

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *

December 12, 2011

3:00 p.m.

* * * *

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
WILLIAM T. YOUNG LIBRARY AUDITORIUM
401 Hilltop Avenue
Lexington, Kentucky

* * * *

HOLLIE SWANSON, CHAIR

ROBERT GROSSMAN, VICE CHAIR

J. S. BUTLER, PARLIAMENTARIAN

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

ANN CHASTANG, COURT REPORTER

* * * *

SWANSON: Good afternoon. Thank you for coming to our December meeting. I can't remember my please slide, but I'm sure you do. It's something about respecting each other and playing nice in the sandbox and turning off all your electronic phones and beepers. Thank you. It is our privilege today to hear from President Capilouto.

CAPILOUTO: I thought I was going to get to enjoy some awards you were making. All right, thank you very much. Good afternoon. I thank all of you

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
for being here. I know it's a busy time of the year. I've missed you. I was here a few months ago, and since that time I have criss-crossed this state and the country as well meeting with a variety of people. For those of you who attended my investiture, I called what I discovered here something very soulful and that is the Kentucky Promise. It's something that was birthed 150 years ago and is defined in a more powerful way every day by the people in this room and those with whom you work. In the past three weeks I've attended alumni events in Atlanta, New York City, Louisville, Washington D.C., and I guess the most common comments I've heard across all those meetings are from many - especially our younger graduates, who now tell me who they work alongside and how it makes them appreciate even more the value of their degree. In Washington D.C. last week there was some young professionals who were working with the State Department, the Department of Defense, CIA. I heard the same thing when I was in Atlanta from a group of graduates who had really redefined and recreated a job in the communications field who said that they would put their degree up against anybody, and the people who work alongside of them were from Ivy League schools, for instance, and they felt so wonderfully prepared for what they're doing today. And this promise is so that we can further insure that our students live a life of and know a life of meaning and purpose and that they take over from us leadership of this state and country. So I thank all of you for doing that. And I've told people when I've traveled the state and all how wonderful everything that you do is in this way. And rather than regale you with all the stories, I'll just tell you that I tell them we do everything from extending and saving lives through something like our center for clinical translational research where we try to take discoveries quickly into the community to stirring souls. And when I say this, I tell them about Nikki Finney's recent book and being

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
acknowledged of the recipient of the National Book Award. I read the first poem of that book last night. It's called Red Velvet. It's about Rosa Parks. I grew up in Montgomery, Alabama in 1955 when she sat on that bus. I was six years old and I remember traveling those buses. I knew what it was like. But reading Nikki's poetry last evening was very powerful and compelling, like I relived a lifetime just within those few pages. So that's what we're able to do here. But we live in a different time. Many people call it the new normal. Some of the funding that we've been used to is not going to return in the near future. I was in Washington last week. I spoke to many of our representatives, Congressman Hal Rogers. I said it's terrific you're Chairman of the Appropriations Committee. He said well, I call it the Disappropriations Committee. That's just the reality of the economy we face. So we're going to have to do some things anew. And I want to talk to you about that today. First of all, these conversations that I've had, you know, across the state. I want to thank all of you in the different colleges that spent an afternoon with me. Those are terrific experiences. I've shared with you what our graduates and many of our grateful donors who I think are ready to step forward and help. I've learned from our student leaders how we can better do what we do, and I'll share that with you at some point. But this has been a terrific experience for me to listen to what's on your mind, and I plan to continue what is very powerful to me. I think when I spoke to you the last time I said that I had charged the University Review Committee that Hollie graciously chaired made up of faculty, administrators, and staff. That review committee's report along with much other data was shared with our Board of Trustees at a retreat. They looked carefully at where we are and along with us considered where we are going. And in accord with the review committee report, talked about redoubling our efforts when

it comes to undergraduate education. So that we will start. We've continued to talk to people about some of those plans and ideas of our facilities and personnel and the talent that we need to have on our campus. And I think much of what the review committee found has resonated with people both on and off campus. As we go forward, I think it's important that we have in some ways some guiding principles or a watchword. First we've got to remain true to our priorities and mission of this University. The last time I was here people asked me about a land grant and flagship and academic health center and what all of that meant. And it is powerful to me and I find that that is part of our soul and we must remain true to it. Whatever we do, we need to define it within that context. It is ours. It's not another university to transport here. It's uniquely Kentucky's. But we must think anew about how we do things. I also heard of the importance to improve and raise transparency. I've heard often that we don't need to be just diverse but inclusive. We've made great strides in some of our recruitment activities and all, but there's yet work to be done. That is important for all of us to continue listening to one another. And a key principle of mine is define good people, step back, and trust the process. So a little about the process in the next steps we'll take. I'll mention four today. There will be some others. First of all - five - first of all, a review of the President's organization. And that's all of those that report to me. And the questions I've asked that have been born out of many of my discussions with you are does our structure align with our mission and priorities. Are the roles and functions of all our offices clear and do - are they integrated, coherent, and coordinated. How's the information flow managed. Are we a learning organization. Do we respond to good suggestions. Do we work to improve. And does the structure need to be streamlined and streamlined. I look at our University as an ecosystem in a way. And it's a delicate one and

it has to be carefully examined and addressed. I've heard what people have had to say and their concerns about these matters and we're committed to objectively and dispassionately taking a look at what we do. Next, reviewing our commitment to creating a comprehensive and innovative undergraduate experience and following the recommendations of the Board of Trustees and what we've heard from the review committee. While we've enjoyed great success in welcoming the best and brightest class in the University of Kentucky's history, it is important for us to meet our commitment to this state in terms of getting our best and brightest here and making sure that the students, all of them, graduate are the best and brightest. As part of that, we're going to enhance and expand our Honors program. I've increased the number of scholarships we will award to top Kentucky students, and we'll put more recruiters in the field of Kentucky and some other target markets. I see Mark Kornbluh is here and others who have been involved. Nathan is here involved in our innovative program, A&S Wired. I don't know if Matthew is here today. I hope all of you saw the Chronicle of Higher Education article last week on our first generation scholar's program. Those are the examples of these living learning communities where our students can come together and build networks, support one another, learn from one another under the guidance of outstanding faculty where we know our success rates are much greater so that we can further improve our graduation rates here at UK. By now all of you know of my commitment to try and improve the facilities on our campus. We must have something that is attractive to students. We've got to have these facilities that lend themselves to these living learning communities that I've described to you. We know that we can do a better job of preparing our students for leadership and lives of meaning and purpose. And we want to provide environments for all of you to work in that are warm, inviting, and

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
further build community. So how are we going to do this? I announced a few weeks ago that in terms of our residence halls we would explore a public private partnership. I've had a committee long at work. We put out a request for proposal several weeks ago. The committee narrowed that list to three competitive organizations that just yesterday I received a recommendation for the firm that we will go the next step with to further understand if this is a route that we want to use to revitalize our residence halls. Still, many questions that have to be answered. But this is an exciting development. I'm pleased with the work of the committee and the recommendation that they have made. It sounds like an outstanding and strongly suited firm for what we want to do on campus. They operate I think some 39,000 residence halls bids across the United States. We have to work to build unique partnerships for our research and educational space. In partnership with the state, donors, many of whom I've talked to, and we've got to look in terms to do this. This is a time where we have to think and seriously consider what we could possibly self-finance through our own resources. But all of these would have to come together and come together in different projects. I've said often times that success is going to be that we get one new building every two to four years or we would have failed. We've got to do much better. And hopefully by weaving together different partners and these different revenue sources in an imaginative way working with and through state government we'll be able to make greater strides. As we do all this, I think it is terribly important that we pause and get an outside view on what our debt capacity is. The last time we did this was before we undertook the ambitious project to build the new hospital. You have to look strongly at your financial picture, your current debt, your costs, your expected revenues in the future, how your debt is going to be coming off your books in time so we'll have an outside group which in an scrub all of our numbers so we feel

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
very comfortable about any steps that we would take financially. I heard loud and clear that people wanted a better understanding of how we budget and finance ourselves internally at the University of Kentucky. So the questions I want a group to examine, is our budgeting system integrated and transparent, does it reflect the priorities and our mission. Does it link revenues to productivity and quality. And does it assign costs according to how resources are consumed. I think this is very important as we take a step forward that all of us understand this part of our economy on campus. And I'm committed to working with a group who advance a budgeting system that achieves these goals. Lastly, bricks and mortar certainly don't make a university. The people do. And insuring that we have the talent that comes to our campus and stays with us to advance our mission is terribly important. We must have systems and programs that support and provide incentives for professional development. I know Hollie has talked with the Provost about looking at some of our assessment mechanisms including post tenure review, but I think we have much to learn about how we assess each other, how we assess administration, how we provide feedback in a constructive way. It's going to take a great bit of ingenuity, creativity, and entrepreneurship to earn our way out of these circumstances. And I hope we on a macro level and a micro level be able to provide incentives to do so. And then I know that we have advanced family friendly policies, but I want to make sure that our practices and the culture that support these matters are constantly reinforced in this day and time. And as I mentioned earlier, we must continue to strive to be an inclusive campus. So how are we going to do all that? Again, I'm going to rely on you and people like you as we go forward. I want to establish work groups made up of the administrators, faculty, staff, students to tackle these very difficult issues. And our solutions must be integrated in this complex environment in which

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
we live. Some of this work would go more quickly. I certainly hope that we're well on our way by June 2012. Something that can go more quickly, for instance, is I hope when you bring in an outside team, to look carefully at our debt capacity, that's something that would be accomplished over a sixty or ninety day period. Other things will take longer to more fully address. But you will be fully engaged in that process and we will keep you fully informed. I also want to share with you a decision I've made that I didn't take lightly. And that was to engage an outside consulting firm Huron Consulting to serve as staff for this ambitious agenda. Huron is a group that worked with our review committee and on our campus during the first phase of this year in preparation for the materials we considered at the Board retreat and the materials we've shared across campus. I find them to be objective, honest, able to pull together best practices from universities across the country but also play the appropriate role and that is help us define what is best for us, not define a solution for them. This is somebody we're going to work with. They work for us. It's going to take a great deal of manpower and expertise to do all this. And over the next twelve months the contract would be up to a little over a million dollars to engage these consultants if we do indeed expend all of the efforts that we may have to in answering all of these questions. But I wanted to share that with you and tell you that that is a serious consideration. If I didn't think this would help us get to a better place, I wouldn't make this level of commitment. So I appreciate sharing this with you. And, Hollie, I'd really like to take any and all questions that people have.

