effectiveness, and outreach and service.

04-23-18Uk senate.txt

You'll notice that in the first column there, we combined teams one and team five, because many of the initiatives that came out of this process -- there were 33 different ideas for how we either generate new revenue or achieve savings.

And so many of those ideas involve increasing enrollment, creating new academic programs, and so we combined teams to deal with those.

These concept teams, then, came together starting in January, to build detailed business plans around each of these concepts that you see here. And these were the concepts that we determined to be able to have the most impact, the fastest, but that were also most consistent with the strategic plan.

If you think back to the first slide that Eric talked about, we're facing essentially a need of an average of close to \$40 million a year. And since this process is just now starting to be implemented, fiscal year '19 will be a challenge.

17

♀

But know that we'll keep the process going.

So we have detailed business plans now in each of those concepts. We are evaluating the concepts and we will be moving forward with seven of these eight concepts and beginning implementation almost immediately.

And as you can see, a lot of them

involve helping our student success and also growing enrollment. And a lot of that involves in developing new online programs, new professional master's degrees, new opportunities for those in Kentucky who have achieved 100 credit hours or more, to find a way to finish their degree if they left the university and are out of the workforce.

So, very innovative ways for us to grow. And that first column really contains the bulk of the revenue that will drive us forward.

So I emphasize this because we're going to be trying to move very deliberately, but perhaps more aggressively than in the past on creating these new opportunities.

And I've already been to talking with Kathryn about how we can partner with the senate to get these proposals to be in much better shape up front so that we can move them through the process

18

♀

more efficiently. And it's Kathryn, and then I hope Jennifer and I work together, and we'll be talking more about that process as we move forward.

I have already talked about the timeline. We are going to start implementation immediately of seven of the first eight concepts.

And then in the fall, we're going to resume the process of building business plans around the next batch of concepts on that list of 33. So that's where we are today.



04-23-18UK senate.txt

President CAPILOUTO: I want to wrap up on this slide to thank Eric and Dave for their leadership and all of you who have participated.

Some principals that we have followed over the last several years in developing our budget started with a highest priority and that was the success of our students to come first.

We thought it was important to support our faculty and staff. We weren't going to take the easy way, a mindless way of just across the board cut. Through it all, we wanted to maintain our commitment to building a campus of belonging, and we have done that, I believe.

I also want to share with you the

19

♀

process that goes forward now.

This morning I had a conference call with Presidents because the Council on Post-Secondary Education sets parameters for tuition and fee increases or changes. And then our Board of Trustees will come back in, and we'll do this in June, to make final determinations on this. We have educational sessions and I'll give our board a lot of information.

I want to say that from these numbers you can see that next year is a challenging year. And to put some things in greater context, when I was on that conference call this morning, one university President said in ten years, we've have one salary

04-23-18Uk senate.txt  
plan. Ten years.

And I'm proud to say because of your hard work in growing enrollment and retaining more students and the many other things we've done, I'm proud to say I've been here seven years and we've had a salary plan every year I've been here.

But I want to be cautious. We don't want to make commitments we can't keep for the long term. So I'm cautious about salary increases that are recurring. But there are all kinds of ways we're looking for to recognize your great work.

20

♀

Now, before I get into something else that appeared in the legislation on dealing with tenure, I want to open up the floor for any questions about the budget to all three of us. Yes, sir?

MR. FARRELL: Herman Farrell, College of Fine Arts.

I'm just curious to know if there was a stated rationale, and I apologize if this has been in the papers, but was there a stated rationale from legislature from the governor's office with regard to the elimination of the funding for the University Press?

President CAPILOUTO: You know, I never heard sort of a fiscal announcement about that. I think when they started, in trying to develop a balanced budget, and remember, this is pretty courageous for people who come back and have to (inaudible) who disagree with the way they did it.

But they started with a balanced budget. So they listed all those programs, and these are just the ones that affected us, that they eliminated or reduced considerably.

And I don't know how that list was developed. I think that when you saw how they restored funding -- you saw in our priority given the

21

♀

things that people linked to students. So certainly we made a case.

And I believe people in the legislature heard from constituents about how important that is to the soul and vitality of Kentucky. And I feel confident we'll find a way forward.

Okay. I want to talk to you about the part of the legislation that addressed tenure. I realized when I sat down in the audience, these video screens remind me of when I had my recent vision exam. I don't know if it's better or it's worse, but it's hard to read these. I'm not going to read this entire thing; I think you've probably read about it.

But it certainly empowered the Board of Trustees in looking at employment regarding tenured positions associated with financial exigency in closing programs. And you certainly read about that across the state in universities having to take those measures.

That is not the conversation we are

having. But to give you context for what these other universities are facing -- let me step back.

The University of Kentucky and the University of Louisville have a defined contribution

22

♀

plan, (inaudible) benefit or pension plan. So what we face is entirely different.

You also know that we have underfunded pensions in Kentucky. And that's real. What you may not realize is the comprehensive universities, Northern, Eastern, Western, Murray, and so forth, they're required to pay, as employers, the actuarial legally determined amount for fully funded pensions.

So in some estimates made to them for some of those universities, to meet that commitment, their benefit cost on top of wages could go up as high as 50 cents on the dollar of wage.

Now, you want to know what that would mean to the University of Kentucky? We're talking about trying to overcome some \$200 million over five years.

We have roughly a billion dollar budget at the University of Kentucky, if we had a 50 cent increase on every wage, we would be talking about a \$500 million recurring bill for benefits.

So you can understand what some of these sister institutions face. And it's no secret that many of those institutions, recognizing they were going to face these hard decisions, wanted clarification on tenure. And we were not one of

♀

those.

And when I testified and Dr. Postal from the University of Louisville testified in front of the -- I think it was the house committee first, one of the Presidents from the comprehensive universities certainly made a case for what he called regulatory relief. And this is why I think this ended up in this legislation.

So we have a deep commitment to tenure at this university. Tenure, to me, has always come with some commitment of economic security. And you best make those commitments by sound planning of people who came before me. You take the benefit plan we have and have kept reasonable, other benefit costs and all, and I applaud them. We're just not in the same place as other universities throughout the state.

We returned back to the AUP declaration of principals on academic freedom and tenure. And it's a hallmark. It's an essential ingredient for being a faculty member at the University of Kentucky, that one has the freedom to pick anything that you would like to say, any research question you have, to answer that question, undeterred by any kind of outside influences.

♀

So we're deeply committed to that and you've been committed to that. And all the people who have come before me have been committed to that because it is manifest in all our ARs and GRs.

I don't want anybody to think that those (inaudible), and I hope that some of the assurances we gave you through our communications to the campus, I appreciate an opportunity to work with the Provost and Dr. McCormick here, in putting together those messages to restate our deep commitment.

Certain responsibilities that come with tenure, in the quality of the work we do, questions we certainly choose to answer, and the impact it makes on Kentucky. But those are good starts and we want to continue to tell our stories and remind ourselves that with tenure comes an individual responsibility, but it's also our responsibility to one another. And I feel very good about where we are.

I wanted to tell people, if you still had any lingering concerns about this, I hope that what I've had to say and communicated to the campus would assuage any concerns you have. Any questions? Yes?

1 Mr. ZOOK: My name is Matthew Zook,  
2 College of Arts & Sciences.

3 I appreciate what you've just said,  
4 but I was wondering if you could just, for me, kind

5 of (inaudible) are you committing to no changes to  
6 tenure going forward? Is that how we can interpret  
7 that?

8 President CAPILOUTO: I don't have any  
9 changes in mind. I don't even have one on my list.  
10 I'm not considering a change to tenure. I hadn't  
11 even thought about it, to be honest, until this  
12 legislation appeared. Yes?

13 MR. JONES: Davy Jones, Toxicology.

14 Dr. Capiouto, if you could just  
15 articulate right now what resonates with us as  
16 scholars, if you're talking to the lay public, how do  
17 you make a compelling case to them why it's to the  
18 Kentucky citizens' advantage that we have tenure?

19 President CAPILOUTO: Yeah, that's an  
20 excellent question. So the best and -- you know, one  
21 of the things I try to do is follow public opinion  
22 because I'm looking for a deeper understanding of  
23 those people who decide to support us with their tax  
24 dollars and what is resonating with them.

25 And I think you can select words that

26

♀

1 better resonate with the public (inaudible).

2 And I certainly follow Gallup surveys.  
3 And I'll have to be honest with you, the support we  
4 have amongst the public, which used to be the  
5 majority of the public supporting higher education,  
6 has dropped considerably since 2014.

7 People have -- people have some doubts about

8 our value. What are their concerns: The ones that  
9 are uncovered in these surveys and other surveys, and  
10 you can look these up, or I can provide them to you,  
11 is too liberal, don't give students the opportunity  
12 to think for themselves, curriculum a little out of  
13 date, costs too much, poor leadership. Those are the  
14 things you see.

15 So I try to talk to them about our  
16 curriculum, what people are prepared to do, and that  
17 a well-rounded education, you know, not just in the  
18 STEM fields, but combined with the arts, prepares our  
19 students to be the best servants for Kentucky, to  
20 attract the businesses that are going to come here,  
21 to make the biggest differences in their community.

22 And I'll say that, you know, to have a  
23 stable faculty, you got to look at what the  
24 competition has. The competition provides tenure.  
25 You don't want to raise doubts amongst our faculty

27

♀

1 because people have choices.

2 So those are the practical things I  
3 try to say, and I think it's working. Keep up your  
4 great work. That helps. Yes.

5 MR. TAGAVI: Mr. President, Kavi  
6 Tagavi, Engineering.

7 Based on my reading of the  
8 budget bill, it looks like we are not compelled to  
9 make any changes to our ARs and GRs. Do you share  
10 that view?

11 President CAPILOUTO: I think I said  
Page 24



12 in my communication, I'm open to working with the  
13 senate, anybody, if you want to revise, strengthen,  
14 I'll take a look, I'll be happy to. I do not have  
15 any draft documents ready to share with anybody.  
16 Yes.

17 MS. BRION: Gail BRION, College of  
18 Engineering.

19 As you're seeking for words to talk to  
20 our constituents, we had a discussion within our  
21 class about this.

22 The students were questioning what  
23 tenure was, and one of the things that resonated with  
24 the students is that they want to be taught by the  
25 best. And if not having tenure means the best won't

28

♀

1 be here, they don't want to pay the tuition. So I  
2 thought that from a student was one of the clearest  
3 arguments that they could bring home and he said he  
4 would go home and talk to his parents about it.

