

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

MONDAY, December 11, 2006
3:00 P.M.

* * * *

* * * *

W. T. YOUNG LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY CAMPUS
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

* * * *

* * * *

AN/DOR REPORTING & VIDEO TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
179 EAST MAXWELL STREET
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40508
(859) 254-0568

* * * *

* * * *

KAVEH TAGAVI, CHAIR
LARRY GRABAU, VICE-CHAIR
GIFFORD BLYTON, PARLIAMENTARIAN
SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR
LISA E. HOINKE, CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER

CHAIR:

I was just thinking my mental of deciding when to start the meeting is like my mental of deciding when my microwave popcorn is ready. The way I do it, I don't pay attention to the -- how much they say you should put in the microwave. But when I don't get any pop for maybe 15 seconds I say, okay, this is done. So, I notice nobody coming in for the last 15 seconds, so it's ready; let's go.

As for the October 9 minutes, unfortunately we haven't been able to quite get the minutes ready and it was not disputed with Senators and, therefore, with your

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
indulgence, we will have this ready for the next meeting.

If you notice Gifford Blyton is not here. He called us and he said that he's not feeling good. But because he didn't talk to me, amazingly enough, this 90-year-old gentleman came over here all the way from his Doctor just to tell me, can I be excused. And, of course, he went home. And please have him in your thoughts and your prayers that he will be okay.

A couple announcements. We are going to have an annual Board and Senate holiday reception. This is both from the University Senate and the Staff Senate, and every year we invite the Board members to come and join us, and some of them do. President is also invited. This is right after the Board meeting, so it's on December 12th from 2:30 to 5:00. This year -- in the past we would have it in various places and the one that I remember is King Alumni House.

This year we thought there is this wonderful exhibition called Romance with the Landscape. I don't know if you have seen the TV commercial on that, but the museum has agreed to extend their exhibition, and these are wonderful paintings, for one extra day exclusively for us. So I think it would be very nice. I hope you put it down on your calendar and come on December 12th from 2:30 to 5:00. If you're late, that's fine. Come late. Leave early. There is no attendance kept during that reception.

When the Senate Council, which is empowered to once in a while make decision on behalf of the Senate in urgent and important places or its empowered to waive rules, by other rules we are obligated to report to the Senate, and these are rules waivers if I could go over them one-by-one with you.

On August 28 the Senate Council voted unanimously that the IRIS's purpose -- for the IRIS purpose the graduate certificate in 13 areas, which were already awarded to students and had current enrollees be deemed as having received appropriate approval for the transfer of information.

For whatever reason, for the past several years graduate certificate did not go through every step that was necessary to go. So several of the -- a dozen or so graduate certificates are under -- people -- students are enrolled in them; they have received them, but they never totally received the proper approval.

So we are making a cleanup and you, in fact, we have had a transmittal sent to you regarding several of these and you have ten days to opine on them.

However, we found it was necessary

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt

to immediately approve it retroactively for those students who have received this.

So that's the -- that's one item that we acted on behalf of the Senate.

If there is any question regarding this waiver, please stop me and show me your hand and you can raise your concerns or your questions.

On October 16th the Senate Council waived Rule 5.1.8.5 A. (2), a two-year window for submission on retroactive withdrawal application due to a then new administrator's misunderstanding of the RWA process.

RWA stands for retroactive withdrawal application. In this University students could get, retroactively, a W for non-academic reasons. We have a process which has been approved by the Senate. The only thing is, students could only request this two years after the end of the semester in which they are asking to withdrawal.

A administrator sat on an application for several months due to lack of understanding of the procedure and then by the time they caught up it was too late to --

according to the rules for the student, to ask for this application to be considered. Hence, this was considered by the Senate Council and we granted an exception.

Questions, comments?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR:

On October 30th the Senate Council voted to authorize the College of Nursing to move their deadline for application to the undergraduate program from May 1st to May -- March 1st, with a final provincial deadline of March 15th with the provision -- proviso that exception to the deadline be made to applicants as appropriate effective immediately.

Later the discussion about possibility (Inaudible) of waiting for official Senate approval, the Senate Council approved a motion stating that the Senate Council consider the deadline change to be urgent enough to act on behalf of the Senate, as long as the Senate would be notified of the approval at the next meeting.

This is one of those problems that are good problems -- a good problem in the

sense that College of Nursing received approval and in keeping budget to double their enrollment, and they came to us and asked us to change their application deadline to have enough time to consider all these applications and the rest is what you see on the screen.

Any questions on that?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR:

One more kind of announcement, and

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt

I want to try -- this is not a vote but I want to see if I could have a unanimous consent or no objection on the part of the Senators. Up to now if you probably have noticed, when under two circumstances there are missing grades in the transcript, and one is when you are still -- for example, right now if a transcript is issued for Fall 2006 in front of every course that students are enrolled, there is going to be three asterisks meaning that there is a grade missing or not issued yet.

Also, when for varying of reasons, professors leaving, not forwarding grades and no way to check on them, there are some

grades which are just simply missing. For these two purposes SIS was using three asterisks.

The new SAP Time Management says that they do not wish to use the same symbol, so I was approached by the registrar and I thought it was -- this was to me serious enough, like a editorial, grammatical change, that upon discussion among my office and the registrar, we agreed on three dashes to be used for when grades are missing.

Since it was pretty clear to me -- if this is some material change or I need approval or both, I'm now giving you guys the chance to have an opinion or objection to these. If not, I consider that three dashes is acceptable to the Senate and we don't need to change the rule by voting on it but with your permission we would ask the Rules Committee to change the rule to show that when grades are missing due to instructors not issuing them we would dash-dash-dash.

Any questions or comments on that?
(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: So that will stand approved?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Okay. One more announcement. Pretty soon we're going to have Senate Council election. Is Doug Michael here? Okay. We need three new members for the Senate Council. Please consider joining our small group. It's a very important committee that requires weekly meeting. The year is -- the term is three years starting January 1st 2007. There is going to be one alum nomination, which we would ask the Senators to nominate other Senators and then based on that round -- based on that round, we will have one more round that will determine (Inaudible) voting and the three members will be elected.

Okay. Our first agenda item: In October 2006 Senate approved the use of the current Honorary Degree qualification for 2006/2007. Some of you might remember that.

At the same time we had asked the

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
Senate Admi ssi on and Academi c Standards
Committee, Ken Calvert, be the Chair, to
submit -- consider submit ting recommendati ons
for quali fi cati on for future Honorary Degree

recipi ents. So thi s woul d apply to next
year.

As some of you might know, ri ght
now, in fact, nomi nati ons have been sought
and so they shoul d be made shortl y. But thi s
is for next year.

The quali fi cati ons remain l argel y
unchanged wi th some reordi ng and thi s comes
to the Senate wi th posi ti ve recommendati on
from commi ttee and Senate Council. The
quali fi cati ons are in your packet.

Is Ken Calvert here? Ken, wi ll you
-- woul d you li ke to add somethi ng.

MR. CALVERT: Well, I thi nk i t' s prett y self-
expl anatory. We j ust -- we added a l i ttle
preamble to ki nd of set the context for
awardi ng of Honorary Degrees and I thi nk
everythi ng el se is prett y much the same as i t
was.

CHAI R: I t goes wi thout sai ng that these
-- we have the j uri sdi cti on as el ected
facul ty senators wi th j uri sdi cti on over
Honorary Degrees, and prett y soon, perhaps
next year, recommendati ons are goi ng to come
to us for approval and then sendi ng to the

Board of Trustees.

So are there any questi ons
regardi ng the Senate quali fi cati ons?
(NO RESPONSE)

CHAI R: Okay. Thi s comes to us from Senate
Council wi th a posi ti ve recommendati on, in
fact, from the commi ttee to the Senate
Council. I t doesn' t require a moti on or a
secondi ng.

Any fi nal l ast chance di scussi on?
(NO RESPONSE)

CHAI R: Okay. Then all those in favor of
the quali fi cati ons indi cated show by raisi ng
your hand.

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAI R: Opposed?
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAI R: Abstenti on?
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAI R: Moti on carri es.
Okay. Our next i tem is a
presentati on i tem by -- thi s is regardi ng
Women' s Pl ace. Dorothy Edwards is the
Di rector. The UK Women' s Pl ace is commi tted
to i mplementi ng creati ve research --

research, treatment, strategi es to
effecti vel y (I naudi ble) physi cal and sexual
vi olence agai nst females in the UK communi ty
as a preventi on, i nterventi on and
responsi bi l i ty. Where is Dorothy? Pl ease.
Thank you for comi ng.

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt

MS. EDWARDS:

You're welcome.

I'm just going to take a few minutes to introduce myself. We've been here just going on two years now, and I thought it's long overdue that I come and introduce myself. I've met many of you through your academic departments as we begun to build partnerships and develop initiatives and strategies with -- across campus, but I wanted to introduce to -- myself to the overall body, and tell you a little bit about what we're doing and what we hope to accomplish.

Like I said, we've been here about two years, and we were originally formed through funding from a grant from the Department of Justice; a grant that is specifically designed to deal with violence on college campuses. The reason such a

category exist is because consistently women on college campuses, students particularly on college campuses, are at higher risk of violence than women in the general population.

