

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

OCTOBER 13, 2008

3:00 P.M.

* * * *

* * * *

W.T. YOUNG LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY CAMPUS

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

* * * *

* * * *

DAVE RANDALL, CHAIR

STEPHANIE AKEN, VICE-CHAIR

KATE SEAGO, PARLIAMENTARIAN

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

LISA E. HOINKE, COURT REPORTER

* * * *

* * * *

CHAIR: Try and get started here. I hate to start out with apologies, I do that all the time. You'll the notice the back side of your handout was not printed. So we're going to have to fiddle around a little bit here to try and get that up for you as much as we can. We'll do the best we can. So we'll bring the meeting to order here. Again, if you would, please, give your affiliation, your name and your affiliation before you speak. And the message you'll here from me every single

Senate meeting is be sure and go back and communicate with the people who you represent so we can keep communications going as effectively as we possibly can.

So the minutes, they were distributed last Tuesday. There are some editorial changes. You can see them in the copy that is present on your page. Do we have this one?

BROTHERS: No.

CHAIR: Okay.

BROTHERS: Well, on page 3 of the handout, in section 4 the language for the approval for the candidates for credentials, it was that same language that was changed for the other degree list as well. And there were some other notation changing from passing unanimously to passing without dissent, but those were the --

CHAIR: I think they're very modest changes from what was actually distributed. One of the things was the minutes originally said a motion passed unanimously, and we changed it to a motion passed without dissent, that kind of thing. So someone, if you would, I need a recommendation that the Senate approve the minutes on September 8th, as amended.

HAYES: Jane Hayes, Computer Science, I move that the Senate approve the minutes of September 8th, as amended.

CHAIR: Can I get a second, please?

CHAPPELL: Joe Chappell, second.

CHAIR: Discussion. Any further amendments? All in favor, aye.

SENATE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay.

SENATE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Passed without dissension.

Tomorrow is the State's Reception. One of the things we want to do is to build better relationships with the members of the Board of Trustees. We want them to get to know us as faculty and have a way where we can facilitate communications so they'll know who we are, just to get to know each other. So Sheila has arranged the State's Reception. There will be food. So at 2:00 in the Lexington Room of the Old Main Building if you're available, please do come up and mix with the members of the Board of Trustees. If you did not RSVP, come anyway. There should be plenty of food.

BROTHERS: There always is.

CHAIR: So please do. Kind of regard this if you would as part of your responsibility as members of the Senate to interact with the members of the Board of Trustees. Get to know each other, facilitate communication. All right.

We passed our last meeting, the Health Care College's Professional Behavior Code. We approved that. Well, legal counsel looked at that process, and academic problems are very carefully defined in the rules as plagiarism, cheating, or falsification or misuse of academic records. The HCC Code did not fall in that range of problems. And so legal counsel felt that it actually did not require our approval. However, the language has changed somewhat so that the Senate will be consulted. So just to inform you that that's the way that document now reads. Richard, any comments you'd care to make on that?

GREISSMAN: I wouldn't touch it.

CHAIR: All right. Turnitin initiative, we will actually launch that for -- for implementing it for our trial run Spring semester. There will be training procedures and that kind of thing that will be carrying on, laying the groundwork to actually implement that. And so that will be happening during all semesters of the launch, in the spring semester. You'll recall the Academic Approvals Work Group was -- the charge was completed, and we're getting ready to launch that effort. The committee members have been identified. What we're trying to do here is to facilitate, make more efficient this academic approvals procedure. So we're working on that. There is an initiative to look at the possibility of actually having a reading period at the end of the semester. This would require a change in the calendar. Senate Council formulated a small working group that's looking at that possibility. If that working group feels that it's worth going forward and looking at this more extensively, we'll do that. That working group will report to Senate Council on the 20th of October, our next meeting, and we'll obviously keep you informed. Again, the possibility of looking at some changes in the University

calendar, it will allow a real reading period.

We had some waivers that we went through. There was a waiver of 5.2.4.8.1 to allow a common-hour exam for Math 110. There are, I think, two sections in Math 110. Initially, I believe, if memory serves, had their exams at different periods. We simply allowed those exams to be held at the same period. The two-year rule was waived for student PJ. That is to say, if you request to withdraw, you must do that within a two-year period of your last -- of your last class. We waived that requirement for the student PJ. And there was a motion by Senate Council to allow the College of Agriculture to submit their -- their Senate election results by November 1st. That extended the period that was allowed.

Our first item of business is to look at UK Internationalization Task Force. I believe Dr. Carvalho is here, but I think --

BARNES: Actually, we're all here.

CHAIR: Yes. Thank you. Go ahead.