5 President CAPILOUTO: So I'll share  
6 another finding per the survey that's interesting.  
7 So Gallup surveys 40 to 50,000 college graduates a  
8 year. And they ask them about the value of their  
9 education. And so I'm making it simple, but the  
10 value you see in your education tends to decrease as  
11 your debt increases. I understand that. Fair  
12 enough. Except for those individuals who have a  
13 meaningful relationship with a faculty member, that  
14 somebody cared about them, cared about what they were

15 going to do in life, showed concern for them. That  
16 relationship is so important.

17 Okay. I'm going to move onto  
18 something else. So I'm going to call Jennifer  
19 Bird-Pollan to come up. Jennifer, you can explain  
20 the process that you went through and what your group  
21 considered and all. You can have the mike.

22 MS. BIRD-POLLAN: Hi, everyone. I'm  
23 Jennifer Bird-Pollan from the College of Law. I'm  
24 here because about a year and a half ago Kathryn  
25 asked me to chair a commitment considering the

29

♀

1 proposal of a new Administrative Regulation 6.2,  
2 which was sexual assault and sexual harassment and  
3 discrimination.

4 So our commitment was formed in about  
5 October of 2016. Actually, I've to ask some of my  
6 committee members, some of them are able to be here  
7 today, so could you, those of you who are here, would  
8 you just stand up and sort of wave your hands. So if  
9 you would just indulge me, would you just give these  
10 people a round of applause? (APPLAUSE).

11 So our committee, we have ten members  
12 on the committee, and it was a committee that met  
13 every week for nine months. We met every Tuesday  
14 morning. And we had representatives from the  
15 faculty, representatives from the staff senate,  
16 representatives from the student government  
17 association, Marcy from Legal Counsel's office joined  
18 us every week, and Martha Alexander from the Title 9

19 Office came every week as well.

20 So we had some experts around campus  
21 who could talk about the current process and the  
22 rules. And we had input from all these different  
23 constituencies. So people really from across  
24 campus telling us about their experiences and their  
25 views.

30

♀

1 And so that was nine months worth of  
2 weekly meetings, including two full day meetings in  
3 May of 2017, where we pounded out a report. And over  
4 the course of that nine month period, we had  
5 presentations from representatives of the VIP Center  
6 here on campus, representatives from student  
7 government, people who had served as hearing officers  
8 for sexual assault hearings under the old set of  
9 rules, for the current rules for AR 6.2.

10 We did research. We divided into some  
11 subcommittees and did research on different parts of  
12 these procedures worked at different schools. How  
13 different schools have handled it, how our school  
14 handles it.

15 As you might have noticed over the  
16 past several years this is big news in a lot of  
17 different places so there are lots of available news  
18 reports and publications by different campuses across  
19 the country about how they're handling sexual  
20 assaults, sexual harassment on their campuses.

21 We researched the federal rules, what

22 the Department of Education requires of universities.  
23 We spent a lot of time thinking about our existing  
24 set of rules and how procedure had gone -- how  
25 hearings have gone through those rules and what the

31

♀

1 procedures look like.

2 And like I said, we had input on all  
3 that stuff from people who have been deeply involved  
4 in the process here at UK over the past several  
5 years.

6 At the end of the last school year,  
7 last summer really, we produced a report. We have  
8 got a 20 page report detailing our recommendations,  
9 what our committee viewed as the most important  
10 elements of changes to this administrative  
11 regulation.

12 We also drafted a new AR, a  
13 recommended AR. That report is on the Senate Council  
14 website. And I think it might be produced for senate  
15 next week. But we can direct you to that if you're  
16 interested.

17 We presented that report to the Senate  
18 Council in the fall. We came twice to the Senate  
19 Council with that report, took comments from Senate  
20 Council members and edited and updated our report,  
21 submitted a new final draft to the Senate Council and  
22 it was endorsed by the Senate Council in the fall.

23 At that point, Kathryn sent our report  
24 on to President Capilouto. And in late, I think it  
25 was in November, 2017, Kathryn and I had a meeting

♀

1 with President Capilouto and Bill Thro, the general  
2 counsel, a long meeting, several hour meeting, where  
3 we really talked through all 20 pages of our report  
4 and all elements of that recommended AR.

5 And I just want to very publicly thank  
6 President Capilouto for taking our recommendation  
7 seriously. These are really complicated issues. Our  
8 committee, part of why I wanted you to thank this  
9 committee publicly is because not only did they meet  
10 every week for an hour, they were willing to really  
11 dig deep on things that are really difficult.

12 Sexual assault is a complicated topic  
13 and protecting the rights of people accused of sexual  
14 assault is a really complicated and important topic,  
15 and protecting the rights of those who have been  
16 sexually assaulted, really complicated and important.  
17 And balancing all of those complicated things is  
18 difficult.

19 So our committee wrestled with things  
20 that are really controversial and we did it in a way  
21 that I think is respectful. And I appreciate the  
22 administration listening to what we had to say and  
23 taking our recommendations to heart in the  
24 promulgation of a new rule.

25 We met again with President Capilouto

♀

1 and Provost Blackwell, Bill Thro, and Bill Swinford  
2 in about February of this year, and again, had a  
3 really, I think, helpful and deep conversation about  
4 a lot of these topics. And that's where we are.

5 President CAPILOUTO: Why don't you  
6 mention, too, we had Martha Alexander in those  
7 meetings.

8 MS. BIRD-POLLAN: Yes.

9 President CAPILOUTO: Kathryn was in  
10 those meetings.

11 MS. BIRD-POLLAN: Yes, right. Exactly  
12 right. So Martha Alexander was there as well, sort  
13 of talking about her experiences. And Kathryn has  
14 been involved at all levels of those conversations as  
15 well. So thanks.

16 President CAPILOUTO: Thank you,  
17 Jennifer. I cannot thank you and the committee  
18 adequately for all the work and thought that went  
19 into something that is difficult and complicated.

20 You're going to get the entire  
21 document and you're going to have an opportunity to  
22 discuss it. I just, at this meeting, wanted to take  
23 a moment -- these aren't the only changes. I think  
24 you'll see in there, there's more: Faculty  
25 participation on hearing boards and appeal panels and

34

♀

1 so forth.

2 But there are ones that we spent a lot  
3 of time on debate and I want to share with you where  
4 I've come to.

5           The first is this determination of  
6     responsibility, your guilt and innocence and the  
7     level of evidence. Certainly a debate, clear and  
8     convincing, and a preponderance of evidence.

9           I chose preponderance of evidence.  
10    That really says it's more likely than not that  
11    somebody is responsible.

12           Now, a companion piece to that, that  
13    was part of the factoring in my decision on this, is  
14    whether the panel members had to be unanimous in  
15    their agreement. And I determined that unanimity is  
16    required. The preponderance of evidence and  
17    unanimity.

18           If one person is not convinced that  
19    somebody is responsible, then they're not found  
20    responsible. So I have done a lot of soul searching  
21    on this level of evidence. And you're trying to  
22    balance the accused and the person who may have been  
23    violated.

24           There is something I kept in all my  
25    readings, it says: In choosing clear and convincing

35

♀

1     evidence, you have to decide if protecting innocent  
2     students from enduring punishment is more important  
3     than protecting sexual assault victims from enduring  
4     an impact of inaccurate exoneration.

5           And that really is the trade off. In  
6     an argument for preponderance of evidence, I thought  
7     it was well-stated: That the shared interest of

8 protecting all students from sexual assault and  
9 sexual misconduct balance the interests of the  
10 accused and avoid an erroneous finding.

11 So this is some (inaudible) much more  
12 I've read about. This is, in assessing the  
13 environment we live in today, what would be the best  
14 step.

15 And third, the opportunity to appeal.  
16 Here it is says: The respondent, the person that's  
17 accused, can appeal. The person who accuses cannot  
18 appeal once found not responsible. That's different  
19 than what we had before.

20 And finally, something that we really  
21 put into place to introduce as much fairness and  
22 representation as possible at these hearings, that  
23 lawyers can actively participate, working with the  
24 hearing office.

25 And I'd like to say this: If you go

36

♀

1 back, we got a dear colleague letter from the federal  
2 government. We had to put all of this in place in  
3 60 days. And we've learned a lot from our  
4 experiences here.

5 And I think from those experiences,  
6 the many improvements being made and professionalism  
7 we now have in all these positions, from the hearing  
8 officers, to the panel members, the training in  
9 advance, Martha and Terry Allen do a superb job on  
10 this now.

11 I'm much more confident that we're  
Page 32



12 doing an even better job of having fair hearings.  
13 Let us not forget, though, that the way we really  
14 change all this is about a change in culture at our  
15 university. And I like to think what we're doing in  
16 that regard affects all of us as well.

17 That is all I have to say, Dr.  
18 McCormick. I think you can answer any questions  
19 about that or anything else. Yes.

20 MS. WOOD: Connie Wood, Arts &  
21 Sciences.

22 I believe the dear colleague letter  
23 that you're referring to that came from the federal  
24 government required that the standard of evidence  
25 just be the 51 percent, not the preponderance of the

37

♀

1 evidence.

2 If the standard of evidence actually  
3 -- or weight of evidence from the federal government  
4 is changed, do you have intentions of changing our  
5 standards?

6 President CAPILOUTO: Right. So right  
7 now Secretary Voss issued further guidance, some of  
8 it good. Some of it has been incorporated and  
9 adopted in this draft proposal.

10 I think the decision on the level of  
11 evidence is still left to the university  
12 responsibility. Just as we did in the previous dear  
13 colleague letter, if the federal government issues  
14 guidelines on how one follows title 9, we would

15 follow it.

16 Any other questions? All right.

17 Thank you and I'll see all of you at graduation.

18 Thank you very much.

19 MS. MCCORMICK: So actually we  
20 prepared some slides that shared the time line, just  
21 to give you some context of this work. And again, I  
22 appreciate, or we all appreciate the work Jennifer  
23 Bird-Pollan, who will follow me as your Senate  
24 Council chair.

25 And so you will have a chance to

38

♀

1 determine, to endorse the changes that the President  
2 had made to this revision. But we did want to give  
3 you a time line.

4 So that commitment was charged by the  
5 Senate Council on June the 17th. She had the first  
6 meeting in October 28, and truly, it was an amazing  
7 group of people who participated in that work across  
8 a number of months.