SWANSON: Questions? Awfully quiet group. You're not usually this quiet, are you?

PEEK: Is it fair game to - Joe Peek. Is it fair game to ask you to comment on the article that just came online at the Herald Leader?

CAPILOUTO: Sure. So I think you have heard me say that as we go forward it's important that our academic

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
priorities remain paramount. This morning - I see that Linda is here. I had the delight of spending time with the editorial board at the Herald Leader and I was asked about Rupp Arena. And as I shared with them, I think there's an exciting vision for downtown but that I couldn't support any requests made to the state that would in any way compete for funds that we need to revitalize this campus. So I shared that with them this morning. I shared it - I shared it with the Mayor over the past few weeks. We've had many conversations about this and I think he fully understands and appreciates our priorities as well. I think he's developed an exciting vision for downtown and our destinies are intertwined and we need to continue being a partner with him as the city as we think about how to vitalize our city. We're fortunate to have an arena like Rupp, a historic venue that holds lot of memories for folks, and we look forward to a long term future there in downtown. That's where we want to be. So I look forward to working with the Mayor, and I will share with you we will continue to make targeted investments in athletics on campus. Athletics support eight million dollars in scholarships annually for student athletes, and some of these students are among the best. I will be carrying to the Board of Trustees tomorrow a proposal that enhances our softball field for our female athletes, and I think that's important, too. Those need to be self-financing as those will be, and we'll continue to make those kinds of investments. It is the case as I've traveled and met with parents and students and some of the best across the country want to come here, they certainly recognize UK for our academics and enjoy the community that is built through major college sports. I find that to be an advantage of ours that we can use as we try to improve our enrollment here on campus.

SWANSON: President Capilouto, could I interrupt and ask the Senate if they could formalize that clause into some kind of statement?

CAPILOUTO: Kentucky is a much more formal place than -

ANDERSON: I'm Debra Anderson, College of Nursing. I would like to ask if we could make a formal resolution from the University Senate supporting that funds from the University not be used for Rupp Arena. And I don't know if we just want to say Rupp Arena or say it more broadly, if we want to be specific, but I would like to make that motion for resolution.

SWANSON: We have a motion on the floor. Is there a second?

WASILKOWSKI: Second. Wasilkowski from Engineering, second.

SWANSON: Is there any discussion for or against the motion?

GROSSMAN: If I understood correctly, the statement you made, Eli, was that you wouldn't support asking the state for funds to renovate.

CAPILOUTO: In any part that would be in competition for what we're trying to do on campus.

GROSSMAN: Right. So I don't think the resolution actually captures the sense of what Dr. Capilouto said.

SWANSON: Could you read back the resolution, please?

BROTHERS: Formal resolution from the Senate supporting the funds from UK not be used for modification for Rupp Arena. That was Debra Anderson's resolution.

SWANSON: Would we want to amend that?

CAPILOUTO: I'd like to share this with you just to be clear. First of all, and I think I have the statement here and we brought some extras. Let me say that as we work through this, one of the people among the folks who understood this most fully have been Athletic Director Barnhart and Coach Calipari. And if you listen to Coach Calipari on his show recently, he does a grand job of talking about what we need to do on campus here. I met with him several weeks ago and he fully understands the need to have a quality experience on our campus. So the statement we issued today was a joint statement that all three of us made in support of this decision. So I'm happy to share this with you. I think it fully captures everything that we're talking about here so maybe this should be part of what you're agreeing.

SWANSON: Okay.

CAPILOUTO: Do you want me to read it?

SWANSON: I thought that's what you intended.

CAPILOUTO:

In what remains a challenging economy, we must be unified as a campus community about our priorities as we seek private support and finite state dollars to help fund our dream for the University in the Commonwealth. To that end our Board of Trustees, our faculty and staff, and our students have spoken with a clear and unequivocal voice. Our primary focus should and must be the construction and renovation of facilities in living and learning spaces so that we can revitalize the core of our campus and in particular further strengthen the undergraduate education we provide. Targeted investments in athletic facilities will be part of that equation as we continue to improve our competitive position across all sports. We also further utilize this - we will also further utilize this powerful brand to recruit and retain Kentucky's best students. We cannot at this time and in this economy support an issue such as infrastructure proposals being made relative to Rupp Arena that compete with pressing on-campus priorities, with scarce state operating dollars, and capital construction funds. We have communicated with Mayor Gray about this issue. He understands our perspective and has graciously engaged with us an ongoing, productive dialogue. We pledge to be an active partner in this process as the health and vibrancy of UK and Lexington are inextricably linked. We are fortunate to be in such a terrific and historic venue for college basketball and we are committed to our long term future there.

ANDERSON:

Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.
I think what I wanted to do was to with all the applause that came from all the Senators here is to show that a resolution or somehow that the University Senate supports what you have stated - what the three of you have stated so clearly in the argument. So that's the intent.

SWANSON:
GROSSMAN:

Bob Grossman?
Can I just propose an amendment then to the motion on the floor which is to just amend it to say University Senate endorses the statement that President Capilouto just read?

SWANSON: Is that acceptable?
ANDERSON: That's fine.
SWANSON: Is that fine? All right, a second?
Is that acceptable?
WASILKOWSKI: Yes.
SWANSON: Further discussion? All those in
favor?
(No audible response.)
SWANSON: Opposed, abstained?
(No audible response.)
SWANSON: Thank you. Unanimous.
GROSSMAN: Now I have a question. Getting
away from Rupp, so the last time
you came before us I asked you how
you were planning to fund new
research buildings and all you were
willing to say at that point was
well, we need to be creative.

CAPILOUTO: Right.
GROSSMAN: I see a little bit more information
here but -

CAPILOUTO: Right.
GROSSMAN: - but, of course, the big elephant
in the room is our limited bond
capacity because of the state
restrictions that most other
universities don't have. At least
that's one big piece of the
problem. So can you share with us
some more specifics about how new
research facilities may be funded?

CAPILOUTO: I'll talk to you about educational
facilities that include research in
general. Let me talk about
facilities. And let me make clear
that we can - what Bob's referring
to is assuming your own
responsibility for building a
building, either all of it or part
of it through debt just like you
would finance your house, okay. We
have gotten in the past and we'll
ask for in the future - I don't
know any specifics about this - for
permission through our state
budgeting process to take on debt.
So it is permitted, all right, so
we're able to do that. The bigger
question for me is making sure we
can afford it. So that's why we
want to do the debt capacity study.
So we have this opportunity now and
I've made clear in working with -
talking with members of the General
Assembly that if we want to pursue
this route and we can demonstrate
to them how we can finance this,
it's something that can be
considered. So what - we have that
mechanism now that we can exercise.
It's through state government and
that's what I want to remain
focused on.

BRI ON:

The last time we were here - Gail Brion, College of Engineering. The last time you were here, I asked you to think about your vision. I see the vision coming out. At the time you said something about a new middle class. And I see you now coming - encapsulating that in your promise to Kentucky. That promise to Kentucky, what does - what do you see it contain with respects to the number of students who can no longer afford an education?

CAPILOUTO:

So when I was in Washington in a tough environment, when one of the things articulated how important it was to maintain the strength of our Pell grant program. Twenty-five percent of UK's students rely on Pell grant which is a strong threshold measure of financial need. I also have taken a close look at the debt that our students leave with and I'm glad to say that that is stable and it's come down somewhat. We're working in many ways to expand financial aid in support and one of the things that we're certainly going to consider when we look at our budgeting system is, you know, how we best control costs here. That's going to be one of the questions we've got to ask each other.

DEBSKI :

Liz Debski, Biology. So I was just wondering, so given that we don't have enough money to do everything that we want, can I take it from your statement today that there's going to be a priority on educational facilities as opposed because, you know, I'm just wondering, you know, a couple years ago Dr. Karp presented a huge vision for increased growth in the medical school and hospital. And do you see that as continuing or as something that can be integrated into education or is it sort of -

CAPILOUTO:

There are many parallels and I'm glad you raised that point. First of all, Council on Post Secondary Education has forwarded its budget recommendations as an operating budget and as the capital component. I remain optimistic. I'm not too certain what the state's going to be able to afford on the operating side, and I don't know how deep our pockets may be on the capital side. One of the things that CPE did this year though was it built something more

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
formulated in terms of capital needs. It took in some components, first of all, the aging condition of your buildings, the deferred maintenance assessments and so forth that had been conducted for all of the campuses in Kentucky. Then we're interested in, you know, more current measures like enrollment. And one I argued for that was accepted was because I think research space is unique in the way it should be factored in, I argued for funded research as a part of the formula, okay? So that what would be good if we step forward with something like this is there would be a pot of money and you'd drive the dollars to each university according to the formula and then at the university level with proper permission and oversight and so forth we would decide how to best use these funds. And these are the puzzle pieces I'm trying to put together. Each project has almost a life of itself but it's tightly integrated, too. The revenue sources I see are certainly on the university side, you can think of any cash you may have. I don't have a lot laying around or if you're going to finance something. What kind of philanthropy could you possibly get in support of the project. People like to direct their gifts. They have affinity for certain things they want to do. And then lastly asking the state to be a partner. So how those work on every project is going to be a challenge but we want to work all of those avenues and see if we can put the pieces together to get this thing going. As Coach Cal says, we won't be making progress until he sees lots of cranes on campus. That's the way I feel about it, too. Not just one crane. It's going to take some putting together. In that we've got to understand what revenues we generate through enrollment and other activities. The hospital plan, as I understand it, was certainly built around a growth in patient services. And sure enough the admissions to the hospital - I can't remember the number, 19,000 to 33,000 annual.

