

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 4-9-12.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *

April 9, 2012

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. We have quorum. Let's go ahead and get started. I was looking for Bill Swinford. He's probably on his way soon, and so we'll go ahead and get started with our announcements. I will start with our please slides. Give your name and affiliation when you speak. Communicate with your constituency. Attend meetings. Respond to e-mails and web postings as appropriate. And respect others. And I just did this, silence your electronic devices.

Page 1

GROSSMAN:

Thank you.

Madam Chair, can you repeat that last one just for everyone's benefit?

SWANSON:

For example, Armando Prats. I'm not calling out names or anything. Does anybody else need their name called out? We have minutes from March 19th but they're not yet ready. We recently received a request from the Martin School regarding alternate calendar and waiver of Senate Rules 5.2.2.2. The Senate Council deliberated on that and we approved a one time waiver to allow the MPA program to teach two three credit hours courses in a four week period with the course calendar reverting to a six week term calendar in future years. So we had a calendar issue there. Congratulations to the following. We had the Provost's award for Outstanding Teachers and I apologize, I should have probably announced this at our last Senate meeting. Kim Anderson, Chemical and Materials Engineering. James Fox, Civil Engineering. Sue Nokes, Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering. William Silvia, Animal and Food Science. And Irene Chico Wyatt, Hispanic Studies. Congratulations. We also have our teaching assistants for Outstanding Teaching. Mahan Ellison, Hispanic Studies. Joshua Guerin, Computer Science. Pauline Stratman, Chemistry. And Nesa Wasarhalay, Psychology. We have the Provost's Distinguished Service awards. Francie Chassen-Lopez, Department of History. Mark Dignan, Department of Internal Medicine. Laurie Lawrence, Department of Animal and Food Sciences. Joseph Straley, Department of Physics and Astronomy. And the Provost's Public Scholars, Paul Eakin, Department of Mathematics. And also recently we have the Faculty Research Professors for 2012 and 2013. And these were presented at the most recent Board of Trustees meeting. Doug Andres, Department of Molecular and Cellular Biochemistry. Mark Dignan, Department of Internal Medicine. Mark Fillmore, Department of Psychology. Chris Pool, Department of Anthropology. We also have congratulations to the Sarah Bennett Holmes award winners. This

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 4-9-12.txt
award is granted annually to women working at UK who promote the growth and well-being of other women at UK and across the Commonwealth. This year there were sixty candidates for this award which I think is a record breaker. I was able to attend a lunch that was very well attended. The winner this year is Ann Bassoni, the staff person, and Gail Kennedy for faculty and libraries. For my chair update, what I'd like to do is just give you a brief update on the work of the RQ Committee, the Faculty Committee on Review, Reward and Retention. We have had a third meeting and will go into our fourth meeting next week. So far we have two faculty quorums. We are eager for input so any input that you'd like to give me, send me, or any of our committee members. We are also in the process of setting up interviews. We've got interviews being set up with faculty with chairs and with deans. And this is to remind you a faculty driven process and our intent is to improve overall professional development. We are currently trying to gather as much data as we can with respect to our processes and our policies and to compare our processes and policies to some of our benchmarks. So we have about four benchmarks that we're looking at to see where we can make improvements. Any questions on that or for that committee? Okay, I'll try to keep you informed as we go along. I regret that I had announced to you about a month or two ago that Britt Brockman would attend today's meeting, but he was called away on surgery today. I asked Bill Swinford if he would step in and address us and tell us what's going on from the President's perspective. Bill, welcome.

SWINORD:

Thank you as always for an opportunity to spend a few minutes with you and get you caught up on the things we're paying most attention to. I guess we'll start with budget. The House and Senate have reached an agreement and have forwarded to the Governor a proposed budget for 2012-13, and I would love to tell you that it changed from what I told you a month ago, and it did not. We are
Page 3

going to face a 6.4 percent reduction in our state appropriations beginning July 1 as I've told you before. That works out to about 19.4 million dollars for next year, 19.4 million dollars for '12-'13. And then we are flat going into '13-'14. It is now on the Governor's desk. We do not anticipate that it will change from that number. I also mentioned to you that we had faced a challenge on getting authorization for agency bonds. In other words, bonds that we could issue ourselves to take on some debt to do some construction. The version of the budget that was agreed to by the House and Senate contains no agency bond authority for any post secondary institution. So what that means is as the budget is written, and we do not anticipate that it will change, we are unable to issue debt to do some capital construction on campus. We also knew going in that it was a longshot that the state would provide any debt authority for the University of Kentucky or any other post secondary institution, and unfortunately we were correct; that there also is not any state bonding authority. So it was a very difficult and disappointing session for us. The one glimmer of good news is that we were able to get authorization to pursue the residence hall initiative that the President has been working on since October and the Board of Trustees's retreat. We have broken ground or are about to break ground for Haggin Field for the first dorm. But the General Assembly also asked us to begin to move forward and continue negotiations with the private developer to move forward with several residence halls over the next twenty-four months. So in general, again, it was not a good session for us and not a good session for post secondary education under the rubric it could have been worse. We took a 6.4 percent reduction. Most state agencies took 8.4 percent. And those agencies are flat lined going into 2013-14. So as it relates to budget, the President has now begun discussions in earnest with unit heads and with deans and others to make a series of decisions. Those decisions you all are very familiar

with. They include the level of tuition we will charge going into the fall of '12. The Council on Post Secondary Education that we anticipate will at their next meeting later this month issue the parameters that they have used for the last three years now where the Kentucky Community Technical Colleges could go up as much as four percent. The comprehensive universities can go up as much as five percent. And the University of Kentucky and University of Louisville can go up as much as six percent. So that's our ceiling. And that is our flexibility. That's our room to maneuver. And so the President is now reviewing the amount of money generated for that. Net it's about 1.8 million dollars percent increase in tuition. The President also is having discussions and will need to make some decisions about salary increases. Those decisions have not been made but, ladies and gentlemen, in the face of the 19.4 million dollar reduction, it's awfully hard to find the money to do that. One of the things the President is considering, one of the things that has been suggested that he's been intrigued by now that we know for better or for worse the state appropriation number for the next two years maybe the University of Kentucky ought to begin thinking in terms of a two year budget. So maybe we can start talking about both '12-'13 and '13-'14. The reductions in the units are coming. We're still having discussion about the magnitude of those reductions. But maybe there is a mechanism by which the more difficult year in essence is '13-'14 and there's a way to begin making some reductions and reallocations in the first year with an eye towards more absorbing the full in '13-'14. He's open to all suggestions at this moment as to how we manage our budget going forward. The other part is that even though we didn't get authorization to do capital projects using our own debt authority in this legislative session, the General Assembly will be back in nine months. We'll make another run at it. So part of our budget discussions may be aimed

Page 5

toward beginning to build a pool of funds that we can use towards debt service on capital construction on campus in the absence of state support for those initiatives. So those are the kinds of things that have to be decided and they have to be, as you all know, in very short order now that we know what the reality looks like. So I suspect that President will make decisions in the next ten days to two weeks and will be communicating with the campus about what those decisions entail. I'm glad to take any questions about that. Let me say just a couple of other things by way of events on campus. As you know, our Provost, Kumb Subbaswamy has been given the opportunity to be Chancellor at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. That time line is yet to be worked out. I'm sure Amherst wants him there yesterday, but we hope to keep him at least a little while as we think about the transition to a new Provost. The President met with Chair Swanson and Chair Elect Blonder late last week for a long time and that was one of the topics of discussion as I understand it to seek suggestions about both the mechanics of a transition but also to identify potential candidates. The President is meeting with a pretty long list of individuals around campus to talk about those things. Professor Jones reminded us that regulations require discussion with the faculty committee and the President is committed to doing that before he makes any decisions about what the best approach is for the University. It's complicated a bit as you can imagine by the fact that we were also in the midst of a search for an Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration. And even as we speak, that committee is meeting to review candidates for that position. The aim continues to be that we will have somebody identified in a short while and to have that person on campus beginning July 1st. Frankly I have not talked with the committee since the President charged them to do their work. Dean Scott Smith of the College of Agriculture is the Chair of that committee and has

Page 6

faculty representation and staff representation, but I don't know if they have settled on a calendar or a mechanism for candidate visits, candidate interviews. The President charged that committee and then asked them to make those decisions about how that process ought to unfold. We also, as you're aware from the newspapers, even though we celebrated a national championship, we had some challenges in the community area surrounding the University. The President, as you know, communicated with the faculty, students, and staff in the run up to the Final Four and during the Final Four and the days after that. It is important to note that the latest figures are that fifty-four people were arrested over the course of those four days. Approximately twenty of them were students. And so while, you know, every number is relative, is twenty a high number; is twenty a low number? It is important to note that a majority of the arrests did not involve our students, and the reports I get we got throughout the week were that most of the challenges and misbehavior was contained to a fairly narrow strip near campus on State Street. And it is worth noting, ladies and gentlemen, that there were thousands of our students on Limestone both after the semi final and the final game and all our reports from UK police and from city police were that they were very well behaved and there were no difficulties related to a pretty substantial number of students celebrating. I can also assure you as the President said in his e-mail to campus that any student found to have violated the law or violate the student code of conduct will be dealt with appropriately. We're working with Robert Mock's office and UKPD to carry that process forward. Those sorts of things can't be tolerated at a university. There is no excuse for that and the President is committed to approaching it exactly in that way. As always, I appreciate your time and attention. I'm glad if it's okay to take a few questions about anything that's on your mind before I let you all get back to your

Page 7

GROSSMAN: other work. Yes, sir?
Bob Grossman, Arts and Science. So in terms of the debt service permission, I know the Governor proposed it and then it seemed to just disappear from the budget that the House Committee proposed. Is there any sense of how much progress the University has made in convincing the important people in the legislature about this issue?