BARNES: Hi, I'm Beth Barnes from the School of Journalism and Telecommunication. And I, along with John Yopp, and co-chair of the Internationalization Task Force. And Susan Carvalho, who is in the back, is also heavily involved, and so between the three of us we hope we can cover any questions that you have. And I also want to introduce Andrea O'Leary who works with Dr. Yopp and helps keep us on track. What we wanted to do today is to give you an update on where the Task Force, but particularly to let you know where you can find information about the draft recommendations that the Task Force is working with this semester towards finalizing a strategic plan for internationalization. You will be getting a handout on that.

BROTHERS: Theoretically, half of it is in your handout on page -- sorry, it's not funny, but the first half of it is on page 5; the second half could be seen on the screen in between the presentation, but I'll e-mail it out to you all tomorrow.

BARNES: And what that will represent is the various subcommittees, and I'll tell you in just a second what those groups are,

but the various subcommittees that have been working on this have each put forward draft recommendations. And those have now been consolidated, and they're grouped by topic area. And so that's what -- the other handout you should be receiving.

The Task Force itself is 26 members. Primarily, that is representation from each of the colleges. Each Dean was asked to nominate a person to serve on the Task Force. That Task Force was then appointed by the Provost and fleshed out with other people on campus who had international expertise. There are also staff members serving on the Task Force, particularly from the Office of International Affairs and several student representatives. And then the work of the Task Force is primarily being done by eight subcommittees and you can see the list of them there, alphabetically. The subcommittees do contain and, in fact, are for the most part chaired by a Task Force member, but then they have other faculty and staff members on them and in some cases student members, again, with expertise in the particular area. And so those different groups of subcommittees come primarily from work that the Task Force has been doing with the American Council on Education Internationalization Laboratory. We have been involved with that internationalization lab for a little over a year now, and it is really from work that they have done with universities all over the country that the recommendations on how we might structure the subcommittees were merged out of that, but also looking specifically at what our situation is here at UK.

In terms of the process, the Task Force got under way in spring of 2007. And the initial meetings were mostly information sharing. It will probably not come as a surprise to any of you that the first thing we realized was that there was much more going on on campus already with regard to international programs and policies that people just didn't know about, sometimes even within the colleges where they were taking place, but certainly outside those colleges. And so our initial work was just sharing some of that -- that information and starting to get a sense of

what was already taking place. We did also during that semester have a site visit by two of the people from the ACE Internationalization Lab. They met with the Task Force; they met with Deans; they also met with the President and Provost. And we had one session that was a public session and had people from the community there, as well as other people from across campus. And at the end of that semester, we put the subcommittees together. Last year it was really the subcommittees doing the heavy lifting. We did have several people from the Task Force attend an initial kickoff meeting of the Internationalization Lab with the other members of the cohort. And I will just mention there that Western Kentucky is a part of the cohort that we are in; they're the most geographically local to us, but it's quite a range of programs. And we have been on a regular basis having phone calls with Dr. Barbara Hill who heads up the Internationalization Lab. Very, very useful in terms of troubleshooting, sharing things that worked or didn't work on other campuses, and we have tried to adopt those to what we're doing here at UK. As I said, though, the majority of the work last year was done by the subcommittees. Each of the subcommittees spent the entire year meeting, coming up with recommendations, and on the Task Force website, which I'll share with you at the end of the presentation, the interim report from each of the subcommittees are there, and you can see in detail what it is that the subcommittees are recommending. Towards the end of the year last year, the subcommittees were asked to go back and prioritize their recommendations and so we would have some sense of a relative weight of recommendations going forward. Over this past summer, one of the big areas that was undertaken by Dr. Yopp's office was to try to collect all of the memoranda of understanding on campus that had to do with International and again, because there's no common repository, it was a very big undertaking. But we think we have a pretty comprehensive listing right now. Those have been provided to the Task Force members and also to the Deans, and we're doing some spot checking with Deans to make

sure we haven't missed anything. But that is going to be available online as a sortable Excel spreadsheet. And so if you're curious about what colleges are working in what parts of the world, what kinds of programs are in place, that information will be available we hope within the next several weeks. Along with that, working with the legal office here at the University, templates have been developed for student exchange memoranda of understanding and other types of exchanges. And so for programs that either have lapsed MOUs or that are looking at starting something new, that's now a very useful resource instead of having to start from scratch. And again, those have been circulated to the Deans, and I think -- are we going to have those on the website? Those will be on the website as well before too long.

One other thing that went on over the summer was participation in another program that the American Council on Education is doing called Bridging the Gap. And that is really looking at the intersection between internationalization and multicultural efforts on campuses and how the two efforts can work together rather than working against each other for resources. And so that is still fairly early on, but that is something else that the University is participating in.