BUTLER:

J. S. Butler, Graduate School. I saw in the presentation numerous comments about faculty, staff, and

their circumstances and undergraduates, but I did not see much about graduate students. Could you comment separately on the professional Doctorate side and on the research Master's and Doctorate side and what you see as future funding in those areas?

CAPI LOUTO:

Sure. I think that many of the things we've undertaken in terms of our facility and enrollment and all meet the core of our mission but not the sole core and the match the magnitude of enrollment which is bigger than most other things we do. I think as part of our being more definitive in the way we budget activities on campus we need to get more explicit in how we acknowledge undergraduate, graduate, and professional activities. They all have different costs associated with them. It's a different student population, a little different mission, so we have work to do in that area. That's how I think it can be best addressed. You still look a little perplexed. Let me - so this is the way I see this. I often told faculty before as we go through a process like this, tell me how you want me to spend your money, okay, because you earn it, all right. And that's what we've got to figure out in alignment with our mission and priorities. So we've got to work through all this to support a broad mission in the most efficient way we can. And I hope we can grow our way to the top, not just look at this as an end product that you have to cut your way to the top, okay, but that's going to take some serious conversation. I think there was a hand up back there.

BLONDER:

Lee Blonder, College of Medicine. If I heard you correctly, you said that you're considering spending up to a million dollars on a contract with Huron Consulting?

CAPI LOUTO:

Yes.

BLONDER:

I'm wondering since that's a fairly large sum of money if you could talk to us a little bit more about what you expect to get in return for that kind of investment.

CAPI LOUTO:

Right. Well, first of all, certainly a precise analysis when it comes to our debt capacity which will come through our financial records extensively and give us an

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
objective view. I also look at this as expert staff with a fresh perspective that can help us rapidly to address the other matters I've raised. Creating an integrated and transparent budgeting system with a set of principles by which we allocate resources and assign cost in a 2.7 billion dollar enterprise is a serious undertaking, okay. And I think we need a team of experts to help us work through that. You've got to understand what you want to do and what you want to achieve. Then you've got to have systems that are fully aligned. Reporting systems and budgeting systems that support what you want to do. It is a major undertaking. And so I think it's critical that we have that kind of expertise. I think we need to be able to rely on them to be analysts, that we direct the questions that we want to be answered in a very methodical way. So it's the fresh perspective moving quickly and having access to best practices and expertise is what I'm looking for.

CONNERS:

Terry Conners, College of Agriculture. I'd like to ask you a question about how we market the University. I'm not a native of Kentucky as you are. And I work primarily in extension. I appreciate the role of athletics in creating an image for the University. But I end up talking to a lot of young people and parents who do not have a college background. And the first thing they think of for Kentucky is great school, great ball team. I'd rather as a faculty member have some marketing effort put into the kind of improvements we can make in their lives, why go to college, the diversity and success of the programs that we educate children in. And frankly, I see more billboards concerning college in Hustler Hollywood than I do for the University academic programs. Can we change that?

CAPILOUTO:

Well, first of all, I want to return to what I said in the beginning and that is I want to thank all of you for giving us great material to tell people about because at the basis of all this you've got to have a real program. I know you've all been out there,

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
but I'll never forget one student who said to me, I said, well, where's your friend going to school. And he said well, they're going to such and such. They're enrolled in Honors Lite. What do you mean by that? It's not real honors. Our kids know what they want and they're sophisticated consumers nowadays and they're getting more sophisticated. And the way they access information, I've seen enough of these kinds of studies. I wouldn't measure it entirely by what you see on the billboards. I mean they look for information in lots of different ways. Still, we are always open to better ways of letting people know what a great value and opportunity this University holds. It is tremendous. I've been astounded by it. I'm deeply moved by it. I look for every opportunity I can to share it and I hope you will join me in that, but we'll look for other ways. I just want to return to you you can't sell something that's not real and what we have here is very real. It's a remarkable place.

CONNERS:

Just one additional comment. I think we have to market not just to the prospective students but to their parents. In my own family having an occasion like that, my wife's family had no college education, she went to a good school because of mentoring. And I'd like to see some examples where we can explain to parents why their children need to go to college. I think that's how we help the rural population in Kentucky, for one thing. Thank you.

CAPILOUTO:
COYNE:

Thank you.
Marc Coyne, College of Agriculture. I know you were treated last Friday to a celebration of the land grant institute. And the opinion that land grant institute is the institute of the common people, that everyone should have access to that. How do you mesh your desire to have the best and brightest at the University of Kentucky with making that experience accessible to all Kentuckians, particularly all high school age Kentuckians? Is there a mechanism that you have in the back of your mind for bringing that Kentucky experience to students who may be starting out

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
with limited academic skills but
who could possibly prosper at our
University?

CAPILOUTO:

I think our admissions process has
been one that's holistic. It is
not simply a determination made by
somebody's grade point average and
ACT. So I think we've been open to
that and I think that many of the
programs like the first generation
Scholar's program I spoke to
earlier are designed with that in
mind. I did enjoy being at the
College of Ag last Saturday
afternoon. In our retreat with the
Board of Trustees a conversation
broke out at the end of the day
about flagship land grant
commitment mission. I had supper
with the Trustees that night. It
was just an informal social event
but I think I stayed up until 2:00
in the morning searching for
articles to help me further answer
those questions. You know, and I
find our land grant mission
manifest in almost everything we do
around here. You know, when I read
the history of the birth of the
College of Medicine here and
realized that, you know, in its
first curriculum it had not only
that you gain expertise in
diagnosing a patient one at a time
but there's a six week course in
diagnosing a community. I'll bet
that that's sort of rooted in our
culture and history here. And it's
still here. Now, the world is very
different than when land grants
were conceived. There were no two
year college system that provided
significant geographic access and
financial access and so forth to
people who have more limited
capabilities given their particular
circumstances. So, yes, we do want
to attract the best and brightest.
We're more committed to making sure
that all of those who come here not
just be top of their class but we
have a spectrum of students leave
here as the best and brightest.
That's the strongest contribution I
think we can make to this state.
For every qualified Kentuckian I
want them to find a spot here on
this campus. But I don't think
it's the case that, you know, we're
going to have an open enrollment
system.

GROSSMAN:

Bob Grossman, A&S. One question.
We've all been reading a lot about
Page 18

administrative bloat both around the country and allegations of it here which have been going around for much longer than you've been here. I did see you said something about reviewing the structure.

CAPILOUTO: Right.

GROSSMAN:

Can you say a little bit more about the time line for that and whether it will be ongoing or just a one time thing?

CAPILOUTO:

It starts with my office. And those people who directly report to me and have dual reporting responsibility to the Office of Provost. And I think that's where you need to begin in any organization. So we'll start there and I hope the - it's my expectation the leadership throughout the different entities that report to me undertake this serious review as well.

GROSSMAN:

Time line?

CAPILOUTO:

Bob, I don't have something specific so I'm not going to say. But it is first and we already have sort of a framework by which we'll start.

SWANSON:

Thank you.

CAPILOUTO:

Thank you very much.

SWANSON:

Before President Capilouto needs to leave for a meeting, I asked some of our great teachers - you saw last week there are a number of teachers who were awarded by the Alumni Association so I know some of them couldn't be here. But if you are here, please come forward and have your picture taken with President Capilouto. Kristin Ashford, College of Nursing. Arne Bathke, Eric Christianson, James - I'm going to mess this up - Haubenreich. That's terrible, sorry. Ajay Mehra and Ana Rueda. Could you come forward, please?

CAPILOUTO:

I'm sorry I must go. I have a telephone meeting at 4:00. But I wish all of you a safe holiday and one full of meaning and purpose. Enjoy yourselves and see you in January.

SWANSON:

We have minutes from November 14th. There were some editorial changes. Could I have a motion to approve the minutes, please?

GROSSMAN:

I move the minutes be approved.

Bob Grossman, A&S.

SWANSON:

Thank you. Is there a second?

BRION:

I second. Gail Brion, Engineering.

SWANSON:

All in favor?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Opposed, abstained?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Thank you. The minutes are approved. Those were our great teachers. So we have from number of college represented. We have a web transmittal that was posted. Please review that. I'd like to draw your attention to the quote, new policy on religious observances where the faculty shall give students the opportunity to make up work and shall indicate in the syllabi how much advanced notice is required for such an accommodation. So those are changes that were just made. And that is on this website if you'd like further information. I'd like to remind you that we'll be meeting with Chair Brit Brockman in April and so as we move forward into the spring, think about some questions that you'd like to ask him and we'll send them forward so he can at least get prepared on some of those and perhaps topics, too. Perhaps you might want to ask him how's it going so far, something along those lines. Any information communicated here or within anything we send you can be shared with faculty colleagues. So please, we don't have good methods of disseminating information but anytime you can, please just do so. I'd like to draw your attention to the University Senate Welcome Back Reception. This is hosted by President Capilouto and his wife. That's on January 19th on Thursday from five to seven at Boone Center.

BROTHERS:

Please RSVP if you have not done so already. I think only ten Senators have noted that they will be attending.

SWANSON:

We have a Senate Council ongoing - we have a nominating committee. Connie Wood, would you like to say just a few sentences about that?