So there is a particular need to address this issue more effectively, so that's how we were born.

That grant cycle has since ran out; we've renewed and actually got that funding again, but that actually probably only covers about half of what we do. The rest of the money comes from Student Affairs and some money has began to come from general funds. Last year President Todd created a position, victim services coordinator, a full-time professional position to provide direct services to victims of violence.

The services -- we do two predominate things. Our unit exclusively focuses on violence against women. We don't have a broader agenda beyond that.

The two primary ways that we do that, number one, is we provide direct services, and those services are available

not only to women and students but to faculty and staff as well; and a considerable amount of our case load is, in fact, women faculty, staff, as well as spouses.

So that mission is broader, and that's important to get that word out there and we're taking some initiatives to let folks know that it's not just students that we serve.

It is also not exclusively women that we serve, although that is our primary mission. From day one we have served male students predominately in a couple of capacities. One is men that have been indirectly affected by violence against women, a sister, a daughter, a girlfriend, and they come in with, this has happened to

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
someone that I love, how do I get help and what do I do with my own stuff around this. And so helping channel that in a way that's productive.

Secondly, is men that are slightly more directly impacted and that we work with students -- male students who are from homes that are currently violent. So as they are

trying to do -- accomplish whatever goals they had when they came to UK, they keep getting pulled back to concerns about my own safety or younger siblings, financial concerns and lots of concerns that can get wrapped up in a violent home.

So working with them and their families wherever they are to get services and support and resources, referrals in place so that he can concentrate (Inaudible).

And finally we deal -- we work with men who they themselves have been directly victimized by violence.

When we start talking about childhood, men and women have pretty close to an equal likelihood of being victims of sexual abuse in some way, and so we have lots and lots of young men that come into college with this issue and so some of them have begun presenting to us, so...

We also want to know that when it comes to the direct service piece, we really are gender neutral, despite our name, that I am currently working on revisiting.

The second piece that we do is around prevention, but the ultimate objective, but the ultimate objective is that less students, less women on this campus experience violence as a part of their pursuit of their degree, and those numbers are incredibly high, not abnormally high for college campuses, 36.5 percent is what the center for research on violence against women found and that included all forms of sexual assault and not just rape, stalking victimization as well as physical assault. So a broad definition, incredibly high numbers.

We have -- historically our work has been focused on providing direct services but we needed to get to a point where women that are victimized were being heard, had a safe place to go, had resources in place. There's an infrastructure that she could navigate so that she can get her needs met and finish whatever goal she came out to do.

We have not done well as a movement bringing those numbers down, and so our commitment is to address that issue, reducing the number of women much more comprehensively

than any movement we have historically; not only individual education and skills

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
training, which has been predominately what we've done in the past. We've gone to classes, we've gone to mandatory freshman program, and we've gone to fraternities and to sororities, we've gone to all these groups to say, hey, this is a problem; hey, ladies, here are things to do and not do to prevent this from happening; hey, here's some definitions and statistics.

That's done great for awareness; it's gotten women to seek services a little bit more but it hasn't touched our numbers. So in order to touch our numbers, the movement is beginning to go -- the literature is beginning to say we need to take a broader perspective and the model that's currently being tapped into is Public Health.

Public Health has had a lot of success in coming at some of these broad issues at a lot of different directions at once, at the policy level, at the law legislative level, at the organizational level, at the protocols, how are units

interacting, flushing out the infrastructure. Not only how our students are educated, how are the faculty and staff educated, how are we all as members of this University community contributing to an environment that is safe. An environment that's truly and visibly intolerant of violence and supportive of victims.

So without going into much detail, that's the direction we're going and I've got my own Top 20 Plan and it involves complimenting our successes toward becoming a Top 20 research institution with becoming one of the safest institutions in our country because in my mind without that basic component in place, without genuine safety and freedom of fear in place for all of the members of this community, the rest feels like luxury; the rest feels like a luxury.

So I wanted to introduce myself, tell you that we're here, let you know that we're open for business for anyone that you -- comes across your path, faculty, staff, students and let you know that I will -- me and my unit will be knocking on your doors,

have we not already, to talk about ways we can begin to collaborate together to make this campus safe.

Thank you so much for allowing me some of your time. I appreciate it.

CHAIR: Thank you, Dorothy. By the way, I forgot to apologize for last time when you were -- you were here and stayed till 5:00 and we ran out of time and I promised that I would get her first.

MS. EDWARDS: I got impatient triplet three-year olds that get quite fussy if I'm not where I say I'm going to be so it was a toss up.

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
Lots and lots of important people or the babies, so sorry, but you were a close second for sure.

CHAI R: Thank you, Dorothy.

MS. EDWARDS: You're welcome.

CHAI R: The next item is also hopefully a presentation but perhaps discussion item. We have Janet Eldred here with us discussing Writing Initiative, and giving us an update. The Writing Initiative began in 2004/2005 with only Department of English but the possibility of other departments

participating in the future. Currently involved is a variety of departments offering W courses.

Let me ask Janet to please come and give us the update on the Writing Initiative.

MS. EL DRED: It's seems like there's no transition between the Dorothy Edwards presentation and mine, but just before I came here I was reading three student papers and I had a two-page student paper and it was about coming to UK's Campus and the fact that she carries a knife; she doesn't really know how to use it, but she was talking about her night classes and how uncomfortable she felt and about going home over the weekend and having the men in her family teach her target practice; and it was an absolutely chilling two pages, and so sometimes there are odd connections.

You've already heard a little bit about the timeline. I'm going to run through it because there are new Senators. Some of you were involved in the process and know more about it.

Funding year zero was 2004/2005.

This is when the curriculum change went through but it just effected English, and so that first year we worked with the Senate to try to see if we could open up the writing across the curriculum to other departments and campuses.

Funding year one was last year, and that's mostly what I'll be reporting on and then funding year two is this year.

So funding year zero, all students required to take a first-year writing class and to fulfill the new graduation writing requirements, so it was two tiers.

Two-hundred level English courses in literature mostly but also in film were established as default courses for the graduation writing requirement. And you've already heard it now three times, but the change was in English, but everybody was eager from the beginning to see if we could get this in other classes.

From the beginning the graduation writing requirement was seen as a minimum requirement for all students. Originally

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
people wanted two or three courses and it

finally got chipped away to what we could do.

The 200-level literature courses were seen as a necessary but not idea default. They're at the sophomore level, they were still doing English. It seemed a step forward but it wasn't where we wanted to go. We wanted to move into junior and senior courses in the major. We wanted individual departments and programs to have control over the writing their graduates produced.

From the beginning, there were concerns that the requirement would become something that existed only on paper because we have a history of those kinds of changes.

And so from the beginning we agreed that there would be review of syllabi every semester to make sure that what went through, what people said they were doing was being done, and assessment, that we would collect papers at the end and run an organized assessment.

And we were very committed to the faculty government, that it would be this body that would make curricular decisions.

Okay. I'm going to kind of skip

through some of the things that we began doing.

I did want to say that the first year the committee met it proposed a criteria for approval of the writing intensive courses; it suggested the assessment; it suggested a governance structure and most of these were accepted. There were some small changes, and so we were ready to roll.

Funding year one we reviewed syllabi for eligible W English courses; we checked student eligibility. We made sure every single student had 30 hours so that they weren't taking it too soon; we enrolled them; we evaluated transfer classes; we helped the nanotechnology honors track to implement writing instruction and we consulted with departments or programs who wanted to implement writing into their curriculum.

Surprisingly five departments were ready for -- with paperwork the minute we said we're going to do this; Anthropology, Geography, History, Russian and Communication Leadership Development which is through AG.

So all of the -- these do now satisfy the writing requirement through these programs. They don't take the 200-level default. If you're an Anthropology major, you satisfy it through Anthropology; if you're Geography, through Geography; et cetera.

Three new programs are in the governance process. Social Work, Communication Disorders and Agricultural

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
Biotechnology. And three new courses added without a change in the major so they're just trying to do it when they can and they will -- when they can get a course through that's a W class they will do that.

Eight more programs are in consultation with us; seven more programs indicating interest.

Okay. So funding year one, this was last year, 50 students outside of English, hardly any; not surprising since it takes time to get through the governance process.

Ninety-seven percent, then, were being handled through English. We ran a baseline assessment this summer, we had good

compliance. There is a committee that will report on that assessment at some point and get back to you about what the results were; what we found in the papers, et cetera.

Okay. So we're now up to speed. We're up to this year. Fourteen new courses are added to Graduate Council now, and we're expecting more major change proposals so more programs are coming on board.

The estimated enrollment outside of English for this academic year is 466 students, which is up from 50. So it's growing. We have more students now who are going to satisfy the requirement through their major or through courses in another department. We can't really predict how many are through English because the courses are also USP courses, it's difficult to tell until they are actually in courses which students are taking it for W credit and which are satisfying some other requirement.

Challenge is an issue, and this is really what I wanted to call to your attention.

We continue to struggle with --

something we talked about when we put -- talked a lot about when we put the proposal in place.

UK does not have a unit that specializes in rating. This was something that Council on Postsecondary Education decided; that University of Louisville would be the program that specialized in writing and that University of Kentucky would offer the Ph.D. in literature.