This fall, we're really trying to fill in our own gaps in terms of a strategic plan. The recommendations from the -- from the subcommittees have now been, more or less, compiled. I put it that way because we're obviously still doing some work on that, but when you get that handout, you will see the range of recommendations that have been put forward. And then we are also filling in some of the holes by meeting with different groups on campus who already interact with international students or who, you know, would have some say over research support for international efforts, curricular support, things of that nature. It is very convenient that Susan Carvalho is also chairing the General Education Reform Subcommittee because certainly on the curriculum side for our strategic plan there's a great deal of overlap there. On

our website there is a schedule of meetings. And you can see when we're talking to these different groups, and the meetings are all open. So you're more than welcome to attend any of those if you have a particular interest in a topical area. We also have made, obviously, this presentation, but we have made presentations to the Dean's Council, to the Graduate Council. We are in the process of making presentations to colleges by invitation, we're not forcing ourselves on them, but we've done several of those already. And we did in the last couple of weeks hold open forums at both ends of campus, again, for people to have a chance to see the recommendations and to comment on those.

The goal that we're working toward is to produce a plan by this December. Obviously, that's going to dovetail with the University's overall strategic plan. You, I'm sure, realize that where the impetus from -- came from in the first place was with international being one of the eyes in the current strategic plan. There -- there will be opportunity to further refine that, and then we will have another site visit by ACE in January. And then at that point once the strategic plan has been approved, either the current Task Force or more likely some group coming out of that, will then really be doing the heavy lifting in terms of the implementation for the plan.

At the same time that we have been working as a Task Force to develop a strategic plan, there have been things happening in the realm of internationalization, and I just want to touch on those briefly. I mentioned the laboratory already. Susan's position as Assistant Provost for International Affairs is a new one as of summer a year ago. And so that just gave additional attention to internationalization. Last year, the first ever international recruiter for the University was hired. That person is housed in the Office of International Affairs. And along with that, the University began to work with Hobsons for recruitment support for international students. And already we're seeing results

of that. This fall we have a 50-percent increase in the number of international undergraduates on campus and we're looking forward to seeing that grow even further. Also, on the Office of International Affairs side, a communications staff member was hired for the first time. If you have seen their new website, you know that it has more information than -- than the past and organized in a way that is a little bit more accessible. And then as I mentioned already, the development of the templates for the memoranda of understanding.

Can I go online from this?

BROTHERS: Yes.

BARNES: The Task Force website is fairly easy to get to. If you just add /ITF to the UK website address, that will bring us up. And really, the idea with this particular website is to make sure that it's as accessible to everyone as possible, what it is that the Task Force has been doing and to give people the chance to comment. So as I mentioned, there is a feedback button right here, and we have been getting people emailing comments and suggestions there. We also at the two open forums had people point out things that they thought were missing that should be in the plan, and so those are being added as we're hearing feedback from people. But the thing I particularly want to show you, if you go under the subcommittees tab, with each of the subcommittees, there's a list of the membership, but there has also then a link to their report. And so that report will give you the detail on what their recommendations are. The two-page handout that you will be receiving is really sort of bare bones on recommendations. So if you see things on that once you get it that you have questions about, I would suggest first going to the subcommittee reports and seeing if the detail that you're seeking is there. But if not, then contacting one of us using the feedback mechanism or certainly, going to your Task Force representative for your college, and that also is on here, and so the representative. So we're really hoping that as many people as possible will take a look at this plan in process, offer comments, suggestions, make sure that we're fully representing all

the different constituencies at the University so that the final plan is one that everybody can be happy with and that will really help to move the University forward as far as internationalization is concerned.

I'd be happy to take any questions? Again, especially when you get that handout with the recommendations, there may be things that will jump out at you there. Yes?

CHAPPELL: I have a few questions, actually.

The -- the first is, what is a 50-percent increase in the number of -- the actual number of international students?

BARNES: Susan, do you know?

YOPP: It's about 70.

CARVALHO: Yeah, it -- it was just under 150 before, and it's just over 200. So it's an increase from -- from tiny to less tiny. But we were happy to see that the number of applications more than doubled. And so we didn't do as well on the yield as we did on getting the applications, but it's all a start. And having someone focused on the fact that, for example, UK means United Kingdom to most international people and so we're going to have to write the words out. And this kind of electronic applications, online applications was not available before for international applicants, only for domestic, which didn't make sense given how complicated it is to apply internationally. So we're removing barriers and -- and working to make sure that we get -- get more visibility and more applications.

CHAPPELL: Is there --

CARVALHO: But we're okay on the number of international graduate students, although we took a hit this year, but -- but we're not behind our benchmarks in -- in that. It's the undergraduate category that we're real pitiful.

CHAPPELL: My other question is about the ACE Internationalization Laboratory. I'm sorry, I don't know what that is. Can you give us a little --

BARNES: Sure.