WOOD:

The Senate Council's currently trying to elect the next Senate Council Chair. Last month you received an e-mail soliciting your input into that election process. That process will go through December the 14th and then the Senate Council will meet on December the 21st to elect the next Senate Council Chair. There has been some questions regarding what type of input we were soliciting. This kind of input can take the form of actual nominations for

Senate Council Chair or just general feelings as to the direction that the Senate Council and hence the Senate should be taking and how that could be affected by the Senate Council Chair. I will assure you that all your comments will remain confidential and the nominating committee will be summarizing your input and providing that to the Senate Council as a whole. Thank you.

BUTLER: J. S. Butler, Parliamentarian. I remind you that you cannot compel voters to vote for three out of six. It's up to three out of six and the voter who finds only two acceptable is not compelled to pick a third. I hope the software permits that because if it doesn't that's a problem.

WOOD: I'm speaking to the election of the Senate Council Chair which currently is within the Senate Council. I will defer to the Chair of the Rules Committee with regard. I believe you're referring to the election of Senate Council members.

BUTLER: I'm referring to what is currently on the screen.

SWANSON: Could we just back up? Let's get to that issue in just a bit.

BUTLER: That's fine.

SWANSON: Could we ask any questions of Connie about the Senate Council Chair election? We were just trying to clarify because we were trying to make this attempt to involve this body more and we had some motions on the floor to make those changes and those motions are back into the rules committee. And so we thought this was sort of a stop get measure as we try to make some changes.

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing. Just a point of clarification. Connie, what you're saying is that any of the Senators in here can make a comment to your committee and say I would like to nominate someone. So it's not just a recommendation? We can actually nominate somebody?

WOOD: It can be formal nomination. The slate of those which were eligible are contained in that e-mail that I believe Sheila sent out was mid November if I remember correctly. We can send that out again if that would be helpful. Also we would appreciate any kind of other input

ANDERSON:

you might wish to express.

Thank you.

SWANSON:

Thank you. All right, so then we also have Senate Council elections. The voting round started today.

JONES:

And, Davy, would you like to address the comments made by J.S.? The University Senate states in the rules that it adopts Robert's Rules except that it would provide otherwise so, you know, rank ordering three out of the six, this is not something invented. The University Senate voted that procedure on itself and the reason we do the rank ordering is because it enables a mathematical run-off calculation so to speak so we don't have to go through another live round.

SWANSON:

So would it be possible in J.S.'s example to vote for one, two, and zero?

JONES:

No, of the three you have to - according to the rules the Senate has voted and published upon itself, of the six you have to select three and rank order those three.

BUTLER:

I'm still Parliamentarian. I made no reference to rank order which is a method of not holding a run-off. My comments had to do with whether there had to be three.

SWANSON:

Right, thank you. All right, vote early, vote often. Additional items that are of note, the UK Alumni Association contacted me a couple of weeks ago and they told me that they had changed their regs, their policies, and what they wanted to do is include a Senator, a faculty Senator within their executive body. Now their executive body has a hundred twenty-eight people. Their first meeting will be in January.

Nonetheless, so I thought that was a wonderful move forward and so he asked me if I would go ahead and do it as the Chair of this body. So I thought I could do it for this year and then ask the rules committee to work on some kind of a criteria and then perhaps we could include that election at the same time. So the same time you're voting for all these people you could be voting for a representation from this body to serve on the Alumni and then we could get more interaction with our Alumni Association. I attended the November 19th AAUP meeting. There

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
are a couple of other people in the room here and I can ask you for some input, too. There was some interesting presentations on financial exigencies, about what they mean and what they are and how they can be used. That was quite interesting. John Taylor from ECU gave a nice presentation on budgets. And one of the things I thought we could consider is that the many universities have a budget committee and within that budget committee faculty, staff, and students send their representatives to be on that committee and that helps the bodies in general understand the process and get some kind of representation. And so John Taylor has been on that committee for a long period of time and so he told us of many types of ways that he educated himself and made an impact on the budget process. And then I met with the COSFL group also and they will be hosting a joint AAUP COSFL meeting some time in the spring. And the budget is another issue they're thinking of picking up. Mark Herman, is there anything else you'd like to add about the AAUP meeting, a list?

COYNE: What I would add, it was a very good presentation from the ECU representatives. In large part or saying if we have a strategic plan, where in the budget does it supply the information to support that strategic plan. So the strategic plan about the budgeting to support it are no good. And the other is the whole idea of shared government of the faculty with decisions in the University and the idea that our role is to participate in the guidance of University policy and the way the University is run.

SWANSON: Alice, do you have comments?
CHRIST: I would agree with that. I was struck by the broader definition of shared government shared governance than just we do the curriculum and they do the budget. We need to get the two closer together. So I appreciate very much your thought of instituting a budget committee.

SWANSON: Herman, any thoughts?
FARRELL: No, I was quite interested and curious about the issue of finance. That's why I was there and concerned about that. But I learned enough from the gentleman

who was there talking about especially with regard to that legal case that are that support such a transformation in the infrastructure of the University. So I'm pleased.

SWANSON:

Good. Thank you. Okay, so Jeannine reminds me to give you an announcement on commencement. We will have commencement this year. It's on Friday, December the 16th at 1:00. We have the graduation - the graduates participating and professional schools and at 6 p.m. we have the undergraduate. They are both in Memorial Coliseum. Do you know what the numbers are now? There were seven hundred the last time I asked you.

BLACKWELL:

Well, it's about six hundred undergraduates and about a hundred fifty graduate and participating professional school students.

SWANSON:

Good. And that's up because last year it was around five hundred?

BLACKWELL:

Right, right.

SWANSON:

Good, thank you. We invited Anna Bosch, Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences. As you remember, we are still piloting our document handling system and we'd like her to come tell us the good, bad, and ugly about this process.

BOSCH:

Well, we are piloting the document handling system. As some of you know, most of our course approvals, new courses, and course change proposals have been handled through a series of shared point sites, shared e-mails, e-mail flow that gets distracted or sent to the wrong person. I think the electronic document handling system really came from the impetus of the Undergraduate Council and Mike Mullen's office due to the rather extraordinary number of new courses and course change forms that had to be processed last year as Sheila Brothers well knows. So I want to thank Hollie Swanson and the Senate Council for inviting me to say a few words here just to give you an update. I really want to stress that we're still at the very beginning stages of working with this system. But I'm very optimistic this is the right way to move forward for us once it's fully implemented. The College of Arts and Sciences was asked to pilot this system with the expectation that as large as we are, we should

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
be able to locate the pressure points of the system pretty easily, and I think we've managed to break it several times already. So far the human factor has been our biggest challenge, and I think you'll all see that when the system is opened up for the University as a whole. Really the biggest problem is training your faculty and training your various committee members to know where to go and what to look for. As you may or may not know, actually the document handling system is set up so that any faculty member can submit a course proposal. Now that may work for some of your colleges if you're small enough, but it wouldn't work for our colleges with more than - well, with around four hundred faculty members, any one of whom could decide to be a lone wolf and propose a course that they wanted to teach at some distance point in the future. We also thought it was going to be impractical to try to give training sessions to all four hundred of our faculty members. So we have strongly encouraged the Directors of Undergraduate Studies and the Directors of Graduate Studies to be the point person for their department for actually doing the uploading, if not writing the actual syllabus. Obviously you have experts in your department who may be responsible for developing the syllabus in a particular course, but we want to make sure the departmental curriculum committee takes full responsibility for the courses that are sent forward from their department. So we've asked the Director of Undergraduate Studies to actually do the uploading of the course proposal and the first step after that is for the chair of the department to sign off. So basically what that means is that your DUS and DGS and chair have to have some kind of training in how to operate this system. Our first course proposals in A&S were submitted on November 21st. So it's really just been a couple of weeks. And we have something like eighteen proposals which have been submitted to us and none of them has actually left the college to my knowledge. Actually one left the college today Mike informs me and

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
went to the wrong person. It went
- we don't necessarily want to send
every course proposal to Mike
Mullen personally. But we want to
make sure his office and
Undergraduate Council gets to see
it and gets to review it. And
that's the kind of thing we have to
work really closely with UKIT on.
And I see Kathy Crouch is in the
back of the room here if you would
raise your hand. Kathy is our
point person who has been
developing the system and my
administrative assistant Roxie
Hanson has been daily, hourly
contact with Kathy Crouch to work
all of this out. The system is
structured so that the course form
which you're already familiar with
from the Senate website is a
fillable PDF but any additional
documentation has to be an
attachment. And that's really
where the problem lies. Ultimately
it would be nice to be able to have
everything be some kind of a
fillable PDF but that would require
your body, your institution taking
some steps on what a syllabus looks
like which may be harder to do than
and we want to tackle at this
point. If any of you have served
on college or university curriculum
committees you probably know that
tends to be several iterations of a
syllabus. And once a syllabus is
submitted to my office, typically
my administrative assistant and I
look it over and go back and forth
with the faculty members several
times to be honest with you to make
sure that the syllabus includes all
the things that are incorporated on
the checklist, the Senate Council
checklist for the syllabus. And so
there are things like student
learning outcomes that have to be
present on the syllabus and so on.
That's the kind of thing that we
check before we even send on to the
college ECC, that is the Education
College Committee of the College of
Arts and Sciences. So, in other
words, once the form is approved by
the chair in your department - in
Arts and Sciences it comes to my
office. We look at it a couple of
times and may go back and forth
with a faculty member or with the
DUS to polish the syllabus. And
then it has to go to the
Educational Policy Committee where

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
various sub groups of the Arts and Science educational policy has to look it over also. And it's making sure that the paper flows to the right person or group of people at the right time that we're still trying to work out. It's actually a little more complicated than you might expect. A further sticking point right now is that course proposals and new courses and course changes can all be processed through this electronic document management system. But so far program changes or proposals for new change is not yet automated online. So if you've got a proposal for a new program saying your Master's degree or something like that, that program goes through one set of channels whereas the courses affiliated with it go through another set of channels. And so, again, you have to manage making sure that whatever committee is reviewing the proposal sees the program proposal from the one location and the course proposals from the other location. So these are the details still working out. Again, I want to say that I'm really optimistic that this is going to be a huge improvement on what we've had up to this date, but the kinks are still there in the system and we're working very hard with UKIT to make sure that we know what to do next and how to improve the system.