SWINFORD: Very good question. You describe it accurately. It was in the Governor's budget. We had made the case to the Governor with some success that as you all know in the past we had the line item each of the buildings that we wanted and the fund source for each. The President convinced the Governor that a better approach was a pool concept where they gave the University a pool of authorization. Then we can make decisions as we went along about how to allocate that debt to various facilities across campus. That authorization disappeared in House Appropriations and Revenue. The President and others spent a lot of time talking with legislators about that both in the House side and the Senate side. The fact of the matter is, ladies and gentlemen, we live in an era where the word "debt" makes policymakers extraordinarily nervous. And we have made it clear in as many ways as we can that the rule of thumb in state government is that debt service for the Commonwealth of Kentucky should not go beyond six percent of revenue in the Commonwealth's budget. And I'm not an economist, although I pretend to be one occasionally. A rule makes sense. It's sort of a guiding principle. But if that rule makes sense, we pointed out to them that currently the University of Kentucky's debt as a percentage of our revenue is around 3.7 percent. So if six percent is the maximum, 3.7 percent looks pretty good. And even if we had taken on all 200 million dollars in additional debt, it would have gone a little above four percent of our revenue. That's the case we tried to make. But ultimately the philosophy in Frankfort is that even though we're a state agency, even though we're a good investment, even though we've

Page 8

been here for almost a hundred fifty years and presumably we'll be here another hundred and fifty more, any debt taken on by a public entity in Kentucky is ultimately the responsibility of the state. If the University of Kentucky by some calamity were not able to make payments on the debt, unfortunately, that's where the conversation always ended was that ultimately the Commonwealth is on the hook for debt that the University takes on. We followed the strategy. We worked awfully hard. The strategy simply did not work as we had hoped. That's on me. That's on the President. That's on all of us. We did the best we could making the case. It was just as you all know in this environment the notion of taking on additional debt was just something we couldn't make the case for. So just a follow-up, do you have any ideas on how to approach it in the future?

GROSSMAN:

SWINFORD:

Another very good question. We're already talking about what we do nine months from now. The General Assembly is back in session. We operate on a biannual budget which generally means that only in the even number years do they do budget matters. But there's always slippage in the odd year, 2013 being the next one, where they will do some budget work. So there will be vehicles to get this done. We're just going to have to rely on our donors. We're going to have to rely on our alums. We're going to have to rely on people who can communicate with members of the General Assembly. We talk about the faculty and the staff and with students about how best to make that case. And we're back to the drawing board. I figured that out. The Senate Committee thinks that after the fall of 2012 elections come and go the environment might be a little bit better to have a conversation about debt, maybe.

SWANSON:

SWINFORD:

Is there anything we can do?

At this moment there is not a lot any of us can do. The document is on the Governor's desk the way the constitution is written and the way the statute is related to the budget are in place. The Governor can only item veto things that are in the budget. He cannot add to

it. So unless he's willing to veto the whole thing, which I do not believe he will, we are kind of at that end of the line. We're talking with attorneys and others with that very question. Is there anything else in the eleventh hour that we can do to accomplish this? And so far we haven't found that stone yet, but we're still turning them over.

GROSSMAN: In terms of preparing the ground in the future, what can we do?

SWINFORD: Well, we are going to re-engage you all in the fall when we get back, and members of the General Assembly will be most focused on the first week of November before they start focusing on the work to be done in January of '13. I assure you we will keep you posted on what we're going to try to do. I assure you we will call on you to help us as we move into the fall. We'll have another shot at it.

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing. I know when you were here the last time you made just kind of a lighthearted remark that perhaps if we win the Final Four that would make legislators amenable to us. We did win the Final Four. We did win the national championship. And according to the Herald Leader there was one article that says when you win the national championship there are millions of dollars earned returned to the University. There was another article in the Herald Leader that said that the sports programs at all universities are a drain on universities. So I'm just curious, where we are in that place and how much we might stand to gain and will it come to the general fund or will it go to sports?

SWINFORD: Very good. The article you're referring is from the Herald not yesterday but probably a week ago - Right.

ANDERSON: And it talked about the level of investment that campuses makes in their athletic program. As it noted, we generated about \$700,000 in student fees that go to support the University of Kentucky athletics mainly to defer the cost of the tickets that our students receive to the football and men's basketball. And as the article also noted, the amount of money that UK athletics sends back to the

campus for the general scholarship fund in addition to the scholarships for student athletes, they return about 1.7 million dollars to the campus. And so as we've always made the case, the University of Kentucky athletics is self-supporting. In terms of a windfall that comes from participation in the NCAA tournament that comes from particularly the Final Four, I don't know what that number is yet. I'm going to find out. We'll find out soon and I assure you the President will have a conversation with athletics the way he has a conversation with all major units on campus about how we handle the budget circumstances we find ourselves in. That's an ongoing conversation. I'd tell you the number if I had it.

DEBSKI :

Liz Debski, A&S. With regard to the Provost search, it was unclear from your remarks if the President is thinking of appointing an interim Provost followed by a national search or appointing someone who is going to serve for awhile in the Provost position.

SWINFORD:

Very good question. And I don't have an answer for you. The President is exploring both of the alternatives you suggest from his previous role at Alabama Birmingham. He saw all sorts of transitions among his colleagues as Chief Academic Officer across the country. The President is having the conversations with various entities, and, as I mentioned, including your current and future Chair, and he's asked that question, what should we do; should it be as you suggest, a short term interim; should it be an interim of extended period of time, a two year commitment, for example. I'm making that part up in terms of longevity, or something a little bit longer, or do you immediately go into a national search. I think he's still gathering opinion on that as to what makes the most sense. Again, it doesn't make a difference one way or the other, but it is a consideration that we do not currently have an EVPFA, and that may have some implication for it. The President wants to make a decision relatively quickly, I assure you. Swammy is talking with

Massachusetts Amherst about his time line with us. The President wants it settled quickly. But I think he's looking at all possible approaches.

DEBSKI : Can I just follow that up by asking when he appoints a new Provost, whether it's interim or acting for a longer period of time, is there going to be a search committee to evaluate the candidates or is it just going to be in the (inaudible.)

SWINFORD: I'm sure that if we move to a national search for --

DEBSKI : I know from the national search it has to be but for an internal search -

SWINFORD: For an interim search, again, the President is talking to a wide variety of people. As the regulations indicate, he is to consult with a committee of faculty and he will do that. There won't be a formal search committee that goes through a formal search process if it's a short term interim or an interim of a defined period of time. I don't think that's the direction he will go. But I assure you at last count there will have been fifty conversations plus with individuals around campus about what makes the most sense. But I also assure you if it is a long term national search, it will involve a search committee with full faculty input and participation. No question about that.

McCORMICK: Kathy McCormick, College of Education. Among the options he's looking at in terms of reorganizing it is, is it the case that one of those options might not include a Provost?

SWINFORD: I don't think so. In all the options that have been discussed and considered in my presence, the option of moving away from the Provost model has not been one of those discussed. The President comes out of a Provost model. I think he feels comfortable with that in that experience. I think he feels comfortable in this model in nearly ten months here. And so I don't want to promise you for sure. I would be very surprised if that were the case. I feel confident there will be a Provost model. I appreciate the time. I wish I could come to you sometime

and bring good news. Maybe one of these days. Thank you all for your time, and I appreciate it.

SWANSON:

We have our Vice Chair, Professor Robert Grossman.

GROSSMAN:

Yes, very quickly. The last time I told you that we're soliciting nominations for the Outstanding Senator award and we have received some nominations. And I thank those of you who have nominated someone. I'm going to close out the nominations this Friday. So this is your last chance to nominate a colleague for the Outstanding Senator award. And, again, let me remind you, it doesn't have to be a currently sitting Senator. It can be someone who has completed his or her term. Thank you very much.

SWANSON:

Bob, if they'd like to donate prizes or anything towards that award --

GROSSMAN:

There's a basket outside my office.

SWANSON:

We have our Trustee, John Wilson.