9 And I'm assured that those were not  
10 easy conversations and that they didn't always have  
11 unanimous consent in our decisions related to some of  
12 the recommendations.

13 But the group made recommendations  
14 that, again, were forwarded. And then I don't know  
15 if you remember, but there was this questionnaire  
16 that was going to require -- would be required in  
17 people who were seeking employment here. And I don't  
18 know what the resolution is on that, but we'll find

19 that out soon.

20 But that was also shared, our chair is  
21 part of the charge. If you get on the senate  
22 website, you'll see their work on that employment  
23 questionnaire as well.

24 And so they came back to the Senate  
25 Council, we discussed, shared input, Jennifer has

39

♀

1 already has shared this, and then came back on the  
2 25th of September and then finally they -- we shared  
3 that information with the President.

4 So it's a progress, I'm going to say  
5 action in progress, and you'll be the -- you'll have  
6 a chance to look at that report as well as the  
7 President's revision.

8 So we anticipate, based on his  
9 comments to some of our conversations with him, that  
10 some of the recommendations that the committee made  
11 will be included in that revision. However, we don't  
12 as yet know what the reconciliation of the senate's  
13 committee or the the senate's perspective in what  
14 actually is in the new AR.

15 So here are the directions from  
16 Sheila, just go on the website and you'll find where  
17 you can find that report. The President and his  
18 staff have shared they'll have their revised AR to us  
19 soon, so that you'll have a chance to review that,  
20 and then we'll be ready to discuss it on May 7th,  
21 which is our next meeting.

22                   So we did receive some editorial  
23 changes in the minutes we e-mailed earlier today, and  
24 unless I hear any objections, the minutes from March  
25 19 will stand approved as amended by unanimous

40

♀

1 consent.

2                   So I'm going to try to move through  
3 this quickly. We have lots of curriculum, other  
4 business ahead of us. Remember that meeting on the  
5 7th, we'll be back, and see you there.

6                   We did not -- were not able to  
7 schedule the University Appeals Board recommendation  
8 and report and we'll try to get that as early as we  
9 can in the fall.

10                  There is a possibility, depending on  
11 how much work we get done today, that we may need to  
12 start at 2 on the 7th, and so just stay tuned for  
13 that information.

14                  We have put together, council as well  
15 as Davy Jones, I know was here earlier, just so that  
16 you have it in hand, the rules -- the governing rule  
17 regulations regarding tenure and how programs are  
18 reviewed. And so Amy Webber is here and she can also  
19 answer any questions that you might have about that.  
20 But remember, it kind of has to happen that way.

21                  Faculty can't be released unless there  
22 is a reason to do that, and that would be the loss of  
23 a program or a unit.

24                  And so this is a little cheat sheet  
25 for you but it gives all of the GRs together so that

♀

1 you can see what really would have to happen by you  
2 and your faculty colleagues in order for us to be in  
3 place where tenure was lost.

4 The biennial budget language that  
5 terminates tuition agreements, I did have a moment to  
6 talk with Eric Monday about that, and the provost was  
7 here and he can give us any updates on that. But  
8 it's my understanding that they continue to work on  
9 that dilemma.

10 As you know, I hope that you saw that  
11 communication on Friday, if your staff, people that  
12 you work with, your students, our employees here,  
13 they can continue to receive the benefits in  
14 continuing class here on campus. It's those who were  
15 taking classes online or other institutions that the  
16 question (inaudible).

17 Do you have any more updates on that?

18 PROVOST BLACKWELL: Just briefly, that  
19 there are about 1800 people potentially impacted. I  
20 think we determined about 1100 are taking programs on  
21 our campus. So there is still a significant number  
22 taking courses and programs on other campuses.

23 There has been some outreach about  
24 collaboration among the campuses that teach these  
25 people out. And we have not had a positive response

♀

1 from that.

2 So there is a still a lot of work  
3 going on behind the scenes to figure out the impact,  
4 and we'll be considering how we can best address  
5 that.

6 But one reason that so many on our  
7 campus take programs at other campuses is because we  
8 don't have either the programs or the programs in the  
9 format that is needed to serve the needs of our  
10 employees.

11 So you know, more evening programs,  
12 more online programs in areas specific to our campus  
13 needs would be a big help. And given the relatively  
14 large numbers, it would be a great opportunity for us  
15 to fill that gap.

16 MS. MCCORMICK: I don't know if you  
17 hear this language as well, but many of the staff  
18 that I work with said that they came to UK, they  
19 talked to the program faculty and they said unless  
20 you're full-time, we really are not terribly  
21 interested in your joining our faculty.

22 And so it may be the case to think  
23 about ways in which to be responsive to those  
24 students that we might consider other options, as  
25 well as online.

43

♀

1 So that part of it was fairly limited,  
2 as I understand. So that's all the news. We'll  
3 share as we learn more.

4 I don't know if you have received  
Page 38

5 this, but we are changing the way in which we access  
6 wireless, and just make sure that you do that prior  
7 to May the 7th. Because as I understand it from IT,  
8 that goes away and your access to wifi is limited.

9 Faculty, outstanding teaching faculty  
10 awards, Roger Brown has -- he's normally here, but he  
11 received one of those, Lynn Phillips, Bradley  
12 Plaster, C. Ray Archer, Christine Goble, Wendy Liu  
13 and Trenika Mitchell were all honored on Thursday,  
14 here in this very room.

15 Again, not to belabor this, but I  
16 won't walk through this every item, but we do need to  
17 be conscious of our moving our curriculum forward in  
18 a timely way. We have really worked hard on Senate  
19 Council and committees, to help you do this. But you  
20 have to do your part.

21 So since some of the faculty may say,  
22 you know, could you change this; you need to do that.  
23 Don't let it sit on your desk for two or three  
24 months, because that slows it all down. And in the  
25 end, you and your program and your students may be

44

♀

1 penalized because you can't get it in fast enough.

2 So these are the deadlines and, again,  
3 I won't read those, but just remember: They happen  
4 pretty quickly.

5 Our councils do work hard to review  
6 but again, depending on how responsive you are to  
7 their requests for further information, it can take

8 two days, two weeks, or two months. So they really  
9 are reasonable, we think, in order to make this work  
10 happen quickly.

11 We did waive a senate rule. You know  
12 that we have the authority to waive some senate rules  
13 as long as we share those with you. And so we did  
14 that on March the 26th.

15 We approved a rule of waiver for a  
16 student in the College of Education to allow a  
17 student to take a special exam for course credit  
18 although they were not enrolled. It's a complicated  
19 issue, but we felt it was in the student's best  
20 interests.

21 We also have heard recently from G.T.  
22 Lineberry, the relationship of our clinical to our  
23 regular faculty, and there are still three colleges  
24 who have been above those parameters and so he's  
25 working with those faculty and the administrators to

45

♀

1 move those forward so that they're in the boundaries  
2 by the faculty.

3 Remember that faculty vote on what is  
4 the percentage of the ratio of clinical to regular in  
5 their colleges and in their programs and in their  
6 departments. Those are guidelines that the senate is  
7 required to respond to and the provost is required to  
8 tell us when those are out of bounds. And G.T. and  
9 the deans are responsible for working with the  
10 faculty to improve those.

11 I see in the back our current Ombud is  
Page 40



12 Joe McGillis, and he's interested in serving again  
13 and Senate Council voted to allow Dr. McGillis to  
14 serve a second one year term, and we're grateful to  
15 him for his work in that role.

16 We also worked with the provost in a  
17 committee that will implement the Blue Ribbon Panels  
18 of suggestions and there are five of these. I'm  
19 going to share them with you quickly. But the idea  
20 is that what we need to do to implement those  
21 recommendations and move forward in terms of graduate  
22 education (inaudible).

23 So the idea was we prioritize those  
24 action items and time lines based on the  
25 recommendations to just demonstrate that there is a

46

♀

1 linkage of prioritized action items to our strategic  
2 plan to work with Graduate School and the Provost  
3 Budget Office to estimate the cost of those  
4 recommended actions, to build on that work and  
5 consider any changes that we might need to do in our  
6 government structure, in our policy, necessary to  
7 effectively implement the prioritized action items  
8 and then finally to determine long term the  
9 effectiveness of those items.

10 These are the kinds of resources that  
11 will be available to that group and we hope to get  
12 that work started soon.

13 We did modify, just for your  
14 information, the standard for we call borrowing

15 courses. And so, again, this is a little tedious but  
16 the idea is that historically, you had to vote as a  
17 faculty, whether it is okay for Dean Vail to borrow a  
18 course from Dean Arnett's college, you know, as you  
19 move your programs forward and you're identifying  
20 those courses, the program courses that you want to  
21 include in any program.

22 So we changed that strategy a little  
23 bit so that that can be a little bit easier and  
24 release the burden on you as you move those forward.  
25 So I did want to remind you of that.

47

♀

1 There are some proposals that we're  
2 working with the registrar and so we really  
3 appreciate the opportunity to work with her and we  
4 hope to have something to you in the coming months.

5 So now we have a representative from  
6 the College of Medicine, he's going to answer any  
7 questions should you have any questions. Our motion  
8 from the Senate Council is that the elected faculty  
9 senators approve College of Medicine student RC-05 as  
10 the recipient of an In Memoriam honorary degree for  
11 submission through the President to the Board of  
12 Trustees.

13 DR. HOELLEIN: This is for a student  
14 who was injured (inaudible) during his third year of  
15 medical school and he died. The request was  
16 originally made by his brother and then strongly  
17 supported by Dr. DiPaola our dean, and his classmates  
18 (inaudible). If granted, this will be conveyed at

19 graduation on May 12.

20 MS. MCCORMICK: Any questions? All  
21 right. This is a motion that the elected faculty  
22 senators approve the College of Medicine student  
23 RC-05, as the recipient of an In Memoriam honorary  
24 degree for submission through the President to the  
25 Board of Trustees. Here's your opportunity to vote

48

♀

1 to approve that. That motion passes.

2 We have Kim Anderson here from the  
3 College of Engineering and the motion is that the  
4 elected faculty senators approve the College of  
5 Engineering student GR-90 as the recipient of an In  
6 Memoriam degree for submission through the President  
7 to the Board of Trustees.

8 MS. ANDERSON: So we are requesting a  
9 degree for Mr. Ryan Greenwell, he was scheduled to  
10 get his BS degree in Civil Engineering in May of 2019  
11 but passed away due to a motorcycle accident in  
12 September of 2017. Exceptional student, has already  
13 completed an internship at Messer, and was an  
14 excellent student.

