

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

**UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY**  
**SENATE COUNCIL MEETING**

**\* \* \* \* \***

**\* \* \* \* \***

**DECEMBER 10, 2018**

**\* \* \* \* \***

**\* \* \* \* \***

**JENNIFER BIRD-POLLEN, CHAIR**  
**SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR**  
**DOUG BLACKWELL, PARLIAMENTARIAN**  
**BRENDA YANKEY, COURT REPORTER**

**\* \* \* \* \***

**\* \* \* \* \***

**\* \* \* \* \***

**\* \* \* \* \***

1           CHAIR BIRD POLLAN: I'll ask everyone to come  
2 on in and grab a seat. Remember to pick your  
3 clicker up in the back and we also have a handout  
4 for you today which we'll talk about later as that  
5 agenda item comes forward. We have, as you noticed,  
6 likely, a very long agenda today. So, I'm going to  
7 impose on your kindness and ask you to remember how  
8 early you got out the last couple of meetings and to  
9 stay until the very end.

10           There are lots of people who will be very happy  
11 if we get all the way through the agenda today. The  
12 first thing I'm going to ask you to do, well your  
13 regular reminder is that we have to be civil and  
14 follow Robert's Rules. Also, leave your clicker  
15 behind when you leave the room please, so we don't  
16 have to come and find you afterwards. We'll have an  
17 attendance slide which will also serve to you as a  
18 reminder that we will have a Senate meeting on  
19 January 14th.

20           I know historically there hasn't, the last few  
21 years, there has not been a January meeting. Part  
22 of the reason there is a very long agenda today,  
23 which actually doesn't include every item that we  
24 would have otherwise put on the agenda, so we will  
25 have a meeting in January instead. Here are your

1 choices with lots of helpful information for you  
2 about when and where you can find that January 14th  
3 Senate Meeting. So, please reply now to mark your  
4 attendance today. Final votes? Mark your  
5 attendance. Great.

6 Yes, it will be from 3:00-5:00 as a matter of  
7 fact. And it will be in 106 White Hall Building and  
8 we hope to see you all there. Note you will receive  
9 additional emails about this before it happens. The  
10 first item on our agenda today is the actual Chair  
11 of the University Senate. So, please join me in  
12 welcoming President Capilouto.

13 (APPLAUSE)

14 PRESIDENT CAPILOUTO: Since we are under a  
15 time restraint, I'll try to be quick. I wanted to  
16 rush over here several times over the past semester.  
17 Every opportunity I get to thank people, I want to  
18 do so. So, I come today with deep appreciation and  
19 gratitude. There are a lot of wonderful things  
20 happening on this campus and the most wonderful of  
21 those are the ones that we, it takes we, it takes  
22 all of us to do.

23 Now I want to review some of those with you and  
24 hope you take pride in them. Some of the things I  
25 share with many of our constituents, both elected

1 officials and donors that I think give them great  
2 confidence of what we do together. So this year we  
3 have an enrollment of well over 30,000 students.  
4 More than 7,000 graduate, professional students. We  
5 have an historic first to second year retention rate  
6 of 84.5%.

7 That's up more than two absolute percentage  
8 points than the years 14-15. So these are  
9 extraordinary numbers for me, and I'll try to put  
10 them in context. We now have reached a historic six  
11 year graduation rate of 65%. I know that doesn't  
12 satisfy anyone. It certainly doesn't satisfy me,  
13 but I also want to put it in context. There are  
14 only about 150 universities in this country.

15 Well over 3,500 that have a six year graduation  
16 of the federal definition, it's a peculiar one, but  
17 a six-year graduation rate of 70% or higher. So we  
18 have moved from 60-65% in a short amount of time.

19 And, you know, we have to run for our students a  
20 challenging curriculum, support, social service  
21 support, all kinds of things to move those numbers.  
22 I'm most pleased too, that we're growing the number  
23 of graduates at the University of Kentucky because  
24 our research and research from around the country  
25 says that a college degree is transformative.

1 In 11-12 we had about 5800 degrees we awarded.  
2 We're well over 7,000 now and increased them 1200  
3 degrees. Most of that is an undergraduate area,  
4 graduate professional degrees, I'm proud of this  
5 too. We have increased the number of  
6 underrepresented minority, particularly African  
7 American graduates by over 60%.

8 We had 312 graduates last year for the first  
9 time, African Americans, for the first time in our  
10 history and we have led the State of Kentucky in the  
11 number of African American graduates. If you look  
12 at the 1200 graduates that we have every year in an  
13 increase, about 50% of that can be attributed to  
14 underrepresented minorities or low income students.

15 We will do Kentucky and this country a disservice  
16 if we do not provide a degree to that category of  
17 student, especially the low income. It is a ticket  
18 to economic and social mobility and that is a chief  
19 responsibility of a land grant research university.

20 I hope you all took pride to know that we had our  
21 first Rhodes Scholar in sometime in Hadeel Abdullah  
22 and what a delightful person. Our UK Leads Program,  
23 which you've heard about, where we're pushing more  
24 of our financial aid to a needs based dimension.  
25 We've increased that. We were in Washington D.C.

1 with a group of people last week and again its  
2 recognized nationally. Hopefully others will  
3 follow. It is, I believe, a standard that our state  
4 will follow. This year was the first year that we  
5 had full allocations of money in the new State  
6 Performance Funding Model.

7 So there are eleven dimensions in that model. We  
8 are the only university in the State of Kentucky  
9 that measured at a high enough level that we got  
10 funding on each one of those dimensions. The next  
11 university, I believe, only reached five or six of  
12 those.

13 So, we had eleven out of eleven, again,  
14 remarkable. This weekend, this Friday, I hope  
15 you'll all be there where were going to award more  
16 than 2,000 degrees. To be around our students and  
17 our families at that time is a wonderful model to  
18 share and I hope you can attend. I also am pleased  
19 to note that nobody is resting on our laurels?

20 Theres a lot of things we've done that given the  
21 competitive environment we live in, the demographic  
22 trends that we notice, we have to be, you know,  
23 nimble and agile to move forward to maintain a  
24 competitive edge. So, I want to applaud especially  
25 the Provost and Vice President for finance,

1 administration and effort they've led on Our Path  
2 Forward.

3 We put out a proposal, two week turn around,  
4 RFD, called for proposals, we get 48 responses for  
5 the programs. Thank you, Jennifer, and all of you  
6 for bringing to tack on an extra meeting in January  
7 so that we can quickly take a look at these and  
8 figure out ways we can move forward, not for a  
9 second diminishing the scrutiny we want to give all  
10 new programs, but move forward quickly to extend our  
11 mission through more educational opportunities and  
12 to do what we've tried to do in a five-year budget  
13 plan.

14 We want to offer good programs, new programs that  
15 are relevant. We want more graduates. We want to  
16 continue what we think is important to our success  
17 which is infrastructure and talent, investments. We  
18 have a plan that I'll thank many who worked on a  
19 five/six year plan for building, for tackling some  
20 of our infrastructure, focusing on the hard campus  
21 now.

22 We'll be presenting this to our Board of  
23 Trustees and the Deans. Many people have seen it  
24 but it is a way forward and then our ambitious goal  
25 which is to have a solid pay pool every year for the

1 next five years. In the area of research there are  
2 lots of measures of research and I do not mean to  
3 overlook any of those. An easy one for me to track,  
4 which is correlated with a lot of other research,  
5 not funded, is the external support we get and  
6 expenditures.

7 So just three years ago we were at \$330 some odd  
8 million. We're at \$378 million as our projection  
9 for this year, an 8% increase over last year. Our  
10 compound annual growth rate for the last three years  
11 is 7%.

12 I had Vice President Cassis compare us against us  
13 a sort of a benchmark group of very prominent  
14 research universities. Our pace of increase is far  
15 above those. So, thank you for that as well. So,  
16 we are the University for Kentucky, that I get to  
17 proudly say and when Kentucky first said we hurt we  
18 must answer the call. One area in particular that I  
19 think calls out individuals, families and  
20 communities today and we can get our hands around  
21 it, it will undermine the fabric of our communities  
22 and it will undermine our economy, and that is the  
23 opioid epidemic.

24 Tomorrow, I believe, we will submit our Kentucky  
25 Can Heal Grant. It's a multi-year grant. The



1 proposal for this demanded that a research  
2 university take a lead, work with partners  
3 throughout the state, different agencies, healthcare  
4 entities, and the goal was you had to come up with a  
5 plan to reduce opioid deaths and events by 40% in 3  
6 years. That's what we're taking on. That's what  
7 we've submitted, a solid proposal to do for  
8 Kentucky.

9 Those are the kinds of things and many others  
10 that I'll share with you this afternoon that lead  
11 people to invest in the University of Kentucky. I  
12 hope you've all heard about our Kentucky Can  
13 Campaign, \$2.1 Billion Capital Campaign. Tomorrow  
14 at our Board of Trustees Meeting, we will announce  
15 another significant record setting again, interest  
16 to Kentucky that gets to the heart of what were  
17 about.

18 The Provost has impaneled search committees for  
19 communication and information, libraries and  
20 education. The search committees represent a  
21 diverse cross section of our campus including staff  
22 and these will have all these individuals who  
23 participated in a conscious bar train and this  
24 process is designed to emphasize the importance of  
25 bringing excellent talent to the University of

1 Kentucky and a very diverse group of candidates.

2 In closing, I want to thank you again. And I'm  
3 happy to take questions. I hope to see you at  
4 commencement. A special thanks to you, Jennifer.  
5 It's been wonderful working with you. Generally I  
6 close with an email that I received. I get these  
7 things. I just love them. (LAUGHTER). This is the  
8 kind of email that now you can't measure this in a  
9 number of graduate or research dollars. Now this is  
10 us.

11 Dear Dr. Capilouto, as many times as I get  
12 frustrated at idiots in the world, every now and  
13 then someone comes along and restores my faith in  
14 humanity. Our daughter, I will not mention her  
15 name, accidentally left the lights on in her car  
16 last night while it was in the parking structure.  
17 She came out to a dead battery. She asked several  
18 for help but no one had any cables.

19 A man, who is an employee at UK came along and  
20 helped her out. Not only did he get her car jumped,  
21 he then gave her an emergency kit with jumper  
22 cables, a flashlight, rain poncho, gloves, first aid  
23 supplies and a wrench. He told her everyone needed  
24 one in their car and he could just pick up another  
25 kit for himself later.

1 My child, unfortunately did not get his name. If  
2 you're here, stand up. (LAUGHTER) I really wish we  
3 knew. I'd love to personally thank him. We live  
4 just outside of the city in the midwest pretty far  
5 from here and it's reassuring to know that there are  
6 people like him not only working there but actually  
7 caring for the students while the students parents  
8 live so far away.

9 I just wanted to let you know how proud you should  
10 be to have such a compassionate employee on your  
11 staff. There's some really good people in the world  
12 and UK is fortunate to have one of those doing good  
13 deeds. (APPLAUSE). So, Jennifer, not to encroach on  
14 your agenda --

15 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: No, no, so we --

16 PRESIDENT CAPILOUTO: Before I go off, before  
17 I go I have to say this. I work with an incredible  
18 team of people many of whom are here today. Many  
19 are Provosts Dave Blackwell, we have Eric Monday,  
20 Lisa Cassis, Bill Swinford, Sonja Feist-Price.  
21 Family comes first, she had to be with her daughter  
22 and couldn't be here today but faculty is  
23 representing her.

24 Mike Ritchie from our Philanthropy cannot be  
25 here. He's over with our Board meeting and Mark

1 Newman has our Health Committee Meeting of the  
2 Board. And I hope I didn't overlook. This is a  
3 wonderful team of people and I owe them a great deal  
4 of thanks and I wanted them all to come today  
5 because they can help me answer questions.

6 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Then we'll open it for  
7 questions. We've got plenty of time to do this.  
8 That's why we adjusted the agenda today. So, we'll  
9 just ask as always that you announce your name and  
10 college affiliation when you ask your question --  
11 President Capilouto will take your question. Okay.  
12 I guess that's it.

13 MR. CRAMER: Cramer Engineering. So, we're  
14 creating these new programs and we have sort of ways  
15 to assess whether these programs are working  
16 academically, but the programs are also being  
17 created as part of the Our Path Forward and the  
18 financial situation of the university. How will the  
19 administration assess whether those, the programs  
20 were actually -- what effect they are having along  
21 those lines?

22 PRESIDENT CAPILOUTO: Be a little more  
23 specific. I'll turn to the Provost.

24 MR. CRAMER: How will we know that --

25 PRESIDENT CAPILOUTO: What would you want to

1 know?

2 MR. CRAMER: I would want to know how we know  
3 that creating this many programs will actually, like  
4 what effect that has actually had on the  
5 university's financial picture.

6 PRESIDENT CAPILOUTO: Oh, the financial  
7 picture I think we can measure certainly because  
8 these will be programs that are largely tuition. I  
9 think in terms of the contribution to the state and  
10 moving us forward, I'll say that we have to be the  
11 heartbeat of advancing culture and commerce in  
12 Kentucky.

13 Some of those measures are a little more elusive,  
14 not like many of the things we are doing now, but I  
15 think when you're adding more than 1000 graduates a  
16 year than you did five years ago, and you continue  
17 at that pace, you can hold it and you add these kind  
18 of programs and the number of college graduates that  
19 you make available to Kentucky is critical.