WILSON:

Good afternoon. In keeping with Hollie's message, my name is John Wilson. I'm in the Department of Behavioral Science and I'm one of your faculty Trustees. And I left my cell phone in my office. I sent out an e-mail informative e-mail on Friday which contained information relevant to the previous Board of Trustees meeting, the March meeting. I wanted to let people know if your e-mail queue is crowded and you really don't want to be on my mailing list, I certainly am willing to try to go into the e-mail and remove people. So let me know if you do not really want these types of communications. We're trying to broaden the communication pool to include people who were not on the election list. People like instructors, lecturers, and the Board of Trustees themselves will be sent these e-mails to try to improve the level of communication. I will be real brief today. I'm certainly going to take a lot of questions related to any topic. But two important things happened. The Board of Trustees unanimously accepted the two amendments recommended by this body the last time. I thought that was a very positive thing. And, secondly, some extended discussion of the Presidential evaluation process

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 4-9-12.txt
took place. Just briefly, as I mentioned in an e-mail, I don't think the old presidential evaluation process used with the previous President was widely acclaimed by faculty as a good process. The Board wants to move dramatically away from that, and I'm not exactly sure they understand at this point what they do want except that it is more akin to a professional 360 type evaluation which will include input from multiple folks which will not diminish input from faculty, staff, and students but will try to get away from the old system which seemed bonus related. The first year of any president's term is problematic for an evaluation process. The President has made it easier this time by declining to accept any bonus whatsoever which was a pleasant change from some previous situations. In that vein I think they are particularly open to the Board of Trustees to input about how this process can be changed to go forward. I know Hollie sent some information from the Senate Council related to questions for an evaluation. That is just a preliminary thing. I think they're open to changing this as time goes on, and once they get a notion that, in fact, a modern process which focuses at least as much on planning for the future as it does on evaluating the past, it's instituted. Those were the two major things that happened. I think one of the nice things was for research professors got an opportunity to spend three or four minutes each telling the Board of Trustees about their research. I thought that worked out very well. It was very well-received by the Trustees. I'm encouraging them to also do something similar for other rewardees, particularly those related to teaching as I think that's the Trustees will be equally receptive to the creative things going on here and the other missions of University, teaching and service. At that I'm happy to take any sorts of questions or input. Once again, I know both of the faculty Trustees would be happy to get input from you at any time about any issues of concern. Can I answer any questions at this point?

JONES:

Davy Jones, Toxicology. Has the Board's thinking about the timing of the first presidential evaluation crystalized at the point where you can say it won't happen during the summer break?

WILSON:

This is an interesting issue. There was some discussion of whether we really needed to do this at all in the first year because there was no bonus provided. I think according to his contract an evaluation has to take place. What that evaluation is essentially met the focus on providing goals and objectives for next year is pretty much the way the sentiment was. That has to be done based on a contract by the end of the fiscal year which certainly does put it in the summer. And so what we're really what you will shortly get which I mentioned in the e-mail one of the most important things that will take place - probably the most important thing during this evaluation process is the establishment of some type of set of metrics or goals. And I think we're going to want more input from faculty about this going forward. I guess the answer to your question is it has to happen in this fiscal year based on his contract. It will have no impact on any bonus issues or anything like that. I think the Board perceives this in an evolving way that the evaluation of professionals really depends on a forward looking arrangement. That's why we think the input from faculty about the metrics that will be established is particularly crucial and important. We also will try to do prior to that time and prior to people leaving is some quick baseline data from faculty on their quality of life and their concerns at this point. That hopefully will be done I hope in April but certainly by the very first part of May. I don't know if that answers your question or not. Anything else? Yes?

BRIAN:

Isn't this a great time to have a dry run when it doesn't have an impact so we can tweak the process?

WILSON:

Well, I think that's the viewpoint of certainly the Board members who have talked with me is that let's do something. I think many of them were concerned and basically during the meeting said be sure to put

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 4-9-12.txt

TRUSZCZYNSKI : draft or sample questions on everything because we really don't know how this is going to play out and what's going to work. And I think from my point of view the proof will come in six months whether how open everybody is. I was not anticipating that it won't be an open discussion. Yes, sir? Truszczynsk, Engineering. What do we know ahead of time what exactly this process will look like, how exactly it will look like, what would the basic issues by which the President will be evaluated this time?

WILSON: I think for the first year I'm not sure how much - how public that will be in advance. I can't guarantee you that. I will certainly push for that. One of the interesting things you should know is that one of the things the President asked for is a template that he could use to hold his senior administrators to evaluation and that makes it even more important, I think, for faculty because I think that suggests that this set of metrics is - could be very useful from a faculty perspective at trying to move the organization forward, not just the presidential evaluation but the assessment of senior administrators.

TRUSZCZYNSKI : If I could follow up. The Senate I understand it are representatives of Senate Council have been working on our faculty driven evaluation of the President, and you mentioned they already sent something to you. Maybe this is what you - he sent to you. What is happening with this? What sort of traction has it received? Did it receive any?

WILSON: I believe the time it was sent Friday so that input has just been received by the Board. I think I would just say two things about that. One is what the Board - the questions the Board chooses will be public. But - or will be made public. I'll put it that way. What the Senate chooses to gather from faculty is the Senate's choice, not the Board's. So the Senate is free to gather from faculty the input they want to send to the Board. And it is the responsibility of your Trustees to make sure the Board receives that

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 4-9-12.txt
input. I don't anticipate that being a problem, but understand they're two separate processes. One is the questions the Board chooses to ask people and one is the questions the Senate chooses to ask of the faculty which is entirely under the Senate. Other questions? Thank you very much. I was wondering with the fiscal things whether we might end up with some new Calipari named buildings on campus as an option that might solve a lot of these problems. Once again, please let us know your concerns. We are anxious to move forward particularly at a time when the Board seems more open to consideration. Thank you.

SWANSON:

With respect to the questions that our subcommittee, Marc Coyne and Greg had developed with those questions, we have a somewhat a Senate Council version of that, and I sent that to Chair Brockman on Friday. I can send that out to you again tomorrow after this meeting and gather additional input for that. And I think after hearing your conversation - it's already April - so what we could consider and what I can go back and ask the Senate Council next week whether or not that would be a good idea for us to use those questions as a dry run. That's one possibility. But I don't want to speak on behalf of the Senate Council. I'd rather get your input and we could take that under consideration and try to get that completed before we leave for the semester. I see heads nodding. So let's take that up as an agenda item next week. Thank you. We have our committee reports. The Senate Academic Programs Committee, Professor Andrew Hippisley, Andrew?

HIPPISLEY:

Thank you. These to do, first one, this is a recommendation of the University Senate approved establishment of a new graduate certificate in School Technology Leadership in the Department of Educational Leadership Studies within the College of Education. There is some motivation for this. (Unintelligible) schools, as you know, are becoming more high tech and the leadership of those schools needs to know the most effective and efficient way of deploying this kind of resource. The target

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 4-9-12.txt
audience for the certificate
proposed principally in
administrator positions already.
And that way it fits in with UK's
strategic plan, plus the high
quality education by providing
(unintelligible), educators, a
basic competency in school
technology and leadership. The
program is fifteen credits all at
the 600 level. The design is
careful. It's based on five
standards dictated by a body known
as the National Education and
Technology Standards for the
administration's body. So each of
the five proposed courses addresses
one of these five standards. An
example of a standard in a course
would be school technology
leadership and another one would be
digital (unintelligible) school
technology. One interesting point
about the format of it is that all
of the courses would be offered
online.

SWANSON: All right, we have a motion on the
floor from the committee. Would
there be anybody who would like to
discuss the pros or cons?

FINKEL: Raphael Finkel, College of
Engineering. In the signature
routing log we have in front of us
there are no signatures. Can you
explain this? This is page nine of
our handout.

HIPPISLEY: I'm aware of this problem. As far
as I know - and Brian Jackson is
here luckily. These submitted
online and, therefore, it's
impossible to have a signature in
the routing log; is that right?

JACKSON: Correct. There is no requirement
for a formal signature per se. A
typed name is sufficient.

FINKEL: What evidence do we have that it,
in fact, has been approved at these
various levels?

HIPPISLEY: There should be dates.

FINKEL: There are dates.

HIPPISLEY: Okay, I'll defer to Mr. Jackson.

JACKSON: I guess I don't really have a
direct answer other than I can
guarantee that it's gone through
Graduate Council. All I can
imagine is that at the current time
we're working through two different
routing processes whether
signatures were all typed names.
In this case it would be my name on
there. It would simply be an
admission.

HIPPISLEY: So in other words we'll see more

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 4-9-12.txt
and more cases like this. There will be no signature because of the way of submitting online.

SWANSON:

Are there any other comments, questions? All right, all those in favor? Thank you. All those opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

HIPPISLEY:

The second one, this is a recommendation that the University Senate approve for submission to the Board of Trustees the establishment of a new BS program in Human Health Sciences in the Division of Health Sciences Education and Research in the Department of Clinical Sciences within the College of Health Sciences. What's the motivation for the program? The response to a need which has been identified by the Institute of Medicine to train future health professionals in a more holistic interdisciplinary way. Each professional needs to be more aware of what the others do. So many of the proposed courses that come along with this proposal go along with this emphasis in intra-professional collaborative knowledge, understanding, and its application. Because of this emphasis the program will not only prepare collaboratively by the students for the medical professional degrees, but it also trains students to go straight from the UK BA degrees straight to health based careers upon graduation. The target audience are good entry level students who are thinking of health care careers but also it will be able to recruit second and third year students who have left this decision to later in their undergraduate years. Student designations, well, the standard specialized degrees for (unintelligible) pharmacy, physician assistant, and physical therapy but also and this is what was interesting to our committee -- direct entry into the profession. Examples would include mid level management, supervisory roles across the health care environment, medical or pharmaceutical sales, health applicacy law, business, or even nursing. The program itself it's comprised of fifty-five credits and forty-four is the University standard. These credits include the standard medical

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 4-9-12.txt
prerequisites as well as a group of general human health sciences courses which aim to give the student a more holistic understanding and appreciation of the health industry. In fact, it's those courses are a direct response to the need for holistic thinking. The minimum requirement is a high school GPA of 3.5. That's not the only way to get into the program. Letters of purpose and health community based experience roles play a role and there will be interviews, selected interviews, which will also be opportunities to tell students exactly what they're in for and what to expect from the degree. Students then can decide upon four options. Dentistry, pharmacy, physician assistant, and physical therapy. Each of these options has its own courses based on prerequisites determined for training in the different professions. For example, Dentistry will have Biology 208, 209, Principles of Microbiology. At the same time all these options share a common thirty based - thirty credits of basic human health sciences so that all students have the same appreciation of the connections between the professions and the different professions' common ground. So an example of such a shared course would be HHS356 Seminar in Intraprofessional Health Care. Students also do science based courses such as Biology 148 and Introductory Biology. It proposes looked very carefully at the impact on existing courses and the conclusion is that it would be marginal. So it's estimated that only fifty students who would have used the existing mechanism towards a professional degree will opt into this new program and the maximum impact will be on Biology which we'll lose about twenty-five students. Sounds a lot but, in fact, Biology has a cohort of some fourteen hundred majors so it's quite minimal. The proposals have support from other programs and a number of bodies were consulted. I want to include a few here. Consultations (unintelligible) were begun in 2009. So they consulted the UK Health Care Colleges, the College of Arts and Sciences, the

College of Education, the Department of Nutrition and Food Sciences within the College of Agriculture. They've all supported the proposal. How is it going to be resourced? Well, like many of these proposals, they will use tip monies to employ various people that will be needed. They're going to employ a full-time program director, an additional faculty member.