15 MS. MCCORMICK: I've read the motion,  
16 again, that the elected faculty senators approve  
17 College of Engineering student GR-90 as the recipient  
18 of an In Memoriam honorary degree for submission  
19 through the President to the Board of Trustees. The  
20 motion passes.

21 We have a second student from the

22 College of Engineering. The motion is that the  
23 elected faculty senators approve College of  
24 Engineering student TM-15 as the recipient of an In  
25 Memoriam honorary degree for submission through the

49

♀

1 President to the Board of Trustees.

2 MS. ANDERSON: Melissa Thomas was  
3 scheduled to scheduled to get her BS degree in Civil  
4 Engineering in this May 2018 but passed away due to  
5 injuries in an automobile accident in July of 2017.  
6 She had 30 hours to complete her degree.  
7 Non-traditional student, came here after being in  
8 Jacksonville Florida for some time with BCTC, and so  
9 they are requesting a posthumous degree for her.

10 MS. MCCORMICK: The motion that the  
11 faculty senators approve College of Engineering  
12 student TM-15 as the recipient of an In Memoriam  
13 honorary degree for submission through the President  
14 to the Board of Trustees. That motion passes as  
15 well.

16 You have received earlier today the  
17 degree recipient list for May 2018 degrees. The  
18 motion is that the elected faculty senators approve  
19 the UK May 2018 list of candidates for credentials  
20 for submission through the President to the Board of  
21 Trustees. This comes from Senate Council. You're  
22 free to vote. That degree list motion passes.

23 The motion from the Senate Council is  
24 that the elected faculty senators approve UKs early  
25 August 2018 list of candidates for credentials for

♀

1 submission through the President to the Board of  
2 Trustees. Questions? You received this earlier  
3 today. You are free to vote. The motion passes as  
4 well.

5 Then we have a student from the  
6 College of Arts & Science that we would like to ask  
7 Ruth Beattie -- so the motion is that the elected  
8 faculty senators amend the 2017 December degree list  
9 by adding a BA Economics for student KD-06 and  
10 recommend through the President to the Board of  
11 Trustees that the degree be awarded effective  
12 December 2017. Ruth Beattie from the College of Arts  
13 & Science is here.

14 MS. BEATTIE: The student had  
15 completed all the degree requirements in time for the  
16 2017 degree. The student had missed the online  
17 deadline for applying online for the degree and had  
18 submitted the degree application by e-mail and  
19 (inaudible) clerical error. That application had not  
20 (inaudible) time for (inaudible).

21 MS. MCCORMICK: Any questions for  
22 Ruth? No questions, we'll move the motion forward  
23 that the elected faculty senators amend the December  
24 2017 degree list by adding the BA Economics for  
25 student KD-06 and recommend to the Board of Trustees

♀

1 that the degree be awarded effective December 2017.  
2 The motion passes.

3 We'll move to committee reports now.  
4 I'll ask Margaret Schroeder who chairs our Academic  
5 Programs Committee to move forward. She's going to  
6 talk with you about the PhD in Forest and Natural  
7 Resource Science.

8 If there are no objections, the  
9 (inaudible) will serve as the acting chair for  
10 purposes of answering questions. Margaret?

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. This is for the  
12 PhD program in Forest and Natural Resource Sciences  
13 from the Department of Forestry and Natural Resources  
14 within the College of Agriculture, Food, and  
15 Environment.

16 The mission of this program which is  
17 in line with the mission of the department is to  
18 prepare students to be well-equipped for conducting  
19 research in natural resource sciences as well as  
20 teaching them natural resources related disciplines.

21 A doctoral program in Forestry and  
22 Natural Resources in related applied disciplines is  
23 not available at any university in the Kentucky  
24 system. And thus, current students pursuing a PhD in  
25 this field must leave Kentucky to do so, currently.

52

♀

1 The proposed doctoral program will  
2 become the only such program in Kentucky and will  
3 enhance UK's academic reputation by attracting high  
4 quality, highly motivated students interested in

5 Forest and Natural Resource Sciences.

6 The PhD program aims to compete with  
7 the best natural resource programs in the nation and  
8 seeks to attract high quality, highly motivated  
9 students.

10 It will offer students an  
11 individualized yet comprehensive program in  
12 management in conservation and natural resources in  
13 the environment. It intends to create additional  
14 graduate opportunities in natural resource sciences  
15 for students in Kentucky, and in turn, enhancing  
16 current undergraduate and master's programs at the  
17 university.

18 Graduates of this program will be  
19 employed in academia, state and federal governments  
20 and private industry. And there's substantial job  
21 growth in this area, which is indicated in the  
22 proposal.

23 The program anticipates admitting two  
24 students each year for the first four years and  
25 maintaining that thereafter. I can answer questions

53

♀

1 of fact.

2 MS. MCCORMICK: So the motion from the  
3 committee needs no second, that the senate approve  
4 for submission to the Board of Trustees through the  
5 President, the establishment of a new PhD in Forest  
6 and Natural Resource Sciences in the Department of  
7 Forestry and Natural Resources within the College of

8 Agriculture, Food, and Environment. You are invited  
9 to vote. The motion passes.

10 MS. MARK: This is a proposed master's  
11 of arts in teaching, MAT, in Secondary STEM  
12 Education.

13 So this is a proposed 31 hour  
14 (inaudible) program that will provide candidates  
15 interested in teaching secondary STEM disciplines  
16 with a matter of art's in teaching, allowing them to  
17 teach appropriate courses in grades 8 through 12 in  
18 Kentucky.

19 The program is designed to be  
20 completed in three consecutive semesters, summer,  
21 fall, and spring, although it could be completed over  
22 two years, if desired.

23 Consistent with other teacher  
24 preparation courses at UK, the MAT in Secondary STEM  
25 Education will follow a clinical model with a

54

♀

1 sequence of university research industry externships  
2 in the summer, diverse field placements in K12  
3 schools in the fall, and student teaching in K12  
4 schools in the spring.

5 The United States contains today's  
6 drastic shortages in STEM teachers, especially in  
7 Kentucky, and the key way to address this problem is  
8 to provide multiple flexible programs, offering  
9 different pathways into STEM teaching.

10 The traditional benchmark institutions  
11 and institutes across Kentucky all offer a MAT degree



12 certification. The proposed MAT in Secondary STEM  
13 Education program will be the most compact STEM  
14 program in the state, as it can be completed within  
15 one calendar year, and will have the components such  
16 as the summer externships.

17 This new degree program will not  
18 require any new resources, a letter of feasibility  
19 from the dean and the provost were included per the  
20 senate rules. And the program anticipates  
21 approximately 20 new students each year being  
22 admitted to the program.

23 After hearing concerns in both the  
24 Department of Curriculum and Instruction and the  
25 Department of STEM Education at the meeting, we

55

♀

1 considered both sides of the argument.

2 It seemed that any of the concerns  
3 that were brought forth by the Department of  
4 Curriculum and Instruction were related to potential  
5 future programs, not the program that was currently  
6 under consideration.

7 And certainly any future programs  
8 should be considered carefully, as are all new  
9 programs. We, as a committee, evaluated the proposal  
10 based on our charge to consider programs based on  
11 academic excellence, the need, the impact,  
12 desirability, and priority of the new academic  
13 program in relation to other programs.

14 And this program did meet all of those

15 criteria, so at our level, we did approve the  
16 program. When the proposal was presented to Senate  
17 Council, concerns of both the Department of  
18 Curriculum and Instruction and the Department of STEM  
19 were considered.

20 Senate Council recommended that the  
21 two departments revisit the idea of an MOU. That's  
22 now attached to the proposal. And Senate Council  
23 asked that a memo from the Department of Curriculum  
24 and Instruction be included regarding not admitting  
25 mathematics and science students into the (inaudible)

56

♀

1 program. That's also now included in the proposal.

2 MS. MCCORMICK: So Margaret Schroeder  
3 is part of this department. And so we have another  
4 report from the committee to present to you. So  
5 questions of facts? Do you see there is now one  
6 attached to the proposal? Yes.

7 MR. EDERINGTON: Josh Ederington,  
8 Economics.

9 Did you say there is now an MOU?

10 MS. MARK: There is now one attached  
11 to the proposal. Yay.

12 MS. MCCORMICK: So the motion comes  
13 from the committee that the University Senate approve  
14 for submission to the Board of Trustees, through the  
15 President, the establishment of a new MAT in  
16 Secondary STEM Education, in the Department of  
17 Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics  
18 Education within the College of Education. You are

19 free to vote. The motion passes, 67 in favor, two  
20 against and three abstained. The motion passes.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. This is now  
22 called significant changes proposal. After the  
23 senate voted on February 12, 2018 to send this  
24 proposal back to Senate Council, the SAPC chair,  
25 myself, SAPC, and other members of Senate Council

57

♀

1 made several changes to the proposal.

2 I tried to make them as clear as  
3 possible in the proposal by highlighting them in  
4 yellow, which means that those were the changes made  
5 since you saw it last. If it confuses you, I'm  
6 really, really sorry; we really tried.

7 To just kind of highlight what we  
8 changed: We clarified the title and original charge  
9 for this proposal to better reflect that the  
10 italicized text above was the original charge to  
11 SAPC.

12 We added language at the beginning of  
13 the document in the rationale, to capture the intent  
14 to encompass certificate and degree programs.

15 We included all of SR 3.2.0 for better  
16 context and to ensure that we were not missing  
17 anything.

18 We revised the significant changes  
19 definition with significant input from Senate  
20 Council, and a special thanks to Kaveh Tagavi and  
21 Connie Wood for their major contributions to that

22 defini ti on.

23 And also, catching up with some of the  
24 language within 3.2.0, we updated letters of  
25 feasi bi li ty. That was a ruling from SREC on December

58

♀

1 14th. That was also modi fi ed by Senate Council, and  
2 the changes with in here reflect the modi fi ca ti ons for  
3 the letters of feasi bi li ty.

4 Speci fi cally, there is no longer the  
5 requirement, as of May 1, 2018, when this rule would  
6 come into effect, to get a letter of feasi bi li ty from  
7 the provost. The letter of feasi bi li ty would lie at  
8 the dean's level for signi fi cant changes and for new  
9 programs.

10 We added in the language in quota ti on  
11 "or their designee" when referring to a dean for the  
12 proposal. There was a member of the university  
13 campus who called into ques ti on because deans were  
14 not forwarding their programs and that's not really  
15 our practice anymore.