CHAPPELL: -- more background?

BARNES: This is a program that they have had in place, what about, seven or eight years now --

YOPP: Yes, just about.

BARNES: -- I would say. And they do different groups of universities each year. It is -- it's by invitation. It's a combination of application/invitation. What it -- what it provides the universities who participate is the focused attention of the people at ACE in the international area for an 18-month period to really help troubleshoot, to do campus audits. John actually has worked with them more closely. Do you want to --

YOPP: Yes. This -- this is a long-term component of the American Council on Education headed by Matt Breen and then Barbara Hill, another former president heads up the laboratory itself, but they have from over a period of about eight years a number of papers that have been compiled in an internationalization handbook that provides a template for integrating eight separate internationalizing elements that correspond fairly closely to our subcommittee topics like international students on campus, internationalization of curriculum, education study abroad and how these are promoted, advanced, how the University adopts a strategic plan or a mission statement regarding internationalization with support from the top, student and international climate on the campus, all these elements are part of their repertoire of expertise. And so they meet with us and the other members of the cohort on doing this. We're one of, I think, only one or two research one institutions in this particular cohort, but they've had a number in the past. So it's -- it's a very well regarded laboratory.

CHAPPELL: Do we get rated by this organization in terms of our performance in the various categories?

YOPP: No, no.

CHAPPELL: We just get feedback as to how we can better implement a particular programmatic focus; is that the idea?

YOPP: That's correct. There are associations like the Institute for International Education, IIE, that does actually, not so much rate, but show universities where they are in terms of these internationalizing elements. So there is an -- there is a national data base on this. And AISE, the Association of

International Students Educators also does look at, upon invitation, at a university and shows where it is relative to its benchmarks.

CARVALHO: The other advantage of the ACE team is that the campus visits involve conversations with the Provost and the President to make sure that the buy-in is there at the central administration level so that the strategic plan that ends up being produced will not sit on a shelf. And we've looked back at strategic plans on internationalization over the past 15 years, and there have been some really good ones that sat on a shelf. We're not above going back to those and taking some of the ideas laid out there, but wouldn't we be miles ahead if we had done those things when they were proposed. So it's another advantage of --

BARNES: This is the last website, and I just wanted to highlight that we're actually poster children on here. They highlighted our website that we put together, right here. And then this is the cohort that we were a part of. This group down here.

Other questions? Thank you very much.

CHAIR: The next item of business is the Ombud's report, Professor Tagavi.

TAGAVI: This report was supposed to be presented by Joel Lee who is -- usually the ombud who was previously ombud would do this, so that we in the ombud office and the Senate Council office, was that we just show you the -- the report. It's very brief; it's on one page. And I'll be here available to answer any questions that you might have. And if it's okay with the Chair, I would like to make one request to Senators after any questions that we might have. Can I call on somebody?

CHAIR: Yes. Please.

TAGAVI: Back here, please.

SUAREZ: I have a --

BROTHERS: I'm sorry, your name, please?

SUAREZ: Juana Suarez, Hispanic Studies.

I'm a little bit surprised of the high number -- as a person from Arts & Sciences, with the number of complaints that have been made in the college. Can you talk a little bit about that, the nature of the complaints, the difference in

number; is this customary?

TAGAVI: I -- I think this is -- Arts & Sciences being the biggest college and also having -- I'm just speculating a little bit at this point, having a lot of undecided majors and people who are entering Arts & Science and then later go to other colleges, that just makes the nature of it conducive to more complaints. Arts & Science also does a lot of USP classes which contributes. We don't have the breakdown by college. This report I've never had to break down by the college, so I cannot tell you what is the breakdown of the complaints that were originated from Arts & Science.

MICHAEL: It's right there.

TAGAVI: But that's not by college; that's the total.

MICHAEL: It's from any school.

TAGAVI: What I meant was, within Arts & Science, we don't -- we don't know of the 115 how many are -- or whatever the number is, how many is plagiarism, how many is -- the nature of the complaint we don't know, but we do know exactly, we have that.

Any other question?

