

SenateMtg 101419.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE COUNCIL MEETING
OCTOBER 14, 2019

* * * * *

The meeting of SENATE COUNCIL was taken before Lisa E. Hoinke, Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Kentucky at Large, at the offices of WT Young Library Auditorium, Lexington, Kentucky, on Monday, October 14, 2019 commencing at the approximate hour of 3:00 p.m.

* * * * *

↑

BIRD-POLLAN: All right. We will call our meeting to order then. Thank you all very much for being present. We've had a small technical difficulty but we're ready to go now, so I hope you all

SenateMtg 101419.txt

find it in the back of the room, pick up your clicker if you're a voting member and we'll get started. Here it is October 14th, our second Senate Meeting of the year. Quick reminder about our conduct rules here in the University Senate. These are rules of order, we ask you to participate. We also ask you, in part of what I think of being a good citizen is, is reporting back on what you learned here to your colleagues and your college's departments, so we are here as representatives with our colleagues. So we'll just ask you to share your information, share your information you get here back with your colleagues. And a reminder to return your clicker at the end of the meeting as well. So we will start with our attendance light, so when this light appears and the question's right you can vote, so our question is, are you here today? I know you all are anticipating Fall Break. Are the votes happening already, Sheila? Okay, you can vote now. I hope. Go ahead and vote now on the attendance light. Okay, final votes. All right. Thank you. So, a couple announcements first, the Minutes we circulated the Minutes from September 9th. We received a couple of just clerical edits, so unless we hear any objections now those Minutes from September 9th will stand approved as slightly amended by unanimous consent. Any objections? Great, thanks. All right, so a couple of announcements. So, the first thing I wanted to announce is that you received an email just a few hours ago from Roger Brown who is the Chair of the Election Subcommittee of the Rules and Elections Committee here at the Senate about nominating Senators to serve on Senate Councils. So, you have until noon on October 18th to submit the nominations

SenateMtg 101419.txt

and details about the whole process are in that email, but I did just want to take a few minutes. This is a really important step in my view. So, the Senate Council is a group of nine faculty, three of whom roll off at the end of December, every year three roll off. It's an election for a three-year term. Whoever we elect now in the Fall will join in January, will join in January and will serve a three-year term. It is that group of nine elected faculty Senate Council members who are eligible to serve as the Chair. My term as Chair ends at the end of May. We will elect a Chair in December. That person will serve a year and be eligible for re-election, but it is only the existing members of the Senate Council who are eligible to run for that Chair position. So, it is important to elect people to the Senate Council who we think are good representatives of us as a group and who we might think might serve as a good Chair. So, if you think that might be you or someone you know, I really strongly encourage you to nominate those people, and I'm more than happy to chat about my own experiences on the Senate Council and in the Chair role. I know lots of people are sitting here throughout the room, I'm sure any of them would be happy to talk about their experiences. If you want to know more about it, ask about the workload, things like that. My own experience is that Deans and Chairs are really supportive of the work of Senate Council; Provost is supportive of that work. So even though it might seem like a daunting task, I think it's appreciated by administrators. I think there's conversations to be had about your DOE and other service work you're doing if you take on this role. So, if you have an interest in this, if you think

SenateMtg 101419.txt

it might be something you want to explore, please really do reach out and have a conversation about it and consider putting your name in the hat. I know it's daunting and it feels like sometimes like you don't want to dip your toe into another pool, but I think it's rewarding work and interesting and I really strongly encourage you all to think about it. One other point about this, one other thing Roger included this year in his solicitation of[07:32??], was encouragement we all sort of think in a way sort of collectively about what it would be to nominate people to be on the Senate Council or what people's positions might be, things like that. We don't really have a sort of debate stage or anything like that, and I'm not sure that we have the time or any of us have the capacity to do that, but we did want to give people an opportunity to share their views about

↑

what they might do as members of Senate Council, or what they might think is important. So, he's included an Excel spreadsheet that lists all the people who are eligible to vote in this election and also be nominated, I think. Or no, it's both things on that Excel spreadsheet, okay. Well, actually there's two lists, isn't there? There's a list of the --

BROWN:

One list.