SWANSON: All right, we have a motion on the floor from the committee. Is there anybody who would like to speak for or against the proposal?

DEBSKI : Liz Debski, A&S. I just have a comment. All of Biology's 1400 majors don't have GPAs of over 3.5 and ACT scores (inaudible.)

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing. I'm very much in favor of this proposal. I just want to clarify one thing. It would be a direct route into nursing but it would be those students could become part of the College of Nursing's second degree program. I wanted to clarify that.

GROSSMAN: I would just like for the record to make sure that something I read isn't going to, in fact, be the case. This program is not going to be advertised as a way of getting into pharmacy school or dentistry school. It is better than the existing majors; is that correct?

SWANSON: Do we have a representative?

STEWART: Sharon Stewart, College of Health Sciences. What it's going to be advertised as is one route that a student who's interested in those professions might take in order to apply. So we have a very heavy advising piece to this proposal and that would be discussed as part of it. And also I want to clarify Liz's comment. The 3.5 is not required to get into the program. It is a program that it will be able to take a maximum of fifty to seventy-five students just because of our resources and the kinds of courses that there are. So it's selective admissions and ACT GPA background experiences and anything related to health care leadership and so forth would be some of the things that would be taken into consideration. So I did want to clarify that.

DEBSKI : But it does remain selective because they go on probation if

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 4-9-12.txt
their average falls below 3.2.

STEWART: It is selective. There are retention criteria also. I know we had this conversation at Senate Council. But one of our concerns is we don't want students to get too far into the program only to find they're not competitive for those advanced graduate professional degrees that they had in mind. And so, again, there is a good deal of advising along the way to assist students. And, in fact, if their GPAs begin to fall, we provide extra tutoring and other kinds of things to try to get them so that they can once again become competitive. You're correct. I did want to clarify that statement.

KELLUM: Stacy Kellum, A&S. I had another question. I looked at the list of courses that were required and, for example, the Biology and (inaudible) and the Biology Department is not required for most of these areas of concentration. Are these students going to be prepared to take their DAT exams and that sort following the curriculum that you laid out there?

STEWART: Sharon Stewart. We worked together with Pharmacy and Dentistry and all the disciplines about what their prerequisite courses are. So we had met and in some cases exceeded that for the requirement. I don't know if somebody in one of the other disciplines wants to speak to that.

SWANSON: Would anybody else care to comment on that issue?

SPEAKER: Cindy (unintelligible) from the College of Dentistry. This curriculum does provide a more expansive foundation for the students to do well on their dental admissions test and to do well in dental school. Right now our current requirements prerequisite for dentistry are a year of biology and a year of chemistry, a semester of physics, and a semester of English. This curriculum is much more expansive.

SPEAKER: Those are still in there, the upper level biology?

SPEAKER: Well, Microbiology and Biochemistry have been added and then students have the option in this curriculum to take additional upper level science courses.

McCORMICK: Kathy McCormick, College of Ed. I

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 4-9-12.txt
was curious also, doesn't this program provide students with a stronger advising and mentorship than they might receive if they were involved in other colleges and colleges less focused?

STEWART: It has a very strong advising piece to it where I believe the students meet with their advisor twice a semester. A student affairs person is right here and can speak to it. Yes, there's a very strong component.

GEDDES: Jim Geddes, College of Medicine. You mentioned the anticipated fifty students that might enter this program versus other programs. Is that the anticipated enrollment and will there be what is the anticipated enrollment and will there be a maximum enrollment in the program?

STEWART: The maximum enrollment is seventy-five. We were just trying to estimate how many students might come to UK because of this program and otherwise might have gone elsewhere. We thought that might be around twenty-five students and that fifty students would have come to UK anyway. And we know that that's just a shot in the dark, but we're trying to figure this all out, and we'll know better after we get this underway. That's where that comes from. So the seventy-five person would be our maximum.

SWANSON: Additional questions, comments? All right, we'll go ahead for a vote. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstained? All right, thank you very much. Motion carries.

HIPPISLEY: This is a recommendation that the University Senate approved for submission to the Board of Trustees an establishment of a new MA program, Arts Administration, within the Department of Theatre within the College of Fine Arts. So what's the motivation? Well, it's a dramatic growth of the arts industry outside of the normal suspect such as Chicago, New York, and San Francisco. It's a local one. A huge audience for live arts events, and local venues have to be able to deal with this. Currently there are 1.3 million people employed in the arts industry. This degree, in fact, is a development of an existing very successful UK Bachelor's Degree of

Science specifically to train art administrators to help meet this much more local need. The proposed degree is designed for a specific kind of career and the proposals have carefully given evidence to show that there is demand for this career. An MA gives job applicants a significant career boost. The Department of Fine Arts already hosts one of the best BAs in Art Administration. It attracts eighty to one hundred majors, many of them are international and, in fact, it has to reject many very good prospective students due to its popularity. The research is being done quite nice where these people have ended up. Many have gone to related careers or good graduate degree programs, Columbia, Harvard, (unintelligible.) Among the graduates they have the manager of Taiwan's national orchestra, for example, or the manager of the Music Box in Edinburgh. The degree program itself while its aim is to train students in an effective managerial leadership within the arts require it (unintelligible) and quantitative analysis skills gives students a good knowledge of field related policy law and ethics and give them an understanding of the benefit of technologies. The program has thirty six credit hours. Two at the 500 level. Examples of courses are things like fund raising techniques, the arts and law, marketing research for arts organizations. There is no thesis planned but instead a capstone course called AAD 750. Its format is entirely online. New personnel will be hired, a course designer, part-time faculty, and administrative assistant. The projected profit for this course is around \$400,000 annual. Our committee felt this proposal was scrupulously motivated and we assigned it a very high priority. Perhaps we should all take that course in fund raising. Is there anybody who would like to speak in favor or against the motion?

SWANSON:

CHRIST:

Alice Christ, College of Fine Arts. I have a couple of questions about the faculty resources. The undergraduate program has been a success in terms of graduating majors but it's not a department. And we have a proposal to put the

Master's program in a department and not just in a college. Is there a reason for - the problem that I see possibly coming up is could you explain again the actual faculty resources on-hand, where they are?

SWANSON: Dean, could you address that, please?

BRAUN: Michael Braun, I'm the Director of the Arts Administration program. I'm the person who wrote up this proposal. I think there are two issues that are going on here. One is the placement of the Arts Administration program. And I would like to say that all the faculty who are teaching which are only two full-time faculty at the present time in the Arts Administration program, one is assigned to Theater and one is assigned to the Art Department. The program itself is, if you will, an independent division of the College of Fine Arts with faculty members assigned to it. When I filled out these forms, when I saw Department, I will admit I just thought of what's my home base in terms of my assignment in terms of promotion and tenure, I put down Theater. And so but actually the program itself is a division of the College of Fine Arts. So that's, you know, one issue. The second issue is in terms of the faculty for this particular - the new degree we are hiring a new faculty member in the second year of the program when we start offering classes in the second year. So there will be a new faculty member to supplement the other two people who are in the program at the current time and that is explained in the proposal.

SWANSON: Let me just clarify. So is this program housed in the Department of Theater?

BRAUN: The program is not housed in the Department of Theater.

SWANSON: So should this motion be changed?

BRAUN: It should be changed.

SWANSON: To?

BRAUN: Well, it's a Master's of Arts in the College of Fine Arts.

SWANSON: Okay.

WOOD: As a follow-up to that, who is - the way this reads, the graduate faculty in Theater would be the graduate faculty for this program. You're telling me that that's not

BRAUN: the case. Who would serve as the graduate faculty for this program? It would be various people in the College of Fine Arts. Different departments and schools. We all have to have a tenure and promotion home. We are assigned to this program.

WOOD: I understand that. But how many current members do you have that would go on that graduate faculty and how many are you anticipating hiring?

BRAUN: We have two currently.

WOOD: And you have -

BRAUN: Full-time.

WOOD: So all three of you are going to serve on all three on all Master's committees?

BRAUN: Well, that's correct. But there's also other people that can be assigned, too.

WOOD: The undergraduate?