This means that we're always operating at a bit of a disadvantage because we don't have a big contingent of people here who work primarily in writing.

We have more -- especially in English, because the workload is hitting them in an unusual way, they're still carrying most of the requirement and it's the only place where they're compelled to do it. The other courses are voluntary.

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt

I sometimes hear people who say, can't we just have W requirements for the students in the class who are doing it for the W. Does the whole class have to be a W class?

If 20 of my 30 students are doing this for the W credit, can't they be the ones who do the writing and the other ten not? And under currently rules the answer is no.

I have students call all the time who want to petition to say, but I took a course in political science and I wrote a lot. Can't that count. And right now we don't have any process whereby that would work. Students need to take a course approved by the Undergraduate Council.

We are struggling and continue to struggle with how to get technical writing on this campus, but we've started preliminary discussions with the College of AG and College of Engineering, and we will keep -- we know it's something that we need to find a way to get technical writing on this campus. It's pretty amazing that we have no expertise in technical writing on the campus.

And we need to figure out what happens after year three. We're at that awkward stage now after year one. We're too far into it to put an end to it but not far enough into it where it makes sense to

institutionalize it just now. So we're going to have to -- and I hope that committee will help.

We are working with distance learning just to let people know some of the things around the edges, and we have worked out expedited transfer from Bluegrass Community & Technical College because those courses do not automatically transfer. They have to petition to have the courses serve as their graduation writing requirement.

What we're going to do for the rest of this year, continue to work with and add existing programs. We're going to try to work on a proposals for technical writing and see if we can start to find a home for technical writing on this campus.

We will be working on reporting out the results of the assessment, and work on preparing the next assessment and to do all that we're going to convene the Graduation Writing Requirement Committee. It is four members, including representatives from a variety of colleges. I will Chair it, and Phil Kraemer in consultation with the Senate

Council will be doing that.

They will advise the Undergraduate Council, they'll recommend approval or rejection of courses. They're going to review and report on assessment data. There

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
is a little -- there's some funds in year two, this year, it's not a lot, you know, but they can chime in on it and they will participate in coming up with a proposal for the Provost to decide what to do with this initiative after it ends.

Information sharing, this report went to the Provost and the Senate Council on the 2nd of October. It was at Undergraduate Council on the 7th of November. Dean Hoch saw it the day after, it is today in front of you, and we will get it up on the Bayesian network and our website soon.

And if you need information, this is the contact information.

That is the very fast report, as I promised you.

CHAIR: Are there any questions for Janet before she sits?
(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Well, you can sit. Thank you very much.

Next item is an action item regarding MS in Athletic Training. Currently students interested in pursuing athletic training at UK pursue a concentration in athletic training through Department of Kinesiology and Health Promotion. Goal of the new MS is to develop critical consumers of research and accepted clinical practices, advanced healthcare providers and leaders in the college (Inaudible) and research and (Inaudible) of their profession.

It comes to the Senate with positive recommendation from Senate Athletic Program Committee.

Is Carl Matlacola here? Thank you, Carl, for being here.

The proposal is in front of you, has been distributed, been approved by the Senate Council with a positive recommendation and is now in front of you.

Does it require a motion or second?
Are there any questions?
(NO RESPONSE)

MR. MATLACOLA: Carl, do you want to add anything?
No, sir.

CHAIR: Any questions regarding this proposal?
(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Then it seems we are ready to vote. All those in favor of this new MS in Athletic Training please indicate so by raising your hand.
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Those opposed?
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Abstain?
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: It's unanimous and the motion carries. Thank you.

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt

Item No. 6 on your agenda is Change to Senate Rule 6.4.4. The change creates a deadline by which students must approach the academic Ombud to contest an offense or penalty. Also, a change in the maximum time for resolving an informal resolution from 28 working days to 20 days which presents a change in semantics but no real change in length of time.

It comes to the Senate with positive recommendation from the Senate Council.

Just a brief history: We just recently revamped the entire academic offenses and since then the person who was most responsible and should get credit for this new program or new proposal I should say, new rule, found a couple loopholes or a couple of things missing and I am truly surprised that there has been only one or two, that shows how well the rule was written.

MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know if I deserve credit or blame.

CHAIR: We'll give you both. How about that?

MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So we -- the way this loophole arose is that in the original rules, the way -- the way it was expressed was that if a student was informed that they were found to have committed an act or offense that warranted a penalty and they didn't like that, they would -- they were told they had ten days to appeal.

And then after they officially submitted an appeal, then the Ombud would get involved and would try to resolve it, try to do an informal resolution.

So when our Committee was going through this it seemed to make sense that the Ombud should try to do an informal resolution or an official appeal was resolved. So we wrote that and said that if the Ombud can't, then -- resolve things informally, then the student has eight days to file an appeal.

So what we neglected to put in was a -- was a deadline by which the student should approach the Ombud to ask for an informal resolution or an appeal if the student is not interested in an informal resolution.

So that's what this does. It just says that the student has ten days after they're informed that they committed an offense and the penalty -- and what the penalty for that offense will be. They have ten days to approach the Ombud. It's the same procedure that we had previously. It's just there's a little bit of a loophole.

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
originally everywhere in the rules it said
working days and we've changed working days
to just days and we put a definition in the
front to say 28 -- to say a day was a working
day, a reduction on the number 28 to 20, it's
about three or four weeks.

So that's -- that's the only change
there.

CHAIR: Indeed minor changes and, Bob
Grossman, thank you for the explanation.

MR. GROSSMAN: And, hopefully, this is the last
time it will have to come before you.

CHAIR: Yes, a question.

MS. DEEM: I'm Jody Deem, College of Health
Sciences.

So you say -- I may be missing it
here somewhere, but you say that that
explanation that days are working days
precedes all these numbers somewhere in the
document?

MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.

MS. DEEM: Okay.

MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah. Yeah. It's in -- there's a
6.0.1 or something. It's definitions.

MS. DEEM: Okay.

MR. GROSSMAN: It just list a whole bunch of
definitions, including that the Chair means
the Chair or the Chair's designee, the Dean
meet with -- you know, we would repeat these
things again and again. We just decided to
put it all in the front.

MS. DEEM: So the ten days for the student is
working days?

MR. GROSSMAN: It's working days also. Yes.

CHAIR: Any other question?

MS. DEEM: Are working days in the
University...

I'm sorry, Jody Deem, College of
Health Sciences.

Working days in the University when
the University is actually in session or are
they working days in the world?

MR. GROSSMAN: It's when it's in session, so then
the period between Christmas and New Year's,
when the University is closed, wouldn't count
toward the deadline.

MS. DEEM: Okay. Thank you, Bob.

CHAIR: But just to clarify, when classes
are not in session --

MR. GROSSMAN: It's still working days.

CHAIR: -- there are still working days.
That's right.

MR. GROSSMAN: But the period between Christmas
and New Year's I think --

CHAIR: Right.

MR. GROSSMAN: -- would now count as not working
days. I mean, obviously, with these sorts of
deadlines you probably bend over backwards to
give the students the credit of any minor --
I mean, interpretation. If it's the 11th day
but one of those days was, you know, Ash

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
Wednesday or something, then -- I don't know.
Leave that up to the Rules Committee to worry
about.

CHAIR: Okay. This comes to you through
the Senate Council with a positive
recommendation, does not require motion or
seconding. Are there any -- are there any
questions, discussion?
(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Then let's vote. All those in
favor of this change please indicate so by
raising your hand.

(MEMBERS VOTE)
CHAIR: Any opposed?
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Abstain?
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: It unanimous and motion carries.
Thank you, Bob Grossman.
The next item is UK December Degree
List. To introduce that item I have Davy
Jones here. Please, Davy, give us your
introduction.

MR. JONES: This, again, is just one more
exercise in which the State Legislature has
identified the faculty at the University as
the entity with the authority and under the
Board of Trustees regulations, the elected
faculty Senators here act on behalf of the
Statutory body, the faculty of the
University, when it comes to this item, which
is the degree list.

In particular, this is the UK
degree list for the December graduation, and
the draft list was given to the Senate
Council, was sent out to all the Senators. A
number of you got back, thank you, with some
corrections.

There were several students who
were supposed to get their degrees in
December but were not on the list, and your
activities ensured that they are on this list
and they will now have the Degree in hand the
date they're supposed to have it.

There was another student who had
already graduated in May who was being listed
again, and this could create some confusion
for the students as to when do they actually
get their degree. That person has been
removed, they already got their degree in
May.

So a number of corrections like
that have been made. So far as we're aware
now this is, you know, the accurate list that
the elected faculty Senators can vote on to
go to the Board for final Board approval.

MR. FINKEL: Raphael Finkel, College of
Engineering.

I did have our people check in my
department to make sure that everything was

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
right, and there were no omissions but there were some names here of people who will, in

fact, not be getting their degree. Is this a problem?

MR. JONES: It's less of a problem than the omissions. There's a little asterisk somewhere that says those who are on their -- provided they have really satisfied all the -- you know, and so they would get caught somewhere supposedly in a cross-check.

But we try to get those off when we can just so the student isn't misled as to what their status is, that they've reached this list when they actually have it, but sometimes we're not going to get all of those. We try to get them as much as possible, but the omissions are the ones that we really...