20 The opportunities we've had and I'll look around  
21 people in the room who attended at the table too,  
22 when we work with entities, city's, states, profit  
23 concerns, to attract new business entities in  
24 Kentucky or to keep them here I mean the first thing  
25 they want to ask about is your workforce. Do you

1 want to add anything Provost Blackwell?

2 PROVOST BLACKWELL: Thank you. I wasn't sure  
3 who had asked -- Oh, there you are, thank you for  
4 the question. So the, in actuality whats happening  
5 with the twenty-six programs that were funded in  
6 this first launch, a number of them are distinct  
7 degree programs at UK and we are simply increasing  
8 access to the state by offering them online.

9 It has given, you know how broad the state is  
10 that that's very important. So they could be  
11 subject to the same type of program review learning  
12 outcomes assessment that any program on campus would  
13 be subject to as well as any of the new programs  
14 that will come out of it will also be subject to  
15 that, but largely on -- my initiative is trying to  
16 reach two audiences.

17 One is to try to satisfy some workforce needs in  
18 the state. So, these are primarily adult learners  
19 that were trying to reach out to and that will be a  
20 net addition to our impact and a net addition to our  
21 commencements so that will be easily measured. Then  
22 some of the others are intended to augment the  
23 degree programs of students both graduate and  
24 undergraduate students that are already on campus  
25 through some innovative certificate programs.

1           So, it will be some options for students to add  
2 a skill-set that will help them in the job market  
3 and of course well be monitoring the enrollments in  
4 those. Yes?

5           MR. BROWN: Allen Brown, Arts and Sciences.  
6 You mention retention rates and graduation rates,  
7 both those have gone up and I understand that that  
8 is a very multifaceted, very complex issue, but it's  
9 also one of the metrics that is one of the most  
10 important it seems like in comparing us to other  
11 institutions.

12           Do you have a sense of what students would be the  
13 most significant lever we have in that area? It  
14 seems like if that's a metric that the university is  
15 being judged on, it would be important to know  
16 what's moving that needle. Right?

17           PRESIDENT CAPILOUTO: Again, I'll try to say  
18 on behalf of the Provost and others, I'll say  
19 there's no silver bullet to this.

20           MR. BROWN: Right.

21           PRESIDENT CAPILOUTO: You know it takes what I  
22 would call micro interventions for a macro effect.  
23 I'll turn to the Provost and let him elaborate.

24           PROVOST BLACKWELL: Thank you. So, largely in  
25 terms of retention rate, we've analyzed extensively

1 with all the data that we have on the two million,  
2 on student success and there's really two large  
3 drivers of the retention rate. One is financial  
4 need, unmet financial need. So that's if you look  
5 at the cost of attending, less all the financial  
6 weight and scholarships and theres still a  
7 difference left and once that need, unmet need, gets  
8 above a threshold of about \$5,000, we've found that  
9 the probability of persistence goes way down.

10 So that was the idea behind UK Leads, was to  
11 focus more money in that direction. The other big  
12 one is belonging and inclusiveness. The ability for  
13 a student to show up on campus and feel welcomed, to  
14 not feel overwhelmed, to have a good experience  
15 those first few weeks, to get the right kind of  
16 counseling both on curriculum, advising, making sure  
17 they're engaged in the residents halls with  
18 activities and things like LLPs, greek life, student  
19 organizations, all contribute to that.

20 But we also have, I guess, very intentional  
21 engagement with students around that where we are  
22 actually trying to use the data to identify those  
23 students who are most at risk because of the  
24 belonging factor, if you will. Yes?

25 MS. DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A&S. So, I remember



1 hearing in the spring that the state had failed to  
2 restore the appropriations to the University Press.  
3 I'm wondering what are the consequences of that  
4 decision and what are the plans for the press going  
5 forward?

6 PRESIDENT CAPILOUTO: I'm going to turn it to  
7 the Provost again. See, I used to be a Provost.  
8 You're a lot better at this.

9 PROVOST BLACKWELL: Oh, I didn't see who asked  
10 the question. Oh, you asked the question. Yeah.  
11 So, I'll just give you an update on where we are.  
12 So, the -- going all the way back to the beginning  
13 the Governor had taken the funding for the press out  
14 of his budget proposal. I think somewhere along the  
15 way it made its way back in but then it, at the very  
16 end, all of the funding for the press was cut. That  
17 totaled \$682,000.00. I remember it quite well.

18 So, once the process played out, I met on  
19 different occasions with Chief Academic Officers of  
20 other institutions of Kentucky, all of whom are  
21 members of the Press Consortium and the Leadership  
22 of the Press, Leila Salisbury and we wanted to have  
23 Leila really take a look at the operation and see if  
24 we could drive that financial need to a lower  
25 number.

1           So she's able to get it down from \$682 down to  
2 \$500,000.00, which is good. And then based on that  
3 we created a formula with some input from the advice  
4 -- Editorial Board, it's called, that governs the  
5 press on how to share the remaining among the  
6 universities.

7           So we devised a scheme that was based on,  
8 partially on enrollment and faculty headcount and  
9 how frequently the press had been used by the  
10 various universities over time and we put that  
11 scheme out there. Not surprisingly, UK out of the  
12 500,000, we would be putting roughly 100,000 of that  
13 500 under this scheme.

14           I think U of L was in for about 80-something  
15 thousand and the rest in smaller amounts. Usually  
16 around 14 or 15,000 to the other regional  
17 comprehensives and some of the private liberal arts  
18 schools. So far U K and U of L have made their  
19 commitment. We have had some of the smaller,  
20 private universities and some of the more struggling  
21 comprehensives decline to make a commitment.

22           So we're, you know, were floating it right now  
23 but there is an opportunity to get some additional  
24 fill in prospect support. So once we've gotten  
25 responses from all of the universities yay or nay,

1 we will approach that foundation about backfilling  
2 it and I hope, you know, that by February, before  
3 our budget cycle really starts to have more concrete  
4 information about the press.

5 MS. DEBSKI: Could that fill in profit  
6 support be short term solution or a long term  
7 solution?

8 PROVOST BLACKWELL: It may be initially a short  
9 term solution. This foundation has indicated  
10 they're willing to backfill for a year or two to  
11 help us figure out a way forward, but longer term  
12 its going to have to be philanthropy, I think, that  
13 fills that gap. I mean, reality is if you look at  
14 these University Presses around the country, they  
15 all get subsidized. None of them are making money  
16 or even breaking even.

17 They all get subsidized and so were trying to  
18 address that reality by being more efficient but  
19 also by trying to enlist our other institutions in  
20 the state to help us along with philanthropy.

21 PRESIDENT CAPILOUTO: Thank you. Yes, let's  
22 go to the back.

23 MS. BRION: Gail Brion, College of  
24 Engineering. So the last time you came here it was  
25 outlined, a budget poll that we were facing and I

1 Know were making new programs and that but can you  
2 tell us where we are with that and what you're  
3 administration is continuing to try to do to help?

4 PRESIDENT CAPILOUTO: It is what we are going  
5 to do. I'm going to turn to our Vice President of  
6 finance to briefly summarize our five year financial  
7 plan. We've decided not to plan so shortsightedly.  
8 So, Eric Monday.

9 MR. MONDAY: Welcome. Thank you. So, we have  
10 a five year financial plan that several of you have  
11 referenced called Our Path Forward. We are in the  
12 second year of that. We were able to balance the  
13 budget in year one. We're rolling into year two.  
14 The focus of that was a multi-effort initiative  
15 across the campus to look at a number of objectives  
16 and new policies, new strategies to generate  
17 additional revenue.

18 One thing we like to talk about is we want to  
19 operate on the right side of the equation. Now  
20 theres no way to cut our way to success. So, how do  
21 we generate additional revenues? To your point  
22 about enrollments, how do we look at new programs,  
23 new delivery strategies? How do we look at how we  
24 pay our bills and efficiencies and effectiveness and  
25 different strategies?

1       So, we're working about six initiatives right now.  
2       It was Dean led, faculty participated in all of  
3       those initiatives and now we've moved to the  
4       implementation phase. The goal is to generate or  
5       reduce expenses to the tune of somewhere between \$30  
6       and \$40 million dollars a year. And that would then  
7       allow us to do the pay raise each year the President  
8       talks about, do the infrastructure needs that we  
9       have on the campus to also look at a modest tuition  
10      and fee increase.

11       So, we are targeting for a tuition and fee  
12      increase for this upcoming year of about 2.4%.  
13      That's what we had talked about last year which  
14      would give us the lowest two year tuition and fee  
15      increase, we did 2.5 last year, in the last thirty  
16      years at this institution. So, where are we right  
17      now? We're working very -- very hard to implement  
18      those six initiatives to generate those needed  
19      revenues that we need to close that gap for the  
20      fiscal year. And that's what were working on -- on  
21      a daily basis.

22           PROVOST BLACKWELL: I want to add one thing  
23      that's coming up. I know the Deans, Associate Deans  
24      and Department Chairs have -- should have been  
25      invited to a session on December 12th and each of

1 the implementation teams. I think we have six of  
2 those Our Path Forward projects going on right now  
3 are going to provide an update of where they are in  
4 that process. So, I'd encourage your Deans,  
5 Associate Deans, Department Chairs to attend.

6 We are hoping that will, you know, help us do a  
7 better job of getting the word out on progress of  
8 the plan.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Arts and Sciences. I was  
10 wondering if you know if there was specific measures  
11 we took that increased the diversity of the  
12 graduating class. Was it a natural result of the  
13 retention measures?

14 PRESIDENT CAPILOUTO: I think it was several  
15 things. I will compliment everybody because it  
16 really takes everybody to move numbers like that.  
17 Six years ago we made it to a point where we doubled  
18 the amount of financial aid provided to our park  
19 rewards program, that certainly has an impact. We  
20 think about it in the ways we recruit, where we  
21 recruit, who does the recruiting.

22 We have, and I want to talk with the Provost and  
23 his team for being here today. What we've decided  
24 to that we want to start interacting with student  
25 the minute they decide they are coming to the

1 University of Kentucky. If you can start that  
2 belonging early and you can prepare someone for what  
3 could be a difficult transition early, get a head  
4 start on it, we think we can be more successful. So  
5 there are a lists of things that we've done.

6 MR. FARRELL: Herman Farrell, College of Fine  
7 Arts. So, President Capilouto, I'm sorry I'm going  
8 to ask a tough question, but I'll preface it with  
9 this note, that what I've always appreciated about  
10 your leadership is that you've been always  
11 proactive.

12 When there have been racial institutes on  
13 campus, you have been at the forefront of stating  
14 publicly for all of us to hear on behalf of the  
15 faculty, students and staff, your concerns and  
16 you're very sort of whole position on those sorts of  
17 incidents as well as even what's going on with Our  
18 Path Forward with a very proactive way of dealing  
19 with the demographic issues that were facing in the  
20 future.

21 So, I am bringing up the issue here of the  
22 settlement that took place this weekend. I  
23 understand that it's a legal case, it's a settlement  
24 but I understand that the position, from what I read  
25 in the paper, is that the position has been that

1 there was no fault from the part of the  
2 administration but it did create some issues that I  
3 would hope going forward you and the Provost, as  
4 well as Deans could take a sort of active, out front  
5 approach about the questions that were raised.

6 So the questions that appears to me were raised  
7 from that settlement as well as from that case was  
8 that the faculty member had spoken publicly on a  
9 public issue. There was some sort of, according to  
10 the reporting, there was some sort of response  
11 coming from the Governor's office into the  
12 administration and then there were consequences to  
13 that faculty member.

14 So that really does affect academic freedom and  
15 it frightens me as a faculty member and I'm sure it  
16 frightens folks in this room. So I would ask if  
17 it's possible, maybe perhaps not now, maybe perhaps  
18 not in this room because it's too close to the  
19 settlement, but at some point in the future that you  
20 would take a sort of a more sort of proactive  
21 approach to what was implicated there.

22 And basically in my own personal opinion some  
23 sort of statement back towards the government, any  
24 government agency that they cant have the power to  
25 leave and effect our faculty and to kind of respond



1 to things that they are doing in a very public  
2 manner that is I think part of their reason for  
3 being in this state is that they engage in public  
4 policy discourse.

5 PRESIDENT CAPILOUTO: Thank you for your  
6 question. I'm happy to answer it and in respecting  
7 the parties agreed. First of all, universities of  
8 imperfect places sometimes and then it's unfortunate  
9 when we have to resolve things sometimes in a legal  
10 context. The courts asked us to sit down and  
11 mediate, which we all did in good faith.

12 And I think we all moved forward in a way that  
13 honors the faculty member and our commitment to  
14 improving health in Kentucky. Let me clarify a  
15 couple of things. There was a contention in this  
16 case about intervention by governmental officials.  
17 That part of the case was thrown out.

18 I know no circumstance where the Governor or  
19 anybody in the Governors administration said  
20 anything to undermine academic freedom. I've been  
21 here seven and a half years. I've never had an  
22 elected official, I've served under two Governors,  
23 tell me anything about someones employment, period,  
24 especially no one has ever said anything to me  
25 employment related to what someone said and you say

1 controversial things and it is my responsibility to  
2 defend you when you say and that's where I stand on  
3 it. Thank you. Other questions?