The only thing that I wanted to mention is this came to my attention two, three years ago and it's coming to my attention at least three times by now. This is the scenario which we would like to avoid: A professor catches a student in some kind of a cheating or a plagiarism, confronts the student, says this is your penalty, let's say an E and then three months after the end of the semester, the student comes to Ombud complaining, and then I call the professor ask if they followed the procedure, they have not followed any of the procedure. So I'm asking you as Senator, if in hallway discussions, maybe in your faculty meetings, you could mention this to your colleagues. Of course, there is a Ombud's notice that goes out at the beginning of every semester, but I have to assume that perhaps not everybody reads every word of it. The rule is when you suspect somebody of cheating or plagiarism, you're allowed or -- you could ask questions to investigate, without charging or accusing the student of -- of cheating. Once you are relatively confident that there is a

charge, then you discuss it with your Chair. The Chair invites the student in his or her office with the professor, confront the student with the evidence, ask the student to defend themselves. At the end of that meeting or two days after that or 48 hours after that, which is the same as two days by the way, then the Chair would write the student saying, we have concluded that you are guilty of plagiarism or cheating and this is our recommended penalty, with a copy to the Ombud and to the registrar. And give the student 10 days to appeal. This is the proper way of doing it. It's very painful and traumatic to the institution when six months later I have to ask the Chair and the professor to go through these steps. It just doesn't look that good. So if I could get your help in doing this. Apparently, these notices are not doing their job, so I thought maybe word of mouth. I'm thinking of maybe I would go to each colleges faculty meeting and just take five, ten minutes of their time and bring this up. And I might do that, but I'm asking you as the liaison to college faculty, please mention this to professors.

ANDERSON: What happens if it's already been done? Someone has already --

BROTHERS: Name, please?

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Medicine. Sorry.

TAGAVI: Just embarrassment. It's not a freebie for the student unless -- and I cannot think of a scenario which because of lack of procedure, the student's ability to defend herself or himself is now totally compromised. What happens is that we would just ask the professor and the Chair of the department to go through the steps. So basically embarrassment on the part of the University that procedure was not followed.

CHAIR: The next item of business is the BCTC -- approval of BCTC Candidates for Credentials. The list of the students is in your handouts, and I need a recommendation that the elected faculty Senators approve the September list.

Yes, Davy.

JONES: Davy Jones, Toxicology.
I make this -- or I move this recommendation.

CHAIR: I have a motion; I need a second.

AKEN: Second.
BROTHERS: Name?
AKEN: Stephanie Aken.
CHAIR: Discussion. All in favor, aye.
SENATE: Aye.
CHAIR: Opposed, nay. Motion carries.

Thank you.

There were a number of -- number of things that go on in this University that may not specifically or do not specifically come under the purview of the Senate, but I think as Senators it's very well for us to be informed about a lot of the things that go on around here. So one of the -- one of the things I'd like to do during my term here is to -- is to introduce us to some of these issues that -- that are below the surface. So I have asked today the director of University Press of Kentucky to come and tell us a little bit about that organization does. I would appreciate it, let me know if you find this useful or if you find it not useful, and if there's an activity that you're aware of that you think would be well to be highlighted, please bring it to my attention.

So, Steve, please.

WRINN: Thanks, David. I'll be brief, but I'd be happy to answer questions. I want to give people a little background on the University Press. I know some of you here are already very familiar with what we do over there, although we still have people who come by and ask us to make Xeroxes for them so.... Some people think we are the -- used to be the University Publications Service, and we still have people coming in. I have been director at the University Press, I'm coming on my seventh anniversary. I came from a commercial publishing background. I had been vice president at Rowman & Littlefield Publishers based in Lanham, Maryland outside of Washington, D.C. It's important to remember that University Presses were established to disseminate scholarship and research. The idea being that research that has no audience, research in a vacuum is pointless. And the University Press was founded in 1943 by Tom Clark. It was then the University of Kentucky Press. In 1969, it was reorganized as the University Press of Kentucky. So that's an important

distinction. We're often listed in reviews as the University of Kentucky Press, but we are consortium of all nine state institutions, five private colleges, and two historical societies. We are a unit of the University of Kentucky. We're housed on South Limestone Street, and every manuscript -- we would -- I would estimate we receive approximately 1,500 proposals each of year. We publish approximately 50 to 60 new books. The -- every book we publish must go through a peer review process by scholars in the field. We -- our emphasis is primarily in humanities and social sciences. We're well known in southern history, Appalachian studies, international relations. So we're in a variety of disciplines. The -- every book after peer review must go for approval by a press committee which is composed of UK faculty members. If it is approved by the press committee, it must then go to a state-wide editorial committee. So every book we publish is very closely scrutinized, internally and externally. The -- we like to think that the value of the books we publish at University Presses transcend sales potential. Some people say that we publish a book before there's a market. One example, the day after 911 there were no books available in English on Al-Qaeda or Taliban. There were three books; there were only three books available. All three had been published by University Presses. The -- one of them had an original print run of about 1,000 copies, and we sold about 700 copies. Within about two weeks, that particular book was on the New York Times Best Seller List. So essentially, we're trying to publish and disseminate scholarship that builds on future scholarship. And at the University Press, we also have a very strong mission to publish books about Kentucky and the region. So many of the books that -- that we bring out are about subjects that don't have a commercial audience broad enough to appeal to commercial publishers. So that's -- that's essentially the mission of the University Press. Many of the authors who publish with us are required to publish with a University Press in order to get promotion or tenure. Currently there are 88