MR. SAWAYA: Peter Sawaya from Medicine. I really find, looking at this list, kind of not my job and I -- it's not that I -- I don't mind it, but I would like to see, for example, under each of the departments that the Chair or the Program Director of that department attesting that these are, indeed, the students attended and completed all that they have to complete and they are ready to

be discharged -- to be graduated.

Rather for me here by my e-mail or you e-mail and name recognition whether it is true or somebody is missing.

So I don't know how we can adopt something like that under each of the -- there is statement from the director that these are accurate names and need to be presented to us.

MR. JONES: If I could comment on that.

CHAIR: Go ahead.

MR. JONES: The way the process works, I understand, is that the individuals that you have indicated at a stage in the process do forward the name, supposedly a correct list, are -- and are ascertaining a correct list but sometimes due to errors above their level like -- well, I won't say where those errors are, but there could be errors above their level that there's no place to catch it again except here at the University Senate, which is why our finger is constitutently on the pulse.

MR. SAWAYA: You mean we have a statement from, for example, Anthropology that these names

are listed and they're signed by a Program Director or a Chairman? Do we have that on file?

CHAIR: Indeed, that's implied. It's my understanding, in fact, from my department, my colleagues, we go through a process and these names have been certified and forwarded by the Dean of the College of Engineering to

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
the registrar; registrar then further check
some other items, and they send it to us.

Just because you don't see the
individual signatures there explicitly, it
doesn't mean they don't exist. In fact, the
Directors and the Chairs of each department
through the College Associate Dean or Dean
have attested to this.

MR. JONES: And, again, just adding to that,
for -- for enumerable numbers of reasons
sometimes what gets forwarded didn't get put
on, somebody was ill and somebody else is
stepping into the office of some Dean or
whatever, and didn't get something in in time
but there are human elements that have caused
these errors that we catch here so that these
these students who are entitled to get a

December degree do get added to the list
because we did a final cross-check.

We are the faculty University
responsible for the approval of the degrees
that go to the Board, and that's our finger
on the pulse here.

CHAIR: Are there any other questions or
comments to be made for this item?
(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: This is coming to us from the
Senate Council with a positive
recommendation. All those in favor of this
item please indicate so by raising your hand.
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Those opposed?
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Abstain?
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: One abstain. Motion carries.
Thank you, Davy.

The next item -- don't go anywhere,
just stay here. Next item is, in fact, the
next two items are revisions to Senate Rules.
These are mostly editorial revisions. In
fact, Davy will correct me if they are some

-- there are some which are not editorial as
it -- as clear as they should be, but rather
than having these two together just to
respect proper order we're going to do these
one at a time.

Section 8 is a global revision --
I'm sorry, Item 8, Section is global
revision, Section V, stemming from 2005
changes to governing regulations. There are
no substantial changes, and this comes to the
Senate with positive recommendation from
Senate Rules and Election Committee.

After approval, no further action
by SRL, Senate Rules and Election Committee
is necessary. That is there because this is
already codified. It already comes from the
Senate Council from the Senate Rule
Committee. We don't want to send it back to
them and to expedite the -- this way we'll

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt

expedite the process.

Davy, is there anything you want to add regarding changes to this section?

MR. JONES: No. Again, I would just reiterate this is the part of the ongoing process over the last year and a half that the Rules

Committee has been involved with stemming from the changes to the governing regulations a year and a half ago that finally codified the Provost system that we're in now that LCC has departed and several changes like that; so the Rules Committee is going line-by-line through the Senate Rules getting all these updates.

There are no substantive changes in here. They are, according to the Rules Committee, that -- these are either editorial or if they're substantive, they're substantive because they're compelled by the higher governing regulations so...

That's all.

CHAIR: Are there any comments or questions regarding this item?

Bob Grossman?

MR. GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Arts & Sciences.

On page -- well, page 3 on the bottom -- I think page 55 on the top, you have grades of XE and XF, and I'm just curious why the grade of XE, normally may not be changed to a W except upon appeal, but has XF -- for the XF -- the grade of XF may not

be changed to a W except upon appeal, so I'm wondering why one of them is normally and the other is not. Is that a change in meaning -- a difference in meaning or --

MR. JONES: It's my memory that this was a cut and paste --

MR. GROSSMAN: Really?

MR. JONES: -- from somewhere else, that XE in that sentence -- sentence had gotten adopted. We did not invent those definitions.

MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.

CHAIR: Yes?

MR. HULSE: David Hulse, College of Business & Economics.

I notice that Rule 5.1.0.1 is deleted. It says by last day of class before the midterm withdrawal date, all teachers must inform the undergraduate students in their courses of their current progress based on the criteria in the syllabus --

MR. JONES: Wait, wait, where --

MR. HULSE: It's on the very first page.

MR. JONES: I don't have all the --

MR. HULSE: The first deletion is grading and

marking system. And, it's the, I guess, the next several items there together. It seems to me that that is a more substantive change. I wonder what the rationale is for it?

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt

- MR. JONES: Okay. I think this was moved somewhere else editorially, but I'm -- I'm not aware that -- or the Rules Committee didn't sit there and think, well, that's a bad rule so we crossed it out. It probably has been moved somewhere else. We did some reorganizations but no substantive changes.
- CHAIR: Are there any other questions or comments?
(NO RESPONSE)
- CHAIR: I should say I received several editorial corrections by Raphael Finkel, my colleague in College of Engineering, and they are all editorial, grammatical and spelling errors. We appreciate your close reading of this. So we're going to forward those to the Rules Committee to incorporate in the updated version.
Any further questions or comments?
(NO RESPONSE)
- CHAIR: We are ready to vote, then. All those in favor of this new version of Section V please indicate so by raising your hand.
(MEMBERS VOTE)
- CHAIR: Opposed?
(MEMBERS VOTE)
- CHAIR: Any abstain?
(MEMBERS VOTE)
- CHAIR: One abstain, and motion carries. Thank you, Davy.
Somewhat similar item, Senate Rule Section VII, same global revisions, stemming from changes to governing regulations. No substantial changes. Comes to the Senate with positive recommendation and we will not require any further action by SREC other than perhaps editorial or those changes that I already mentioned.
Davy, is there anything different on this one that you would like to tell us?
- MR. JONES: I'd just repeat everything I said.
- CHAIR: Okay. Raphael?
- MR. FINKEL: Raphael Finkel, College of Engineering.
Could you please read 7.2.0 as amended?
- CHAIR: What page?
- MR. FINKEL: The first page of this -- it's page on the bottom, 106 on the top.
- CHAIR: Do you want us to read it loud or just to ourselves?
- MEMBER: No, read it out loud please.
- MR. FINKEL: Read out loud, please.
- CHAIR: 7.2.0.
- MR. JONES: The word individual is supposed to be after the word, the. That is -- that is right; you're right. The teaching and research personnel was changed to the word individual because up above it says who this Code shall apply to.
- MR. FINKEL: Right. Okay. I just wanted to --

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
MR. JONES: But editorially the word individual should be placed there.

CHAIR: Are there any comments?

MR. JONES: Yes. We need him on the Rules Committee.

CHAIR: Okay. We are ready to vote. All those in favor of these changes to Section VII please indicate so by raising your hand.
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: All those opposed?

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Abstain?

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: It's unanimous that the motion carries.

Thank you, Davy, again.

The next item is change of voting status for one ex officio member of Retroactive Withdrawal Application Committee.

Senate Retroactive Withdrawal Application Committee unanimously request non-voting status for ex officio Counseling and Testing Center members, and this actually comes with recommendation of the same member -- same member agrees that this membership should be ex officio non-voting.

Apparently, the rule either implies there is a voting for that member or it's ambiguous.

The concern is possible conflict of interest if SRWAC hears cases from student involved with the CTC.

The Senate Council unanimously approved, and this comes to the Senate with positive recommendation.

Anybody from -- from Retroactive Withdrawal Committee want to add -- make any comment? If not, Bob Grossman?

MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah, Bob Grossman, Arts & Sciences. Not that I want to derail this or anything, but I have no idea what the purpose of this -- I mean, anyone on the SRWAC Committee could have a conflict of interest. If they do, they just recuse themselves from voting. Why is the Council and Testing Center such a special case that they should always be non-voting?

CHAIR: This is an ex officio member. It's my understanding it's a non-faculty -- non-senator, non-faculty member who is there for -- to give supporting material or give information.

And, in fact, they have -- they have not been -- this person has not been voting but then it came to the attention of the Chair of that Committee that the rule doesn't say that there is no vote for this person. And then the Committee on their own decided that they want this member from CTC be not only ex officio which it is, but also

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
be non-voting. This is what they are requesting.

MR. GROSSMAN: So, it's just a reduction of practice to the rules.

CHAIR: Correct.

MR. GROSSMAN: Making the rules conform with the practice.

CHAIR: Correct. This is not changing practice.

MR. GROSSMAN: But I don't -- I still don't understand why the question of conflict of interest comes up?

CHAIR: I guess that was one explanation or one of the reasons for the change for the -- request for the change. That's not the only reason.

MR. CALVERT: Yes?
Ken Calvert, College of Engineering.

At the bottom there's 1.4.3.2 Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee, so is that going to be modified so that this CTC rep is also listed as one of the ex officio non-voting members?