SWANSON:

Questions for Anna?

BOSCH:

I'm sure Kathy could answer your technical questions. I think that it's going to be a great system once we get the kinks worked out.

GROSSMAN:

Is there a rollout date for the whole campus set yet?

SWANSON:

No.

GROSSMAN:

No, okay.

SWANSON:

We want the bugs out first.

BOSCH:

I think it would probably be nice to have a couple courses go all the way through every committee, don't you? Okay, feel free to send me an e-mail if you have any questions.

SWANSON:

I'd like to thank Kathy Crouch for the tremendous work that she has put into this system and Anna for allowing us to use their colleges. Thank you. We have our officer's report is concluding with Joe Peek, our Trustee. Joe, would you like to say a few words.

PEEK:

So as faculty Trustee, I pretty

much see my job as getting issues on the radar although it also got my pictures on some dartboards. But, you know, there have been a number that I think we've been very successful on. We've gotten the regulations for appearing before the Board changed. It took a long time. A lot of people were involved in a lot of meetings. I was going through some stuff in my office yesterday and I found some interesting things. I found my petition after the Cole Lodge - on the Cole Lodge thing and I made a petition to speak before the Board of Trustees about the Trustees not allowing people to speak before the Board of Trustees. Ironically my petition was declined. So that was well before I was a Trustee. So but since that time we made progress there. Other things like the Reynolds Building, a problem for a long time that's being dealt with. Raising the Honor's program, the Ombuds office. The Ombuds office I think is going to happen. We've talked about it before. And it's now on the President's desk. My understanding is he is in favor of this and has asked the joint staff and faculty committee to provide some more details of how it would actually be implemented. In terms of other news, you know about the new dorm and trying to do a public private partnership. Right after the last Board meeting we had - the RFP went out. There's been responses. And it's my understanding that University administrators have chosen a finalist to discuss this with and make a final decision about whether it will be a public private partnership or perhaps we'll use our own debt to accomplish that. Another issue on the radar that some of you may or may not have heard about is a lot of our endowments are under water much like your TIA crap and other accounts. And so there have been some issues, some fighting back and forth with the CPE. It is going to affect our ability to continue spending endowment income which may be somewhat disruptive to some programs. I've talked to Angie Martin about this and others and so I think the feeling is yes, we're going to have to cut back what we

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
take out of the endowments, but we'll try to do it in such a way that we'll minimize the disruption to ongoing programs that rely on the endowment income continuation. And you've already heard about the statement from President Capilouto about not using state funding for Rupp Arena. That's something I've been very concerned about and I think other Trustees have been very concerned about. So I think that to me is a very positive statement. So I think the University is on a much better path. I think we are moving forward. So my work here is done. So December 31st is my last day as a Trustee. So I'll be at the Federal Reserve Bank of Austin. I saved the University. Now we're going to try to save the economy. So it can't be more difficult. So I'm done. And I do appreciate all the support that I've had, you know. A lot of people pitched in. A lot of support. A lot of people yelling. A lot of people complaining. And I really believe we are on a better path and I believe the Board of Trustees is on a better path. You know, when I went there, I didn't have much use for the Board of Trustees, but I got there and I found out that actually a lot of them do care. A lot of them do pay attention. And we actually see no votes once in awhile. So they're not simply rubber stamping. So I think it's a much more active Board, much more involved Board. Part of that has to do with some of the people on the Board, some of the new blood on the Board. Part of that has to do with the new administration with President Capilouto who I think is much more open to the faculty, to the staff, to the students, and much more willing to share information with the Board of Trustees. So -

BRI ON:

PEEK:

SWANSON:

WASILKOWSKI :

SWANSON:

BRI ON:

Three cheers.
Let me just say after this I will no longer be a rebel without a cause. So thank you.

Greg?

I would like to make a motion that the Senate thank Joe Peek for exemplary work and representing our interests at the Board of Trustees.

We have a motion on the floor. Is there a second?

Second. Gail Bri on.

SWANSON: Discussion? All in favor?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Opposed? Abstained?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Motion carries. Thank you.

PEEK: Thank you.

JONES: I was just going to ask Joe very briefly, we're having another election to run and we're going to solicit for nominations and candidates. Can you capture in a nutshell information that you didn't know when you were considering as to whether to be a candidate that would be good information for potential candidates here to know?

SPEAKER: That would still make them run.

JONES: Which direction?

PEEK: Okay, I mean many of you know that the whole thing started as a lark. We were sitting around joking around and so forth and it started sort of as entertainment value. But then it sort of worked out and so the key thing is there was a lot - there was and is a lot of discontentment among the faculty. And so what's the (unintelligible) thing when he was asked about running for President about, you know, why do you want to be President? He said I don't want to be President; I want to run for President; there's a difference. There is a difference. And I think whoever does run for Trustee has to understand there's a difference in campaigning and serving. It's really important because you have to get along with the Trustees because we need their votes. And so, you know, there are important things. I've had a very good working relationship. It started out rough. When I showed up, I was the enemy, but over the course of the year, I've developed a good working relationship with Chairman Brockman and many other Trustees. I think they now more or less trust me. They do listen, you know, so it's worked out and it can work out again, you know, I'm no different than many of the other faculty members here other than, you know, I don't really worry about making a fool of myself. That's really the only difference, you know. There are a whole lot of people who can do this as long as you don't have any pride, as long as you'll get up and say whatever. That's really

SWANSON: the only real difference.
Thank you. This is something I did on my weekend. I put together a little something for Joe. And, Michelle, if you wouldn't mind coming and getting it, we'll put it on the table in back and people can sign it as they go out. If you don't have an opportunity to sign it, we'll leave it in the Senate Council office. I'd like to share this with you. I don't know if you've seen this. This is how we almost got our twelfth President at the University.

(Thereupon, a short video was played.)

SWANSON: Thank you, Joe. Moving on to business, we have agenda item number four. We have a number of calendars that need to be approved. Could I have a motion from the floor?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A&S. I move to approve the calendars as published in our handout.

SWANSON: Is there a second?

WASILKOWSKI: Second.

SWANSON: Discussion? All in favor?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Opposed? Abstained?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Motion carries. Thank you. Item number five, the establishment of a Senate (unintelligible) Service Faculty of records for the Honors program. As you know, we've been in intense discussion of the Honors program. We want to move this forward but it came to our attention that who is the faculty of record. And let me give you a little bit of history. Prior to 2005 there was a clear body of faculty that was responsible for the Honors curriculum and these faculty had split appointments between the Honors and their departments. And then since 2005 the faculty teaching the Honors no longer had split appointments and their only appointment was in their home body. And so this is a question we've been dealing with. This is our fix that we came up with within the Senate Council. And so let me read the recommendation to you just so we can be clear on what we're trying to do here. That the Senate create an Honors program committee appointed by the Senate Council in consultation with the Associate

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
Provost for Undergraduate Education
to act as the faculty of record for
all Honors curriculum. This
committee will be composed of ten
faculty broadly representative of
the undergraduate colleges. The
committee will report to the
Director of Honors to whom it shall
transmit its recommendations for
consideration by the Undergraduate
Council. Questions?

WATKINS: John Watkins, College of Public
Health. I don't see any real
charge in that recommendation, just
how they're going to be appointed
but not what they're supposed to
do. Would that be part of the
recommendation at this stage?

GROSSMAN: If I can address that, Bob
Grossman, A&S. The purpose of this
committee is to serve as the
faculty body responsible for the
curriculum. And so what the
faculty is responsible for is
already in the Senate rules, what
the faculty of each department is
responsible for, what the faculty
college is responsible for. This
essentially serves as a department
for a program that doesn't have a
department that is across many
departments and across many
colleges. So they're responsible
for all of the new courses, degrees
if it comes to that, the different
tracks that they have, all the
educational things the faculty are
in charge of.

WATKINS: Including teaching?
GROSSMAN: Including teaching? What do you
mean including teaching?

WATKINS: Is this committee going to be
teaching all of the courses within
the Honors program?

CHRIST: Or any of the course?

SWANSON: No, no, not necessarily.
WATKINS: Then there is no clarity in terms
of that split of responsibility. I
wonder if just some clarity might
help with that. Faculty of record
for all Honors curriculum does
imply, if not explicitly say that
this committee will serve as the
faculty who is teaching the
curriculum and doing all the other
things.

GROSSMAN: The problem is that the faculty who
teach in Honors change from year to
year. And so this committee will
presumably - the purpose of this
committee is to - or the thought is
that the committee members will be
the people who are dedicated to the

Honors program, who care about the Honors program. Not everyone who teaches an Honors course will be on this committee. And it may be some people on this committee may not teach the Honors course in a particular year. But this seemed to be the best way that we could think of of creating a body that would be responsible for proposing curriculum.