4 MS. ODOM-FORREN: Jan Odom-Forren from the  
5 College of Nursing. I was wondering if you could  
6 talk for just a few minutes about what we are doing  
7 to increase the needs based financial support for  
8 students because you kind of mentioned that but I  
9 was wondering what we were doing?

10 PRESIDENT CAPILOUTO: Sure. So, we, you know,  
11 this started a few years ago and we wanted to know  
12 what works. So, we first did careful analysis,  
13 developed a model that helped us anticipate gee if  
14 we intervened what kind of impact would it have? So,  
15 that's what we predicted.

16 Then we applied the money. We ran our trial and  
17 we looked at what was observed and we -- when we  
18 applied money to one pilot group it increased the  
19 retention rate first year by 20 absolute percentage  
20 points over what was expected had we not done  
21 anything. All right? So, we repeated that.

22 We've got two pools that we've gone through. We  
23 also, during that period, were able to sit down with  
24 donors who care deeply about this and say Look this  
25 worked. You want to make an investment that works

1 with some specificity, here it is. So stay tuned  
2 tomorrow as we announce another investment along  
3 these lines and it's gotta be a cornerstone to our  
4 campaign. This unmet need that the Provost talked  
5 about in any given year for our students, it's \$60  
6 million dollars. Close that gap so that you move  
7 those success rates, that's a lot of money and we  
8 want to work towards being able to spend money but  
9 also endow money so that this impact we have is in  
10 perpetuate. Thank you.

11 MS. DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A&S. So, it was  
12 mentioned that we have to, of course, find new ways  
13 to generate more revenue to close potential budget  
14 gaps and it always seems that increasing the number  
15 of students we serve is an important part of that of  
16 increasing the revenues.

17 And the word efficiency was also mentioned and  
18 I'm wondering are there any models that kind of --  
19 or any way of you guys predicting with the amount of  
20 classroom space we have with the amount of faculty  
21 we have, you know what is the size of the student  
22 body we should be serving if we were working at max  
23 efficiency?

24 PRESIDENT CAPILOUTO: So, a very good question.  
25 What we tried to do for instance in planning our

1 infrastructure and space going forward is to look at  
2 exactly those kind of benchmarks. If you were able  
3 to anticipate that kind of enrollment. You know  
4 looking at some decent standards around the country  
5 that are used, what kind of space would you need?  
6 We can certainly looking at gross figures on  
7 faculty/student ratio.

8 When you start getting down to the granular  
9 leaven in a particular department or a particular  
10 program I think it gets a little more difficult.  
11 Alright? We have a group working in the Provost  
12 office that I hope they're working on some metrics  
13 we can use that helps us at the more granular level  
14 make those decisions because efficiencies involve  
15 thousands of decisions every day that everybody  
16 makes. And those who are closest to them can make,  
17 I believe, the best decisions if they're able to  
18 internalize the consequence of decision, both the  
19 cost and the revenues and so forth.

20 So in the new programs to get these things  
21 started and all, we have a revenue sharing situation  
22 that you know encourages this and it can analyze  
23 your cost and so forth. I think we will be better  
24 served if we, at some level, move more that sort of  
25 across the campus in a fair way because I believe

1 that is the best way to achieve, you know, the  
2 appropriate use of your resources which are  
3 precious. Other questions? Let me offer my deep  
4 gratitude again. I wish you all the best for a  
5 safe, joyous holidays with your family and friends  
6 and Ill look forward to seeing you on Friday. Thank  
7 you very much.

8 (APPLAUSE)

9 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: All right. Thank you  
10 President Capilouto. Thank you all for those very  
11 good questions. So back to the next item on our  
12 agenda is the minutes from November 12th. Those  
13 were circulated to you last week. We hadn't  
14 received any additional changes beyond that so  
15 unless I hear any objections now -- hearing none  
16 those minutes will stand approved as distributed by  
17 unanimous consent.

18 I have a few announcements that I will just go  
19 through quickly again in light of time. We will  
20 have a meeting in January. Again, a reminder,  
21 January 14th, second Monday as usual, 3:00-5:00, but  
22 it will not be in this room. This room was already  
23 booked when we decided we needed this meeting so we  
24 will have our meeting in White Hall, room 106.

25 You will get many more reminders about this so

1 please make a note of it and please do try to  
2 attend. We appreciate your commitment to this. In  
3 that January meeting we will have an update on  
4 campus security. This will be an update from Jay  
5 Blanton and Chief Monroe from the UKPD.

6 This has to do with the bomb scare that happened  
7 about a month ago on campus and they wanted an  
8 opportunity to speak to the Senate about the, both  
9 about the event itself and about the universities  
10 response, both the actual response by the  
11 administration, the police department and also the  
12 announcement and the communication that went out  
13 around it.

14 So that's the presentation well have in January.  
15 As I've mentioned to you before the President and  
16 the Senate Council have voted, have worked together  
17 to create an advisory group on sexual assault and  
18 sexual harassment. The nominees have been made for  
19 that group and the President and I are working  
20 together to form the committee. As soon as that  
21 committee is formed, I'll make an announcement.

22 The President will probably make an announcement  
23 to the university about that as well. So, you'll  
24 hear about it as soon as were complete -- as we've  
25 completed that. This online initiative you've

1 already heard mentioned a couple of times today, 48  
2 proposals were received and over 20 of them were  
3 funded. There'll be an update about this here in  
4 the Senate in January as well. The Provost will  
5 come with Associate Provost Kathy Kern to talk about  
6 the online initiative more broadly, a little bit  
7 about this request for proposals and the decision  
8 making process for funding those and the approval  
9 process which includes, of course, our approval  
10 process, the traditional Senate approval process as  
11 well.

12 This is just an announcement for you. One of the  
13 items that comes out of a proposal is a CIP code  
14 that's Classification of Instructional Program.  
15 This is an identification code that's associated  
16 with every program on campus. New programs have to  
17 identify a CIP code but existing programs all have  
18 one as well. Occasionally the Council on  
19 Postsecondary Education, so the state body, won't  
20 let the UK approved CIP code stand either for an  
21 existing program or for a new program for a variety  
22 of reasons.

23 Sometimes that's wrong. Sometimes it's the wrong  
24 code. Sometimes there are other changes involved  
25 and so sometimes with no associated change in the

1 program the CIP code has to be changed. So, the  
2 Senate Council Office, Sheila and I have worked with  
3 representatives from OSPIE, the Office for Strategic  
4 Planning and Institutional Effectiveness, that's  
5 Assistant Provost Amy Davis-Weber, who unfortunately  
6 couldn't be here today, to think about how to do  
7 this when this happens.

8 So what we've decided in instances where the CIP  
9 code has to change but there are no other associated  
10 changes with the program that will, OSPIE will do  
11 that. They'll notify us and Amy Davis-Weber will  
12 come and give an annual report to the Senate about  
13 all changes associated with that. If there's any  
14 proposed or required change beyond the CIP code, any  
15 changes at all, those will have to go through the  
16 Senate approval process.

17 So, this is for the most part merely a code  
18 change, if there's any other meaningful change that  
19 will have to come through as a program change. So,  
20 we'll have one more annual report at this time from  
21 Amy Weber. Okay. Another reminder tomorrow I hope  
22 you all have received notice about our Connect Blue  
23 reception which is the Senate reception with the  
24 Board of Trustees tomorrow at 2:00 p.m. We've asked  
25 for an R.S.V.P, but you can come anyway. It's okay,



1 even if you haven't RSVPd, please come make some  
2 time. Come and say hello. We'd love to see you  
3 tomorrow at 2:00. Take a little break. One more  
4 initiative happening at the Senate Council level,  
5 currently neither staff nor faculty who are on  
6 phased retirement are permitted to serve as a  
7 Senator or as a Trustee of the university.

8 The SRAC requested the Senate Council to consider  
9 changing the rules which would then potentially  
10 allow phased retirement faculty to run for these  
11 positions. So, I spoke about this with the  
12 President who asked for broader feedback about this  
13 issue before considering a change, which would  
14 require a change to the Administrative Regulation.

15 This would be a change that would have to happen  
16 at the President and Board level rather than at the  
17 Senate level. And so this is the steps were sort of  
18 in the midst of right now. I've met with Jon Gent  
19 who's the Chair of the Staff Senate, since this is  
20 an issue that would affect both faculty and staff.  
21 We've decided we'll develop what we believe are a  
22 list of major issues. And we'll share them with our  
23 respective executive body, that's the Senate Council  
24 for me and the Staff Senate Executive Body, Jon will  
25 share that with them.

1           We'll ask for additional thoughts from those  
2 bodies. That will happen in early to mid January  
3 and expand the list of what we think are the  
4 relevant issues and well create from that a survey  
5 and well send that survey to you, to the Staff  
6 Senate, to the University Senate, asking for your  
7 responses, so your thoughts on these issues related  
8 to the expansion of the right to serve as Senator or  
9 as a Trustee to people who are currently on phased  
10 retirement or who enter phased retirement amidst of  
11 their term.

12           Then what we do next will depend on what we hear  
13 from you. So, that will happen as I said both at  
14 the Staff Senate and University Senate and we'll  
15 sort of determine next steps on the basis of what we  
16 hear. Of course, you'll be given lots of notice  
17 before you get a survey like that. But I will be  
18 very eager for you to participate and to share your  
19 thoughts about those issues as they come before you.  
20 I think this is an area where faculty governance  
21 allows, requires really, feedback from the broader  
22 faculty before we make those changes.

23           One more reminder, you've seen this at every  
24 meeting so far. If you would like to have a new  
25 program in the fall of 2019 or other new curricular

1 matters these are the deadlines we've asked for. If  
2 your program or other curricular changes to be  
3 effective in the fall of 2019 these are the dates  
4 you have to keep in mind. For new degree programs  
5 we ask you to submit your materials by February 11th  
6 to the Senate Council Office. That means that  
7 they've already been approved by the Academic  
8 Council before that day.

9 So really this means pretty soon you have to get  
10 it to the Academic Council. That's for a new  
11 degree. If you're asking for a new certificate,  
12 transfer of a degree, new department, change to  
13 credit hours, significant program change, etc, the  
14 deadline is March 15th. Again, it has to be through  
15 the Academic Council by that deadline and then if  
16 its another kind of program change or a minor then  
17 the deadline is April 15th.

18 So again, through the Academic Council to the  
19 Senate Council Office by these deadline is the best  
20 way to ensure a fall 2019 effective date for your  
21 changes. Again, we are here to help you meet these  
22 deadlines. We encourage your contact early and  
23 often, please. So that's the end of my  
24 announcements.

25 Now for my Chairs report: This is going to come

1 up a couple of different times over the course of  
2 the meeting today. So last week the Senate Council  
3 considered the Honorary Degrees which you will see  
4 today. There was a request from the Honorary Degree  
5 Committee to waive the Senate Rule, the Senate Rule  
6 permits, this one 5.4.2.3.C.1, permits five total  
7 Honorary Degrees per year and a maximum of four in  
8 any one meeting.

9 The Senate Council voted last week to waive that  
10 rule and forward to you five nominees today that in  
11 addition to the one degree which will be awarded on  
12 Friday at the December commencement would make six.  
13 So that would violate both the five per year and  
14 four per ceremony. We're going to talk more about  
15 this. The parliamentarian, Doug Michael, is going  
16 to make a brief report, this part of his report and  
17 I'm going to say more about this when we get to the  
18 Honorary Degrees section, but I just wanted to, as  
19 required, notify you that the Senate Council waived  
20 that rule in its meeting last week.

21 I was invited by President Capilouto to attend  
22 the annual visit to Washington D.C., which I did  
23 this week with several people who are here in the  
24 audience. We had presentations on the future of  
25 higher education, healthcare, anticipated

1 legislative changes and had a reception in the  
2 evening with legislators and legislative staffers.  
3 I'll be happy to talk more about that with any of  
4 you. It was a great event and nice that the faculty  
5 were there represented in addition to  
6 representatives from various college and the Vice  
7 President of research.

8 Next announcement, I guess, actually this is part  
9 of Chair's report. Roger is going to come up and  
10 tell us about election results.

11 MR. BROWN: Okay. Election season ended for the  
12 Senate Friday. Since our last meeting the Senate  
13 Council met and elected the new Finance Chair Elect,  
14 that will be the person who is the Vice Chair in the  
15 getting to June 1st and going for the next year.  
16 The Vice Chair Elect was Kaveh Tagavi. (APPLAUSE).

17 The other election that we've held this fall  
18 season is for the three new members of Senate  
19 Council. That also concluded on Friday. I want to  
20 thank everyone for all of my emails that you read,  
21 your nominations, your voting and especially to  
22 those who are willing to serve in this important  
23 role. After the second and final round of voting it  
24 was concluded, I sent an email out this morning that  
25 the three new enate Council members who will start

1 their roles on January 1st in alphabetical order  
2 DeShana Collett from Health Sciences, Aaron Cramer  
3 from Engineering and Gregory Hall from the Graduate  
4 School. If you are here please stand up and  
5 identify yourself. These are our three new members  
6 of Senate Council. There's Aaron. (APPLAUSE).