16 So we added or designee because that  
17 is the language that's consistent across the senate  
18 rules. And I think that's it. Questions? Yes, sir,  
19 Davy.

20 MR. JONES: Davy Jones, Toxi col ogy.

21 So you mentioned no letter of  
22 feasi bi li ty required for new programs from the  
23 provost?

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Or programs with  
25 signi fi cant changes, yes. That was what Senate

♀

1 Council voted on at their last meeting.

2 MR. JONES: I was just at a meeting a  
3 few weeks ago in which Ann Webber actually said that  
4 there was going to be new practices in which the  
5 provost's letter was going to come even earlier than  
6 it was before. So I'm (inaudible).

7 MS. SCHROEDER: That was -- your  
8 meeting with her was prior to that Senate Council  
9 meeting by four days? Four days. I know which  
10 meeting you're referring to and it was four days.  
11 You met with Annie, in her office, four days prior to  
12 the Senate Council meeting where this new rule was  
13 determined.

14 MR. JONES: Okay.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Other questions? All  
16 right, thank you.

17 MS. MCCORMICK: So the motion from the  
18 committee through the Senate Council is that the  
19 University Senate approve the SAPC's recommendation  
20 regarding significant program changes.

21 Are there any other questions? All  
22 right, you are free to vote. The motion passes.

23 Herman Farrell is here. He has a  
24 number of proposals for you. Hopefully you've seen  
25 them all, and you're prepared to vote and we'll move

♀

1 quickly. So again, if there is no objection, Herman  
2 will serve as the acting chair for purposes of  
3 answering questions of fact. Any objections?

4 MR. FARRELL: So first off, we have  
5 four proposals and I'll go through them one at that  
6 time. But just to give you an overview, the first  
7 four proposals come to us from the College of  
8 Engineering.

9 As you may recall, we visited with  
10 some proposals that came to us from the College of  
11 Engineering last month. Those proposals and these  
12 proposals as well were instigated because of the CPE  
13 mandate with regard to the total credit hours that  
14 are allowed: 120 is the number for most disciplines,  
15 but STEM disciplines are allowed to peak up to --  
16 they peak up to 128.

17 There were several programs, many  
18 numerous Engineering programs that needed to be  
19 reduced down.

20 So the four proposals before you have  
21 done the same thing that the proposals did last month  
22 with regard to how they proceeded to reduce down  
23 their total credit hours by eliminating the supported  
24 elective credit hours.

25 But these four proposals are each

61

♀

1 individually dissimilar in that they go about, as I  
2 would say, skinning the cat in a different way. Some  
3 proposals reduced down and then add a new course, or  
4 some reduce down the number of credit hours for

5 courses. So I'll just go through them one at a time.

6 So the first before us is from, again,  
7 the College of Engineering, and it is with regard to  
8 Chemical and Materials Engineering, in particular,  
9 the Materials Engineering Program, and so this is a  
10 reduction down of credit hours to 128. And in this  
11 case the supportive elective credit is eliminated.  
12 But it also involves the addition of one new credit  
13 course (inaudible).

14 Are there any questions of fact?

15 MS. MCCORMICK: The motion before you  
16 comes from its committee, that the University Senate  
17 approve the proposal from the College of Engineering,  
18 Department of Chemical and Materials Engineering, to  
19 change the required credit hours to 128.

20 No questions? You're free to vote.

21 And we have 41 in favor.

22 MR. FARRELL: The next proposal is  
23 from the Department of Mining Engineering. In this  
24 particular proposal, again, the supportive elective  
25 credits are eliminated. It also involves replacement

62

♀

1 of ME 220 and ME 330 with a course, CE 341.

2 We vetted these changes and checked  
3 with the other department that was affected and the  
4 change had already been approved.

5 MS. MCCORMICK: Any questions for  
6 Herman? The motion to you is that the University  
7 Senate approve the proposal from the College of

8           Engineering, Department of Mining Engineering, to  
9           change the required credit hours to 128. You are  
10          free to vote. The motion passes.

11                   MR. FARRELL: The third proposal is  
12          from Chemical and Materials Engineering, the Chemical  
13          Engineering Program, in particular. And this one,  
14          supportive elected credits are eliminated and this  
15          also involves reducing the credit hours of two core  
16          chemical engineering courses from four credit hours  
17          down to three credit hours. Any questions? Yes?

18                   MS. BRION: Gail Brion, College of  
19          Engineering.

20                           It says Department of Mining  
21          Engineering but then it says (inaudible). Is that a  
22          mistake?

23                   MR. FARRELL: Probably. Yes, it  
24          should say Department of Chemical and Materials  
25          Engineering.

63

♀

1                   MS. MCCORMICK: Thanks, Gail. The  
2          motion is that the University Senate approve the  
3          proposal from the College of Engineering, Department  
4          of Mining Engineering -- Chemical Engineering, to  
5          change the required credit hours. Sorry. And that  
6          should say Chemical as well. No matter how many  
7          times you review it, it happens. And that motion  
8          passes as well.

9                   MR. FARRELL: The fourth and last  
10         engineering proposal comes to us from Computer  
11         Engineering. Here, again, the supported elective



12 credit hours -- credit course was eliminated and this  
13 also involves an addition of a new one credit course  
14 CPE (inaudible).

15 MS. MCCORMICK: The motion is that the  
16 University Senate approve the proposal from the  
17 College of Engineering, Department of Computer  
18 Engineering to change the required credit hours to  
19 128. You may vote. Motion passes as well.

20 Next up we turn to the Martin School  
21 of Public Policy and Administration. This involves a  
22 change in the master of public policy program.

23 The change involves the creation of an  
24 executive track specialty within the existing MPP  
25 program. I'm going to take a few moments describing

64

♀

1 this because there has been some debate prior to this  
2 proposal. And I'll share with you some of the debate  
3 and we'll go from there.

4 An executive track within the MPP  
5 degree in which the credit hour requirements will be  
6 reduced down from 37 credit hours to 30 credit hours  
7 for those students on the executive track.

8 The mission to this particular track,  
9 besides the requirement in place for the MPP, would  
10 also include a requirement that applicants have five  
11 plus years of professional experience.

12 This executive track specialty is  
13 geared towards those working in international  
14 government, and specifically, students involved in

04-23-18Uk senate.txt  
15 the Korean Developing Institute.

16 What's involved here in terms of those  
17 reductions down seven credit hours, is the  
18 elimination of requirements that students participate  
19 in a capstone course project, as well as an  
20 econometrics course.

21 And I would just share with you a note  
22 that was given to me, and it's also contained within  
23 the proposal, as to the rationale for the elimination  
24 of those requirements for these executive track  
25 students.

65

♀

1 The capstone is meant to ensure that  
2 the regular MPP students can carry out a major  
3 project, including a professional presentation,  
4 similar to which students may be expected to carry  
5 out in a professional job. Most of the regular  
6 capstone students lack experience in a professional  
7 job.

8 Therefore, it's important that they  
9 show evidence that they can complete a major project  
10 and make a presentation in that capstone class.

11 The executive MPP students are  
12 required to have five years of experience.  
13 Therefore, these students should have had experience,  
14 already completing a major project like the capstone.  
15 As a result, they're dropping the capstone  
16 requirement for the executive track.

17 However, to ensure students on the  
18 executive track shall master presenting an analysis,

19 they will be required to give a formal presentation  
20 of their papers in the course (inaudible) policy  
21 process, which is not required of MP students on the  
22 regular track.

23 And with regard to the econometrics  
24 course, unlike students on the regular MPP tracks,  
25 students on the executive track typically already are

66

‡

1 in supervisory roles and upon completion, they can  
2 gain further promotions.

3 In their positions, they typically do  
4 not conduct econometric analyses, and people coming  
5 out of school would have to do that. Rather, they  
6 oversee junior analysts conducting these analyses.

7 PA 692 econometrics and its supporting  
8 (inaudible) course PA 795 (inaudible) at the  
9 beginning of their career and who will be needed to  
10 handle and analyze data.

11 For executive track students who more  
12 typically oversee such analysts, it's more important  
13 to help design studies and to ask good questions.  
14 These skills are developed in the PA 622 program  
15 evaluation course, which is required of all students,  
16 including those on the executive track.

17 And so when this proposal came before  
18 the Senate Council, there are several questions that  
19 were raised, notably the question of whether or not  
20 there is some rule regarding the differential between  
21 a program requirement and a track. Here, you

22 obviously have 37 for the program and 30 for this  
23 executive track.

24 And so the question was put out and as  
25 you can see in your packet, there were responses that

67

♀

1 came to us a week later from the Provost's Office, as  
2 well as from the Graduate School.

3 The response from Annie Davis Webber  
4 was that the multi-track programs can have variable  
5 credit hours, as long as each track meets minimum  
6 requirements for the type of degree, 30 credits for a  
7 master's or 120 for a bachelor's. SACSCOC will  
8 therefore be satisfied. And the CPA programing  
9 inventory system is specifically set up to handling  
10 tracking the variable credit hour tracks.

11 Dr. Brian Jackson shared with us an  
12 e-mail in which he reviewed Graduate School and  
13 Graduate Council policy relating to tracks with  
14 differential credit hours leading to the same degree  
15 and he states: To my knowledge, there is not a  
16 policy on this issue. And he provided three examples  
17 of approved multi-track programs that do have  
18 variable credit hours: One from social work, one  
19 from master's program for Clinical Rehabilitation  
20 Counseling and Clinical Rehabilitation Counseling and  
21 Mental Health, and an interdisciplinary PhD in  
22 Educational Sciences.

23 I reviewed all of these and I found  
24 that the third example is probably the best example  
25 because it does include what is referred to as not

♀

1 tracks but variant threads.

2 There is 12 hour common core required  
3 courses and then depending on the background of the  
4 candidate, their work experience, and their desire to  
5 study one area or another, there are different  
6 advance strands.

7 So one example is quantitative and  
8 psychometric methods which has a minimum of 24  
9 credits, and advanced strand curriculum instruction,  
10 a minimum of 27 credits.

11 And so after all that, Senate Council  
12 approved the proposal. Are there any questions of  
13 fact?

14 MS. VISONA: Monica Blackman Visona,  
15 College of Fine Arts.

16 I'm just curious to know what the  
17 committee's response was when you read that these  
18 students would not be responsible for mastering a  
19 certain kind of material because they would be  
20 administering people who did? That seems a little  
21 strange to me that they don't have to know the stuff  
22 because they'll be supervising (inaudible).