University Presses in the United States, and those 88 University Presses buttress the entire system of tenure and promotion, making it very challenging. I won't go into the extent of budget cuts or the fact that Barnes & Noble stock dropped about \$20 today and we'll probably be seeing massive returns tomorrow. But it's -- it's something we do here that I don't know that a lot of people are aware. We also feel that our mission is to demonstrate Kentucky's commitment to the world of ideas. Many of our books are reviewed around the world. They are translated into foreign languages, and -- and -- and we feel a certain amount of pride in demolishing stereotypes about Kentucky. So simply put, it's -- it's something that we feel very proud about what we do, and I just wanted to introduce myself and the University Press. Are there any questions?

CHAIR: Kaveh, yes.

KAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi.

Tell us about the governance of your organization. Who chooses the person in your position? If there is a Board of Directors, who appoints the Board of Directors? Just the governance of it.

WRINN: The governance. I -- there was a -- when I was hired, there was a hiring committee. I can't recall how many people, but they were from institutions around the state.

TAGAVI: Who chose them?

WRINN: I expect it was the President.

TAGAVI: Of?

WRINN: Of the University of Kentucky.

TAGAVI: Oh.

WRINN: Okay. We are -- we do not get any financial support from any of the other schools. The President also chooses the members of the press committee. Each institution in -- in the consortium chooses their own members of the editorial board. So I -- I have no -- I, personally, have no input into who governs the organization.

TAGAVI: Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you.

If you look in the back room of the -- of the University Club, all the books there are University Presses. Just go through and -- and see what -- who published it. I'm sorry, Sheila, did now want to --

BROTHERS: No. I'm just moving the slide.

CHAIR: Okay. All right. We have some business now that comes before us. There are three proposed changes in the Senate Rules. Professor Michael is here to answer any questions if any should arise. He is Chair of our Rules Committee. Rule 1.3.1.2.A.3, specifies a two- or a three-step process for this body electing members of Senate Council. And that's a bit of a tedious process we've used for council the last few years, but the Rules Committee is recommending that we now move to a one-step process where individuals in voting, specify a first choice, a second choice, and a third choice. The language that is changed in this Senate Rule, is move from the multi-step to the one-step process for electing members to Senate Council.

Doug, comments?

MICHAEL: You explained it perfectly, but I'll be glad to address the technicalities. The language that's up there that's underlined is the new language. The bottom half of that is -- if you have the second page. We have the second page of it which starts out all the language (inaudible). You already vote for three people. That part won't change. It requires a vote for three choices when you elect members to Senate Council out of six candidates. All this is doing is taking the people with the most first place votes, and those are the ones elected. (Unintelligible) the (unintelligible) process which (unintelligible) for many years didn't result in different outcomes. We'd gotten the same results in a three-fold method. (Unintelligible) that will take a couple of hours to elect three people at a time.

CHAIR: Questions or clarification on what we're going on? All right. Then we need a motion that the proposed change in this Senate Rule be accepted. We'll get the language back up here in a moment. Recommendation that the University Senate approve the changes to SR 1.3.1.2.A.3 effective immediately. This comes to you from Senate Council with a positive recommendation. Do I have a motion for this?

HAYES: Jane Hayes, Computer Science. I move that we approve the changes to SR 1.3.1.2.A.3, effective today.

CHAIR: A second?
TAGAVI: I will second.
CHAIR: Discussion. All in favor, aye?
SENATE: Aye.
CHAIR: Opposed nay? Motion carries.
The next rule change is -- there we go.
Previously in voting for the faculty representative to the Board of Trustees, we didn't have a bio and picture placed until the second round. We are now recommending that a brief biographical sketch be submitted by each candidate for the preliminary or the first vote. That would then appear again in the second vote. It's nothing more than giving the person casting the ballot some information and a picture straight away on the candidate. And so we need a proposal that this be -- that the University Senate approve changes to SR 1.5.2.B with an immediate effective date.

WILLIAMS: David Williams, Agriculture. I move that the recommendation be approved.

CHAIR: Second, please.

CHAPPELL: Joe Chappell. Second.

CHAIR: Discussion. All in favor, aye?

BROTHERS: Excuse me. Does that motion include an effective date?

WILLIAMS: Yes.

BROTHERS: Just checking. Okay.

CHAIR: Thank you, Sheila.

ANDERSON: Clarification?

CHAIR: Yes.

ANDERSON: Heidi Anderson, Associate Provost, Faculty Affairs.

Why do you need a photograph in addition to having a bio sketch? I'm concerned about that because it tends to -- that tends to violate what we -- even applications that you apply for (unintelligible) you don't ask for a photograph of the individual. I need some rationale behind the -- why you need a photograph.