7 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Thank you very much to  
8 Roger and to Davey for administering those  
9 elections. We appreciate it. Thanks to everyone  
10 who ran. Those who ran and weren't elected this  
11 time, please consider running again next year. We  
12 had a great pool of candidates and I'd love to have  
13 another great pool next year. Just so you know the  
14 reason we don't have a Trustees report today is  
15 because our Trustees are attending the Board of  
16 Trustees meeting. That's why they're not here  
17 today. We will hear from them again in January.

18 We have the Provost report, but I think nothing  
19 to report. He already got to speak and said Provost  
20 Blackwell -- he says thank you.

21 PROVOST BLACKWELL: Thank you, for helping us  
22 with Our Path Forward.

23 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: He says thank you.  
24 Excellent. He'll make a report, I think, in January  
25 with Assistant Provost Kathy Kern as I mentioned and

1 so we'll wait for that. Anything from our Vice  
2 Chair? Nothing to report. So our Parliamentarian  
3 has a brief report.

4 PARLIAMENTARIAN: Thank you, Jennifer. This  
5 may be nitpicking but nits are my business so humor  
6 just a minute. You will be asked later to vote on  
7 candidates for Honorary Degrees. Like Jennifer said  
8 you're being presented five candidates although the  
9 rule really permits only four and what the Senate  
10 Council did was to waive the Senate rule to that  
11 effect and they are coming here.

12 What do -- the Senate doesn't abide by its own  
13 sub-Senate rules. If we were talking about rules of  
14 procedure then yes, there'd be something for me to  
15 say. So, I'm also nitpicking that I'm a little off  
16 my jurisdiction. So I'll try to make it brief. The  
17 Senate doesn't waive its own sub-senate rules. If  
18 you have a rule that says there is supposed to be  
19 four candidates and you nominate five, you've done  
20 both of those things.

21 Now, it's up to somebody else to figure out what  
22 does that mean. And I encourage you if you are  
23 going to nominate five people to say we are doing  
24 this knowing that it's in violation of this rule and  
25 we want to do that. So everybody is good with that.

1 Now, that's the parliamentarily correct way to do  
2 it. Our Chair is not going to do it that way  
3 because it seems unseemly in the context of these  
4 five wonderful people we have for any one of them or  
5 the person who would be the fifth candidate to bear  
6 the weight of that debate on whether we should have  
7 five candidates.

8 So, I believe she's going to ask you to waive the  
9 Senate rules, but technically what you are doing is  
10 making a motion that we know that we were basically  
11 going to ignore the rule 5.4.3. -- anyway .2.3.C.1  
12 and we're doing that knowing what we're doing and  
13 that will -- then if you do that, we can then talk  
14 about the candidates, without any one of them  
15 bearing the brunt of whether or not you think there  
16 should be five candidates. But the proper way to do  
17 it would be to fix the rule. And that's the rules  
18 committee, not my job.

19 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Okay. This is what you  
20 do when you let your Senate be run by lawyers. So,  
21 our first action item today is the December 2018  
22 Degree list. This has been circulated to you. We  
23 did receive some adjustments. There were three  
24 undergraduate students and one Masters student added  
25 to the list that was circulated last week. You have



1 a motion before you from the Senate Council that the  
2 elected faculty Senators only please, only vote. If  
3 you are an elected faculty Senator, please vote to  
4 approve the UK December 2018, list of candidates for  
5 their credentials for submission to the President  
6 through the President to the Board of Trustees.

7 Yes, Senator Jones?

8 MR. JONES: Yes, this typo comes up every  
9 once in a while for submission THROUGH the President  
10 to the Board.

11 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: I corrected it in my  
12 speaking.

13 MR. JONES: Oh, I'm sorry.

14 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: But the rule is it's  
15 through the motion, but it's true it's incorrect  
16 here. So we'll say for submission through the  
17 President to the Board of Trustees. I'm not able --  
18 can we correct that in real time, Sheila? On our  
19 slide?

20 SECRETARY BROTHERS: I wouldn't risk it.

21 (LAUGHTER)

22 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: It's a little tricky but  
23 we will make sure it's recorded in the minutes that  
24 the motion is through the President to the Board of  
25 Trustees. Okay. So any debate on this motion?

1 Okay. So, I will put the motion on the floor. This  
2 is a motion to approve the December 2018 Degree  
3 list. Again, only elected faculty Senators please  
4 cast your votes. Okay. And the motion passes.  
5 Great, thank you very much. I'm sure they will be  
6 very happy with those.

7 Okay. So the next item on the agenda is the  
8 late addition to the December 2015 Degree list.  
9 This comes to us from the College of Arts and  
10 Sciences. This is a student who entered UK in fall  
11 2011 to pursue a BA in Art History and Visual  
12 studies. In spring of 2015 the student declared a  
13 second degree which is a BA in Anthropology.  
14 Between 2011 and 2015 the requirements for a BA in  
15 Anthropology, for a Degree in Anthropology changed  
16 and the student graduated with that BA in Art  
17 History in December of 2015. The student had  
18 applied to graduate with the Anthropology Degree on  
19 the same date but the Anthropology Degree was denied  
20 on the basis of the criteria in place in 2015 even  
21 though the credits hearing should've been based on  
22 the 2011 criteria.

23 So, the student had declared a second major but  
24 should've been held to the 2011 standards rather  
25 than the 2015 standards. The student realized the

1 error after the degree had been awarded. The  
2 College of Art and Sciences admits the error and  
3 supports the awarding of this degree. The Senate  
4 Council voted on this and voted to recommend that --  
5 we've got it right on this one -- through the  
6 President to the Board of Trustees that the degree  
7 be awarded and retroactively be effective back to  
8 December 2015. So, any comments or arguments or  
9 whats the word I'm looking for?

10 Unidentified male: Debate?

11 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Debate. Any debate on  
12 this motion? Thank you. Hearing none, I will put  
13 the motion on the floor. Again, only elected  
14 faculty Senators please. The motion passes. Thank  
15 you.

16 Then the next item on our agenda is our In  
17 Memoriam Degree and Kalea Benner from College of  
18 Social Work is going to present this for us.

19 MS. BENNER: Thank you. We are seeking that  
20 an In Memoriam Degree be awarded to our student  
21 Justin Prater. Justin didn't follow the traditional  
22 path of a college student. He enlisted whenever he  
23 got out of high school. He served two tours in  
24 Afghanistan. When he got out from him service he  
25 wanted to come back and he wanted to help other

1 veterans transition back to life after deployment.  
2 Sadly, he died a year ago. We would like to honor  
3 him with that In Memoriam Degree. He was successful  
4 as a social works student on a clear path to  
5 graduation as well.

6 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Are there any questions of  
7 fact for Professor Benner? Okay. Excellent. Thank  
8 you. So, the Senate Council voted to recommend this  
9 item that the again elected faculty Senators approve  
10 this student as a recipient of an In Memoriam Degree  
11 for submission through the President to the Board of  
12 Trustees. Any debate on that motion? Hearing none,  
13 we'll open it for voting. Again, elected Faculty  
14 Senate members only, please. The motion passes.  
15 Great, thank you.

16 The next item on our agenda is our Honorary  
17 Degree Recipients so Dean Brian Jackson is here from  
18 the Graduate School to make the presentation. I'll  
19 just remind you that these names are embargoed and  
20 we ask you not to mention the names outside of this  
21 room.

22 The President would want anyone that we decide  
23 to award an Honorary Degree to or recommend the  
24 award of an Honorary Degree, the President would  
25 want to reach out to them directly. So, we wouldn't

1 want these names to leave here. So please keep them  
2 confidential.

3 MR. JACKSON: Good afternoon. On behalf of  
4 the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees  
5 it's my pleasure to present the nominees for May  
6 2019 presentation. First nominee is Steven B.  
7 Bright. Mr. Bright received a Bachelors Degree in  
8 Political Science and subsequently a law degree from  
9 UK in the 1970s. In 1982 he was named the Director  
10 of a Southern Center for Human Rights and later  
11 became its President. While leading the center he  
12 focused on defendants facing the death penalty.

13 He was instrumental in getting the American Bar  
14 Association to establish the Death Penalty  
15 Representation Project. While serving SCHR he  
16 taught at a number of prestigious law schools  
17 including American University, Harvard, Yale,  
18 Georgetown. He is indeed a prolific legal scholar  
19 on the right to legal counsel, the death penalty,  
20 race and poverty, injustice system and judicial  
21 independence.

22 He's received multiple awards including the  
23 American Bar Association Thurgood Marshall Award,  
24 the Roger Baldwin Medal of Liberty from the American  
25 Civil Liberties Union. He's also received several

1 honorary degrees including one from the University  
2 of Louisville Career Center, Emory University and  
3 Georgetown University.

4 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: We're going to vote on  
5 these as they come forward rather than voting on  
6 them as a group. So the Senate Council voted in  
7 favor of the motion from the committee and voted to  
8 award or to recommend that Steven Bright receive an  
9 Honorary Doctor of Laws. So are there questions of  
10 fact related to this motion? Yes.

11 MR. SWANSON: Yes, Mark Swanson, Public  
12 Health. So is this one of the more than our allowed  
13 by the rule nominations?

14 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: No.

15 MR. SWANSON: This is a different thing?

16 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: So, there are four  
17 nominees that the committee forwarded to the Senate  
18 Council as the four nominees within the purview of  
19 the rule. There is a 5th nominee that they asked  
20 for a waiver in order to award as a 5th nomination.

21 MR. SWANSON: This is one of the four?

22 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: This is one of the four.  
23 Yes.

24 MR. TAGAVI: If you're not explicitly voting  
25 on waiving, which I'm fine with it --

1 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: That's not true.

2 MR. TAGAVI: When are we going to do that?

3 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: For the 5th nominee. I  
4 will bring it up before the 5th nominee. The  
5 recommendation from the committee and from the  
6 Senate Council is for these four to be the four that  
7 are awarded in accordance of the rules. There is a  
8 5th which the committee asked for a waiver of the  
9 rule for, which the Senate Council waived the rule  
10 in order to recommend and so we will discuss the  
11 waiver before the 5th nominee.

12 MR. TAGAVI: I was going to say I wish we  
13 don't say who is the 5th.

14 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: That's the way it is  
15 designed.

16 MR. TAGAVI: That's fine.

17 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Any other questions of  
18 fact? Yes?

19 MS. JOHNSON: Julie Ann Johnson, College of  
20 Arts and Sciences. So, I don't understand, is the  
21 5th person, like is this a ranks list?

22 MR. JACKSON: The situation we were in was  
23 that -- I should have said there were two meetings  
24 and the very first meeting and it was not  
25 particularly pleasant turnout of nominees. After

1 discussions with Senate Council and the Board of  
2 Trustees we were able to figure out a timetable that  
3 allows to extend the deadline for submitting  
4 nominations and on the second go around we were  
5 delighted with the number of candidates that we  
6 actually received.

7 In the original discussions and the way we polled  
8 the committee, that at that point in time the  
9 understanding was that we had the opportunity to  
10 nominate four, but by the time we got into the  
11 discussion it became evident that there probably was  
12 a 5th person who deserved our consideration too.

13 So, the original four were the ones that voted  
14 and probably came out in talks at that point in time  
15 in terms of the way we conducted the poll on the  
16 committee.

17 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: So, I would say that among  
18 the four, the first four you're going to hear is out  
19 of Medical. Yes?

20 MS. DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A&S. You already  
21 know that these people can attend the ceremony?

22 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: No, we have not reached  
23 out to them. We don't reach out to them until after  
24 the Board of Trustees votes for the --

25 MS. DEBSKI: Is it still possible, is it still



1 necessary to be able to get the Honorary Degree to  
2 show up at the ceremony?

3 MR. JACKSON: Yes.

4 MS. DEBSKI: So it's still possible that some  
5 of these people may not be able to attend that  
6 night.

7 MR. JACKSON: Correct. We're waiting the  
8 faculty's consideration.

9 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Other questions of fact?

10 MR. LOUHAN: Craig Louhan, The College of  
11 Design. I've got a question on the eligibility  
12 (coughing). While it says about the five limited  
13 the number of Honorary Doctoral Degrees be awarded  
14 for academic year is limited to five. Underneath  
15 Eligibility Requirements it lists that the number of  
16 Honorary Degrees at any given ceremony shall be  
17 limited to three.

18 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: No, it's four.

19 MR. LOUHAN: It says three on your website.

20 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: In the Rules it says  
21 four. It's possible the website is out of date.  
22 The Rules themselves, the stating rule limited to  
23 four per ceremony and five per academic season.  
24 Which I'm not sure which website you're looking at.

25 MR. LOUHAN: The Grad School at the

1 University --

2 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: We've got to update that.  
3 It's four per ceremony. So, in voting for the 5th  
4 the Senate will be waiving both components of that  
5 rule. Other questions of fact? Okay.

6 So I'll put on the floor the motion from the  
7 Senate Council that the elected faculty Senators  
8 approve Steven Bright as the recipient of an  
9 Honorary Doctor of Laws. So debate? Any debate on  
10 that motion? Okay. So again, remember this is  
11 limited to elected faculty Senators. So I'll open  
12 that for voting. Last votes? Okay. The motion  
13 passes. Okay.