23 MR. FARRELL: Well, I guess maybe the  
24 characterization within the text may be (inaudible).  
25 The assumption was that they would have those skills

♀

1 but Dr. Zimmer may be able to answer.

2 MR. ZIMMER: The junior people  
3 typically do these econometric analyses for their  
4 organizations at some point. We have two different  
5 courses. We have a course that trains them, and a  
6 second course conceptually describes these  
7 evaluations that they would do.

8 So they would know the detail of the  
9 analysis and the conceptualization of those analyses.  
10 They just wouldn't actually have to do all the  
11 econometric analysis themselves.

12 So that's why we thought this was not  
13 necessary for them to have the econometrics course.  
14 So they would broadly understand what they are trying  
15 to achieve in these evaluations.

16 MS. VISONA: So they wouldn't master  
17 the material and they're meant to be able to apply  
18 it?

19 MR. ZIMMER: So I think of this as  
20 what skills do they need at this point in their  
21 career? So I would think of it in a similar way that  
22 you would ask a subordinate to do some accounting  
23 exercise, maybe they're an accountant, you don't  
24 complete mastery of all the skills that they need to  
25 understand what they're doing conceptually. They may

70

♀

1 not know all of the details of what they're doing in  
2 terms of nitty gritty. (Inaudible).

3 MR. JONES: Davy Jones, Toxicology.

4 Just a point of note here for if this  
Page 62

5 gets approved, when it's incorporated into the  
6 university system, (inaudible) references have been  
7 made to tracks. That's actually undergraduate. For  
8 master's degree, it's concentration. That is what's  
9 shown on the transcript.

10 MS. MCCORMICK: Thank you, Davy.

11 MS. BRION: Gail Brion, College of  
12 Engineering.

13 I was one of the ones debating this on  
14 the Senate Council, and while I didn't perceive any  
15 ruling on this, what bothered me was, unlike  
16 undergraduate credit, where we have a program, there  
17 is some type of testing to show that these courses  
18 could be waived.

19 There was not a plan for that  
20 guarantee -- exactly what you asked -- if these  
21 students actually did have the econometrics.

22 So I did mention that I think that  
23 what we're doing now is giving academic credit for  
24 life experience. And while I am not wholly opposed  
25 to that, I am opposed to that without some type of

71

♀

1 academic evaluation.

2 MR. ZIMMER: So a couple different  
3 things we're doing with that, and again, total  
4 evaluations, they will have to take that class and  
5 have to understand the (inaudible) research designs  
6 and so on. So they will be tested on those concepts.

7 They will not be tested on matrix

8 algebra on their econometrics (inaudible). We don't  
9 think that's necessary for them at this point of  
10 their career to be able to (inaudible).

11 So in terms of capstone, the capstone  
12 is basically meant to ensure that these individuals  
13 have the ability to carry out a major project and  
14 present that major project to an audience. So your  
15 research question, information, come to a conclusion,  
16 and present some recommendations.

17 In another class, 651, we're going to  
18 require them to go through a presentation and they're  
19 going to present some information and make a case in  
20 terms of the evidence provided.

21 So we do make sure that they have  
22 those presentation skills of presenting information  
23 to an audience. We don't have them go through the  
24 same exercise in capstone because they've probably  
25 done this in their actual job, and that's part of the

72

♀

1 reason (inaudible).

2 MR. FARRELL: Would you mind also  
3 speaking to the issue of the review of the five years  
4 of experience, just as they are coming in because  
5 maybe that will (inaudible).

6 MR. ZIMMER: So they have to have  
7 relevant experience. This is a masters in public  
8 policy degree, so we would expect that in a  
9 government agency or a nonprofit agency, and we're  
10 going to require them to submit a resume to show that  
11 they have this five years of experience and that will



12 be a way to ensure they have the proper experience.

13 MS. MCCORMICK: No other questions? A  
14 motion from the committee is that the University  
15 Senate approve the proposal from the Martin School of  
16 Public Policy and Administration involving a change  
17 in the Master of Public Policy. We had discussion.  
18 You're free to vote. 43 in favor, 13 opposed and  
19 eight have abstained. So the motion passes.

20 MR. FARRELL: Two more proposals. So  
21 the next proposal comes to us from the College of  
22 Health Sciences and College of Pharmacy involving the  
23 suspension of admissions to the Pharm D/Master of  
24 Science in Physical Assistant Studies Dual Degree  
25 Program.

73

♀

1 As noted in the proposal, this dual  
2 degree program was approved back in 2009 and only  
3 five students have since enrolled. One student  
4 withdrew, while the remaining four completed the dual  
5 degree program. One successfully passed the  
6 Physician Assistant National Exam, and the other  
7 three have elected not to pursue the PA certification  
8 today.

9 The faculty in both units and colleges  
10 endorsed the suspension of the dual degree program  
11 pending further review and possible major peer review  
12 revision of the program. Are there any questions of  
13 fact?

14 MR. ENGLISH: Tony English, College of

15 Health Sciences.

16 I don't see it up there on the screen,  
17 but what you said was physical assistant but it's  
18 physician assistant.

19 MR. FARRELL: Sorry, I apologize.

20 MR. ENGLISH: Do we need to correct  
21 that? Yeah, it says physical there.

22 MS. MCCORMICK: Thank you. So this  
23 should read that the University Senate approves the  
24 proposal from the College of Health Sciences and the  
25 College of Pharmacy involving a suspension of

74

♀

1 admissions to the PharmD Master's of Science in  
2 Physician Assistant Studies dual degree. Thanks.

3 It looks like most of you have voted.

4 MR. FARRELL: I'll just note that that  
5 error probably came from me as I was typing up. No  
6 fault from the Senate Council Office. It was my  
7 error.

8 And then last but not least, we have  
9 considering a proposal from the College of Medicine  
10 to change the grading system for the College of  
11 Medicine and also the Senate Rules 5.1.2.3 and  
12 5.3.3.3.A and 5.3.3.3.B.

13 So this is a change from numerical  
14 grading to a pass/fail system. This is in keeping  
15 with the nationwide practice at most medical schools.  
16 The change also will aid in the reduction of stress  
17 to medical students.

18 The proposal is detailed and provided  
Page 66

19 evidence of the number of medical schools in the  
20 nation using pass/fail, and you have that document  
21 showing that the vast majority now use pass/fail.

22 It was noted by the folks who joined  
23 us that the failure to switch over to a pass/fail  
24 grading system has already adversely affected and  
25 it's continuing to adversely affect recruiting.

75

♀

1 Noting that UofL, Vanderbilt, and a variety of other  
2 competitive medical schools in the region have  
3 already switched over to the pass/fail system.

4 Members of the committee did wonder  
5 how students would be evaluated for residency and  
6 these questions came up in Senate Council as well.  
7 Whether how they would be evaluated for residencies  
8 and other continuing education and employment  
9 opportunities. And it was noted by Dr. Griffith and  
10 Dr. (Inaudible) who were present that licensure  
11 exams, reference letters, interviews, are still used  
12 as a major measure of a student's relative success in  
13 medical school.

14 And it was also noted that the  
15 students, of course, favor this transition to the  
16 pass/fail grading system, and even one of our  
17 colleagues on the Senate Council also chimed in with  
18 the faculty also being very happy with this change,  
19 since apparently there's always a debate about a .01  
20 differential on grades. So any question of fact?

21 MR. ENGLISH: Tony English, College of

04-23-18UK senate.txt  
22 Heal th Sci ences.

23 This is across the board, a pass/fail  
24 or just to particular courses?

25 MR. FARRELL: Across the board.

76

♀

1 MS. MCCORMICK: For medical students.

2 MR. FARRELL: For medical students.

3 MS. MCCORMICK: The motion is that the  
4 Uni versity Senate approve the proposal from the  
5 Col lege of Medi cine to change the grading system for  
6 the Col lege of Medi cine and to change the Senate  
7 Rul es. Whi ch I know Davy and hi s col leagues wi ll  
8 appreci ate. They're al ready done a nice job of  
9 making those changes for you: 5. 1. 2. 3, 5. 3. 3. 3. A and  
10 5. 3. 3. 3. 8.

11 UNIDENTIFIED: B.

12 MS. MCCORMICK: You are free to vote.

13 UNIDENTIFIED: It's supposed to be B,  
14 not 8.

15 MS. MCCORMICK: I think it's B. Let  
16 me check. It's B. The motion to endorse carries.

17 Our next change comes from the Senate  
18 Rul es Commi ttee, and Dr. Jones, who chairs that  
19 commi ttee, co-chairs is going to share with us a  
20 l i t t l e bit about that. If there are no objections,  
21 Dr. Jones will answer your questions following.

22 DR. JONES: Okay. The issue had been  
23 that a recurring situation over the years has been  
24 that the senate would adopt a proposal and there  
25 would not a date of effectiveness on the the

♀

1 proposal. Sometimes this would create little issues,  
2 that went to, when does the new grading system take  
3 effect, or which rule is the student under?

4 The rules committee was tasked by the  
5 Senate Council from it's retreat to cogitate on this,  
6 and it turned out to be a tougher nut to crack than  
7 we had anticipated.

8 We started from the mindset, well,  
9 let's pin it to, okay, all the rules take effect the  
10 fall semester. Well, different programs start fall  
11 semester at different times. Some start even fall  
12 semester before July 1. And so we finally decided we  
13 can't pin it to a particular term.

14 And so we said, well, let's do this,  
15 let's require all proposals in the future, they will  
16 have an effective date. That would be a standing  
17 requirement. And if some of our proposals slip  
18 through that doesn't have an effective date, then the  
19 Senate Council chair, taking a best judgment and  
20 consultation, will decide what is the most  
21 appropriate starting date. And this is for changes  
22 to senate rules.

23 Any other policy changes, the Senate  
24 makes policy decisions, Senate Council sometimes  
25 makes policy decisions, any other decisions not

♀

1 involving the senate rules, per se, will just  
2 automatically take effect the moment they are  
3 adopted.

4 So this is what we want you to  
5 consider, is that this become a codified rule as to  
6 when do our rules take effect. And I have to humbly  
7 admit that when we sent this to Senate Council, we  
8 neglected to put a start date of effect. But that  
9 was corrected.