- BRI ON: Gail Bri on, College of Engineering. If I might recommend a modification to the recommendation where it says to act as family record for oversight and direction of all Honors curriculum, not necessarily teaching. It's oversight.
- SWANSON: It is oversight. Is that acceptable to make that change?
- GROSSMAN: This comes from Senate Council. I don't know who's responsible for change.
- SWANSON: J.S., can you help us?
- BUTLER: That should be phrased as an amendment.
- SWANSON: As an amendment.
- BUTLER: The committee cannot meet to approve that. It must be (unintelligible.)
- SWANSON: And we need a second on an amendment.
- GROSSMAN: Do we have the exact wording of the amendment?
- BROTHERS: Yes, the faculty of record for oversight and direction of all Honors curriculum. So it would be a faculty of record for oversight and direction of all Honors curriculum. So their oversight and direction.
- SWANSON: Do we need a second for an amendment?
- BUTLER: Oh, yes.
- SWANSON: Is there a second?
- COYNE: Mark Coyne, College of Agriculture, second.
- SWANSON: I open the floor for discussion.
- KORNBLUH: Mark Kornbluh, Arts and Sciences. The new proposal for the Honors academy includes the possibility for departments to offer Honors courses which would presumably be governed by it their, you know, it has to go through a department process and for Honors sections as well. So that's not clear to me what the role of the faculty records versus that would be.
- SWANSON: I thought the intent would come from the Department to this committee. We need a university-wide committee for oversight.

KORNBLUH: That's my understanding.
So I came here from Michigan State which has the largest Honors College in the country, and one of the reasons it works so well is that the faculty at large in their departments took this as a responsibility and always offered a wide variety of Honors courses. And it didn't go through a process of somebody above the department level looking at each syllabus from each department.

SWANSON: Okay, there's a question over here. Is there a question over here?

SPEAKER: Yes, but not in relation to this amendment.

SWANSON: Okay, any other discussion with respect to - Connie?

WOOD: Although I agree with the intent of the amendment, I'm not sure that it is specifically needed because faculty - if SACS qualified, are eligible to teach courses in these areas. What this faculty is charged with is proposing, changing, setting tracks, and setting standards for an Honors degree. And I don't think that that excludes other faculty from participating.

SWANSON: Okay, any other points?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: So we need to vote on the motion on the floor first and then the amendment.

BUTLER: We need to vote on the amendment. We need to vote on the amendment. This whole discussion right now is just adding some words right there. This is not a discussion of the substance of the proposal.

SWANSON: So we're going to vote on the amendment. All in favor of the amendment?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Opposed?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Abstained?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Motion carries. Would you agree, Michelle?

SOHNER: Yes.

SWANSON: All right, now we've got the amendment on the floor. We have a main motion on the floor as amended. Any discussion on the main?

OSBORN: Jeff Osborn, Arts and Sciences, Biology. It seems to me that it's composed of ten faculty broadly representative of the undergraduate colleges. That should be

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
representative of the number of
courses the colleges have or are
proposing or that exists within the
Honors curriculum and within the
Honors college rather than just
broadly representative.

SWANSON:
GROSSMAN:

Bob?

We had an extensive discussion of
this in Senate Council and there's
a tension between wanting to have
representation from the groups that
have always taught Honors and then
also wanting to bring new people in
to teach Honors. And so this is on
purpose not very specific except
broadly representative is supposed
to mean that it is broadly
representative of the faculty who
are teaching or may in the future
be teaching Honors curriculum.

There was certainly a lot of
discussion about how A&S has a very
heavy load in teaching the Honors
courses and that, therefore, the
colleges that do teach the most
Honors courses should have a larger
representation on this committee.
Presumably that will come out as
the Senate Council has discussions
with the Associate Provost.

They'll try to appoint a group that
is appropriately represented.

SWANSON:
DEBSKI:

Liz?

Liz Debski, Biology. That was
exactly going to be my point
because as it reads now, they don't
have to have anything to do with
the Honors curriculum. And so why
doesn't it say broadly
representative of the Honors
curriculum as opposed to the
undergraduate colleges? I mean
because or at least I think it has
to somehow get in that they have to
have something to do with the
Honors program.

SWANSON:

Perhaps what we could do when we
get the committee formed we could
have them write their own specifics
of the composition. Would that be
helpful, to address the composition
and the term limits and how they're
going to roll off? Connie?

WOOD:

Part of our discussions in Senate
Council not only reflected the fact
that you want people who had been
uniquely involved in and involved
for a long period of time in the
Honors curriculum but also giving
us the ability to expand the Honors
curriculum hopefully so that there
would be Honors participation
across all of the colleges and

that's one of the main intents here. Therefore, we try to write the representation on this committee in such a way that it would reflect the fact that in the future we want to have all colleges involved but also allow for greater representation from those areas which currently are offering the most courses. And hence the word "broadly representative."

DEBSKI : I understand all of that. I just don't see why it doesn't say that they have to have anything to do with the Honors. As it's written now, you could have ten faculty members who have never taught an Honors course.

SWANSON: You could but you would expect the people who are choosing those folks would keep that in mind.

OSBORN: Jeff Osborn, A&S. I would go back to based on Bob's comments and what you said in terms of teaching and curriculum within the Honors program, I would support what Mark Kornbluh just mentioned in that this directive should really come from the departments, and the broad representation should be driven by departments who want to participate in the Honors curriculum and that's where the aegis of the Honors program should be represented.

SWANSON: Are there additional comments from people we haven't heard before?
I'm going to call for a vote, all right?

GROSSMAN: Can I just address? The department can't serve on a committee. People have to serve on a committee. There is currently no body of faculty who are responsible for proposing changes in the Honors curriculum. There is no one. No one has the responsibility for it. No one has the authority for it. In the absence of that, it defaults to Mike Mullen's office to make the proposals and none of us want the - as much as we all like Mike Mullen and think he's a good guy and trying to do a really good job and doing a really good job, we want the faculty to have control over the curriculum. This is a way of re-establishing faculty control over that curriculum.

SWANSON: All right, I'm going to call for a vote now. All in favor?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Opposed?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Opposed?

SOHNER:

I think maybe seven.

SWANSON:

Abstained?

SOHNER:

Three.

SWANSON:

Motion carries. Thank you. We have a committee report, Senate's Academic Program Committee. Andrew, would you come forward, please.

HIPPISLEY:

So we have one piece of business here, the graduate certificate in International Education. And broadly this is to create well-qualified professionals who could work in the growing field of International Education and the desire is to respond to a huge year in increase in American students pursuing studies abroad. It's going to be achieved by a fifteen credit certificate that includes two kinds of courses, four courses on higher education in administration, student services and comparative education and then elective courses in international studies fields such as French, German, Hispanic studies, History, and Geography. So who's it planned for? Well, students pursuing a graduate degree in education primarily, but what we found more interesting was students not in education but in graduate programs in the modern languages, geography, history, and so on. So they can pick up this extra certificate on (unintelligible.) It follows standards and best practices. The proposal outlined three university programs all doing MAs in Education, International Education, and their main courses paralleled the core of those three programs. This is the Graduate Institute in Vermont, Lesley University in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and the University of Minnesota. Finally one of the main entry qualifications for graduate status is the first one. The second one which is more vague but has been firmed up in subsequent revisions is some kind of international experience so students coming into this program have to be proficient in a given language other than in English and that language would be related to the professional aims of the student. And the student will have to demonstrate some kind of experience of living in another country, again, related to the

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
professional aims of the student.
The last point about international
experience is something that the
committee spent a lot of time on
and went backwards and forwards
with the authors of the proposal
and we are satisfied that these
criteria (inaudible) international
experience being addressed. Finally
I should say that we as a committee
think it's an important proposal
because it's important in the
context of an increasingly
internationally oriented university
where internationalism should be
part of the flagship's mission of
the state. So do I say the motion
or -

SWANSON: No, we can ask for questions. Are there questions?

HIPPISLEY: I think the authors are here as well possibly, yes. Beth Goldstein over there is the author of the proposal.

BUTLER: The author of the proposal is the committee for purposes of this discussion.

HIPPISLEY: Okay.

SWANSON: Are there any questions?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A&S. So may I address myself to the Chair of the committee? So the Senate Rules Election Committee recently discovered the CPE has imposed a mandate on us that all graduate certificates must be at least eighteen credits. Is that not true?

SWANSON: No, no.

BROTHERS: No, no, you missed an e-mail.
GROSSMAN: That changed this morning? Did I sleep late?

SWANSON: Jeannine, please clarify.
BLACKBURN: There is a national definition from the Department of Education of what constitutes an official graduate certificate and that is indeed eighteen hours. That means you have to report it and it has to go through all approval procedures. We do not have graduate certificates nor are we planning to have graduate certificates that meet that threshold. We want to keep it below at fifteen or below; certainly below eighteen hours because then we do not have to go through the full approval procedures of the CPE. Our graduate certificates are not reported nationally in the data base IPEDS but they remain that functional very efficient model of

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
a graduate certificate with a focus on learning a specific skill set. And so I talked with the CPE about this last week to confirm and they confirmed yes, indeed, we can continue with having graduate certificates around fifteen credits, between nine and fifteen and we can continue doing that. I report those once a year to the CPE so they're registered but they are not part of the approval process. So we're safe.

GROSSMAN:
SWANSON:

I stand corrected.
We have a motion on the floor from the committee. Is there anybody who would like to debate the pros and cons of the motion?

SWANSON:

(No audible response.)
All right, all those in favor?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Opposed?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Abstained?

SWANSON:

(No audible response.)
Motion carries. Thank you. Our next committee report is in the Senate's Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, Wally Ferrier is Chair. Wally? Sorry, I went too fast.