14 MR. JACKSON: Our second nominee is Yvonne  
15 Giles. Ms. Giles over the last twenty years has  
16 been instrumental in covering the various histories  
17 of African Americans in Lexington's history. She  
18 made efforts to restore documents and maintain  
19 Lexington's African Cemetery Number Two, identifying  
20 over 1200 persons out of approximately 5000 buried  
21 there, notably only 600 or so were actually  
22 recognized with Headstones.

23 She founded a museum a dedicated to the sculptor  
24 Isaac Scott Hathaway who was born in Lexington in  
25 1874 and broke racial conventions with his artwork.

1 Ms. Giles was instrumental in creating Lexington's  
2 African American Heritage Trail. She has authored  
3 Still Voices Yet Speak, a history of African  
4 American cemeteries in Lexington and Fayette County.  
5 One of the first African American students to attend  
6 Lexington schools after integration.

7 Ms. Giles earned a BS in Home Economics at UK  
8 and followed that with a Masters in Food Science and  
9 Nutrition in 1977. She is also notable as the first  
10 African American Extension Agent in Oldham County.

11 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Okay. So again, the  
12 committee, the Honorary Degree Committee recommended  
13 awarding an Honorary Doctor of Humane Letters to Ms.  
14 Giles and the Senate Council recommended that to the  
15 Senate. So questions of fact related to this  
16 motion? So then I'll put the motion on the floor  
17 that the elected faculty Senators approve Yvonne  
18 Giles as the recipient of an Honorary Doctor of  
19 Humane Letters. Any debate on that motion? Any  
20 debate? Okay.

21 So I'll open for voting on that. Again,  
22 remember elected faculty Senators only for a  
23 recipient of an Honorary Doctor of Humane Letters  
24 for submission through the President to the Board of  
25 Trustees. Any last votes? The motion passes.

1           MR. JACKSON: Our 3rd nominee is Jim Host who  
2 graduated from UK with a Degree in Radio Arts in  
3 1955. He since has served in State Government as  
4 Commissioner of Public Information and Tourism  
5 followed by a term as Commissioner of Parks. In  
6 1969 he served as Chair of the Kentucky Horse Park  
7 Commission which ultimately led to the creation of  
8 the Kentucky Horse Park.

9           In 1971 he created Jim Host and Associates which  
10 later became Host Communications. Mr. Host served  
11 as Rupp Arenas first Executive Director. In 1974,  
12 Jim Host and Associates acquired exclusive radio  
13 rights to UK sports which led to the NCAA Radio  
14 Network Rights the following year. In 2006, Mr.  
15 Host was named as the Chair of the World Equestrian  
16 Games that was hosted at the Kentucky Horse Park in  
17 2010.

18           He's been named to the UK Hall of Distinguished  
19 Alumni and U K Athletics Hall of Fame and is  
20 recognized as outstanding alumnist by the College of  
21 Communication and as an outstanding business leader  
22 by the Gatton College.

23           CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Again, this was a  
24 recommendation from the Honorary Degree Committee to  
25 the Senate Council The Senate Council voted to

1 recommend this to the Senate that elected faculty  
2 Senators approve Mr. Host as the recipient of an  
3 Honorary Doctor of Humane Letters. Any questions of  
4 fact related to this motion? Okay. Hearing none,  
5 I'll put the motion on the floor that the faculty  
6 Senators, elected faculty Senators approve Mr. Host  
7 as the recipient of an Honorary Doctor of Humane  
8 Letters. Any debate on the motion? Okay.

9 Hearing none I'll open for voting for this  
10 motion. Oh goodness, hold on. There you go. No,  
11 this slide didn't work.

12 SECRETARY BROTHERS: If you click it once  
13 more, where does it go? No.

14 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: No, I don't know what  
15 happened. Can we do it now? Oh, okay let's vote.  
16 Sorry about that. These were technical  
17 difficulties. Final voting for Jim Host. Any last  
18 votes? Okay. The motion passes.

19 MR. JACKSON: Our fourth nominee, Howard L.  
20 Lewis. Mr. Lewis is the 10th child of a  
21 sharecropper family who went to a community college  
22 in Covington and then subsequently transferred to U  
23 Ks main campus, graduating in 1970 with a Degree in  
24 Business Administration which was subsequently  
25 followed by an MBA at Xavier University. In 1989,

1 Mr. Lewis started Family Heritage Life Insurance  
2 Company of America, which by 2012 served over a  
3 quarter of a million families. Mr. Lewis Chaired a  
4 successful U K Philanthropic campaign launched in  
5 2013 for the renovation expansion of the Gatton  
6 College of Business and Economics.

7 He has served as Board member or Special Advisor  
8 to multiple nonprofit organizations including Big  
9 Brother Greater Cincinnati, Wigs for Kids, St. Judes  
10 Research Hospital and the Heart to Heart Christian  
11 Academy serving intercity children dismissed from  
12 the public school system.

13 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: So again, this  
14 recommendation came from the committee to the Senate  
15 Council which voted to recommend to the Senate the  
16 awarding of an Honorary Degree, specifically an  
17 Honorary Doctor of Humane Letters to Mr. Lewis. Any  
18 questions of fact about this motion? Yes.

19 MS. DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A&S. So, do these  
20 people speak at the ceremony?

21 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: They do not, historically.

22 MS. DEBSKI: And when was the last time four  
23 degrees to be given out at one ceremony?

24 MR. JACKSON: Well, if one asks me about  
25 ceremony, there are actually four separate

1 ceremonies. So, the process --

2 MS. DEBSKI: I thought during one certain  
3 graduation.

4 MR. JACKSON: I'm not -- I'll have to check on  
5 that protocol.

6 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Other questions of fact  
7 for this motion? Okay. Then I'll put the motion on  
8 the floor that the elected faculty Senators approve  
9 Mr. Lewis as the recipient of an Honorary Doctor of  
10 Humane Letters. Debate on that motion? Any debate  
11 on this motion? Okay. So then we'll open voting.  
12 Final votes for this motion? Okay. The motion  
13 passes.

14 Okay. So as Professor Michael explained at  
15 the last Senate Council meeting the Senate Council  
16 voted to waive the Rule which incorporates two  
17 parts. That Rule includes both a limit on the total  
18 number of degrees, Honorary Degrees awarded in one  
19 academic year to five and limits the total number of  
20 degrees awarded at any one commencement to four.

21 So, the Senate Council voted to waive that Rule  
22 and before they knew the identify of the nominee and  
23 then voted to recommend the awarding of this degree.  
24 So, the Parliamentarian explained that the Senate  
25 doesn't need to formally waive the Rule. Awarding

1 the Degree would be waiving the Rule; however,  
2 several people have brought up to me a concern about  
3 using that particular procedure in this situation  
4 since in this instance we would have to tell you the  
5 name of the nominee.

6 And voting to waive the Rule would also be  
7 voting to award the degree but voting against the  
8 waiver of the Rule would also be voting against the  
9 awarding of the Degree and it creates potentially  
10 some -- you might not want to vote against the  
11 awarding of one particular degree but nonetheless  
12 vote against waiving the rule.

13 So even though it sort of violates the  
14 recommendations of my Parliamentarian, I'm willing  
15 to accept a motion from the floor to separate these  
16 two items and have first a vote on the waiver of the  
17 Rule and second a vote, if that motion passed, wed  
18 have a vote on the identity of the nominee. Senator  
19 --

20 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So moved.

21 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: So moved. Okay. So you're  
22 moving that the Senate waive SA -- sorry hold on.  
23 That's not what I --

24 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You're going to break it  
25 into two?



1 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: No, no, no, no, no. I  
2 actually have a slide that says exactly -- hold on.  
3 Uh-oh, no, no, no.

4 SECRETARY BROTHERS: Let's do it by a show of  
5 hands.

6 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: I'm sorry. I meant to  
7 have a motion from the floor to break it out. Yes,  
8 it's true, we're going to have to do that motion by  
9 way a show of hands. Is there a second for that  
10 motion?

11 MULTIPLE PEOPLE: Second.

12 MR. TAGAVI: Second.

13 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: So many seconds. Okay.  
14 we'll take Senator Tagavi. Okay. So is there  
15 debate on that motion to break it into two motions?  
16 Were not yet voting on the waiver itself. Is there  
17 a debate on the motion to break it into two motions?  
18 We'll have to have this vote by a show of hands. So,  
19 any debate? Okay. So the motion is to break into  
20 two motions the motion to waive and the motion to  
21 award the Honorary Degree. Questions?

22 Okay. All in favor a show of hands, please.  
23 Okay. Opposed? Okay. Motion passes. So then I  
24 take a motion from the floor that the Senate waive  
25 Senate Rule 5.4.2.3.C.1 which are the circumstances

1 for awarding the degree. Senator Jones?

2 MR. JONES: So moved.

3 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: A second?

4 MR. KEARNEY: Second.

5 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Senator Kearney.

6 MR. KEARNEY: Paul Kearney.

7 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Okay. All right. So  
8 actually let me start, are there questions of fact  
9 related to this motion? I know this is a little bit  
10 confusing. We've thrown a lot of information at  
11 you. Is there questions of fact about what were  
12 asking, what were trying to do here? Any questions  
13 of fact? Okay.

14 So then we'll put the motion on the floor that  
15 the Senate waive this rule which limits the number  
16 of degrees in an academic year and the number of  
17 degrees, Honorary Degrees in any one commencement.  
18 Debate on that motion?

19 MR. TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering. I  
20 think Senate Rules are very centric and other wisdom  
21 has gone into it for a lot of years, and I think,  
22 the threshold to waive our own rules should be high  
23 and at the very least we should ask for rationale.  
24 On the Senate Council, I ask for a rationale to the  
25 best of my knowledge no rationale was given.

1 I really think we should vote against because it  
2 is somewhat too late because Senate Council already  
3 knows the identity of the 5th person but personally  
4 I would vote against this while I would vote in  
5 sync??? for the actual nominee.

6 I think we should -- if we think about the number  
7 we should just change our rule and this is not the  
8 first time it happened. It happened three or four  
9 years ago and I made the same comment three or four  
10 years ago.

11 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Debate on the motion?

12 MR. SWANSON: Mark Swanson in Public Health.  
13 I have no problem with waiving the rule if theres a  
14 reason for it but to waive the rule without being  
15 given any reason makes little sense to me. If  
16 there's some time sensitivity to this, if the person  
17 is on their deathbed or something like that it would  
18 make sense. But I don't -- why have a rule if  
19 you're just going to waive it with having no reason  
20 to do so.

21 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Right. So maybe I'll ask  
22 Dean Jackson to speak on behalf of the committee.  
23 What was the rationale for asking for the waiver of  
24 the rule?

25 MR. JACKSON: Again, simply on the second call

1 to nominations the cohort of nominations that came  
2 in were just so, so strong. The initial vote was on  
3 the belief that there was going to be four potential  
4 nominees but by the time we got into discussion and  
5 as Tagavi mentioned they were having an exception to  
6 the rule in previous years, we felt that the fifth  
7 person deserved a nomination so therefore sought  
8 approval of a waiver.

9 MR. SWANSON: But there's no reason this fifth  
10 person couldn't be nominated next year?

11 MR. JACKSON: No.

12 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Okay. So according to  
13 Robert's rules after we would have people speak  
14 against the motion. Would anyone like to speak in  
15 favor of the motion? You'll speak in favor of the  
16 motion?

17 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No.

18 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Okay. Would anyone like to  
19 speak in favor of the motion?

20 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Four or five? For me,  
21 this argument for me against the waiver -- wait let  
22 me -- so theres a question about a waiver being  
23 asked for no rationale for it. The difference  
24 between three and four and five, there is no real  
25 rationale in my mind for a difference other than

1 just a number that we picked that we think would  
2 suffice for the ceremony and we put some cap on it.  
3 So, I have no problem with doing five especially  
4 since what I'm hearing is that you have five  
5 wonderful candidates ready to go right now. So, I'm  
6 all in favor of waiving this rule.

7 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: All right. Anyone like to  
8 speak against?

9 MR. TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, College of  
10 Engineering. At least I would like it to be stated  
11 in the minutes that I would like to question it.

12 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: No, you can speak now. I  
13 just know Robert's Rules require us to alternate in  
14 opinion.

15 MR. TAGAVI: Well, in my opinion, if we think  
16 that six is a good number we change the rule because  
17 I think that any number -- and three was actually,  
18 you know, at the time, down the importance of this  
19 Honorary Degree. It's something very special. It  
20 should be very -- very important to be the person  
21 who is selected to receive it. That's why I am very  
22 much against it.

23 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Anyone want to speak in  
24 favor of the motion?

25 MR. LOUHAN: Craig Louhan, College of Design.

1 Looking at the past recipients, there's been as  
2 little as two and as many as twelve in a given year  
3 so I don't see any reason to prevent it if the  
4 honoree is worthy and meets the criteria of the  
5 nomination.

6 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Speaking against?

7 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Quite a bit for me. In  
8 what year were there twelve? Because we have never  
9 exceeded the limit but by one.

10 MR. LOUHAN: 1942.

11 (LAUGHTER)

12 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Okay. Anyone else want  
13 to speak against? Yes?