CHAIR: Which page? The last page.

MR. CALVERT: Last page, 112.
So there's a recommendation and then a rule is quoted which doesn't say anything, unless I missed it, about the CTC representative.

CHAIR: So you're saying 1.4.3.2 doesn't say what we are asking you to approve. Is that -- is that your point?

MR. CALVERT: I'm asking what is the purpose of this -- why is this text here because it doesn't mention this, and is it being amended or -- I don't understand why it's here since it doesn't mention CTC at all?

CHAIR: I don't quite understand the point but if you approve this then we would change the rule, send it to the Rules Committee to change the rule so that the rule -- Senate Rule would say this person does not have a vote.

MR. GROSSMAN: What were they doing on the committee to begin with if they're not even mentioned down here in the existing rule?

CHAIR: I don't know. Is there any one --

MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's your question.

MR. CALVERT: Right.

MEMBER: It don't look like they are a member, ex officio or otherwise.

CHAIR: Okay. Well, this is behind -- before us. Somebody could make a motion to table this so that we would ask this question and then we get back --

MR. CIBULL: Move to table.

MR. BOLLINGER: Second.

CHAIR: Could I get your name?

MR. BOLLINGER: Chris Bollinger, Eco --

CHAIR: It was moved by Mike Cibull. Okay.

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt

MR. CIBULL: There's no discussion to table.
CHAIR: Very limited discussion, if Gifford
was here, or perhaps no discussion. Are we
ready to vote for that?
(NO RESPONSE)

All those in favor of tabling this
item --

MS. BROTHERS: Table until when? Until when?
CHAIR: That's right. Mike, table -- would
you please be more specific?

MR. CIBULL: Table to the next Senate meeting.
CHAIR: To the next Senate meeting. Okay.
All those in favor please indicate
so by raising your hand.

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Opposed?

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Abstain?

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: One abstain; is that correct? One
abstain. Motion carries.
Our last time is Work-Life Survey
Results presented by Laura Koppes.
Work-Life Task Force was appointed
in 2002, their office established and
director was hired for it. Life culture --
work-life culture survey was conducted in
October 2005 for the staff and February 2002
for the faculty, and here we have -- is Laura
Koppes here?

She is not here. Did we tell her
to come at a later time?

MS. BROTHERS: Yes, we did. This is --

CHAIR: When did we tell her to come?

MS. BROTHERS: I don't remember.

MR. CIBULL: Well, if she's not here, I mean, we
can't have this report --

CHAIR: She's not here, so that we cannot
have the report. We went too fast. Okay.

All right. Then we will --

MS. BROTHERS: Can I try to call her to see if
she's on her way?

CHAIR: Yes. Can you please?

MS. BROTHERS: Okay.

CHAIR: If you'll indulge us, if she's on
her way I would feel guilty that she come
here and we would not be here. Just indulge
us for a...

(MS. BROTHERS EXITS MEETING)

CHAIR: Yes?

MR. REMER: Rory Remer, Education.

I have a question or a concern anyway. I
believe that we voted last year on something
along the lines of holding our approval of
the Business Plan in abeyance and never went
back to discuss it or make a decision about
whether to support it as a Senate. What's
happened to that discussion?

CHAIR: The Top 20 Business Plan?

MR. REMER: Uh-huh (affirmative).

I believe what happened was the

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
President showed up and said something and there was no time, and that was all that happened was we said, fine, he said it.

CHAIR: Well, I'm speaking from top of my head but I don't think the Business Plan required Senate approval. It required Senate input. And you said it was last year; correct? Or was it this year?

MR. REMER: It was last year.

CHAIR: Last year. I'm just speaking from top of my head, I think the setup was that we would give our input either when the President was here giving the presentation or by sending input to the Senate Council or the President's office directly. That's all I can say from top my head, but I will do a little bit more investigation and...

MR. REMER: Because there was an issue that came up about the -- the paper quoting us as having supported the Business Plan unani mously as a Senate which never happened.

CHAIR: Well, perhaps then the paper was incorrect? I don't know.

Which paper, by the way?

MR. REMER: Herald-Leader.

CHAIR: Bob Grossman.

MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah. What the Senate did pass was essentially non-committal on the Business

Plan, but it did say it looked forward to working with the President on the implementation of the Business Plan. So the Business Plan was essentially (Inaudible) by the time it came before the Senate.

So the Herald-Leader misrepresented what we had voted on but since then maybe you want to share some of the -- the committees that have been put together to implement the Business Plan that do involve a lot of faculty representation.

CHAIR: Okay. I know nobody -- is somebody from Provost Office here? I think Richard Greissman who is the liaison to the Senate Council and I think also to the Senate wrote us and said he cannot attend.

Yes, there is -- after the Business Plan then there was a Top 20 Strategic Plan. There was a University-wide Committee appointed first by the President, and then shortly the new Provost joined us. It's called UCAPP. UCAPP has several sub-committees and it's heavily populated by regular faculty. The Senate Council Chair, in this case myself, and the ex officio to

the UCAPP main company and all of these are better (Inaudible) and, in fact, recently the Board also approved the Top 20 Strategic Plan which was based on the Top 20 Business Plan.

Sheila?

(MS. BROTHERS RETURNS TO MEETING)

MS. BROTHERS: She'll be coming through door

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt

shortly.
CHAIR: She's coming through the door
shortly.
Are you Laura?
MS. KOPPEs: Yes.
CHAIR: Thank you for being here.
MS. KOPPEs: I didn't think I was on until 4:30,
sorry.
CHAIR: Oh, okay. I have already given the
introduction, and we are ready for you as
soon as you are ready for us.
MS. KOPPEs: Well, good afternoon. Thank you.
It's a pleasure to be here. My name is Laura
Koppes. I'm the Director of Work-Life here
at the University, and I'm thrilled to be
able to show you the survey results from the
Work-Life Survey that was completed.
And, let's see. What I'm going to

do is -- this is the full presentation that
shows both the staff and the faculty results,
and given the time constraints we have, I'll
probably skim through pretty quickly the
staff results and show and rely primarily on
the faculty results.

This particular presentation is on
the Work-Life website, this exact
presentation, and the report of the same
results are also on the Work-Life website so
you'll be able to see all these results
because I won't have a chance to go through
all the data points, sorry. I was running up
the hill when she came out and got me; catch
my breath...

The presentation focuses on three
major categories of the survey findings. The
first category is going to be on the work
environment and the culture, so there's a
number of things that we measured that fall
into that category.

The second category is what we call
quality of life and work-life effectiveness,
and those items are certainly related to work
environment and culture but there's some very

specific questions about work life and the
quality of work life.

And then we'll look at what faculty
respondents said about why did they come to
the University, why do they stay, what's
their commitment and intentions to leave.

The reason we're interested in all
of this work-life initiative and the things
that come with it is with the idea of keeping
the best faculty and, of course, as we know,
we're going to be recruiting and hiring
additional faculty.

I'll summarize these results in
terms of strengths and opportunities, and
then show you the steps that we're currently
taking and the action for implementation.

Briefly, this survey was a part of
a work-life initiative that began in 2002.

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt

It was a recommendation from a task force -- a work -- Work-Life Advisory Council. There's a University-level Work-Life Advisory Council that has members from all areas of the University, both faculty and staff on it. These are full census surveys, so everybody had an opportunity to participate. It wasn't sampling.

And one of the things I do want to comment on is it was a joint effort. This was truly a collaborative effort between faculty and staff. There was an external consulting firm involved in the development of the survey, and a lot of people came together to make this work.

And I do want to mention Roger Sugarman, who's the Director of Institutional Research Office. He was very involved in this survey project and in the analysis of the data.

So let's go ahead and get into the survey information. Just to let you know, 56 percent of the staff responded. That's 5,409 individuals. And almost 45 percent of the faculty responded; that 870 full-time faculty.

We were pretty pleased with these results -- or excuse me, with these response rates. They -- for this kind of survey, if you completed the survey, you know it was very lengthy. The staff survey had 170 questions on it, and the faculty survey had

135. So those of you who do survey research, you know those can be long surveys. So we were generally pleased with these response rates.

We did look at the demographic characteristics of these respondents to see if they represent the population here at the University, and for the most part when we broke it out by gender, race, ethnicity, job classification, tenure status and faculty (Inaudible), you see the same proportions in the respondents as you would see in the population. So that's good. We can say it's representative.

So looking at work environment and culture, one of the questions was overall satisfaction and 60 percent of the faculty respondents indicated that they agree they're satisfied with their faculty position at the University; one-fourth indicated that they disagreed with their satisfaction. Over 70 percent of the staff indicated that they're satisfied with their jobs.

Then for staff, we did look at additional job-related dimensions, and they indicated their satisfaction on a number of items. Again, I'm going to not go over every one of these data points, but you can see at

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
the top of the chart this is percentage of very satisfied and satisfied. At the top of the chart we see working relationships with co-workers; at the bottom of the chart we see few respondents satisfied with salary/wage; and I can tell you about 50 percent said they're dissatisfied with salary/wage.