FERRIER:

This is your Senate Committee for Academic Planning and Priorities. And I want to start with two main points. One is we're back and two, and we're ready to listen. As far as I understand it, the story about the recent history of this committee kind of goes something like as follows: I was probably summer before last when the Senate Council had a summer retreat during which I suppose they typically review kind of the composition and the charge and the purpose and the outcome for a variety of committees. They discovered that this one in particular had been dormant and inactive for a number of years. So that summer before last Hollie and the Senate Council reinvigorated, reinstated, and got us working again. So there are a lot of new faces, some great Senators, and your colleagues on this committee. So we're ready to go. We are not a super committee sequestered to come up with some grand designs for academic designs and priorities. Rather we want to serve as kind of a listening post for your ideas and new initiatives. It's no doubt if you paid attention

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
to some of the key words that resonated with me in particular what the President had been talking about in the past hour, he used words like new, innovation, creative, entrepreneurial. I'm sure that more than a handful of you over the years had some wonderful dreams and ideas only to have them beaten down in a variety of ways. And after the third or fourth time of that, what's the point? So I think now is an excellent opportunity to provide kind of a major cultural and attitudinal and institutional shift toward a new normal and that part of that vision is we've got to dream up and carry through some new ideas and activities as we move forward. And I think we need to emulate as best as we can what real entrepreneurial organizations do. They communicate a lot. They reward failure. I'll repeat that. They reward failure. Part of our heritage of having new ideas beaten down is that it's discouraging. So we don't have any mechanisms or even a culture or attitude to say yes, great idea but go back to the drawing board for round two and round three. So we want to help celebrate the creativity and innovation and entrepreneurship in a variety of different ways. The first is really to kind of help nurture new academic initiatives. If you want to think about this as academic entrepreneurship, whatever that means for you, that's what it means for you and we can all share in that. Perhaps the most important way to get this jump-started is to have our committee serve as kind of a meeting point for the exchange of lots of new ideas. So why not use technology available to us to kind of get this rolling. So our committee has a new e-mail address academi cpri ori ti es@uky. edu. This is a direct line from a given Senator or one of your colleagues in the faculty at large to the committee. The other is a new list service, academi cpri ori ti es@l sv. uky. edu. And it serves as any list server really does, kind of an exchange and ongoing conversation. So make note of these. If you have any difficulties getting on these or if

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
you don't know how to work lift
serves, fine, I could certainly
help you do that. So I encourage
you. You've got ideas and want to
bounce them to us, we'd be happy to
help you in that regard and welcome
other friends and colleagues and
Senators in that broader
conversation. I met with Doyle
Frisken, one of our top information
officers, and I understand that the
University at large is moving more
toward a kind of DRUPAL system and
I think our friends in Arts and
Sciences have really taken that
initiative and it looks pretty
good. But, you know,
entrepreneurial initiatives really
benefit from more information and
exchange, not less. So once we
have the access rights, we'd like
to begin kind of a blog where we
can upload pictures and documents
and even have Twitter feed such
that if you're sitting in traffic
on Nicholasville Road, not while
driving, but sitting, and you have
a Twitter account, tweet in a few
ideas. Respond to another
colleague's suggestions and ideas.
One way to emulate an
entrepreneurial enterprise is to
really have a face to face forum
for exchange of ideas much in the
way that a new venture would give a
quick pitch to a group of
investors. Now our committee is
not really investor like in terms
of our purpose and responsibilities
but we want to provide from time to
time maybe once toward the end of
each semester a friendly or not so
friendly depending on the nature of
the idea, but a dispassionate,
unbiased objective environment that
you and colleagues can pitch some
ideas and we'll give you feedback.
Those ideas that seem to bubble up
and have some resonance and
feasibility, we'd like to further
support and further advocate and
further vet and maybe champion
those ideas. Those ideas that are
a little bit out in left field and
a little squirrely and weird, well
we'll tell you it's a little weird
but we want to give you the
opportunity to compete with - I
guess our analogue to an award that
some companies, even Procter and
Gamble, right up the road. They
call it the bold failure award. We
didn't want to have some negative

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
overtones associated with that but our award is going to be called something like great idea but kind of award and give you a real trophy to hold, a traveling trophy with your name on it for the boldest, freshest idea that just ain't going to work. But we want to celebrate that. So in that regard, that's all I have to say. Hollie, thank you for having me in and thanks to my colleagues for helping us out get this committee jump-started again. This is your committee. Let us work and speak for you and with you. Thanks.

SWANSON: Any questions for Wally?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Okay, thank you.

FERRIER: Thank you.

SWANSON: I'll send the PDF to this presentation to you tomorrow so they don't have to write down all those addresses.

FERRIER: Sure, that would be great.

SWANSON: We have a report from the Interim General Education Oversight Committee. Bill?

RAYENS: Thank you. I'm Bill Rayens and I am the Chair of the Interim General Education Oversight Committee. I promise you I'll be brief. It's late. Like some of the others, I've been standing back there the entire time. I may end up leaning here on the podium at some point. But what I was asked to do is come in and just give you a brief update on what the Oversight Committee has been doing the last twenty months. First if you don't mind, I know we have a couple of these people here, but you'll see in a couple of slides why I want to start with this. I want to start with some acknowledgments first to the Senate Council. Senate Council has been very supportive of us. I've had to go sometimes nervously, sometimes not and appear in front of the Senate Council and ask for things. And the Senate Council has been very supportive as has Mike Mullen. I've been on the ground with these folks though for the last twenty months. And the area experts are the ones who are really doing a tremendous amount of work. If you're here, at least raise your hand. John Allison. Ruth Beattie. Heather Bush. Larry Grabau. Jane Jensen. Derek Lane. Roxanne Mountford. Karen Petrone. David

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
Royster. Ben Withers. And Ernie Yanarella. We've also had some very dedicated ex officio guests who have been at nearly every one of our meetings. Deb Sharp in the back. Richard Greissman. Anita Simpson. It's been a really hardworking group and I just want to take a couple minutes and tell you a little bit about what we've done. Some of the people have rotated off here and we have actually a couple of slides that are open. Our primary role when this committee was formed, what, early summer 2010, was to have a group in place that could vet all the courses that were anticipated that were about to be released and indeed there were a lot of courses released. We were given a charge primarily to vet courses. The actual charge which the Senate Council put together in conjunction with Mike Mullen was a little bit broader. That certainly was our first most important task. We had to early on come up with a vetting plan. There was no vetting plan in place. We had to come up with forms, a lot of mundane things that were actually, you know, obviously very important things to make the process work as well as we could make it work. We did get all of those approved by Senate Council. I should say for a period of one year. And we went back to Senate Council this fall and had that process re-approved. The process is a very intricate process in terms of not intricate I think in terms of what faculty have to go through but the details are all spelled out and that's on our UKCore website if you want to see that. We are in a position I would say we would like to tweak the process a little bit but we're resisting doing that because we need a document handling system. We don't want to create a new thing that's going to be in place in a couple of months. We're hoping the document handling system which will have a place for the UKCore will be functional soon. Summary of vetting activity well, you can see the ten areas there. Basically there are two hundred courses that have been approved for the Core out there. You can see how those are broken down, about one hundred

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
twenty-seven are completely approved. And by that I mean they've gone all the way through the Senate. There are seventy-two more that have been approved by the Core - and I'm sorry, approved for the Core by the Oversight Committee and they're beyond that group say with Undergraduate Council or waiting for Senate approval. Some of those we also had some courses of those that were pre IGEOC in that first round, initial round before this Oversight Committee was ever formed there were some courses that were created. Quite a few that were created. Some of those IGEOC ended up having to deal with or having the opportunity to deal with but not most of them. If you count the ones that IGEOC definitely touched, we vetted one hundred fifty-one. A few more than that because, again, we had a few of the pre-IGEOC courses. You can see how they're distributed across the areas. We were sort of told early on that our roles would be defined as we function and as the committee actually worked and we developed a role in assessment. One of the things we did is we were asked to serve as a group that would facilitate the development and ultimately the revision of rubrics used to score the artifacts that are being collected around campus. We've completed one cycle in the sense of that rubrics were created and approved by IGEOC for the CNC and citizenship courses. Those individual faculty who participated in the scoring of courses in those areas have had suggestions how those rubrics could be revised and those revisions are being facilitated back through IGEOC. We have rubrics being created for each of the four inquiry areas and for Quantitative Foundations and Statistical Inferential Reasoning. Those will be completed early in January. We've also been asked to provide a voice for you in revisions to the assessment plan. And we've had an opportunity to do that. We had a role that emerged in policy making. If you look at the original charge, one of the bullet points basically says to help think through things as these things come up, very colloquially stated. I said well,

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
okay, what do you do that with that. Well, things came up all the time. Certainly we don't set policy. The Senate Council basically has said to us say what you think is right. Say that very carefully after a lot of reflection and ultimately those things that you suggest will find their way to the Senate. So there are some - we haven't decided what we're supposed to call preliminary policies that are hanging out there on the UKCore web page. There are a few of the ones that we've had to deal with. In summary I guess what I want to pass along, I'm very proud of this committee. When you serve on the ground with these kinds of people for - very dedicated people who put in just a tremendous amount of time, you serve with them for as long as I have, it's important for me to tell you even if you don't like it sometimes, they're very loyal to the Core with respect to the Senate approved template outcomes. That's what you asked the committee to be. And we are very stubborn where that's concerned. Very hard working group. They have a very faculty friendly attitude. The policies have intended to be faculty friendly. They are, in fact, exceptionally stubborn and some of you in the room who have worked with us know we can be very stubborn where fairness and integrity are concerned. We will not tolerate any sort of bias on the committee with respect to lobby for one particular area or the other. We turn around and we look at the template outcomes and that's how we make the decision. So we're very stubborn where that's concerned. I think what the Senate Council wanted back in the summer of 2010 was to have a strong faculty presence in decisions about the Core. And you certainly have a strong faculty presence in decisions about the Core. This group is not afraid to service tackle some problems. You are due from me at some point in the near future suggestions for how this committee might be staffed. That was a suggestion that Connie Wood had about a year ago. Connie has already left today. We certainly talked a lot about that in our

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
committee and I'll be submitting something here in the short term. Also I've been asked to put together a vision for the committee's function long term and that's in process as well. Primarily I just wanted to come and let you know we have been working to give you a few numbers so that you can see what particular courses number-wise have been vetted. Any questions that you have that I can answer, I'd be happy to.