BRAUN: Yes. Our Associate Dean was one of the founders of this particular degree and would also be likely assigned for purposes of committees.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A&S. This is actually quite a crucial question because it comes down to which faculty have the authority to make decisions about this program. So if you say it's housed within the Department of Theater, then only the graduate faculty who are in the Department of Theater have the authority to make decisions about the program, adding required courses, things like that. If you say it's within the College of Fine Arts, then all of the graduate faculty within the College of Fine Arts have the authority to make decisions about this program. If you don't want the first and you don't want the second, the proposal needs to be changed so that it addresses who are the faculty of this program who have the authority to make decisions about it and how would faculty join this body and how are they removed from this body. So I appreciate that you just kind of wrote something. You just wrote down the Department of Theater. This is actually a really important question. If you want the whole college, all the graduate faculty in the college to have authority to speak about this program, it's fine, we can just remove Department of Theater. But

if that's not your intention, I suggest that we table this until we know exactly what your intention is.

CHRIST: Alice Christ again. I understand and our Dean is right here and might be able to answer that that we do have in the College bylaws provisions for an advisory committee on the program of Arts Administration and we could use that committee as the college mechanism for making decisions for the program. But is that correct?

TICK: I've been here two years so I inherited this program - Michael Tick, Dean of the College of Fine Arts. We in tracing back the history of this program, we learned that the CPE, what, sixteen years ago -

BRAUN: Twenty-three years ago.

TICK: Twenty-three years ago actually approved this program as a freestanding division in the college. Again, it's not an interdisciplinary program. It's its own academic discipline. It just so happened that Michael as program director is tenured in theater. Rachel Shane is a new faculty member the newest faculty member, actually will her tenure home will be in art. It's likely that a third hire, fourth hire, their tenure home could be music and relative to graduate faculty. Again, I would emphasize that we have a current three faculty members in the college that work in this area that are graduate faculty and all matters relative to curricular design going forward are handled at the college level.

JONES: Davy, what am I missing? Well, you said you chased down something.

SWANSON: Davy Jones, College of Medicine.

JONES: Previously the status of recalling back into this was that arts administration as originally approved by the Senate was actually approved as housed in the Department of Theatre rather than housed as a program attached to the college like Bob was talking about.

TICK: I think that's incorrect. But we'd have to - I'm pretty sure that's incorrect. At least the documents I've seen.

BUTLER: J. S. Butler, Graduate School and Parliamentarian. I think you don't mean to table which means that we

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 4-9-12.txt
just stop talking about it for
awhile. I think return to the
committee is what you meant because
I think you meant for it to be
reconsidered so that we can vote
up, vote down, or return to
committee.

GROSSMAN: I don't have a dog in this fight.
And I just want it to be clear who
are the faculty who have the
authority to make the decision
about the program. If you're
saying it's all the graduate
faculty in the college who want to
have a say in it, that's fine, we
can. I would suggest that someone
from the college propose an
amendment to this motion to remove
the Department of Theatre, and then
it will be housed in the College of
Fine Arts and then the graduate
faculty of the College of Fine Arts
will be able to make decisions
about the program. The issue about
tenure homes is irrelevant as far
as I'm concerned.

STEIN: Rich Stein, Arts and Sciences.
Taking a page from Raphi's book,
I'm looking at the signature
routing log. And by the way,
parenthetically I can't help but
notice that we don't know how to do
electronic signatures when we
approved the program to teach
people how to use technology.

SWANSON: We can teach it.
STEIN: So I'm looking at the signature
log. Again, I don't have a dog in
the fight either. I'm like Bob.
But the only quote, signature, I
see on there is the person who
brought us the proposal, no
graduate faculty in the Department
of Theatre, nobody else.

SWANSON: Brian Jackson, could you confirm
that yes, it went through the
Graduate Council?

JACKSON: It did indeed go through Graduate
Council.

SWANSON: Thank you.

WOODS: May I ask a question about the
deliberations in Graduate Council?
Who did you all consider to be the
graduate faculty?

JACKSON: I don't believe that question came
up. Sorry.

SWANSON: Okay, additional comments?
FINDEL: I'm a little concerned about a
different issue and that has to do
with the fact that apparently all
the courses are to be offered
online. Is that the case?

JACKSON: Yes.

FINKEL:
JACKSON:

Can you defend that?
Well, this particular Master's degree is really aimed at people who are working within the field that have some experience who are interested in studying their discipline in an organized manner academically. So we would like to be able to provide an opportunity for somebody, for instance, in Somerset or Bowling Green or Pikeville as much as anybody to come in and study this particular discipline in the best way they can because I think it's a rather narrow group of people who can come to a university like the University of Kentucky and take the two year's worth of study and pick up their family and all that and come here. It really ends up limiting the number of people who can participate within a program like this and get a degree. So we are purposefully making it online so that it is as open to people as possible.

SWANSON:
ANDERSON:

All right, other comments?
(Unintelligible) it can be anyone, can't it?

SWANSON:
ANDERSON:

Of course it can.
Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.
I move that we delete the words Department of Theatre from this recommendation as a --

SWANSON:
ANDERSON:

Friendly amendment?
Yes.

GROSSMAN:
JONES:
SWANSON:

I second.
That's a substantive
That's an unfriendly substantive.
Do we have a second?

FIEDLER:

Second. Ted Fiedler, Arts and Sciences.

GROSSMAN:
SWANSON:
GROSSMAN:

Can we discuss?
Discussion of the amendment?
I would just like to hear from the Fine Arts people if they're okay with this amendment.

SWANSON:

That we would delete the Department?

JACKSON:
JONES:

Yes.
Also wanting to make it clear right now that suddenly it's going to be the entire member of the graduate faculty and college that's not right. Who's a member of the graduate faculty who can be on committees? That has to be determined. I don't think it's been worked out yet.

JACKSON:
SWANSON:
JACKSON:

Could I raise a question?
Sure.
Can there be - can it be an

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 4-9-12.txt
assigned faculty member within the
College of Fine Arts as opposed to
the entire graduate faculty? I
will say the intent was for it to
be the people who are assigned to
this particular degree, not the
entire faculty.

SWANSON: So you're going to have an advisory
board?

JACKSON: Yes.
GROSSMAN:

I would say if that's the case,
then it needs to be part of the
proposal; that we shouldn't - if
that's what you're saying should be
the case, then we should withdraw
it and reconsider it in May so you
have an opportunity to modify your
proposal to say how these people
are assigned, who has the power to
assign them, who has the power to
unassign them.

SWANSON: What their terms are.

GROSSMAN: What their terms are, all those
things. But as it is, if that
information is not available, I
would vote against the motion if it
were so amended.

SWANSON: So we're still discussing the
amendment. Any further discussion
on the amendment? All right, we're
going to go

McCORMICK: (Unintelligible) of why it can't be
tabled.

SWANSON: It can be sent back to committee.
So right now we're going to vote on
the amendment. All those in favor
of the amendment? Okay, opposed?
All right, abstained? Motion
carries.

BROTHERS: I'd like to have a count.

SWANSON: Let's do that again, please. All
those in favor of the amendment?

SOHNER: I have thirty-one.

SWANSON: Okay, all those opposed?

SOHNER: Seven.

SWANSON: All those abstained?

SOHNER: Ten.

SWANSON: So motion carries. So now we've
amended it to just read the College
of Fine Arts.

GROSSMAN: I would like to move that we return
this to committee and consider it
at a future date.

SWANSON: Okay, is there a second?

BRION: Gail Brion, second.

BUTLER: To explain, if you table it, it
simply says we're not going to talk
about this for awhile and nothing
happens. It just comes back
exactly the way it was. You have
to send it somewhere for something
to happen.

SWANSON: Okay, I'll send it back to

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 4-9-12.txt
committee. We've got a second.
Any discussion for or against the
motion? All right, we're going to
go for a vote then. All in favor
of sending it back to committee?
Opposed? Abstained? Motion
carries. Thank you. Our next item
of business is a Senate Academic
Organization and Structure
Committee, Professor Herman
Farrell, Chair.

FARRELL:

Good afternoon. The SAOSC voted
unanimously to recommend acceptance
of the proposal to move the
Appalachian Center from the Vice
President for Research to the
College of Arts and Sciences. The
community had actually met with Ann
Kingsolver, Director of the
Appalachian Center, and Dean Mark
Kornbluh and we received written
responses to our questions
regarding the proposal. First of
all, I'll read from the proposal.
It says that the University of
Kentucky Appalachian Center
emphasizes community university
partnerships in shaping research
that is useful in and beyond the
region in keeping with the land
grant mission of the University.
The whole there is to facilitate
stronger connections between
students and faculty researchers
from all across across all
colleges at the University of
Kentucky whose teaching research,
learning, and outreach includes a
focus on Appalachia. We also work
to strengthen relationships between
colleges and universities in
Appalachia region and between
communities and the people of
Appalachian counties of Kentucky
and University partners in
collaborative projects documented
in addressing the regions,
particular contributions and
challenges in a local context. The
aim of the Appalachian Center is to
help minimize duplication and to
amplify use of resources and
ongoing resources teaching in
(unintelligible) efforts of the
University in the region. I'll
note that and it's noted in the
response that we receive from Ann
Kingsolver that this move of the
Appalachian Center was in response
to a survey of the UK Appalachian
studies faculty in 2010 and the top
goal listed by the faculty in
moving towards the future was to

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 4-9-12.txt
reunite the Appalachian study program and the Appalachian Center. There also was a periodic review that also made an emphatic recommendations for this change. In terms of the governance, there will be a committee of whole of the faculty of the Appalachia studies program representing eight colleges at UK that will work on faculty governance and the day to day work, but there also will be an advisory council of deans from across the University. There was some colloquy about this in Senate Council and even within our committee. And many of us believe that this is a great way to allow for what we call buy in from across the University so that it's not just considered to be siloed only in A&S but a variety of colleges and deans and faculty from across the University will participate and continue to participate as they already have. I've already noted that Ann Kingsolver is the Director of the Appalachian Center. She has already been made both the Appalachian Center Director as well as the Appalachian studies program Chair, I guess. And the only other thing to note is that Dean Kornbluh conveyed in his report to the committee that the Appalachian studies faculty had requested this change and voted to make it happen. It was a bottom up effort. So we voted unanimously in favor of it, and then it went forward to the Senate Council. There was a bit of a change offered up at the suggestion of Davy Jones that the Senate Council include in its recommendation the designation of the ARC, the Appalachian Research Center, is a multidisciplinary research center.