We also asked staff respondents about supervisor effectiveness, and down here at the bottom left-hand corner there was an overall question about satisfaction and over 70 percent of the staff said they were satisfied. And there were a number of questions here that deal with -- or a number of statements that deal with supervisor effectiveness, and you can see what those percentages look like.

We also asked staff about job career growth advancement opportunities on campus. This is an agreement item, so they read the statement: I understand what I'm responsible for on the job, and you can see

about 90 percent agree with that which I thought was great; 90 percent know what they're supposed to do on the job, but then I started thinking, well, maybe there's ten percent that didn't agree with that. What does that tell us?

I have the information to do my job effectively. At the bottom of the chart you see fewer respondents agree with: I know what I need to do to advance here at the University and my advancement opportunities are good, 34 percent, and there's a lot of disagreement with those statements.

But let's take a look at the faculty survey. Some areas are the same on the surveys, but they weren't given as separate surveys.

On the faculty survey, the faculty respondents provide an assessment of workload and resources. And this dotted little -- dotted line, yellow line, separates above are the workload expectations and below are their resources.

So the way we read this chart is the gray portion here represents the

percentage that assessed these items as too little. The pink part of the bar is about right, and the dark red part of the bar is too much.

So, for example, expectations for securing outside funding, 55 percent of these respondents said those expectations are about right; 40 percent said too much; followed by we see administrative responsibilities you can see teaching load, service and outreach and advising, over three-quarters of these respondents say those expectations are about right.

Below the dotted line are

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
resources. Time to develop relations with colleagues, our colleagues as a resource, internal funding for scholarship, resources for scholarship and creative activities. That was defined as things like equipment, facilities, technology and then staff resources which were defined as administrative staff and technical staff. And you can see here the percentages of these -- the faculty respondents that said those resources are too little.

Another important part of a work environment and culture is the feeling of respect or perception of respect. Do faculty and staff feel respected on this campus and also feeling valued. So we actually asked both staff and faculty about this question.

Let me show you the staff respondents. This was an agreement statement so the staff member responded to: I feel respected by my co-workers, followed by immediate supervisor, students. 53 percent of the staff respondents said they feel respected by faculty and 39 percent of the staff respondents feel respect from senior administration.

The faculty were asked a similar question. Their categories were a little different. This tells us that 86 percent of the faculty respondents agree they feel respect from the staff, 83 percent from students and 74 percent from colleagues.

In addition to respect, we asked about feeling valued. We asked both faculty and staff this question. It was setup or written as a satisfaction with feeling

valued, and 36 percent over both -- for both faculty and staff, over a third, are satisfied as feeling valued.

And I can tell you about the same number expressed dissatisfaction with feeling valued, and everybody else was in a middle category. There was a neutral category used on this survey.

Another important component of the work environment that was measured on the survey is what we call commitment to diversity, and this was actually asked several different ways. They only have one way in the presentation, and so both faculty and staff -- this is an agreement item again -- responded to this statement: My colleagues respect individual and cultural differences. So do you agree with that. And this chart shows agreement, and this is telling us -- this is the only item we have in this presentation by race, that 46 percent of the faculty -- African-American faculty agreed that their colleagues respect individual and cultural differences.

This gray bar are other races,

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt

ethnic groups. There were too few respondents, so we collapsed them into one category. And then this red bar represents whites. So 74 percent of the white said -- agreed that their colleagues respect individual and cultural differences.

We asked this a couple other different ways. There was a question asking about the University in general respecting cultural and individual differences, and a question about University policies showing respect for cultural and individual differences.

And you see the same kind of response. Differences in perception, African-Americans -- fewer African-Americans agreed with these perceptions -- or agreed with these statements as compared to whites. And, in fact, those other two items, these overall percentages are lower.

We also asked about the direction of the University, communication that's perceived and trust. So on this chart both faculty and staff are on this chart.

Let's take a look at the faculty results, which is this gray bar. Again, this is an agreement item so the faculty member read the statement and indicated their agreement: There is a high degree of trust within my department. 44 percent of those faculty respondents agreed with that statement; and this is agree and strongly agree combined; followed by senior leadership communicates UK's direction: I have confidence in the direction UK is going. Senior leadership understands faculty concerns, and at the bottom of the chart there is a high degree of trust within the University. 11 percent of the faculty agreed with that statement.

All right. So those are the different aspects of the work environment and culture that were on the survey. In addition, as part of the environment, is the quality of life and so every respondent indicated their level of satisfaction with the quality of life as defined as the ability to integrate their work and have a fulfilling work life with a personal or home life.

So here we have all the data points of the scale. The gray bars are the faculty respondents, and you can see the very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, satisfied and very satisfied.

As the Director of Work-Life at first you look at these numbers and you think that's not too bad, but I'm really paying attention to these dissatisfaction numbers and especially if, you know, you combine all three categories, which some survey

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
researchers will actually suggest you combine the middle -- neutral category with the negative side of the scale because if the person doesn't feel strongly enough to indicate positive then it might be a negative.

That's just one approach that's used. I'm not necessarily advocating. It's just some researchers will do that.

Just for your information, I won't spend any time on this, but one of the conversations that was happening on the campus when I arrived in March was that staff work a second job; that they have to work a second job, and this was actually a question

on the survey and about one-fourth of the staff respondents said they work a second job. 14 percent of that 24 percent work for essential living expenses. It was defined as rent and utilities. Then another 10 percent said they do it for extra spending.

I did a quick crosstab. I was curious who these individuals were. These are five job -- or six job categories we use on campus and people self-identified what category. These are actual numbers. These aren't percentages, and you can see those individuals who said they work in a second -- worked a second job, where they also said their job was located in terms of a category.

When we look at work life it's important to look at all the life issues, but traditionally we look at parenting or dependent care issues. And this is faculty and staff combined, and what this chart tells us is that currently almost 40 percent of faculty and staff combined have children under 18 years of age living with them, and another 20 percent are going to have more children. Of those who have children, 9

percent are going to -- are planning to have children and another 12 percent who currently don't have children will.

Their greatest difficulties are finding childcare and emergency backup care.

In addition to child dependent care, we asked about adult dependent care. Again, this is faculty and staff combined, and out of these respondents 11 percent said they currently have elder care responsibilities but this is the number that I'm paying attention to, and that's 28 percent. We're going to triple that number that say I don't have current elderly care responsibility, but I will in the next two to three years.

They have trouble -- greatest difficulty finding resources and finding care of acceptable quality, which isn't surprising because there aren't many options available right now.

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt

Of course, we have an outstanding elder care program on this campus, which is highly unusual for Universities as well as corporations.

Another area that we assessed under quality of life is stress and burnout. Now this chart is a little bit different; that the lower the number, the better because they're stated as stress items.

So the gray bar, again, is the faculty percentage. The stress of meeting family and personal responsibilities keeps me from doing my best at work. You can see a third of the faculty agree with that statement.

And here we have: No matter how hard I work I can't get everything done. Three-quarters of the faculty responded to agree with that statement. And I feel physically and emotionally drained at the end of the work day, over 60 percent agree.

We also take a look at perceptions of support. Do you feel supported. As a faculty member here at the University, do you feel that your department chair, your administration within your college and then outside of the college, do they support the fact that you are managing all of these responsibilities and obligations. Again, the

gray bar represents the faculty respondents. At the top of the chart: My chair is supportive of my personal responsibilities followed by colleagues, administration of my college. At the bottom of the chart we have UK policies, 31 percent of the faculty respondents say, agree that UK policies are supported, followed by UK in general. And at the bottom of the chart, 29 percent of the faculty respondents say that senior leadership is supportive of personal and family responsibilities.

We asked about work-life programs and practices, and I won't go into all this in detail. It's available on the website. But most -- most staff selected flexible work schedules as being valuable to them, 77 percent of the staff, and related to that is compressed work week and telecommuting as -- for potential work-life programs as being important. We also see this college tuition program for employees' children or dependents.

So let's look at faculty. Faculty were given a list of initiative programs and policies and asked to indicate if that program was of value or great value, and 91 percent of the faculty respondents indicated that increased technical staff support would be of value followed by resources and technology to work from home, administrative

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
staff support, greater assistance from my
chair or director.

We compare these results oftentimes
when we look at work life with parents who
have very young children. You can see for
the most part the results are similar with
the exception of phased in retirement.

In addition to providing that list,
we did offer another list of potential
programs that aren't currently offered
University wide, and the faculty respondent
could select one item as most valuable and
there were clearly two items that were by far
-- the most respondents compared to any other
item on the list, the top one was college
tuition program for children, dependents or
spouses, followed by a comprehensive employee
assistance program, which is for personal
counseling.

There was an open-ended option
where faculty could write in additional
items, and that's where we see the domestic
partner benefits was the most frequently
written comments, followed by this expansion
of current benefits or what we call cafeteria
style benefits.

We asked faculty why did they come
to UK, what attracts them and what will stay.
On the left side is staff, but let's take a
look at the right side. The faculty
respondents, they could select one: What's
the most important factor for coming to UK.
29 percent of these faculty respondents
selected colleagues, followed by career
development and then followed by location in
Lexington, Kentucky. So 12 percent of these
respondents selected the location in
Lexington, Kentucky.

When had asked: What will keep you
at UK, why would you stay here. 24 percent
of the respondents selected colleagues by --
followed by family considerations, ability to
balance work and life and location in
Lexington, Kentucky.