CHAIR: Why we need a photograph?

ANDERSON: Yes. Biases -- well, a number of biases can take place, not only racial but gender. And so if you're looking to look at the qualifications of an individual for the position, then what's the purpose of the photograph?

CHAIR: Interesting question. Hadn't occurred to me. Personally, I like the photograph --

ANDERSON: You can have the photograph after

--

CHAIR: -- usually I would know the person or whatever, but... It's an issue, early discussion.

MICHAEL: I can answer the process of the --

CHAIR: Please.

MICHAEL: -- Rules Committee is that typically the three finalists will submit a photograph and bio, and I've done two of these elections, and I get phone calls from hundreds of people around ballot time, where are the pictures and bios? I don't know who I'm voting for. And there's -- there's nothing in our rules that has ever required anyone to submit a picture but they almost always do, and if that said would require a picture, I'm sure it could be optional. It's been more the other way around, that people wanted to put them on rather than anybody is required to do so.

WERMELING: Wermeling in Pharmacy. Heidi, every pharmacy election I've ever seen has a picture with a bio --

ANDERSON: I question that as well, too.

WERMELING: Well, it's -- well, people that you may not recognize by name, but you may recognize them by familiarization, hearing them speak, or look at other positions that may -- they may have taken, that, you know, I would be reminded of that by their picture, perhaps not by their name.

ANDERSON: No, I understand your point. It's well taken. (Unintelligible) pharmacy organizations, I have written them a note every year questioning that as well.

SMITH: Richard Smith, Psychology. My experience is that I often find myself looking -- making votes on people I don't know a lot about, who I don't know personally. And so it could be that a lot of people do end up making their votes based on things that we -- we don't think they're making the votes on, like -- like a photograph. So I would say at least the psychology is true that we do base our decision a lot on the way people appear to look like, so it could be a pretty strong effect that we wouldn't want based on just a photograph.

CHAIR: Other comments?

UNIDENTIFIED: Can you put the wording back up?

CHAIR: Now if we were to vote this

down I assume we send it back to the Rules Committee or -- we would send it back to the Rules Committee. So not approving it is certainly a possibility. Debra?

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.

It says, may contain a picture and a brief statement.

CHAIR: May contain. Now, certainly I would think the candidate would --

ANDERSON: Is that --

CHAIR: -- would not be obligated.

NADEL: Alan Nadel, Arts & Sciences.

By making it optional is even more discriminatory.

ANDERSON: Exactly.

NADEL: Either you have the same rule for everyone or you don't.

CHAIR: Michelle, are you here? I think we'll take -- we'll take an actual vote on this one. Any other comment? All right. We will take a vote on this. All in favor, please raise your hand.

ANDERSON: Point of order.

CHAIR: Point of order, yes.

ANDERSON: Can we have what we're voting on stated?

CHAIR: Yes. That we're approving -- Sheila would you go back to the actual motion. I believe it was moved and seconded, and this is the motion here. I'm sorry, then all in favor again, raise your hand.

MICHELLE: I'm sorry, let me try again.

UNIDENTIFIED: We're getting less people each time.

MICHELLE: I got 20.

CHAIR: Twenty, that's what I got. Opposed?

MICHELLE: Thirty.

Thirty. Motion fails. So we'll take this back to the Rules Committee and...

MICHAEL: Doug Michael, College of Law. Chair of the Rules Committee.

How are we supposed to do this? I mean, does that mean that the rule should say you can't have a picture? Does it mean being able to -- you want us to editorially review the candidate's statement which may all refer to their background on which you (unintelligible) would make an proper decision? They are

free to free-write in every trustee election the amount of information that you get from the candidates because they have access to e-mail lists, multiplies geometrically. I'm not sure what you want us to do with this now. Is there a sense of the Senate we can take back?

NADEL: Alan Nadel, Arts & Sciences.

It's real simple, you simply ask them for a biographical sketch.

MICHAEL: We already do that.

NADEL: That's right. You ask for a biographical --

MICHAEL: But this is -- this is -- I'm just concerned that it might somehow yield impermissible information because a picture is --

NADEL: I don't think that --

MICHAEL: You can have a thousand words, you know, that's a picture, I mean.

NADEL: I think figurative language is not really useful in a legal situation. A picture is not a document.

CHAIR: Okay, all right.

Finally, the Retroactive Appeals Withdrawal Appeals Committee has traditionally operated with invited guests who come to present information on the student or the student's background. What we're simply asking here is that the Senate Rules be changed to reflect who is actually coming to these meetings. Can we have the language of that?

BROTHERS: I will never ever screw up another handout.