SWANSON: Okay, we have a motion on the floor. Was there anybody who would like to speak for or against the motion?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A&S. I'm in favor of this change, but I just want to clarify for everyone that it is not up to us to approve or disprove the move. We can endorse, decline to endorse, or oppose the move, but this is not a decision that the Senate is empowered to make; is that correct?

SWANSON: So are you suggesting that you would change the word "approve" to

GROSSMAN: Yes, I suggest that we change the word "approve" to "endorse."
SWANSON: That would be an amendment.
JONES: I second that.
SWANSON: All in favor discussion of the amendment to change from "approve" to "endorse"? All those in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. So now we're voting to endorse the move. Anyone in favor or oppose this motion? All right, let's go ahead and vote. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

FARRELL: Thank you. The next proposal is a name change from the College to be clear about this -- the College of Communications and Information Studies to the College of Communication and Information. This proposal came to our committee. We had some follow-up questions for Dean O'Hare who was who wrote the proposal. He came to Senate Council as well earlier last week. Basically there are a couple of factors going into this change. First the word "studies" is considered to be redundant to the mission of the college and often confuses students and administrators outside the college with the sciences label for the School of Library and Information Science. Two, there is I'm reading from the responses to questions about the impetus for the proposed change. Number two, one of the units recently changed its name to Media Arts and Studies within the college, and this is appropriate for its mission but is redundant with the name at the college level. The name currently for the college is the longest name of UK's colleges and is often truncated to just communications. And removing "studies" puts more emphasis on communication and information. I'll note on this point the name change during the Senate Council discussion there was some concern about the term "information" being broadly applied, and Dean O'Hare's response was that it's basically the common practice in the field right now to use the term "communication and information." The name change improves clarity of who we are. This is a reading from their responses. The name change

improves clarity of who we are and what we focus on. It also supports the college's top two goals in its 2010 to 2015 strategic plan. Goal one is to establish the college as a leader in information communication technologies. And goal two is to prepare students for leading roles in information driven society. The name change will not have any adverse impact on current students and will more clearly define the college to future students. The name underscores the mission of the college to teach students to communicate effectively, to obtain and evaluate information, to create and produce semi-effective communication messages, and to make strategic use of the knowledge. They anticipate that their enrollment will increase with a more streamline name and the new name will more clearly define prospective students to the college's mission. We note that the college assembly voted for this unanimously as well as the College Faculty Council as well as its College National Advisory Board, and an External Review Committee made up of Florida State and Rutgers that actually provided a strong rationale for the name change. I won't read through all of the language in the rationale, but essentially they do support this and encourage this name change.

SWANSON: Thank you. We have a motion on the floor. Is there anybody who would like to speak for or against the motion?

ANDERSON: Just a friendly remove the word "studies" from the recommendation.

DEBSKI: Actually I think it has to be of the name of the College of Communications and Information Studies to the College of Communication and Information.

FARRELL: Right.

DEBSKI: It's been shortened here but unfortunately it's not specific there. So it makes that interpretation --

SWANSON: We did not specify. So the change is to we are changing it to the College of Communication and Information.

ANDERSON: Right, just delete the word "studies."

BROTHERS: Well, this is the name of the college as it is.

GROSSMAN: Could I I would like to propose a friendly amendment. That the Senate endorse the proposed change of the name of the College of Communications and Information Studies to College of Communications and Information.

SWANSON: Davy Jones, is that amendment friendly?

JONES: I'm not the Parliamentarian.

SWANSON: J.S., is that amendment friendly?

BUTLER: No.

SWANSON: Is there a second for the amendment? Connie Woods, Arts and Sciences. Anyone like to speak for or against the amendment?

PRATS: Is it Armando Prats. Is it going to be Communications or Communication? In the document that was submitted most of the time it's singular.

SWANSON: Communication, singular; is that correct? Yes, College of Communication and Information.

GROSSMAN: If my amendment said Communications, I would like to change it to Communication if my Senators approve.

SWANSON: Any further discussion of the amendment? All right, so we will move forward on the amendment to clarify that name. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries.

BROTHERS: One opposed. One abstained.

SWANSON: Opposed? Abstained?

BROTHERS: Two abstained.

SWANSON: So now we are voting on the original - the corrected amended motion. Do I need to read it out? All right, any discussion for or against?

O' CONNER: Lisa O'Conner, College of Communication and Information. I'm thinking positively. I just want to reiterate THAT our faculty widely endorsed this. Our old name has been archaic and frankly it's just a darn pain.

SWANSON: It's a darn pain. We'll put that in the Board notes. Any other comments? We'll go forward for a vote. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstained? One abstained. Motion carries. Thank you. We have a committee report from the Senate Rules and Elections Committee, Professor Davy Jones, Chair.

JONES: Okay, where to start here. The handout that you have, let's remember that the Board has just approved some amendments to the

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 4-9-12.txt
governing regulations that further clarified where the Senate makes decisions relating to academic status and academic content as opposed to where it makes recommendations or advising on managerial matters that may impact education. The University Senate rules has a rule covering how are proposals going to be processed through the Senate that relate to the abolition, the closing, the transfer of either academic programs or educational units or both. That rule dates back to 2003 before the Board of Trustees passed the 2005 and now just 2012 GRs that were clearly separated where the Senate makes decisions and where the Senate makes recommendations and advisement. So it's very important for us especially if we're getting into situations now where programs are going to be affected or educational units are going to be moved or transferred to make sure that our Senate rules governing the process accurately reflect the role of the Senate and the administration in these processes. The 2003 rule kind of got these mixed together and made it sound like even an academic program change the Senate was only advisory. But the Senate controls those decisions now. So the Senate Rules and Elections Committee has for several months been going through that rule making sure now the tracking is clear, these roles and how these roles relate to each other. In February we had reached a draft and Hollie announced at the Senate meeting that that draft was posted. We obtained feedback from various Senators and committees. The version that was posted in February has been changes accepted, and what has been received since then is what you see in your handout now as the underlining in the cross-through. Actually the rule has been much more heavily revised than the most recent version of strikes to underline would indicate because it was so hopelessly intertwined before. So if you have it here, I'll walk you briefly through the rule as it's being proposed now to be adopted. The first section that you have on the inside there, section 3221, you'll see an old 123 stricken

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 4-9-12.txt
through and a new 1234 there.
That's basically reflecting the governing regulations that we have today. One and two are where the Senate basically makes all decisions about the status and content of all academic programs except those academic programs that are degree granting programs. The establishment and closure go past us to the Board upon our recommendation, but everything else is controlled by the decision of the Senate. That's one and two. Number three you see there where the Senate must be consulted for its recommendation on proposals for academic organization. What does academic organization mean? It can mean movement of say a degree from one college to another. It can be movement of the Department. It could be dissolution of a department. It could be merger of a department. That's what's meant by academic organization. The Senate must be solicited for its recommendation on those actions. Number four, the Board also envisions that changes to personnel, moving faculty around, and/or resources and whatnot could affect the attainment of educational objectives, and the Senate has a role to weigh in and advise on those situations. And we can envision where any number of combinations of these things may be in play. And so that's why it's important to identify which one is the Senate making a recommendation about so is the Senate role advisor or controlling. That's our first section. So having defined that specific scenario, if we go into (A)(5), basically what that section is about is, okay, who can initiate these proposals. If it's initiated at the level of a department or a college or if it's initiated by a chair or a dean or by the provost, how do these things track and eventually find their way into the Senate apparatus? That's what these numbers here are about. Number six, definition of significant reduction of academic program or educational unit, there's some time spent there because you notice the title is about the abolition, the termination, or significant reduction. Well, what is a

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 4-9-12.txt
significant reduction? What's the trip wire that below that did it have to come to the Senate? The college faculty can call to us if they want. But if it's above some threshold, the Senate has a standing declaration, we want to hear about this. That's what number six there is about. Going on now to part B, this basically says part (B)(1), this says okay, that the proposal has entered the Senate apparatus. Okay, the Senate Council is going to look at the situation, see is it an academic program content that's in play, is it something physical resources or some other combination, and Senate Council is going to decide given the scenario what are the proper committee or committees or councils of the Senate or maybe something ad hoc, they're going to look at the swig and decide how this should be vetted in the Senate advisory system so the Senate gets the best information. Under (B)(1), you flip over, we see there are some metrics here (A) through (I) that have been provided that okay, basically this is the Senate saying you proposal writers out there, we're letting you know. These are the kind of metrics that we're going to be looking at once it reaches the Senate apparatus. The second set of metrics, if it's coming forward, if the proposal is more from an organizational structure issue or a physical resources are affecting the program or perhaps issue, then there's some additional metrics that come from that direction. They're not mutually exclusive. But it's acknowledging that there can be the two different directions to come at or depending whether this is a Senate controlling situation or a Senate advising situation. Numbers (2), (3), (4) are basically the fairness, how is the Senate going to make sure that the way that it's processed through the committee, you know, there's a fair chance for effective parties to be involved. There will be a hearing. It's all going to be transparent. Everybody knows what's going on. The Senate is going to make sure of that with these (2), (3), (4), and (5) here. Going on to number (6) part , then okay, so the Senate now has gotten