14 MS. DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A&S. So, I think  
15 one of the reasons for putting on those limits was  
16 the fact that sometimes it was very hard to get any  
17 nominees. Right? And so there was this idea that  
18 in fact one would sort of not use everyone up in one  
19 year and sort of spread them out a bit and I think  
20 you're actual statement that initially you got very  
21 few and had to put out another call also argues that  
22 it might be better, unless again there is  
23 extenuating circumstances where someone is not going  
24 to be around for another year, it might be better to  
25 just wait and have this person renominated the

1 following year.

2 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: I'm sorry, Dean Jackson,  
3 does the committee recommend every nominee that it  
4 received?

5 MR. JACKSON: No.

6 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Anyone want to speak in  
7 favor of the motion?

8 MS. CORNWELL: Martha Cornwell, Arts and  
9 Sciences. I know there are many schools nominate,  
10 there are schools who award more Honorary Degrees  
11 than we do. Harvard awards ten every year. It  
12 doesn't make it much smaller. I think as UK has  
13 gotten bigger and better and we have more alums and  
14 people to honor that meet the qualifications its  
15 good for us to award them.

16 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Okay. Anyone want to  
17 speak against the motion? That would be a second  
18 time on the motion for you Senator Tagavi, so I'll  
19 ask you to wait. Is there anyone else who wants to  
20 speak against the motion? Okay. Senator Tagavi?

21 MR. TAGAVI: Tagavi, Engineering. Since I  
22 see that there is no rationale for five, I'm not  
23 going to claim I was here when this rule was passed  
24 but the reason is because it cheapens it. I do not  
25 disagree with the former Senators -- Harvard is ten.

1 We are no worse than Harvard. I agree. Again, why  
2 don't we change the Rule and not come back to us  
3 time and time for no good reason ask us to waive our  
4 rule. That just takes away our self respect.

5 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Okay. Anyone want to speak  
6 in favor of the motion?

7 MS. WEBB: Lisa Webb, College of Medicine. I  
8 guess I saw the esteemed faculty that are on our  
9 nominating committee and I respect their  
10 recommendation and on that basis I say we waive it.

11 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Okay. Anyone else want to  
12 speak against the motion to waive the rule?

13 MS. BRION: Gail Brion, College of  
14 Engineering. One of the reasons that was given at  
15 Senate Council was perhaps we should have more  
16 nominees in case someone couldn't show up. That's  
17 what I had heard and I just don't want scheduling to  
18 be guiding what our Senate Rules should be.

19 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Okay. Anyone else want to  
20 speak in favor of the motion? Okay. Any other  
21 debate on the motion? Okay. And just to clarify,  
22 this would be a vote to waive the Rule. If the vote  
23 to waive the rule passes then we would identify the  
24 name of the person who has been nominated and we  
25 would separately vote on the decision to award a



1 degree.

2 Any further questions or debate on this motion?

3 I think this would not be limited to elected faculty  
4 Senators, the waiver of the rule. Parliamentarian?

5 PARLIAMENTARIAN: You're asking me?

6 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: I'm asking you.

7 PARLIAMENTARIAN: I think it should be limited  
8 to elected faculty Senators since they waiving  
9 rules.

10 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Okay. So only elected  
11 faculty Senators should vote on this Rule. Okay.  
12 So elected faculty Senators, confirmation from our  
13 Chair of the Rules Committee in the back of the  
14 room. Elected faculty Senators please vote on the  
15 waiver of Senate Rule 5.4.2.3.C.1. Any final votes?  
16 Okay. Motion passes. Okay. So I think we made  
17 ourselves one slide just in case. So, now we can  
18 un-hide the person.

19 MR. JACKSON: So our additional nominee is  
20 Reece S. Terry, Jr., who originally intended  
21 studying civil engineering at U of K but  
22 subsequently changed to electrical engineering,  
23 earning both his Bachelors Degree and Masters  
24 Degree. In 1973, Mr. Terry co-developed and holds  
25 patent on the first programmable heart pacemaker.

1 In 1980 he co-developed the first programmable dual  
2 chamber pacemaker. In 1987 he co-founded Cyberonics  
3 in Webster, Texas to develop therapies for patients  
4 with epilepsy and other neurological disorders.

5 He co-developed Vegas Nerve Stimulation Therapy,  
6 a breakthrough in seizure reduction treatment for  
7 epilepsy now used for many other conditions.

8 Mr. Terry founded the Reece Terry Endowed  
9 Professorship in electrical and computer engineering  
10 and also helped to endow the Reece Terry Engineering  
11 Capstone Design Support for the medical and health  
12 applications. He has served on the UK Electrical  
13 and Computer Engineering Advisory Council and the U  
14 K Gail Hart Foundation Advisory Board.

15 He is an inductee of the College of Engineering  
16 Hall of Distinction and the UK Hall of Distinguished  
17 Alumni.

18 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Okay. So this item came  
19 from the committee to the Senate Council. The Senate  
20 Council voted to recommend that Reece Terry be  
21 awarded an Honorary Doctor of Engineering for  
22 submission through the President to the Board of  
23 Trustees. Are there questions of fact related to  
24 this nomination? Okay. So I'll put the motion on  
25 the floor that Mr. Terry receive an Honorary Doctor

1 of Engineering. Debate?

2 MR. Gary Engineering: I'm actually in the  
3 Department Electrical and Computer Engineering.  
4 Reece Terry represents one of the brightest among  
5 our alum and I hope that we can vote to sort of  
6 waive our rule. I hope that despite all that  
7 discussion -- I'll just say this that we actually  
8 considered the candidate as the candidate, not as a  
9 Rule breaker.

10 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Other comments?

11 MR. TAGAVI: Tagavi, Engineering. I will vote  
12 yes on this and I think he deserves this, not  
13 because he is an engineer, but I think he's acting  
14 as the other four or any other that is apart from  
15 their class. I think he is definitely qualified.

16 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Any other debate on this  
17 motion of awarding an Honorary Degree?

18 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'll just say as an  
19 epilepsy survivor, I'm proud to vote in favor of  
20 this.

21 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Any other debate on this  
22 motion? Okay. So again the elected faculty  
23 Senators, please vote. Any remaining votes  
24 regarding Mr. Terry? Okay. The motion passes.

25 (APPLAUSE)

1           CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Okay. So the next item on  
2 our agenda is Professor Joe Fink reporting to us  
3 about the University Appeals Board.

4           MR. FINK: Thank you. I'll try to be  
5 relatively brief with this. I have several slides to  
6 go through here. The first question is, What's the  
7 jurisdiction of the University Appeals Board? We  
8 deal with two types of cases. Most, in numerical  
9 count would be academic appeals dealing with a grade  
10 dispute between the faculty member and the student.  
11 Maybe an allegation of cheating or plagiarism on  
12 behalf of the student, something like that.

13           A more rare case is a case that arises under the  
14 Code of Student Conduct what I would label a  
15 behavioral appeal which deals with a student who has  
16 faced some allegations related to having breached  
17 provisions of the Code of Student Conduct. So there  
18 are two major categories of cases we deal with. The  
19 appeal process is the academic appeals come through  
20 the Office of Academic Ombud.

21           The behavioral appeals come up through the Office  
22 of the Dean of Students. So they follow different  
23 pathways. They both end up at the University  
24 Appeals Board. The Composition of the University  
25 Appeals Board, there are thirty members, eighteen

1 faculty, twelve students. The twelve students are  
2 appointed for a one year term. Faculty members, six  
3 are appointed each year for a three year term.

4 So there is some continuity from year to year  
5 because of the faculty members who have multi-year  
6 terms. A Quorum for conduct with the Appeals Board  
7 business is eight. Of that eight, at least five  
8 must be faculty members.

9 So it can be a maximum of three students. I am  
10 not a voting member of the Appeals Board. I am the  
11 process guy. I never try to have an appeal without  
12 at least one student in the mix. Often we can get  
13 two or three but always at least one. The Appeals  
14 Board has adopted some practices and procedures.

15 Those are available, if you want to take a look  
16 at those, off the website of the Office of the  
17 Academic Ombud, various procedural things, rules and  
18 procedures that sort of thing. Here is the heart of  
19 the report. These are the data that I'm actually  
20 reporting on two years. The two columns on your  
21 right 16-17 and 17-18. The reason I'm doing that is  
22 because I always have class on Mondays at 3:00 and  
23 this is the only meeting of the year I can make. So  
24 cheating or Plagiarism cases, you can see  
25 surprisingly somewhat the number has been going

1 down.

2 Now we had an uptick this past year, but the  
3 trend was downward. A fair and just evaluation,  
4 that's a provision in the code that says that a  
5 student is due a fair and just evaluation of his or  
6 her performance and of course. A no merit appeal is  
7 where the student has talked to the Academic Ombud,  
8 the Ombud has talked to the student, talked to the  
9 faculty member and after investigating the matter  
10 has reached a conclusion that the matter lacks  
11 merit.

12 The Ombud sends the student a letter that says  
13 that and then in the letter the closing paragraph  
14 says, You have the right to appeal minor termination  
15 that you're case lacks merit. Within thirty days  
16 you can contact the University Appeals Board and the  
17 University Appeals Board will review your matter to  
18 see whether you should indeed be granted a hearing.  
19 So we label that a no merit review. The student at  
20 that stage does not appear before the Appeals Board.

21 It's totally a paper review and then the very  
22 narrow question is, Should the student be granted a  
23 hearing? And so that no merit case has a little  
24 different flow than the typical. If the decision is  
25 that the student should be granted a hearing then

1 that's a separate proceeding and a separate  
2 occasion. College Honor Code Violation, we haven't  
3 had one of those in this whole range of years.  
4 Professional Colleges tend to have College Honor  
5 Codes and through some situation that arises is  
6 vital to the provision in there, that would come to  
7 the Appeals Board if the student wanted to appeal.

8 Retroactive withdrawal, we haven't had any of  
9 those appeals in a while. Code of Student Conduct  
10 cases, you can see that blip 2014-15 we had  
11 seventeen cases. Those were numerous headcount of  
12 students arising out of the same factual situation  
13 and that's why that number went up like that. So  
14 the cases in the first categories at the top, except  
15 for Code of Student Conduct, are all the ones that  
16 come through the Academic Ombud. This last category  
17 down here, Code of Student Conduct, is what comes up  
18 through the Dean of Students Office and that  
19 pathway. Down at the very bottom we give you the  
20 data about did the student prevail or did not  
21 prevail and over the time I've been doing this it's  
22 roughly 50% of the time the student prevails.

23 In recent years it's more like a third, a quarter  
24 to a third of the time and there are various  
25 factors. Each case is totally determined and

1 evaluated and assessed by the Appeals Board on it's  
2 own merit. So there's no argument about precedent.  
3 There's no argument about Well, you decided this  
4 earlier case this way and therefore todays case  
5 should be decided this way.

6 And so, those are the data for you. There are  
7 some continuing challenges. Getting a quorum is  
8 much more difficult than you would think. Thirty  
9 people, you need eight, you think Oh, no problem.  
10 It's a problem. Getting eight people together to do  
11 the appeal and there are a number of alumni of the  
12 Appeals Board in the audience here shaking their  
13 heads who have experienced that.

14 You have two of them right here and that's a  
15 continuing challenge. For a number of years we had  
16 difficulty with getting the faculty to attend and  
17 present their view about the decision they made  
18 regarding this student. In recent years that trend  
19 has diminished and faculty are showing up more  
20 frequently to present their perspective on the  
21 matter. Any questions?

22 MS. DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A&S. How many times  
23 does a student prevail when theres no merit  
24 instances?

25 MR. FINK: Oh, about between 5-10% of the



1 time. About 90% of the time the decision of the  
2 Ombud is confirmed.

3 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: I'll just remind those of  
4 you who were here last month that we had Joe  
5 McGillis back and his Ombud to present and so this  
6 is the next stage after they go through Joe McGillis  
7 office, then they go to Joe Finks office.

8 MR. FINK: Dr. Jones?

9 MR. JONES: Yes, I have a situation, a student  
10 is accepted at UK. The student at UK is trying to  
11 have a course taken elsewhere declared to the  
12 equivalency of a course here. So it's not for an  
13 evaluation of poor performance here. It's decided  
14 no, it's not equivalent. Is that cognizant of the  
15 UAP?

16 MR. FINK: We've never had a case like that. It  
17 depends on how -- well, first go to the Ombud.  
18 Okay. The Ombud would make the initial  
19 determination. Then if the Ombud determined the  
20 matter had merit, the Ombud would pass it up. So  
21 that's really an Ombud question in my opinion. Other  
22 questions? Thank you.

23 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: All right. Thanks Joe.

24 (APPLAUSE)

25 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Okay. So on to Committee

1 Reports. So again, I'll ask your patience and  
2 indulgence if you could wait it out. We're going to  
3 get through as much of the agenda as we can. First  
4 item on the agenda is from Herman Ferrell from the  
5 Admissions and Academic Standards Committee.

6 MR. FERRELL: Good afternoon. First, I just  
7 want to begin by thanking the committee halfway  
8 through the year for their quality of work and their  
9 time spent even through Thanksgiving break we were  
10 trading emails especially on this particular  
11 proposal.

12 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Actually, I'm going to  
13 interrupt you for one minute.