We asked about commitment. There's
different ways you can get at a person's
level of commitment to the organization, and
we asked both staff and faculty and you can
see these are a number of items that were
asked of staff and the percentages about
going the extra mile, work extra hours.

But let's take a look at the items
we asked of faculty. So this was an
agreement item: I would choose to accept a
faculty position at UK again. 58 percent of
these respondents agreed. I feel loyal and
followed by, I recommend UK to other faculty
as a good place to work, and that supposedly
tells us conceptually something about a
person's commitment to the organization.

So we've looked at why did the

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
faculty come to UK. We asked them why did you come here and why do you stay, what's your level of commitment.

We also asked about what are your intention to leave, and I thought you might be interested in the staff. Over half of the staff said they're seriously thinking about leaving and, again, here are the job

categories. We just did a quick crosstab to see who's thinking about leaving. We asked them why, what would be the most important factor, they could select one. 39 percent selected salary/wage.

But let's take a look at the faculty results. We also asked them about their intentions to leave. The item was a little bit different. It was more of an active item. Are you actively pursuing, so have you begun to explore possibilities and are you engaged in an active search, and one-third -- almost one-third; not quite, almost one-third said that, yes, I have either explored other possibilities or have engaged in a search 12 months prior to completing the survey.

So, again, a real simple crosstab on who's thinking about leaving, so these respondents who said they were thinking of leaving by tenure, 181 tenured faculty said that they are exploring or engaged in an active search, followed by tenure-track and non-tenured; 90 professors as compared to 97 associate professors.

We also asked then what would be the most important decision for your leaving -- or to consider in your leaving the University. They could select one. Similar to the staff results, 39 percent selected salary/wage followed by opportunities for career development, level of bureaucracy and ability to balance work with personal/family life.

Okay. So what does this all mean. These are really a very quick review of the results. I think that's the fastest I've ever done it, so you're lucky. I'm speaking fast today.

But how do you -- how do we make sense of this. So just to give you some preliminary ideas, we're giving these results to a lot of individuals and groups to review. But what the data seems to tell us is that overall there seems to be some satisfaction with the -- from the staff with their job and different dimensions of their job.

The faculty, if you remember, three-quarters or more said that they're teaching loads and service and outreach

expectations are about right, and it seems that for the most part wherever there was a

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
question about colleagues or co-workers the responses tended to be favorable. So working with -- you know, having those interactions, the respect and the support.

Both faculty and staff indicated the benefits are good here. Staff talked about some -- or indicated some work-life programs that we currently offer are valued, and we looked at two reasons that are common to both faculty and staff for coming to UK and staying and what was common to both groups was opportunities for this career growth advancement and ability to balance work.

But, really, the best part of the survey research is to try to get some direction or areas of opportunity. Where do we need to improve, and that's what I like to pull from this.

And there seems -- for staff in particular, there's something going on with job career growth advancement. People come here for those reasons but yet there's a lot of dissatisfaction there.

Salary and wage we saw for both faculty and staff. Supervisor effectiveness, there were some components of that for staff, that seems some areas we want to work on. Faculty respondents' satisfaction with their position, my question to the University is -- 60 percent of the faculty said they agreed that they're satisfied -- is that sufficient? Is that okay for UK?

The faculty respondents' assessment of workload and resources, especially those items that deal with scholarship and creative activities, there were several initiatives and programs that the faculty said we value these but you're not offering them so, again, that's an area of opportunity.

And then there were a number of items -- I don't know if you caught this because I was moving very quickly, a number of items about the University in general, the senior administration and the senior leadership that I think lends to areas of improvement with regard to feeling valued, commitment to diversity, trust, confidence

in the direction, and communication and understanding employee concerns.

There was -- I mentioned on the quality of life charts that there's some dissatisfaction with the quality of life and how are people managing the demands in personal lives.

There are a number of faculty and staff with dependent care concerns. I think we need to pay attention to that.

And the levels of stress and burnout, especially for faculty; the percentage of faculty respondents who

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
indicated stress and burnout.

And the perceptions of work-life support from the University administration, the policies are -- again, some more specific work-life programs and policies that we're not offering that faculty are telling us are important.

And the levels of commitment and manager responsibilities, which really I didn't talk about. That -- that really was out of the staff survey.

So what are we going to do about

it? What are the actions? I gave all of these results to the President's Cabinet, it's been given to the Board of Trustees and, you know, everybody said, okay, so what are we going to do about these results.

So when we met with the President and his Cabinet, we had given him a number of -- given them a number of recommendations, and they wanted to be sure that we shared some immediate action items. It doesn't mean this is the answer to all of these results. It's just where we're getting started.

There is a University Work-Life Advisory Council, and actually we do need representation or we would like representation from the University Senate. So if there's anyone on -- in the Senate Council who would be interested, we really need that representation.

They're going to take all of these results and recommendations from a number of groups, and use that to develop a vision and a long-term strategy.

The Provost has indicated his interest in incorporating the results with

UCAPP and, in fact, I met with the Faculty Development Subcommittee just this past Friday and we went through every single question on the faculty survey and reviewed those results to give them some ideas and direction of what they can work on as a committee. So they actually have seen all of the results.

We are moving ahead with a childcare initiative. We did a childcare feasibility study earlier this summer based on these results and demographics and provided justification for expansion of our childcare centers, and I'm heading up a committee that's overseeing an RFP for childcare centers here on campus and looking at providing more resource and referral.

There are some initiatives that are ongoing. The Staff Senate proposed a shared leave pool for staff, and we're moving ahead with that.

I met with the Task Force on Racial Diversity and Equality, and have given them the staff results by race and I'm meeting

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
with them later this week to look at faculty
results by race to identify any issues there.

We really need to work on our flexible work arrangements and providing more information, and we are currently in the process of continuing to distribute the survey findings and I'm meeting -- I met earlier today with the Commission on Women and I met -- I'm starting to meet with the College of Deans to look at results by college, assuming there's enough respondents to have some meaningful results.

We have appointed several work-life committees to look at very specific issues that arose from these survey results, and before we can actually make a decision it was decided let's do some feasibility studies and develop recommendations.

So we have a Work-Life Committee looking at expanding the tuition benefit to dependents and our spouses, so they're going to look at the different options for that. That was important to both faculty and staff.

The faculty indicated a comprehensive employee assistance program, so we have a committee looking at the different options for offering this kind of program.

We also have a committee looking at the feasibility of including domestic partners in University benefits and developing recommendations.

And then for staff, again, I didn't spend any time really on this today, but it was very clear in the staff results there's some exploration needed for career advancement, job career growth advancement.

So in conclusion, I want to remind all of us that this really is a baseline and an assessment here at UK. I've had many people ask me, well, how do we compare to our benchmarks? How do we compare to these organizations?

And really UK is at the cutting edge in doing the comprehensive assessment that it has done. Other universities have done bits and pieces, but the comprehensiveness of this survey, there -- we don't really have a lot to compare it to.

I can give you a few things but for the most part we really have to look at improvement internally. I do think there's

some strengths that -- that are good, but most importantly there are a number of areas of opportunity that I think are going to provide us foundation for what I call a work-life strategy so we have a supportive work-life environment and culture.

And, of course, we all know where we're -- where we're going and the vision of the University, and we know that this kind of

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
culture environment is needed to help us get there; to keep the best and the most talented faculty as well as look at recruiting new ones.

And there's lots of empirical evidence. I don't have it in this survey, but that shows the link between all of these issues and -- tied to retention and recruitment and productivity and those kinds of things.

And I don't know if you know, but the University of Kentucky was rated by AARP, which is the American Association of Retired, I think, Persons? No. And every year they identify the top 50 U.S. companies that employ those who are 50 years and older, and

UK was in the top 50. We were No. 30.

And we went to the award ceremony in Chicago and I have no doubt that we'll move up when I heard what these other companies are doing. And there's only a few universities on this list. MIT is No. 7; there's Cornell University, and so there's just a few universities and I think we will be able to improve on that list.

Okay. Now that I have my breath, any questions?

Yes?

MR. CIBULL: I have two questions. Mike Cibull. First, are you going to share your presentation with the faculty and staff in general? Have you sent out an e-mail telling them where the website is or -- to do that --

MS. KOPPES: Yes.

MR. CIBULL: -- so they can look at it themselves?

MS. KOPPES: Absolutely.

MR. CIBULL: And the other question is: Do you have data that would address the Medical Center as opposed to main campus? Because my guess is there are -- the problems are

somewhat different between those two areas?

MS. KOPPES: Right. We can break down by college, and then we can -- people self-identified if they were work for UK Healthcare, so we can break out UK Healthcare versus the rest of the University.

MR. CIBULL: Are you going to do that?

MS. KOPPES: Yes.

MS. BORDO: You mentioned --

CHAI R: Name, please.

MS. BORDO: Oh, Susan Bordo, English.

You mentioned that you were going to be talking with the Commission on Women and minority task. Have you already done an analyses on the basis of race and age and gender --

MS. KOPPES: Uh-huh (affirmative).

MS. BORDO: -- of this and, if so, has there been any real striking findings?