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 4-9-12.txt
it on the floor here. The Senate is going to exercise its role.
(1), you can see that's proposals to change academic programs. This is where the Senate makes a controlling decision except if it was a to close a degree program. To close a degree program, it would have to go to the Board. Everything else the Senate would be deciding. So under (1) there, it's talking about how the Senate will make its decision. Number two, this is from the other side, the other direction, instead something that's more managerial or administrative that's impacting the educational objectives (2)(A) and (2)(B) discuss the Senate's role in how it will inform the Provost and President of the Senate advice. (2)(A) is a situation that a program is being moved from one educational unit to another. (B) is the department is being dissolved. The department is being merged or the Department is being moved. That's the situation for (B). After (B) is (3) here is basically putting a time table on it saying we don't want to leave people hanging here. We expect this process and the president to get back and make an answer within these amounts of time. Finally on the last section, section (D) there, this is where in the Senate is very cognizant and is making sure the administration that they're interacting with is very cognizant. You're affecting students here. You're affecting faculty careers are involved. Tread lightly here and be sure to tread in a manner that the regulations provide for protecting the faculty careers. Last paragraph here it makes sure it draws attention to the multidisciplinary research centers like the Appalachia Center we heard. They are educational units and they're protected in the same way the departments or colleges are protected by this process. So this is the revised status of the rule here that we're looking for the Senate to act on.
All right, so we have a recommendation from the committee that the Senate approve the proposed revisions to Senate rules 3.3.2 effective immediately. Is

SWANSON:

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 4-9-12.txt
there anyone who would like to
speak in favor or against the
motion?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A&S. Can I ask for a
small editorial change in the very
title? You have transfer closure
like Wilson Carney.

JONES: Transfer, closure.

GROSSMAN: Yeah, thank you. Much better.

SWANSON: Any other comments? All right,
we're going to go for a vote. All
those in favor? Opposed?

Abstained? Two absentia. Motion
carries. Thank you. I'd like to
invite Vice President for Student
Affairs, Robert Mock.

MOCK: Thank you for this opportunity to
come before you today. I'll be
brief. I've given this
presentation multiple times to
different constituents and some of
those constituents are listed up
above there. And you may be
thinking I wasn't there when he
gave the presentation to my
particular college. I gave it to
some individuals in that college
based on who attended. I'm not
that popular so I just gave it to
what I had. You can see the
opportunities that have been
presented. And I'm glad to be
before today. And I promised
Hollie that I would be brief. Here
is one of the areas that we're
involved in in student affairs is
UK101 and 201. We're proud to
present that we teach over thirty-
three percent of those courses in
student affairs. I know we're not
an academic unit. Our goal is to
try to support the academic mission
here at UK. I personally teach but
not inside of UK101. I teach in
the new College of Communication
and Information as well as Arts and
Sciences. I teach a class on
Tuesdays and Thursdays, one class a
year. So trying to continue our
mission to be academically driven.
So as you can see, we provide
teaching space as well. Over
12,000 square foot of instructional
space inside a residence hall and
dining facilities. In forty-six
sessions I've talked inside the
residence halls. And we hope as we
get new residence halls on line
that will continue to be the norm
to try to build academic spaces
where courses are taught inside of
residence facilities. This graph
basically shows the traffic inside

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 4-9-12.txt
of the Student Center. We have the reservations you can see that going up very, very highly. I consider the Student Center as Grand Central Station here at UK. It's not a very new place, as you know, but it is a very used place. We have lots and lots of foot traffic and it continues to climb. We have courses taught in there as well. I won't show you that particular graph because I'm short on time. But I wanted you to see that we do have (unintelligible) opportunities inside the Student Center. The other one is living learning program. We have more living learning programs on this particular graph. This is through '09-'10. We're constantly trying to grow our living learning programs to try to, again, blend the academic and student affairs missions together so that we can support the academic mission here at UK. And as we begin to expand our residence facilities on this campus, we continue to hope to expand our living learning programs as well. Again, to be focused on the academic mission here at UK. Our counseling center unfortunately some of our students come to us with issues that have to be addressed. Many more than what I am proud to say. In my opinion and you'll see some slides here in a moment students come to us more medicated than ever before. Coming to us. I see some head nods in the room. And unfortunately their behavior sometimes demonstrate the need for those meds. And so unfortunately we have to provide services in many instances to our counseling center does this and we try to address the issues as our students progress to us and hopefully through graduation. Here is the Disability Resource Center. We also have students with disabilities on this campus as you are aware. I thought it was important to show our students are not just the undergrads you see on that slide. It shows the Master's students as well as the Doctoral and non-degree students as well. And so we try to deal with those students and you'll see on the next slide it talks about what particular type of needs inside of the Disability Resource Center are

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 4-9-12.txt
provided. And you will see here as you look at this particular slide the biggest amount is the ADHD number. That number has really, really grown over the last few years. And when I showed this to the dean's council and to the provost retreat, our Dean of Medicine said he didn't believe that all of those diagnoses were accurate. Of course, I was thinking but I didn't say aloud, well, your medical profession diagnosed but I didn't say that out loud. Unfortunately we have hidden disabilities. Hidden. Those that are not obvious. Years ago we saw the people with mostly mobile issues and visually impaired and hearing. But we have now more than ever before people that have identified and diagnosed with ADHD. And here are some of the services that we provide. You can see the extended time on the exam, 758, and low distractive private testing. Yes, we provide testing spaces. We wish that we had more space but we're working on those particular issues so you can see when students need extra time on exams or issues in terms of how to deal with interpreters, all those things come through the Disability Resources Center. Here are all the departments associated with Student Affairs. You heard Bill Swinford talk about some of them earlier in terms of what happened during the Final 4. I'll add some data to his numbers. He was right with the fifty-four, but I think we had fifteen students that were arrested. The other fifty-four were non-students in terms of the issues that we have to deal with there. Staying close to my time and (unintelligible) steward of your time and your time as well, any questions before I turn you over to my next presenter who I spend a lot of time with. He's going to talk about University Appeals Court.

SWANSON:

Questions? Robert, what's the process if we have a student who needs extra time testing and so on, what is the process by which we would go through?

MOCK:

Well, the first thing I would suggest you would contact the Disability Resource Center. They will help you.

SWANSON:
MOCK:

Okay.
What we hope happens is students come to your class the first day of class and give you a letter stating here is my service. I see some head nods. This is what we expect and then we'll be able to work with them. You know, when you have a student that is visually impaired, mobility, impaired and many cases they have multiple disabilities and so that puts a great strain on our resources and we do get some state funding, but that state funding is being cut even though it's a Federal mandate. Let me say that again. The state funding is being cut even though it's a Federal mandate at the time the number of students with disabilities are going up.

SWANSON:

I expect we will see an increase with an increased enrollment of our military personnel?

MOCK:

Absolutely. I am a military veteran myself. I served in the military and joined the National Guard after 9-11. I'm thirty-seven years old and unfortunately I saw many returning vets even now on this campus who will need more and more services. And so we'll have to deal with those issues, to be quite honest.

SWANSON:

Any questions? Thank you very much.

MOCK:

Thank you.

SWANSON:

We have Joe Fink to tell us about the University Appeals Board. Welcome, Joe.

FINK:

Thank you. Good afternoon. I'm going to review the data from last academic year. And the reason for that is that I taught a course during the fall at 3:00 on Mondays so I was unavailable to do this in the fall. So that's why we're running behind on this report. The first question is what's the jurisdiction of the University Appeals Board? The University Appeals Board's jurisdiction flows from four sources, the governing regulations, the administrative regulations, the Code of Student Conduct, and the Senate rules. So there are four different things that give us work to do. Over the years I've been doing this for twelve years now. We've seen an increase in the percentage of cases that include an allegation of cheating and plagiarism. And

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 4-9-12.txt
that's unfortunate. I think the Internet is to blame for the plagiarism issue. Students working on a paper, sees a paragraph somewhere and says boy, that's really good; I'll cut and paste that into my paper, that sort of thing. What is the appeal process? Everything comes to us either through the Office of Academic Ombud if it's an academic matter or through the Office of the Dean of Students if it's a student conduct, student discipline matter. So nothing comes directly to us. It has to come through the University unit on the way to us, and those folks work up the case to come to the Appeals Board. Composition of the University Appeals Board has thirty members, eighteen of whom are faculty. Twelve of whom are students. In order to hear a case, you have to have a quorum of eight members. That quorum must consist of at least five faculty members out of the eight and at least one student out of the eight. We usually try to get five faculty and three students, but often times that's a challenge. And, in fact, just getting a quorum is a challenge. It is unbelievably difficult. You would think with those numbers, thirty people to yield eight, not a problem. It's a problem. It's a big challenge to get a quorum in the University Appeals Board, particularly because you have to have that specified mix. That's the quorum for the Appeals Board business. We have a document that's posted on the page of the ombud that is a question-answer format piece about explains to the student, to the faculty member who's going to come before the Appeals Board what is the process, how does this work. Nuts and bolts issues like do I need to get dressed up to come to the Appeals Board hearing, just things like that. And so that document is available if any of you are interested. You just go to the Ombud website and over on the right side there is a clickable link that takes you to the information about the University Appeals Board. How many cases were handled last year? The answer was thirty-two. This is a little higher than the average over the time I've been doing it.