10 MS. MCCORMICK: Any questions for Dr.  
11 Jones? So the motion from the rules committee is  
12 that the University Senate approve the proposed  
13 changes to Senate Rule 1.2.3. Yes. Thanks, Davy.  
14 There is 58 in favor of the motion and it passes.

15 MR. CROSS: Is it usual authorization?

16 MS. MCCORMICK: Yes. I'm going to say  
17 if there are no objections, the presenter will serve  
18 as the acting chair for purposes of answering  
19 questions of fact.

20 MR. CROSS: Thank you. This is from  
21 the Senate Academic Organization and Structure  
22 Committee. Would the members of the committee please  
23 raise their hands? I haven't had the opportunity to  
24 meet them because we deliberated by e-mail, so I'm  
25 looking forward to doing that after the meeting.

79

♀

1 Our first proposal is for a new Center  
2 for Health Equity Transformation. This would  
3 coordinate transdisciplinary translational research  
4 and training efforts across diseases, behaviors, and

5 UK units to risk health inequities, which there are  
6 many in this state and beyond.

7 It would also increase the competitive  
8 advantage in research training of the university and  
9 Dr. Nancy Schoenberg, who is here to answer any  
10 questions, has already identified targets for  
11 extramural research funding.

12 This is a multidisciplinary resource  
13 center, so we look at both the academic side and the  
14 organizational side. CHET, the acronym, would be  
15 housed in Research Building two, would get the pilot  
16 grants from the vice president for research. And the  
17 vice president has delegated administrative  
18 responsibility for the center to the College of  
19 Medicine.

20 The center would partner with the  
21 College of Nursing to expand the program to enhance  
22 research training among underrepresented minority  
23 groups and others who are interested in underserved  
24 populations.

25 The college and the Markey Cancer

80

♀

1 Center would each support recruitment of two regular  
2 titled faculty for CHET.

3 The director would be appointed for a  
4 six year term by the dean of the College of Medicine,  
5 by the provost, President, and Board of Trustees and  
6 will be eligible for reappointment.

7 Now there are other details but we're

8 limited on time, so the motion, the first of two from  
9 the committee, through the Senate Council, is that  
10 the Senate approve the proposal from the College of  
11 Medicine for a new multidisciplinary research center  
12 based on its academic merits.

13 MS. MCCORMICK: Any questions for AI?

14 MS. VISONA: Just a point of  
15 clarification, Monica Visona, College of Fine Arts.

16 I gather that this is the initiative  
17 that was referred to by the president in his opening  
18 remarks?

19 MR. CROSS: It would be part of that,  
20 I think. Nancy, is that correct?>

21 MS. SCHOENBERG: It would be part of  
22 it, but that really referred more to the building, I  
23 think.

24 MS. MCCORMICK: Okay, any other  
25 questions? Hearing none, the motion is that the

81

♀

1 University Senate approve a proposal from the College  
2 of Medicine for a new MDRC based on its academic  
3 merit. You're free to vote. The motion passes.

4 MR. CROSS: And the second motion  
5 would be that the senate endorse and not approve the  
6 proposal based on organizational and structure merit.  
7 We endorse and not approve because this is a  
8 nonacademic function. Any questions on this motion  
9 the motion?

10 MS. MCCORMICK: The motion is that the  
11 University Senate endorse the proposal from the



12 College of Medicine for a new MDRC based on its  
13 organizational and structure merits. It looks like  
14 most of you have voted. This passes.

15 MR. CROSS: The next proposal from the  
16 Academic Organization and Structure Committee is  
17 recommendation for approval of the transfer of the  
18 certificate in Universal Design from Division of  
19 Undergraduate Studies, which no longer exists, to the  
20 School of Interiors in the College of Design.

21 That's necessary because of the  
22 elimination of the division and the proposal says  
23 that faculty members in the School of Interiors have  
24 been involved in the certificate since its inception  
25 and the certificate curriculum complements the

82

♀

1 school's current and proposed curriculum. The  
2 certificate director, who is director of the Human  
3 Development Institute in the (inaudible) will remain  
4 the same. There was support for the endorsed  
5 proposal. Any questions?

6 MS. MCCORMICK: There is a  
7 representative from the School of Design here, also  
8 one from Human Development Institute if you have any  
9 questions that AI is unable to answer.

10 So the motion is that the University  
11 Senate endorse the proposal to transfer the  
12 Undergraduate Certificate in Universal Design and  
13 Undergraduate Education to the School of Interiors,  
14 College of Design. All in favor? All opposed?

15 Motion carries. All right. So Ben is here to talk  
16 with us a little bit about fall break.

17 MR. CHILDRESS: Thank you, Kathryn,  
18 and thanks for having me here again for a second  
19 reading. Because it is a second reading, I won't  
20 verbally go through any details of the proposal. I  
21 will address any comments I have gathered from the  
22 last meeting.

23 The first of which was we had asked  
24 you to consider changing the date (inaudible) Fayette  
25 County Public Schools, fall break on the calendar.

83

♀

1 And so we kind of reviewed that and  
2 ultimately decided that we wanted to stick with our  
3 original plan.

4 And kind of the main reason for that  
5 was a lot of the numbers in talking to the counseling  
6 center and in talking it seems that really that  
7 midterm, middle of April date we thought was really  
8 important and they see up ticks and appointments and  
9 issues with that regarding (inaudible) on campus for  
10 that specific time.

11 But I do think that kind of two week  
12 difference between Fayette County Public Schools,  
13 when they do theirs and when we do ours is a sizable  
14 enough difference that we want to stick with the  
15 plan.

16 We also thought that this would not  
17 address kind of the problems faced or the needs by  
18 teachers with instruction in other school

19 districts, and also private schools. So ultimately we  
20 decided we want to stick with our original date in  
21 the proposal because we feel this time really has the  
22 maximum amount of impact on the issue at hand.

23 Also, the issue of the one day  
24 seminars on, I think Thursday, in particular, that  
25 could be impacted by this proposal. And we do

84

♀

1 realize that any kind of change to the academic  
2 calendar has (inaudible) to cause some extra burden  
3 on those professors, many have classes and they need  
4 to rearrange their schedules some or reschedule  
5 class.

6 And so I'm not up here contesting that  
7 fact at all. Really I'm just up here asking if the  
8 faculty at this university would be willing to do  
9 that and putting that in a chapter to make that  
10 change because I feel like this is such an important  
11 issue that I would not be up here advocating for it  
12 if I did not feel that way.

13 I think that we talk a lot about  
14 mental health and wellness in the national spirit and  
15 on UK's campus, but ultimately there are very few  
16 steps that we take to concretely address that. I  
17 believe this that is (inaudible).

18 I don't have a remedy for the fact  
19 that folks might have to change around their classes.  
20 I'm just asking if the faculty would willing to do  
21 that.

22 Those are the main points of feedback  
23 that I gathered. Were there any other questions or  
24 things that have come up since then?

25 MR. FARRELL: Herman Farrell, College

85

♀

1 of Fine Arts.

2 I think I expressed this concern last  
3 time with regard to at least the College of Fine Arts  
4 with rehearsals and recitals (inaudible) that are  
5 still for credit. So I guess my question is, is how  
6 this is going to be -- how the information is going  
7 to be passed on to the students with regard to their  
8 Thursday and Fridays.

9 So Thursday and Friday, there would be  
10 no classes, no course work, and I guess no  
11 performances and no recitals during that time period?  
12 It's treated like a spring break; we're not allowed  
13 to on spring break to do anything like that.

14 And then I'm also kind of concerned as  
15 to what happens on that Saturday and Sunday that  
16 follows, because I think, forget the College of Fine  
17 Arts, if it's anticipated that it's a four day  
18 weekend instead of two days off for school, as we do  
19 work on the weekend, we're not requiring students to  
20 show up for a rehearsal on Saturday afternoon.

21 Is that -- I guess my question is will  
22 that information be passed on to the student as it  
23 applies directly to Thursday and Friday -- I guess  
24 that's half the question because the first part of  
25 the question is what information is being passed onto

♀

1 the faculty (inaudible)?

2 MR. CHILDRESS: So I guess for your  
3 particular department, I know we talked -- and I  
4 guess it's my belief that this shouldn't be touching  
5 things on the weekend and if you have a friendly  
6 amendment to satisfy that, I'm more than happy to do  
7 that.

8 This is to focus on Thursday and  
9 Friday classes. It's not meant to I guess impact  
10 things outside of the classroom or things that might  
11 be scheduled on that weekend.

12 As far as communicating that to  
13 students, I'm more than happy to try to work with  
14 people and departments and communicate to those  
15 students that might be impacted, that their recital  
16 or band and let them know this is still fall break,  
17 and extra curriculum activities or things that go  
18 above and beyond normal classes should still  
19 continue.

20 I'm not quite sure I but I know other  
21 cases that folks -- I have friends that are required  
22 to do things, student teachers and things. They're  
23 not able to make their own spring break plans. I  
24 don't think I believe at least this should be in line  
25 with (inaudible).

♀

1 MR. FARRELL: I'll follow up question  
2 with one quick question, if I may. So is the office  
3 of the registrar (inaudible).

4 MS. MCCORMICK: Yes. And in fact, Kim  
5 Taylor is here, so I think she's willing to do that  
6 work and work with senate as well as SGA.

7 And remember, this won't happen until  
8 next fall and so I think that there will be come  
9 conversations around how this might be carved out and  
10 what would be the best way to manage that. Margaret,  
11 did you have a comment?

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah. Margaret  
13 Schroeder, College of Education.

14 I just want to comment that student  
15 teaching, we have a separate calendar that was  
16 pre-approved that we would have to go and if this  
17 fall break were to be approved, we would have to go  
18 and include that as gifts. It would affect our  
19 student teachers but it affects in the way that's  
20 similar to what Herman was talking about.

21 And so we would have to come with an  
22 exception for that group of students.

23 MS. MCCORMICK: Kim, did you have any  
24 comment?

25 MS. TAYLOR: Just that we can work

1 with the students just to make sure that (inaudible)  
2 and it can work for everyone on campus and  
3 (inaudible).

4 MS. MCCORMICK: We know that Associate  
Page 78

5 Provost Kellum is here.

6 MR. KELLUM: I just to have to make a  
7 case for faculty teaching courses with labs and  
8 different sections meet one day of the week week,  
9 (inaudible) Thursday and Friday and messes up the  
10 schedule up for the whole semester.