14 MR. FERRELL: Yes.

15 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Because this is the item  
16 you have a handout about. So I just wanted to point  
17 that out. So you have a handout because on the  
18 version that was posted and actually voted on all  
19 the way through the Senate Council, we discovered  
20 over the weekend there was an error. It was some  
21 text was deleted that should've have been deleted  
22 just in the process of doing the editing.

23 So we have circulated to you -- I thought I had  
24 my own copy of it. We have circulated to you a copy  
25 of the proposed text with the mistakenly deleted

1 text highlighted. So, I'm going to let Herman  
2 present. We're going to debate this but after the  
3 Committee motion is on the floor, I would solicit a  
4 motion from the body to add that stricken text back  
5 in. The Committee did not mean to be recommending  
6 the change. As far as I can tell theres never been  
7 a debate on the limiting of that language. That  
8 language has been in the Rule since 93.

9 So, this is the way we've decided to handle  
10 this. So, we've circulated the hard copy of the  
11 text to you and we can have a debate about that  
12 language after it's been put on the floor.

13 MR. FERRELL: So, you'll have to indulge me for  
14 a few moments here as I go through the process, not  
15 all of it. You have a lengthy PDF in front of you,  
16 but just to give you the highlights of what took  
17 place and how we got to this place.

18 First of all this is a proposal that comes from  
19 Dean Mark Kornbluh, the Chair of the Concept  
20 Implementation Team. These Concept Implementation  
21 Teams are teams that are put together by the  
22 administration to deal with these different  
23 strategies for Our Path Forward.

24 In late August, actually in early September I was  
25 asked by the Senate Council Chair, Jennifer

1 Bird-Pollan, to serve as a Senate Representative to  
2 this committee. Please understand I walked into  
3 that committee as a representative of all of you  
4 which was a daunting task since I had to come up to  
5 speed on even the questions that were being posed  
6 here.

7 So, I wore two hats. First as the representative  
8 from the Senate Council, in particular but from all  
9 of the Senate to this Concept Implementation Team  
10 and then subsequently as the Senate Chair of the  
11 Committee that would deal with all of this. The  
12 proposal itself was worked on over about a two month  
13 period, maybe a month and a half and then when it  
14 finally came to us on October 31st it was then, at  
15 my suggestion, sent to the Councils just to get  
16 their input and their feedback.

17 Again, just hoping to get more voices in the room  
18 in regard to the proposal because of its potential  
19 impact. So, we heard from the Undergraduate Council  
20 and the Graduate Council and those comments and the  
21 feedback were then applied into the conversation  
22 that we had in the SAASC on November 14th. At that  
23 point Kevin Donahue acted as the facilitator for it  
24 and we started talking about the proposal.

25 As you can see even prior to that I had raised my

1 own concerns about the proposal. Again, a lot of  
2 those concerns were alleviated by the end result of  
3 that meeting when we came up with a way to get  
4 around what were my concerns and even some of the  
5 concerns of some folks on the Undergraduate Council.

6 So, let me just backtrack and note that when  
7 this came to us from Dean Kornbluh he made it very  
8 clear that this was meant to be expanding our  
9 enrollment for non degree seeking students and he  
10 made the point that when we're welcoming these  
11 students it does not compromise the quality of  
12 educational experience for degree seeking students  
13 and that it's actually, all of this has been  
14 developed as part of Our Path Forward as a way of  
15 exploring ways to make the undergraduate courses  
16 more available to non-degree seeking students and  
17 even with regard to our Land-Grant mission, this is  
18 aligning completely with that notion.

19 So, when it came before our committee there was  
20 general support for it. The question was just the  
21 language of it and in particular some protections  
22 for -- well some -- not protections, but just some  
23 basically ways of monitoring these non-degree  
24 seeking students that are making their way into the  
25 University of Kentucky.

1 I'll just note that when, again, when I had to  
2 come up to speed initially on the Concept  
3 Implementation Team one of the first things I did  
4 was look at the extent rule and the extent rule  
5 talks about the goal with regard to non-degree  
6 seeking students. There's this already in the rule  
7 and we're not making any change to it. But I think  
8 it's really good for us to hear it because it lays  
9 out really sort of the policy implication.

10 And it basically says that, The goal at UK Policy  
11 for non-degree students is to provide appropriate  
12 access to academic courses for students who would  
13 like to continue their education but who do not wish  
14 to seek a degree. Although degree seeking students  
15 should have top priority in terms of utilization of  
16 University resources, the University does wish to  
17 provide access to these resources on space available  
18 basis for non-degree seeking students.

19 The policy will provide reasonable access to a  
20 broad range of students without unnecessarily  
21 limiting university resources for degree seeking  
22 students. So as President Capilouto just noted were  
23 at about 30,000 students now. About 22-23,000  
24 undergraduate and the rest graduate students. So  
25 now were talking about expanding our enrollment in

1 terms of online but also face to face to these  
2 non-degree seeking students. It's partly driven by,  
3 as the President said, a goal of sort of increasing  
4 tuition revenues, but our job as Senators is to  
5 monitor quality of it and to really consider the  
6 impact of all of it.

7 So, one of the things that I pointed out in that  
8 long nine page document that I sent to Senate  
9 Council Chair as well as to the Undergraduate  
10 Council Chair, and the Graduate Council Chair was  
11 this notion of the three different constituencies  
12 that we might want to consider when looking at this.

13 The first, are of course, our degree seeking  
14 students which the goal is already in the Senate  
15 Rules say that we have to take into consideration.  
16 There has to be not just a balancing out of degree  
17 and non-degree seeking but a privileging of our  
18 degree seeking students over the non-degree seeking  
19 students. That's already in the goal. And it's one  
20 we obviously want to maintain with regard to the  
21 30,000 students and the 30,000 students that well  
22 continue to have as we go forward.

23 Then there's also the consideration of the degree  
24 seeking students themselves, how will this impact  
25 upon them? And then it's also the impact on the

1 faculty. The faculty, as many of you know, if you  
2 have a student in your classroom who might be  
3 problematic but doesn't hit the level of  
4 qualifications, the baseline qualifications of your  
5 other students that you end up spending a lot of  
6 time dealing with that one student.

7 So, with all those concerns taken into -- and  
8 challenges taken into consideration, the committee  
9 still thought that we could go forward with the  
10 proposal that had come to us from Dean Kornbluh and  
11 the Concept Implementation Team.

12 The question that was really on the table was if  
13 you admit these non-degree seeking students, what  
14 qualifications do they have to proper or demonstrate  
15 to us in order to be admitted? Our degree seeking  
16 students, as some of you may know, have to have a  
17 2.0 high school GPA. They have to have a High  
18 School Diploma in hand or on the way and they have  
19 to have taken the ACT with an approximate 18 or  
20 higher.

21 So with these non-degree seeking students, which  
22 fit into three types of categories, were basically  
23 asking that they self certify on some level. That  
24 they basically let us know in a click of a button  
25 that they have those qualifications. They're not



1 expected to give to us transcripts or do any of that  
2 kind of documentation. The motive behind that is  
3 that were, again as part of this effort to attract  
4 as many students as possible, the hope is that, and  
5 the notion is that in our 21st Century culture,  
6 students will want to sign up and click once and  
7 click twice and click three times and then join the  
8 classroom without having to worry about providing  
9 this additional documentation subsequently.

10 So that's sort of the tenor of the conversation  
11 that took place and we went through benchmarks and  
12 when we went through those benchmarks and looked at  
13 some of our other institutions that have dealt with  
14 non-degree seeking students.

15 We saw that some of them limit non-degree seeking  
16 students only to a very particular term like summer  
17 term. Some of them will limit them to one or two  
18 terms in terms of their time limit for enrollment or  
19 a number of credit hours. One of the things that we  
20 landed on that was kind of a solution to at least my  
21 kick up with all of this and not so much with the  
22 members of the committee but it was my concern about  
23 this was that we followed the Michigan State  
24 University Model.

25 That model provides for an enrollment limitation

1 and that enrollment limitation is set forth in the  
2 proposal. Basically the notion is that as students  
3 who have taken nine credits or more as an admitted  
4 non-degree seeking student must maintain a 2.0 GPA.  
5 If they drop below that then they will get a letter  
6 and they'll be basically prohibited from continuing  
7 to enroll in classes.

8 For me that satisfies the issue of students who  
9 might come into the university who are not at that  
10 baseline levels. No way of knowing how many are  
11 going to be at that level. The committee made it  
12 very clear to me early on that they felt that there  
13 might actually be many students coming in as  
14 non-degree seeking students who perhaps didn't have  
15 a high school degree or didn't have a college degree  
16 but are more qualified than students in the  
17 classroom because of their lifetime experience and  
18 so that will raise the bar for the educational  
19 experience.

20 So, with all of that taken into consideration, we  
21 voted six to zero in favor of the proposal and then  
22 sent it forward to the Senate Council and then it  
23 came back to us because of some issues with regard  
24 to language. In particular the document that you  
25 have in front of you, the letter that came to you

1 from Dean Kornbluh, as well as even my covering  
2 letter talked about these four different categories  
3 of students. We've actually reduced them down to  
4 three types. I know I'm really just going through  
5 it in baseball stuff here as to how we got here but  
6 it's important for you to know that we have  
7 basically looked at this very carefully.

8 We caught this one mistake, this language that  
9 was cut from the proposal but the committee is  
10 wholeheartedly in favor of this proposal and I am as  
11 well.

12 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Okay. I meant to ask Dean  
13 Kornbluh if you wanted to say anything in addition  
14 to that? (LAUGHTER)

15 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Do you have anything to  
16 add? Do you want to add anything else?

17 DEAN KORNBLUH: I want to say that we have a  
18 very well registration policy and priority  
19 registration that allocates seats and how faculty,  
20 departments and colleges can determine how many  
21 seats in this particular class in allocating and so  
22 there is nothing here that requires anybody to take  
23 non-degree students or not, it doesn't affect our  
24 registration policy it all.

25 This just facilitates the ability of non-degree

1 students to take our classes if we are offering  
2 seats that we want to make available to them.

3 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Okay. So Dean Kornbluh is  
4 the Chair of the Implementation Team was the  
5 original proposer of this. It's spent a fair amount  
6 of time in the Admissions and Academic Standards  
7 Committee. Came to Senate Council as Herman said,  
8 went back to their committee and most recently was  
9 voted in -- the Senate Council voted to recommend  
10 the changes to these Rules. So are there questions  
11 of facts about the suggested changes, which you have  
12 in front of you in hard copy as well? Yes?

13 MS. DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A&S. Yeah, I looked  
14 at the PDF on the agenda and actually I didn't see  
15 any of the language of the rules.

16 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: It's in the PDF, it's at  
17 the end.

18 MS. DEBSKI: It's at the end?

19 MR. FARRELL: It's in there or in the middle  
20 somewhere.

21 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: It might be in the middle.  
22 I've got it here.

23 MR. FARRELL: In the middle. Yes.

24 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: I've got it here.

25 MR. FARRELL: It's after Dean Kornbluh letter.

1 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Yes, that's right. So the  
2 first is the report from Herman. Then there's the  
3 letter from Dean Kornbluh and then the language of  
4 the rule change. Yes?

5 MR. POOL: Chris Pool, A&S. So, the purposes of  
6 this -- are Undergraduate Certificates considered a  
7 Degree which a student sort of measures be able to  
8 pursue a certificate or would they need to convert  
9 to a degree program?

10 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: The current rules, if I  
11 understand them, non-degree students cannot enroll  
12 in Undergraduate Certificates. You may see such a  
13 proposal coming before the Senate soon.

14 MR. FARRELL: It is coming before us yes, but  
15 that is not on this --

16 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: That would not be  
17 contemplated by this Rule change. Yes?

18 MR. JONES: Davey Jones, Toxicology. The  
19 provision that you talked about where at the  
20 completion of nine credit hours or more, the student  
21 at UK will not be continued enrollment. Does this  
22 mean it excludes that the student is doing the  
23 repeat option for one of the already taken courses?  
24 Or you don't intend this language to prohibit that?

25 MR. FARRELL: That's one question we did not

1 consider out of the 10,000.

2 (LAUGHTER)

3 MR. JONES: I would favor this to be allowed as  
4 long as students are not trying to continue getting  
5 additional credit in enrolling something they've  
6 already taken to try to get a better grade in that  
7 credit. It would be, simply mean -- do we need an  
8 amendment to say that explicitly?

9 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Parliamentarian, do you  
10 want to talk about that?

11 PARLIAMENTARIAN: That's not in order. That's  
12 not on the table. That's Mr. Jones --

13 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: I know it's the Rules  
14 Committee. Does the Rules Committee have an opinion  
15 about that?

16 MR. JONES: I'd like to make an amendment that  
17 at the end of that sentence, Will not be allowed to  
18 continue enrollment, except that non-repeat option  
19 is permitted

20 SECRETARY BROTHERS: So what was the -- what  
21 part?

22 MR. JONES: On page 2 down toward the bottom  
23 the Rule starts Non-Degreed Students. The end of  
24 that sentence ...continue enrollment, except repeat  
25 option is permitted.

1 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Okay. That's a motion to  
2 amend the Rules. Is there a second?

3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Second.

4 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Okay. Is there other  
5 questions of fact about that motion?

6 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Amendment?