We've averaged about twenty-five cases a year. So we're up a little bit. We're up a little bit last year. I think we'll be up even more this year. Here is the breakdown of the basis on which the cases came to us. First is an interesting one. If a student comes to the academic ombud and the ombud investigates and concludes no, there's nothing here that needs to be pursued, this case lacks merit, the ombud sends the student a letter that says your case lacks merit but you have the right to appeal that decision. And the student in such an instance does not appear before the Appeals Board. It's purely a paper review and the sole question at that point is should the student be given an in-person hearing. And so those kinds of cases we had six of those last year can they lead to a full blown hearing. Often times they do not. I'd say in at least two-thirds of those cases the decision of the ombud is verified a no hearing is granted. Right to a fair and just evaluation of academic performance. This is often times a deviation from the syllabus. Faculty members at the beginning of the course said we're going to determine your grade this way and then two-thirds of the way through the course said no, we're going to change that. We're going to determine your grade that way. You can't do that. Appeal of a determination of guilt in a case of alleged cheating or plagiarism, as I indicated earlier, this is our increasing area of business for the Appeals Board, particularly in the plagiarism area. And there are different software packages now that help uncover that. I'm sure you're aware with that. Disciplinary suspension under the Code of Student Conduct. These are the cases that come up through the Office of the Dean of Students. Dean Dana Walton McAuley administers that process and does it extremely well. A student who is suspended from the University or expelled or had some other disciplinary sanction applied has the right to appeal that within seven days to the University Appeals Board and then the Appeals Board gets together a panel to

review that matter, try to do that relatively expeditiously because a lot of times what got the student in trouble cross-wise with the code of student conduct is the type of situation that may not want that person around campus. That was what led to their expulsion initially. So we try to handle those relatively expeditiously if we can. And then as you're aware, a number of colleges have honor codes, particularly the professional colleges, dentistry, medicine, pharmacy. Law has a quasi honor code. It's a little different than the others. And so we only had two cases based on the honor code. So a total of thirty-two cases handled during the last academic year. I think we're on track this year. It will be a little higher than that. We do see a flurry of activity after finals. So in January students who felt they were aggrieved with something that led to their grade in the fall semester will appeal and then after the end of April, May final exams we'll see a flurry of activity in there as well. We do try to function during the summer because sometimes students need a decision on their appeal in a spring course to determine what course they're going to go into in the subsequent fall. So we do try to function during the summer. It's a little even more challenging during the summer, particularly the student participation. But we try to keep on keeping on if we can in the summer. So those are the kinds of cases. The obvious question this leads to is how often does the student win? And the answer is the student last year won fifty-three percent of the time. And that figure has been fairly consistent over the time I've been working with this. It's roughly fifty percent of the time the student prevails on appeal actually. And that's across all those different categories of cases. That's just a gross number. But last year the answer was fifty-three percent. And that's a fairly consistent number. What are some continuing challenges facing the Appeals Board? The one that is greatest frustration to me is faculty members who did something to lead

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 4-9-12.txt
to the student's appeal and do not appear for the Appeals Board hearing. The student shows up and the faculty member does not. And that is - I'm not going to go there. I can't believe faculty members don't show up to stand behind their decision at the Appeals Board level, but it happens. And there are a fair number of present and members of the Appeals Board in the audience as well as alumni of the Appeals Board in the audience and they can verify that that indeed hampers the case because the faculty member is not there to explain what the dickens happened that led to this situation and to provide their perspective. They're notified. They're invited. We don't have subpoena power. We can't make them be there, but they're invited to attend and participate. To have an Appeals Board quorum is you have to have two things to have a hearing. You have to have the University Hearing Officer there and that's me. And you have to have a quorum of the Appeals Board and that's it. Student doesn't have to be there. Faculty member doesn't have to be there, okay? It can be done on a paper basis. It can be a paper review. But they are invited, okay? What we are required to do is give the student an opportunity to be heard. The student doesn't have to be heard. It has to be given an opportunity to be heard. So if you have faculty colleagues who are embroiled in an Appeals Board matter, please do encourage them to attend, participate, bring with them every scrap of paper related to the issue because often times they'll come and they won't have the syllabus or they won't have this. They'll come unprepared. So if you have colleagues who get caught up in this procedure, please encourage them to come to the hearing and to be arrive fully prepared. I'd be glad to try to answer any questions and some of the other folks who have Appeals Board experience in the room may also want to do that.

ANDERSON:

Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.
Fifty-three percent, forty-seven percent, is that based on whether or not the professor showed up for the Appeals Court? Does that make
Page 47

a difference?
FINK: I think so, absolutely. Oh, absolutely. That influences that, sure. Other questions?
GROSSMAN: Just one comment and one question. First of all, a lot of appeals end at the ombud level because the ombud says this doesn't have merit. And so these numbers are skewed because the ombud has already reviewed the case and decided that they have merit.
FINK: That's a very good point. Michele, What do you deal with, about three hundred cases a year, something like that?
SPEAKER: Yes.
FINK: We deal with twenty-five. So the ombud does a heck of a job in filtering out things that aren't worthy of coming to the Appeals Board and mediating a result, an outcome between the faculty member and the student and so forth. So this is the tip of the iceberg. Bob, you're absolutely right.
GROSSMAN: The question I had, in terms - I know how difficult it is to schedule a quorum. Do you also take the faculty member's schedule into account when you try to schedule a quorum?
FINK: No, if we did that, we'd probably never have a hearing because just getting eight members of the Appeals Board there is a heck of a job. We do not. Nor do we take into account the student's schedule. Now, if the student comes to me and said you've scheduled this hearing for 9:00 on Monday and I have Dr. Grossman's chemistry class and I can't miss, I say I'll give you a note. I will send him a note or I will send him an e-mail.
GROSSMAN: I wouldn't take a note from you.
FINK: But that's about the best you can do. Other questions I can try to answer?
FRIAR: Alan Friar, A&S. Faculty members can't materialize they can submit comments in writing?
FINK: Oh, yeah, sure. We'll circulate them. The case packet that is assembled in the ombud's office that has an ombud's cover letter that gives the synopsis to the case and identifies the issues and then has any relevant documents attached, syllabus, copies of e-mail message or whatever, that's all sent to the members of the

Appeals Board in advance of the session so that they have at least one weekend to look it over before the hearing and then so they can come to the hearing prepared. They familiarize themselves with the packet. If somebody can't appear, they can send in supplemental materials. We put it with that packet or we'll send it out to the members of the panel in advance of the hearing.

VALENTIN: Ryan Valentin, College of Law. Is UAB the final appeal for students?

FINK: Good question. There is no appeal beyond us. We're the end of the line. We're sort of the Supreme Court of this whole thing. We had an interesting case last year where a parent was involved at one of the six regional universities of the state. In those instances there is a Kentucky statute that says you can appeal to the Board of Regents of the institution. We do not have that in the statutes that apply to the University of Kentucky. So the mother in this case was certain that she could appeal our adverse decision to the UK Board of Trustees and we tried to clarify that.

JONES: If hypothetically new information becomes available, our process does not preclude that the UAB could revisit a previous decision.

FINK: It does not preclude that. It has never happened.

PRATS: Armando Prats, A&S. If, for example, on the disciplinary suspension under the Code of Student Conduct, are you upholding or overturning or enforcing that in those cases?

FINK: Either one.

PRATS: In other words, the instructor sent forward a request of suspension or

FINK: This is a conduct matter. This is a student who did one of the things Dr. Mock was talking about over the celebrating State Street. It's conduct. It's not academic.

PRATS: Okay, how does it come to you in the first place? Who's filing the appeal?

FINK: The student is. The student has been subject to discipline by the Dean of Students Office. There is a hearing process, internal (unintelligible) students office. That decision is announced. The student is informed you have the

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 4-9-12.txt
right to appeal and then the
student comes to the Appeal Court.
Any questions?

SWANSON:

FINK:

SWANSON:

Thank you.
Thanks so much, Joe. Thank you,
everyone. One last note. I have
been thinking about trying to get
Tim Tracy, the Chair of the Budget
Committee here in front of this
body, but he met with the Senate
Council members and our meeting
lasted two hours, and we thought if
he came for ten minutes you might
get frustrated. So rather than
have everyone go through that
experience, we decided we would
assist him in trying to hold at
least two forums. So Sheila and I
are in the process of that so we
can have a nice sit-down two hours
or so session to try to understand
the work of that committee. With
that we have no further decisions
or business. And could I have a
motion to adjourn?

BRI ON:

I move to adjourn, Gail Bri on,
College of Engi neering.

SWANSON:

Second?

FRI AR:

Alan Fri ar, second.

SWANSON:

Upon hearing no objecti on, the
meeting is adjourned. Thank you.
See you in May.

(Thereupon, the University of
Kentucky Senate Council Meeting for
April 9, 2012 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 26th day of
July, 2012.

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