11 So can you consider moving the fall  
12 break to the beginning of the week to even out what  
13 is lost at the end of the week. (Inaudible) if you  
14 get two weeks there the Thursday and Friday. They're  
15 going to schedule. So consider fall break to being  
16 at the end of the week to make if you went through it  
17 earlier (inaudible).

18 MR. CHILDRESS: We can certainly  
19 consider it. I think we addressed some in the  
20 proposal. Ultimately, I would be happy Monday  
21 Tuesday, Thursday Friday. I think that we're serving  
22 students on the campus best with Thursday Friday,  
23 which is why I continue to promote that, although if  
24 faculty feel that this kind of scheduling burden is  
25 too much to be overcome, then I would be willing to

89

♀

1 accept a change for Monday Tuesday. But I guess  
2 ultimately that's why we want to talk to faculty  
3 about this. Because I defer to the better judgement  
4 on that.

5 MS. KELLUM: If you keep it to  
6 (inaudible). If we have two weeks where we lose  
7 Thursday Friday, that would require we have to drop

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

one (inaudible).

MR. CHILDRESS: And there would be no way to reschedule those for the days that (inaudible)?

MS. KELLUM: The student may not want (inaudible) sections of the course and they Thursday and Friday (inaudible).

MR. CHILDRESS: Absolutely. So I would be willing to accept, depending on hearing other feedback from folks, I guess for the ninth week of the semester, a Monday and Tuesday, so that would be the Monday and Tuesday, if we're talking about that middle of October instead of having Thursday Friday, Saturday Sunday, Saturday Sunday Monday Tuesday, so that would make it the ninth week. I would be willing to accept that friendly amendment.

TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: Yeah, Bob Grossman, Trustee.

♀

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

Just one general comment. I support the idea in principle. People may not know the reason we started on Wednesday is simply because when we used to do registration on paper, they required a full day of students going to the gym to register on paper for their classes, and another full day for all that information to be worked out for scheduling classes and things.

So those reasons are obsolete now. We can certainly look at (inaudible). In terms of the Monday and Tuesday versus Thursday Friday thing, we



12 were assured at the last meeting that this having on  
13 Thursday Friday would even out of the number of days,  
14 number of instructional days per semester with  
15 respect to Monday Tuesday Wednesday Thursday.

16 But I looked at the little chart you  
17 provided. This time around it actually does the  
18 opposite. It makes the days less even than the  
19 current. And so I guess I would also support Monday  
20 and Tuesday proposal just to keep the days as even as  
21 possible across the (inaudible).

22 MR. CHILDRESS: Would you like to make  
23 a friendly amendment?

24 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: I'll move to amend  
25 the proposal so that the month of fall break be

91

♀

1 changed to a Monday Tuesday. I guess for the same  
2 week?

3 MR. CHILDRESS: The ninth week.

4 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: For the ninth week,  
5 instead of Thursday Friday,

6 MS. MCCORMICK: Is there a second?

7 MS. BRION: I second, Gail Bri on.

8 MS. MCCORMICK: There's a second.

9 Discussion?

10 MR. FARRELL: Herman Farrell, College  
11 of Fine Arts.

12 Why the ninth week?

13 MR. CHILDRESS: Because I guess as we  
14 looking at right in the middle of October, the ninth

15 would be that Monday Tuesday kind of that same middle  
16 chunk, so to speak. So it's the eighth week for  
17 Thursday and Friday, but if we kept it on the eight  
18 week, then it would be a week earlier with the Monday  
19 Tuesday. Does that make more sense?

20 MR. FARRELL: I guess my question when  
21 do midterms fall, seven weeks?

22 MR. CHILDRESS: I think midterms are  
23 spread out some. It's kind of what we were hoping to  
24 hit on --

25 MR. FARRELL: The end?

92

♀

1 MR. CHILDRESS: It's the middle of  
2 October is --

3 MR. FARRELL: So just in terms of the  
4 (inaudible). So just in terms of the whole rationale  
5 behind this, which is to reduce the pressure to our  
6 students, it seems to me you're moving it off further  
7 and further in a way. Kind of that air being out of  
8 balloon for them. So I'm more in favor of -- to this  
9 amendment to allow it to occur during that eighth  
10 week on the Monday and Tuesday so it falls right  
11 after the midterms rather than wait another week  
12 after that.

13 MS. MCCORMICK: Any opposition to the  
14 -- friendly amendment to the friendly amendment?

15 MR. CHILDRESS: Keep it at eight  
16 weeks?

17 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: I'll defer to  
18 whatever the SGA prefers (inaudible).

19 MR. CHILDRESS: I think at eight weeks  
20 still accomplishes it. I think in talking to  
21 students we were pinpointing (inaudible). My intent  
22 was to try to have it directly in the middle of  
23 October as possible because that's when in talking to  
24 students, academic pressure and things like that,  
25 that's what that needs to be centered on.

93

♀

1 We think that eight weeks comes --  
2 well, I don't have a calendar in front of me. I'm  
3 okay with that, and just continuing on that eight  
4 week.

5 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: I'll accept a  
6 friendly amendment to the eighth week.

7 MS. BIRD-POLLAN: Jennifer  
8 Bird-Pollan, College of Law.

9 So I was a little surprised you're  
10 accepting this as a friendly amendment. I just  
11 wanted -- I actually think it's a good idea  
12 (inaudible) but I'd like to remind everyone what we  
13 heard from the SGA in the original proposal was that  
14 Thursday and Friday was more desirable time line  
15 because there's a concern if we make it Monday  
16 Tuesday, there would be a tendency to consider Friday  
17 an extension of that as well and that six day instead  
18 of just the two days.

19 So I think we ought to make sure that  
20 we are okay with that before we -- and think about  
21 the risk of that before we move this from a Thursday

22 Friday to a Monday Tuesday.

23 MR. CHILDRESS: Like I said, my  
24 preference is Thursday Friday, although I understand  
25 that Monday Tuesday works better for some of the

94

♀

1 bigger issues that we've seen from faculty. I'm  
2 willing to make that concession.

3 I do think that's definitely a  
4 potential, although like we heard last time, I don't  
5 think it matters when the days are. I think people  
6 are always going to be concerned about attendance  
7 issues.

8 Now with that being said, I would --  
9 personally, I don't want us to assume all student  
10 are just going to skip all their classes. I hold our  
11 student body in higher esteem than that and I don't  
12 want us to change the policy based on that either.  
13 Any other comments, questions?

14 DAVID HULSE: David Hulse, B and E.

15 B and E did a poll of (inaudible)  
16 result of this. At least that being said voice for  
17 your proposal. First see the additional days off  
18 /AFRPBD 12 percent seek just based on hallways, we  
19 observed by the proposal that students will try to  
20 stretch out the fall break, whether it's Monday  
21 Tuesday or Thursday Friday. How would you respond to  
22 that

23 MR. CHILDRESS: Well, I think we've  
24 made it very clear that the center of this discussion  
25 of this proposal (inaudible). I think that just

♀

1 putting it on Thanksgiving break and not including  
2 break time in the middle of that area (inaudible)  
3 this is what this is designed to do. But it doesn't  
4 really address the heart of the principle so I will  
5 not move on that.

6 I think, secondly, that the issue of  
7 student attendance, you know, again, I'm not a  
8 professor. I've never had a class. But I won't just  
9 assume that student are just going to skip their  
10 classes. And I also think that (inaudible) are  
11 prepared to deal with issues of in certain cases  
12 maybe they need to incentivize who came to class.

13 Again, maybe that's a risk and I don't  
14 want to be blind to that, but I don't think that's a  
15 reason why we should say no to this proposal. Does  
16 that answer your question?

17 MS. MCCORMICK: Any other questions?  
18 I appreciate the lateness of the hour. So you have  
19 before you a motion from the Senate Council that the  
20 University Senate approve the change to the  
21 university calendar to implement a fall break on the  
22 Monday and Tuesday, correct, of the eighth week --

23 MR. CROSS: If it's the eighth week,  
24 isn't that before midterm?

25 MS. MCCORMICK: Midterm is the seventh

♀

1 week. Oh, my.

2 MS. TAYLOR: It would be the eighth  
3 week.

4 MS. MCCORMICK: This couldn't be the  
5 eighth week.

6 MR. CROSS: Anyway, you better get bob  
7 to accept that as a friendly amendment.

8 MS. MCCORMICK: All right. Bob, will  
9 you accept that? And we're going to do this on  
10 Monday and Thursday of the ninth week? Wasn't that  
11 your amended --

12 UNIDENTIFIED: Monday and Tuesday.

13 MS. MCCORMICK: Sorry, excuse me.

14 TRUSTEE GROSSMAN: If there is a  
15 compelling reason to make it the ninth week, then I'm  
16 fine with that.

17 MS. MCCORMICK: Okay. So Monday  
18 Tuesday ninth week, all in favor?

19 MS. KELLUM: So midterm week is the  
20 eighth week?

21 MS. BRION: Could we say the week  
22 after midterm?

23 MS. MCCORMICK: All right. So the  
24 week after midterms. All in favor of the amendment  
25 which is basically moving from Thursday Friday to

97

♀

1 Monday Tuesday. All in favor of that amendment? By  
2 hand, please. I don't have any way, I assume of  
3 doing it otherwise. All opposed? So the motion  
4 passes. So now the motion, the larger motion is that

5 the University Senate approve the change to the  
6 university calendar to implement a fall break on the  
7 Monday and Tuesday of the week following midterms.  
8 All right, you're ready to vote. No further  
9 discussion. You're free to vote. It looks like most  
10 of you have voted and the motion passes.

11 So Ben, congratulations. So 42 to 8  
12 and 6 abstained.

13 So now we have a motion you've all  
14 been waiting for which is can we adjourn? Thank you  
15 very much.

16 \* \* \* \* \*

17 THEREUPON, the meeting was adjourned  
18 at 5:21 p.m.

19 \* \* \* \* \*

♀

STATE OF KENTUCKY     )  
COUNTY OF FAYETTE    )

I, Lisa Grant Crump, the undersigned Notary Public in and for the State of Kentucky at Large, certify that the Senate Meeting was taken down in stenotype by me and later reduced to computer transcription by me, and the foregoing is a true and accurate record.

My commission expires: April 6, 2019.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my  
Page 88



04-23-18Uk senate.txt

hand and seal of office on this the 25th day of June,  
2018.

/s/ Lisa Grant Crump  
LISA GRANT CRUMP  
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE-AT-LARGE  
NOTARY ID: 530912

100