SWANSON:

Questions for Bill?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Okay, thank you very much, Bill. We have another item on the floor that we didn't get into your handout in time on the agenda and so what I'm asking for first is that we make a motion to waive Senate Rule 1.2.3 to allow us to consider the proposed proposal that would like to put next on the agenda. Could I have a motion? Lee Blonder, College of Medicine. Is there a second?

EFFEN:

Second. Susan Effen, Health and Sciences.

SWANSON:

Discussion?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

All in favor?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Opposed?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Abstained?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Motion carries. Thank you. All right, we have item number D, the Senate Academic Organization and structure committee. Herman is the Chair of that Committee.

FARRELL:

Thank you. This proposal was sent out to you, I believe, at the end of last week. It's a proposal to create the Institute for Sustainable Manufacturing in the College of Engineering. It's actually sort of a new structure that is coming from an old structure. The Center for Manufacturing was a multi-disciplinary research center that was established back in 1986. It's currently suspended and waiting approval of this new ISM Institute for Sustainable Manufacturing and subsequently the issue of the termination of the Center for Manufacturing will come back before the SAOSC and before the Senate. This proposal was put together in March of 2011 and then subsequently

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
submitted to the Senate. We reviewed it in November. We had two meetings to talk about it in the SAOSC which is Senate Academic Organization and Structure Committee. And the first thing we did was we lined up proposal with our guidelines, those guidelines that were presented to the Senate back in September, there was guidelines that we had put together in the committee last year under the leadership of Dwight Denison, the last Chair. These were questions we had. We certainly wanted to standardize the process so people would know what they need to present to us with regard to changes in academic organization and structure. So we sent to them the guidelines as well as particular questions. Those questions have been provided to you as well as their responses. We then subsequently met. When we met we met with Dr. Jawahir, the Director of the ISM, as well as Bob Gregory, who is here today, and we approved the proposal and we incorporated those responses into the actual proposal and sent them off to Senate Council and the Senate Council then proceeded to vote on the manner. That's sort of a substance of the - of our process. Just to give you some sort of a description of the proposal itself, of the institute itself, the term sustainable manufacturing is defined as the creation of manufactured products that use processes that minimize negative environmental impacts, conserve energy and natural resources, safe for employees, communities, and consumers, and are economically sound. And then specifically this multi-disciplinary research center will be responsible for conducting academic research, inventing, and commercializing innovative products and processes and technologies, transferring knowledge to industry through extension outreach and coordinating graduate and undergraduate educational programs offered by the college and individual departments. I just have a brief summary of the issues that we raised in our questions to the folks proposing the ISM. We were concerned about or we wanted

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
to understand the difference between the current center for manufacturing and the new institute for sustainable manufacturing. We also wanted to understand where the administrative responsibilities would lie under part seven of the governing regulations set forth by the Board of Trustees. You can - multi-disciplinary research institute or center can report either to the head of research, the VP for research or to an academic officer. We were informed that the College of Engineering Dean would be the academic officer responsible for the administrative side of things. We also asked questions about voting rights, relationships to other colleges notably how this the issue of sustainability and other sustainable initiatives across the University, how they would relate to each other, being asked for letters of support from the few chairs that are involved in this multi-disciplinary research center. And we had sort of a red flag issue which we then also raised with the Senate Council which was the issue of the creation of member firms that would be responsible for supporting and sustaining financially the ISM itself. And we just sort of set forth our suggestion that any funding mechanism of this sort that would involve support from private enterprises that it be vetted by the Office of Legal Counsel as well as the Commercialization and Economic Development Office just to make sure that everything is as we say in New York kosher. So we resolved the proposal was academically sound. There was an issue with regard to our process because we didn't have a quorum present at the moment we passed it. We did it electronically and it was supported. When it got to the Senate Council, there was an issue about the vote itself that took place in the College of Engineering. Apparently the College of Engineering vote when it was unanimously supported by the members present didn't have a quorum so they had a vote last Friday and there was a vote of seventy-six vote - seventy-six members of the College of Education, faculty members of the

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
College of Education in favor.
Thirteen opposed and two abstained.
Engineering.

GROSSMAN:

FARRELL:

GROSSMAN:

FARRELL:

What I did say?

Education.

Engineering, thank you. So, Davey Jones has made it clear to us we would need to make actually two votes on this; is that correct? I don't know if we can go ahead with that. The recommendation would be there would be a vote on the academic merits coming from the Senate as well as an endorsement of the non-academic merits on the administrative side of these.

SWANSON:

Do we have any questions about the proposal?

GEDDEN:

Jim Gedden, College of Medicine. Any information as to what the concerns were in Engineering of those faculty who opposed the center?

FARRELL:

That's a good question. I didn't know. We just got those votes on Friday and it was just an up or down vote. Would it be appropriate if Bob Gregory would respond to that?

GREGORY:

It was an up and down vote. We spent a couple of years before we finished the proposal circulating it through the departments and through various committees and colleges. And the college is not huge. We felt like everybody who was interested certainly had a chance to read and talk to people and object and so on. We didn't feel like there was some sort of wood screen.

SWANSON:

Is there anybody that's representative from the college, any of the five Senators have any insight?

FARRELL:

And the committee's - one of the questions we always ask is what - if there was some dissent, if it's one or two people, we'd like to know what was their argument, what was their concern whatever the proposal is. Do we know?

GREGORY:

One issue right away is this called for any kind of resources that would be pulled away from the departments.

SWANSON:

GREGORY:

And what was the answer?

The answer was no, that the Dean proposed to use minimal resources from the Center of Manufacturing to provide a small amount of operating money and he'd already dedicated some faculty lines for center of

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 12-12-11.txt
manufacturing and he proposed to count those. They wouldn't be housed in the center. They would be in their departments and those faculty associated with the center so there wasn't going to be any resources drawn from departments for the (inaudible) and that seemed to resolve that issue because that's all (inaudible.)

SWANSON: Further questions?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Okay, we have a motion on the floor from the committee that the Senate approve the proposed New Institute for Sustainable Manufacturing effective upon Board of Trustees' approval based upon its academic merits. All those in favor?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Opposed?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Abstained?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Motion carries. Thank you. The second motion that we need to vote on is that the Senate endorse the proposed New Institute for Sustainable Manufacturing effective upon Board of Trustees' approval based upon its non-academic merits. Any discussion?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Okay, all those -

CHRIST: Actually I do have a question why it isn't under a Vice President of Research because it seemed to me we're considering in my program - sorry, this is Alison Christ in Fine Arts - that the advantage of having institutes in centers is their interdisciplinary structure, not just the interdisciplinary content of people who happened to be collaborating. And the definition of this institute is that it has associated faculty as well as some FTE dedicated faculty but those associated faculty are not in the College of Engineering. Right. At this point.

GREGORY: Right. At this point.

CHRIST: Yeah, and I guess the biggest obstacle that we usually find to interdisciplinary collaboration is the deans -

GREGORY: Right.

CHRIST: - who don't want to release resources through another college.

GREGORY: Right.

CHRIST: And it seems to me that this structure is designed to provide for that; that it's a structure that allows above the deans to say

Look, we have an interdisciplinary center; why don't you throw in something?

GREGORY: That's right.

CHRIST: And I also didn't see any documentation of attitudes from the chairs of the departments of the associated faculty. I mean if everything is going to be still be in Engineering, you can see why people wouldn't have to agree.

GREGORY: Sure, right.

CHRIST: Aren't you losing an opportunity to have a real interdisciplinary?

GREGORY: Opportunity was part of it because we wanted to move quickly to pursue sustainable engineering projects that we needed large partnerships for and we got some projects with other colleges involved and projects with design education and business right now, but we weren't prepared to work out agreements with other colleges at this point for something very complex that could take a long time to negotiate and so on. We thought we'd start with the people that were already committed to this within Engineering, get something up and running, attract people from the other colleges by having something that was actually functioning rather than something that was just on paper and at that point we'll have to come back to the Senate.

CHRIST: But can't you do that under a vice president?

GREGORY: That's what we would think about doing is at that point come back to the Senate, say we have something that involves colleges, we're going to structure it to report say to the vice president or somebody outside of the Dean of Engineering and we'd like you to review this larger more ambitious organization. This is the sort of step one.

CHRIST: And the Dean of Engineering wants to hold on to his resources, right?

GREGORY: I'm not really privy to his designs, but that, I would be surprised.

SWANSON: Are there other comments, discussions?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Okay, we'll go ahead and call a vote then on motion number two. All in favor?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Opposed?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Abstained?

(No audible response.)
 SWANSON: Motion carries. Thank you. Robert Mock has graciously agreed to come back at a later time. Our last item of business, J.S. Butler has asked for a moment.
 BUTLER: When there is a motion on the floor and you wish to change it by a small amount, say by a few words, that's an amendment. If there is a motion on the floor and you wish to make all the words and replace them with another bunch of words, that is a substitute motion. So technically the correct term is I wish to make a substitute motion.
 SWANSON: Excellent. Thank you very much. Do we have a motion to adjourn unless somebody want to change the wording?
 (No audible response.)
 SWANSON: We're adjourned. Thank you. Happy holidays.
 (Thereupon, the University of Kentucky Senate Council Meeting for December 12, 2011 was adjourned.)

STATE OF KENTUCKY)
 COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

I, ANN E. CHASTANG, the undersigned Notary Public in and for the State of Kentucky at Large, certify that the facts stated in the caption hereto are true; that at the time and place stated in said caption, the UK Senate Council Meeting, was taken down in stenotype by me and later reduced to computer transcription by me, and the foregoing is a true record of the proceedings which took place during said meeting.

My commission expires: May 12, 2015.
 IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 31st day of January, 2012.

 ANN E. CHASTANG,
 NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE-AT-LARGE
 K E N T U C K Y
 ID #442199