7 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: The amendment? Okay,  
8 debate on that amended amendment?

9 MR. TAGAVI: Tagavi, Engineering. I almost  
10 never talk against a motion by Davey Jones, but  
11 perhaps Herman -- Herman's committee should  
12 contemplate this. They spent hours and hours and  
13 now we are doing this at the spur of the moment.  
14 Heres one problem that I can see. A student is  
15 expelled after being probationally expelled.

16 Now, we have to let the student, perhaps, I'm  
17 just saying, to come back to take only repeat  
18 option. This isn't good. That case in my opinion  
19 is not acceptable and neither should this case.

20 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Motion on the amended  
21 debate? I mean, debate on the amendment? Stay with  
22 me guys, were not done yet. Yes?

23 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: A point of information.  
24 Are non-degreed students eligible to even apply to  
25 repeat options? That's what I was wondering if we

1 could have clarity about.

2 MR. JONES: This would make them eligible if  
3 it's not already.

4 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: The Rule about repeat  
5 options is in the section entitled Students in  
6 Undergraduate Programs.

7 MR. FERRELL: So they would be --

8 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: So under the current rule  
9 they would -- if they're not in the program, they  
10 would not be eligible although the suggestion from  
11 Senator Jones is would make them eligible for the  
12 repeat option.

13 MR. JONES: Yeah, there's a robust sentence  
14 here that is intended by this proposal that's on the  
15 floor. In that spirit I'm offering consideration  
16 here that the repeat option become available.

17 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Okay. Other debate on this  
18 motion? Senator Wood?

19 MS. Wood: I agree with my colleague, Senator  
20 Tagavi. I find it very hard to argue against  
21 Senator Jones, but how many repeat options are we  
22 going to allow? I mean, this is, this is totally  
23 specified in, you know, clearly in the Senate Rules  
24 that it's in Degreed Programs. And I'm very  
25 hesitant to, on the fly, allow students who were



1 non-degreed to do repeat options without thinking it  
2 through about how many and what not.

3 MR. JONES: Would Herman's group be interested  
4 in considering this question further? Outside of  
5 being --

6 MR. FERRELL: As in sending this proposal back  
7 and not going forward?

8 MR. JONES: I'm asking, just with some  
9 additional thinking later if it merits to ask.

10 MR. FERRELL: Yes, that would be a great  
11 solution.

12 (LAUGHTER)

13 MR. FERRELL: We would. We will do it. We  
14 will do it.

15 MR. JONES: Parliamentarian, am I allowed to  
16 withdrawal my motion?

17 PARLIAMENTARIAN: With unanimous consent.  
18 It's already been put on the floor.

19 MR. TAGAVI: Without any objection --

20 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Without any objection, you  
21 could withdrawal it with the consent of the  
22 secondary. Who was the seconder again?

23 PARLIAMENTARIAN: That would be an  
24 objection. Everybody --

25 SECRETARY BROTHERS: Well, because he

1 seconded.

2 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Are there any objections  
3 to withdrawal that motion? Okay. All right. So  
4 are you withdrawing your motion then?

5 MR. JONES: Yes, yes.

6 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: All right. So is there  
7 -- we're still on questions of fact, I think. Yes.

8 MS. DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A& S. Can you just  
9 provide the rationale for what is the reason for  
10 having this self certification as opposed to --

11 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Dean Kornbluh, do you want  
12 to answer that?

13 DEAN KORNBLUH: Yeah. So it's really the  
14 undergraduate -- offered by Ohio State, by Michigan  
15 State, sitting in your advisors office at another  
16 university and saying you're coming home for the  
17 Summer to Kentucky. You can show your advisor, look  
18 I can take this course at the University of  
19 Kentucky. Will that work for me? And they say yes  
20 and you could register immediately.

21 So the whole goal here is to create a seamless  
22 process that somebody could register right away and  
23 the turn around or if you had this offer as opposed  
24 to well we have now where they look closely at a  
25 transcript. It takes ten days to get a Link Blue ID

1 and we need, you know, that begins a long cumbersome  
2 process right now to be admitted as a non-degree  
3 student.

4 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Senator Udvardy.

5 MS. UDVARDY: Monica Udvardy, Arts and  
6 Sciences. I just wonder that below the statement  
7 that Davey Jones made that you can no student may  
8 continue to enroll as a non-degree student after  
9 earning 24 semester hours without special permission  
10 of the Dean. I just wondered how the 24 semester  
11 hours was arrived at?

12 MR. FERRELL: That's not a new rule. That's  
13 been around since the beginning. So, I can't answer  
14 that. I don't know what the rationale was but were  
15 not changing that rule.

16 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Any further questions of  
17 fact related to this proposed change? Okay. So  
18 then I'll put the motion on the floor to amend the  
19 rule and I would also solicit a motion from the  
20 floor to restore 4.2.1.3.2.1, the highlighted  
21 language. Dean Kornbluh?

22 DEAN KORNBLUH: I so move.

23 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Is there a second?

24 MS. WOOD: Second.

25 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Senator Wood. Okay. Is

1 there questions of fact limited to resubmitting,  
2 re-adding that language? Okay. Is there debate on  
3 the motion then? Sheila, I forget if we have a  
4 slide for this. Did we make a slide for this?

5 SECRETARY BROTHERS: I'll check. Yes, we did.

6 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Oh that was so smart of us.  
7 Okay. Right, okay, so, any debate on the motion  
8 related to re-adding the highlighted language on  
9 your text? Okay. So the motion is that the Senate  
10 restore the incorrectly stricken language.

11 So, I'll open voting on that motion. Any further  
12 votes? Our numbers our dwindling. Hey look at  
13 that. Okay. I'll close the voting. Okay. The  
14 motion passes. Great, thank you. So now, can I  
15 advance this? Yes.

16 So the motion on the floor right now is that this  
17 newly edited document with the language re-added be  
18 approved by the Senate. Debate on that motion? Any  
19 debate on the motion to amend the Senate Rules in  
20 accordance with the language you have in front of  
21 you? Okay. Hearing none, I'll open that for  
22 voting. Any further votes. Okay. And the motion  
23 passes. Great, thank you. One more item from Herman  
24 Ferrell from the Admissions and Academic Standards  
25 Committee.

1           MR. FERRELL: So this proposal comes to us  
2 from Dean Brady, Dean Christian Brady from the Lewis  
3 Honors College to change Senate Rule 5.3.2 to  
4 require Honor students to maintain a cumulative 3.4  
5 GPA in order to remain in good standing in the  
6 Honors College. We reviewed this proposal twice  
7 over the period of, I think October, and we noted  
8 first of all that as the proposal states that a  
9 cumulative 3.4 GPA that is now being called for  
10 aligns with the Cum Laude distinction as delineated  
11 on UK diplomas for all students graduating with a  
12 cumulative 3.40 GPA.

13           So, it makes sense to align those two things.  
14 There was some discussion at the meeting and  
15 previous meetings by Undergraduate Council  
16 considering how first year students who might be  
17 struggling, how this might affect them. We took a  
18 look at benchmarks by institutions and saw that they  
19 had the same sort of kind of probationary period in  
20 place of allowing for one semester to be tagged as  
21 being problematic and having another semester to  
22 basically turn things around and get above a 3.40.

23           What's added -- so it's almost a year, again  
24 they'd be at the end of the Freshman year that  
25 somebody might be in jeopardy. But what's also

1 added in to the rule is that the appeals can go  
2 through the Dean and we thought that this proposal  
3 had really taken into consideration first of all  
4 that fact that its not going to affect that many  
5 students in the Honors Program.

6 Many in the Honors Program are well up as you  
7 can see from the chart, up at the 3.9/4.0 range  
8 already but we felt that making this marker a 3.40  
9 as a cutoff wouldn't be that problematic even based  
10 on the information that Associate Dean Crofcheck  
11 gave to us with regard to the last five years. So  
12 with all of that taken into consideration the said  
13 Admissions and Academic Standards Committee voted  
14 unanimously in favor of this proposal.

15 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Okay. So Dean Brady, do  
16 you have anything you want to add to that?

17 DEAN BRADY: No, I think he stated it well.  
18 Herman, thank you.

19 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Okay. Great. Questions  
20 of fact related to the motion to change the Senate  
21 Rules in the way that is suggested by the Admissions  
22 and Academic Standards Committee? Any questions of  
23 fact? Okay. Hearing none, then we'll put the  
24 motion on the floor that the new SR 5.3.2.8 be  
25 adopted. Any debate on that motion? Any debate on

1 the motion? Okay. Hearing none, we'll open that  
2 for voting. Any further voting? We're not done yet  
3 you guys. Okay. The motion passes. Great, thank  
4 you. Let's just put controversial things at the end  
5 of the agenda it turns out. All right. We've got  
6 one more on here from the Admissions and Academic  
7 Standards Committee. Again, I really appreciate  
8 those of you who stay as we try to get through this  
9 agenda.

10 MR. FERREL: This is a proposal that comes from  
11 the College of Department of Health Management  
12 Policy for a change in the Masters in Health  
13 Administration Program, reducing the credit hours  
14 for one course from 3 to 1 credit hour. This is an  
15 easy one.

16 So, this one, the only thing that we felt that  
17 needed to be changed with regard to the proposal was  
18 a clarification with regard to the rationale. It  
19 wasn't clear in the rationale that the competencies  
20 were being reduced with regard to this proposal and  
21 so that change was made and then it went and it was,  
22 the proposal itself was again unanimously supported  
23 by the Senate -- the Admissions and Academic  
24 Standards Committee.

25 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: So questions of fact

1 related to the Masters of Health Administration?  
2 Professor Riddell is here as well. Do you have  
3 anything you wanted to add to that statement?

4 MS. RIDDELL: No, thank you.

5 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Any questions of fact?  
6 Okay. So the motion is on the floor that the Senate  
7 approve the proposed changes to the MHA. Any  
8 debate? Okay. I'll open that for voting. Okay.  
9 Any further votes? Okay. The motion passes.  
10 Great, thank you very much.

11 Okay. We do have one more set of committee  
12 items. So, those of you who can stay around I'm  
13 sure these people will be very grateful if you can  
14 stay and vote on these remaining items. Aaron  
15 Cramer from the Academic Programs Committee. New  
16 Senate Council member, Aaron Cramer.

17 MR. CRAMER: So the first item is a  
18 recommendation that the Senate approve the  
19 establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Child  
20 Welfare Practice in the College of Social Work.  
21 This will create opportunities for a Master of  
22 Social Work MSW students and Kentucky Child Welfare  
23 Professionals to gain skills and knowledge to serve  
24 abused and neglected children and their families.  
25 It's a 9 hour curriculum.



1       It will allow advanced MSW students to specialize  
2 and enhance their program. It will also provide a  
3 pathway for those post -baccalaureate students to  
4 transition into the MSW program. It bridges a gap  
5 between research and practice. It will increase the  
6 qualifying and competent professionals serving  
7 children which is a need across the country, but  
8 particularly in Kentucky.

9       There is a combination of one like courses and a  
10 graduate practicum course in a setting serving  
11 children and adolescence. We're looking initially  
12 at an enrollment of 60 student with a steady state  
13 value of 8 students.

14       CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Any questions of fact  
15 related to the new Grad Certificate in Child Welfare  
16 Practice? We have Kalea Benner here from Social  
17 Work to answer any questions you might have. Any  
18 questions of fact? Okay. So then the motion is on  
19 the floor to establish a new Graduate Certificate in  
20 Child Welfare Practice. Any debate? Okay. Hearing  
21 none, we'll open that for voting. Any last votes?  
22 All right. And the motion passes. Great, thank you  
23 very much.

24       MR. CRAMER: All right. The next item is a  
25 recommendation that the Senate approve the

1 significant change to the MS in Nursing in the  
2 College of Nursing, in particular that program is  
3 closed. We're here talking about reopening that  
4 program. The program was suspended in 2012. What  
5 they found, they closed it because the American  
6 Association of Colleges of Nursing recommended  
7 moving the advanced practice nurses to Doctor of  
8 Nursing Practice Programs.

9 What they found was a number of requests that  
10 hey, you need to reopen this. They've got strong  
11 survey data that says that theres a strong demand  
12 for this among nurses in Kentucky and so what they  
13 want to do is open this program again.

14 CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Any questions of fact  
15 related to the reopening of the MSN? Okay. Then,  
16 yes?

17 MS. DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A& S. How many  
18 students are they -- did they need to get to  
19 consider this a success, the opening a success?

20 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So we have --

21 SECRETARY BROTHERS: I'm sorry, name please?

22 MS. HEATH: Janie Heath, Dean of Nursing.  
23 Take a look at HBA 10 with the understanding that  
24 that's going to grow. We've got a pretty good feel  
25 for it.

1           CHAIR BIRD-POLLAN: Any other questions of  
2 fact? Okay. So then the motion is on the floor to  
3 approve the reopening of the Masters of Science in  
4 Nursing. Debate? Debate on that motion? Okay.  
5 We'll open that for voting. Any final votes for  
6 nursing? And the motion passes. Great, thank you  
7 all very much for staying until the bitter end. I  
8 appreciate it. Have a lovely holiday and remember  
9 well see you on January 14th.

10       (WHEREUPON, the Senate Hearing concludes at 5:30  
11 p.m.)