CHAIR: Thank you, Sheila. We're simply adding a representative of the Counseling and Testing Center and a representative from the Advising Network to the membership of this committee. It effectually encodes in the Senate Rules what is actually happening. So I need a recommendation that someone move that Senate Rule 1.4.3.2 be changed to include one nonvoting ex officio member from the Counseling and Testing Center and one nonvoting ex officio member from the Advising Network, again, effective immediately. This comes as a positive recommendation from Senate Council. Doug, any comments?

MICHAEL: I had nothing to do with it.

CHAIR: Okay.

MICHAEL: That's probably the best thing that can be said for it.

CHAIR: I need a motion.

ZENTALL: Tom Zentall, Psychology.

So moved.

CHAIR: Second?

TAGAVI: Second.

CHAIR: Discussion? All in favor, aye.

Opposed, nay? Motion carries.

Is Dean Lester here?

LESTER: Yes.

CHAIR: Dean Lester is going to give us a pep talk about United Way. Thank you for coming.

LESTER: Thank you for allowing me to be here. Lovely afternoon, and I'll be brief. I appreciate the opportunity to come once more before the University Senate this year and talk to you about UK's United Way campaign. We kicked it off October 1st. Last year the University community gave and gave generously. We set a record of \$506,000 going to United Way agencies throughout the seven-county Bluegrass area. This year we are shooting for a half a million dollars again. Obviously, the economy is tough. Pay raises have been scarce to nonexistent, and the President has decided that we will stick at \$500,000. However, we want to encourage people to give. Last year our percentage of donations from participating faculties and staff went from 24 percent to 22 percent. So I would encourage you to talk to your colleagues, at least to get them to participate, as I would cordially invite you to do so because this is a community-driven organization responding to community needs. This year United Way of the Bluegrass is focusing on three areas. One is access to health care. Secondly, is early childhood education. And the third is establishing some financial stability for families and individuals who run into problems. This does not mean financially -- this does not mean the United Way agencies who don't focus on that will not receiving -- not be receiving assistance. What it does mean it that United Way for the first time will start to prioritize their giving to agencies where that is the goal.

We are as an institution right in the middle of a pack of SEC schools. In terms of overall giving, we are about half of what University of Florida is with the

same number of faculty and staff, but we are only behind Florida and Vanderbilt in terms of our absolute giving. Likewise, we are in the middle in terms of our average gift for faculty members and staff members which is \$39 which, you know, puts us about half of what University of Florida is. So I would -- I would thank you again for having me here. By the way, I want to introduce Pam Siemer who is vice president, United Way of the Bluegrass. Pam has brochures, and we will have them available for you as you finish up the meeting today. They do a very nice job of explaining what the goals of United Way of the Bluegrass is. They also talk about the fact that it is a very efficient organization, something on the order of 80 -- better than 80 percent to 90 percent of the funds generated by philanthropy from throughout the Bluegrass area go directly to programs. A very small number, a very small percentage, actually, goes to the administrative cost of the program. So you have been generous in the past. We are one of the three largest United Way givers in the -- in the seven-county area, along with Toyota and Lexmark. And I know as colleagues I can -- I can depend upon you to respond once again generously to support this year's campaign. It will go for approximately the next two months. You should have people within your respective units who have volunteered to be the solicitors. We are going person to person this time, as we did last year. Two years ago, we did electronic solicitation and found that to be a dud. It's very easy for us to delete an e-mail. Much more difficult for us to turn a colleague down. So when your colleague from your department or your unit comes by to solicit your United Way campaign, I ask that you treat them with courtesy and deference and don't rant and rave about the deficiencies of the University or United Way of the Bluegrass, but simply respond generously if you -- if your heart so dictates that. So Pam and I will be in the back if you have questions. We would be happy to respond to them. And we do have these brochures which I think are a wealth of -- provide you with a wealth of information. And with that, I thank you for allowing me to appear before

you.

CHAIR: Thank you. Well, I expect there may be a motion to impeach the Chair since we're done before 4:00. Any motion?
Hearing none -- Yes?

HAYES: Jane Hayes, Computer Science. I move that the meeting be adjourned, and you not be impeached.

CHAIR: Next meeting will be November 10th. I actually won't be here, so someone will be chairing that, but we'll see you then again. Again, communicate with your people. Communicate with me or with Senate Council. Let's get done what you need to get done. Thank you very much.

* * * * * * * * * *

THEREUPON, the University of Kentucky Senate Council meeting for October 13, 2008 was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

* * * * * * * * * *

STATE OF KENTUCKY)

COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

I, LISA E. HOINKE, 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 under my direction, and the foregoing is a true record of the proceedings which took place during said meeting.

My commission expires: January 26, 2011.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 4th day of November, 2008.

LISA E. HOINKE
NOTARY PUBLIC
STATE-AT-LARGE
K E N T U C K Y