MS. KOPPES: Interestingly, no. When we did

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
that first -- one of the first analyses we did, we, being Roger Sugarman and I, was not only to look at what I presented to you but we also broke it out by demographics because we felt if there were any compelling or striking results, that should be part of the report to the President and to the University community.

We were -- we did not see -- and, in fact, I just went through all of them by race again and went through all the gender results today, and surprisingly there are -- there are some differences, but I wouldn't call it striking, you know, compelling difference.

For race, really, the area where we saw the most -- the greatest percentage difference -- of course, being a census survey, I'm not sure we could really do significant testing on it, was that commitment to diversity side, where there are clearly differences in perceptions between African-Americans, other race, ethnic groups and then white caucasian.

Gender differences would be probably what you would hypothesize.

CHAIR:

Yes?

MR. MILLER:

Joe Miller, College of Communications.

I was kind of curious, the one

result that seems kind of startling is just the low level of trust, in the overall measure. Is there some sort of explanation in terms of the context? Was there was time frame in which this was done or -- where you have follow-up ideas about how you would get a handle on something that's kind of bad, nebulous in a way. I mean, you have some good ideas about some specific responses that people filled you in on. What about that one issue?

MS. KOPPEL:

Well, I -- I'm -- you know, I've been at the University since March, so this survey actually closed -- the faculty survey closed the first week of March, and so I don't know historically and contextually what was happening at that time at the University, if that affected the results during the month of February.

Now in conversations that I've had with different people across campus is that trust issue is a historical issue, that it's for many years of the culture here at the University. I don't have any way to validate that. It's all antidotal information that

I've been given.

This is an area -- some of these work environment and culture areas dealing with feeling valued, the trust, the perceived respect, I think are all areas that they're

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
harder -- you're right, it's harder to really get your arms around it and to specifically know, and I'm going to ask the -- I've already asked them actually, the Work-Life Advisory Council, to help us get at those more culture issues.

Those other items -- most of those action items are very program adage in nature, but what you're talking about some of these culture issues and I'm really open to any suggestions or help in trying to understand it.

MR. STEINER: Shelly Steiner, Biology.

What I didn't see was -- or have you polled the impact on recruitment of abandoning retiree health benefits?

MS. KOPPES: Uh-huh (affirmative).

MR. STEINER: I mean, that's the future of the University, and intuitively we think you're trying -- particularly if you're trying to

get associate-level people, it's going to cause a crash.

MS. KOPPES: Uh-huh (affirmative).

MR. STEINER: Have you polled that issue?

MS. KOPPES: It was not part of this survey, and I have not been involved with that particular issue since I've been here but I think it's a very good point.

CHAIR: Yes?

MS. SNOW: Diane Snow, Medical Center.

First of all, a comment that I want to applaud your herculean effort to do this. This must have been monumental for you and your entire team, and we're really glad to see this kind of data come out. It's very valuable.

One area of concern to me is that there are 31 percent of people who are actively looking for other jobs, wanting to leave. If there's 31 percent that say they're actively doing it, there's got to be a significant other population who are thinking about it and that seems to be a bit of a disconnect with such a large number saying they're satisfied.

MS. KOPPES: Uh-huh (affirmative).

MS. SNOW: Is there way within this instrument to try to tease away at that? That seems to be a huge problem.

MS. KOPPES: Uh-huh (affirmative). I think you're right. And when I met with the Faculty Development Subcommittee on Friday they were particularly interested. There is some other data that I presented to them that I didn't include in this presentation just because of the time constraints, that ask about: Are you planning to stay? How long are you planning to stay and are you planning to retire? And those numbers aren't as high as you might hope them to be given some of the other results.

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt

You know, we can -- you know, given it's a census survey, the statisticians will tell that we really can't be doing any correlations or any kind of -- you know, because we don't have a sample, it's not random sampling so we can't do that. I mean, we could do maybe some simple crosstabbing, but it's hard to tease that out without being able to do some of the statistical --

additional statistical analyses.

MS. SNOW: And is that done by gender, the people who are deciding to leave or not.

MS. KOPPES: Yes. Yes. It is. And I actually just looked at that over lunch hour, and it's -- there's not -- again, I can't say a significant difference, but if you look at the percentage points it's -- it's not as large as I thought maybe it would be. The Commission on Women is looking at those particular issues.

CHAIR: Bob Grossman.

I have a comment and a question.

MS. KOPPES: Okay.

MR. GROSSMAN: The comment is, if you ask the President to issue a directive telling us all to trust each other, I think that should really improve the climate a lot.

But the question is, you know, I've been here only 12 years now but as long as I've been here people have been complaining about how their spouses can't take classes for free at UK. Is there a deadline by which these committees are going to come up with a plan and present it; someone's actually going

to make a decision to do something?

MS. KOPPES: The -- yes, I can answer that specifically for you. The tuition committee -- the committee that's looking at the tuition benefit and the committee that's looking at the domestic partner benefit, they've been charged with submitting those recommendations in mid January.

And the primary reason for that, those recommendations will go to the Work-Life Advisory Council who will take that into consideration with all the results recommendations.

And one of the reasons we're moving so quickly on that, one, is a lot of work has already been done on those issues, but if there are any budget implications that will go into effect July 1, we need to make sure it's in the pipeline early enough. So both those committees have a mid January deadline.

CHAIR: Yes, please?

MS. BORDO: Susan Bordo, English.

I also applaud you for this, but I wanted to say something as someone who started to do the survey and then stopped.

And it may have something to do with your

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt
concerns about there are certain kinds of discrepancies that one gets into when you're doing a survey. I don't remember it all that well because it was a while back, but I do remember feeling somewhat boxed in when it came to questions about satisfaction; boxed in to saying I was satisfied because of the way the choices were aligned and I think that there's a kind of -- and I'm not a statistician, far from it, so I wouldn't presume to criticize, but what I felt as a respondent was that those questions were too crude to get at what I felt about UK.

MS. KOPPES: Uh-huh (affirmative).

MS. BORDO: And that the questions that get more specific about trust, et cetera, really get more at the malaise that I feel a lot of my colleagues suffer from. But that there were too many questions that I, as I went through, I don't remember at what question I got to, I just felt, no, you know, I -- the array of possibilities given to me do not allow me to answer satisfactorily in describing why -- I'm not unhappy here. I'm

not planning to leave, by the way.

You know, I wasn't one of those who said I'm planning to leave, but why I feel that there are real problems with this institution. There's something about the instrument that did not get at that in my opinion. I don't know what it was, but I think it may have something to do with that -- those gaps between people saying they're going to leave and people saying they're satisfied.

MS. KOPPES: I appreciate that comment, and this is the one time where I can actually say I wasn't here when the survey was developed, so you're welcome to criticize. But, point well taken.

Yes?

CHAIR: Please.

MR. HERTOG: Jim Hertog, Telecommunications.

There's a lot of numbers up there and generally speaking, when you evaluate surveys you evaluate percentages against something and there's nothing to evaluate them against here. Is there any benchmarking that you can do with these same questions if

-- you know, is 73 percent good or bad, depends upon what you're comparing it to and saying, you know, would 73 percent of the -- you know, the Bush Administration currently say that they're satisfied. I mean, how would you compare? What's a good number? Were the questions that were developed for the survey taken from other surveys somewhere else that you could then go back and compare to those numbers? Then we would really know whether this was good, bad or indifferent to some extent.

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt

MS. KOPPES: The consulting firm that was contracted for the development of the survey, one of the reasons they were contracted was because they had given comparable surveys to other universities and said, you know, we'll have a database to give for comparison purposes.

That database has three other universities in it, and only one really is comparable to us. And the items -- not all of the items were on those same surveys. Only specific areas, stress and burnout, commitment and I think quality of life were

the only three that we can actually -- we could compare with one other university.

And I would say for the most part the results are similar. There is --

MR. HERTOOG: What university is that, or is that, I mean --

MS. KOPPES: Ohio --

MR. HERTOOG: -- it's not a secrete, right?

MS. KOPPES: Ohio State University.

MR. HERTOOG: Okay. Ohio State.

MS. KOPPES: Uh-huh (affirmative).

And if you look in the almanac of the Chronicle, they list a number of survey items and there is one in there about satisfaction of faculty, and it's broken out by, you know, the type of university, public, et cetera.

I looked at it when it came out this Fall, and our satisfaction percentage is lower than what's in that. But one can question that data because it's -- you know, across the board and, you know, I don't know how well the comparison can be made.

But other than that -- you know, so there's -- it's looking any scientific

literature that may look at specific concepts, so I can't say, yes, this exact survey was in used in this exact university for a direct comparison. And that's why we said it's really a baseline in looking at what we can do internally to improve.

But I know what you're asking for. I asked for those same questions -- and, you know, asked those same questions.

CHAIR: Are there any other questions?
(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, Laura.

MS. KOPPES: Thank you very much.
Now I entertain a motion to adjourn.

MEMBERS: So moved.

* * * * *

THEREUPON, the University of Kentucky Senate Council Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

* * * * *

STATE OF KENTUCKY)
COUNTY OF CAMPBELL)

December 11, 2006 xcript.txt

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 Senate Meeting convened and 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 Senate Meeting of November 13, 2006.

My commission expires: January 23, 2007.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 16th day of December, 2006.

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