BIRD-POLLAN:

One list, I thought there was a list at the bottom of the email itself, anyway, okay. Roger is going to explain it.

BROWN:

At the end of the email is a list of everyone who is eligible to be nominated. The Excel spreadsheet are all the people that can vote and nominate the larger list.

BIRD-POLLAN:

Okay. And so the thought was maybe one thing we can do is we could sort of share our views via email, so if you have thoughts about what you might

SenateMtg 101419.txt

↑ see in a Senate Council member or thoughts about why you might make a good Senate Council member or why someone else might, please feel free to use that information to share your views. I think it would be great if we could have a sort of robust conversation about that. The time frame is short. We're seeking the first round of nominations by Friday at noon. That's just the beginning though. That's the nomination round and then we'll have election rounds after that, so, but do put this at the top of your radar and think about it and participate in those conversations. And thanks to Roger and his team for organizing that. Okay. A few other announcements. In the middle of September we had the groundbreaking of the new Jim Beam Institute. If you remember, in the Spring Seth Debolt came to our Senate meeting to talk a little bit about this. There's been a big gift from Jim Beam Suntory to start this institute. They are not currently an MDRC. They are not currently an institute that's been approved by the Senate, but they are in the process of putting that application together so you're going to see more information from that group too. And, so I just wanted to give you all a heads-up about that. It's moving forward. We are very much on their radar. Seth and -- and his colleagues have been very engaged on the kinds of things they need to do to get the Senate approvals to move forward with their academic pursuits. I also just wanted to point out Bill Smith -- is Bill here? There he is. Thanks, Bill. Bill has agreed to be the Chair of the Admissions and Academics Standards Committee for the year and he's doing a great job. One of the things that his committee has had to do is to

SenateMtg 101419.txt

start with a bunch of policies that the committee did not have time to consider last year and so they are in the middle of that work already. And so if you remember last year was busy. Especially the end of last year. We had a lot of meetings with a lot of presentations. Herman Farrell was the Chair backing the committee last year. He was in front of you regularly moving proposals forward. So, there were many things that had to get put on the table for this year, so they are already working hard on that. I just wanted to make you aware of that. Annie Davis Weber, who I just saw walk in, the Assistant Provost for our Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness, came to talk to the Senate Council on October 7th, and I thought it was a great presentation because what she brought to us was this SACSCOC standard 10.4 which is about academic governance, and the question is sort of what role did the faculty play in the curriculum at the University. And so it's, you know, a series of questions that I think Annie and her team have had to answer with some regularity, but what I thought was nice for us was to have those questions in front of us and think about what we think the answers to these questions are. What role does faculty play in the curriculum here at UK? So we were able to have, I think, an interesting conversation about that. And Annie is going to be able to come back to us, I think over the course of the year, with a few additional standards that the Senate, in particular, may have an interest in or might have observations about. And this is sort of, I think, a mutually beneficial conversation because Annie is looking for, sort of, assistance as she prepares the next report. It's also helpful for us because I think it

SenateMtg 101419.txt

-- it sort of encourages us to ask questions of ourselves, about our processes and whether we're -- we're taking seriously our responsibility to have faculty oversight over the curriculum. I think so far the answer is, yes. Annie says thumbs up, yes. Okay, great. I'm continuing to go to the faculty council meetings. I've been to -- I haven't counted -- but a lot of them so far. There's still -- turns out we have a lot of colleges here at UK. So, I have more to go, but it's been great. It's been really productive I think. I'm grateful to the Deans and the faculty council members who have invited me. If you happen to know that your college hasn't had a chance to talk with me yet, I'm more than happy to -- to meet with them, so if your college is on the list of people that I haven't seen, have them reach out, but I'm going to be reaching out as well to the ones I haven't -- I haven't had a chance to talk to yet. We are always putting these deadlines up, this is just a reminder. So, again please share this information with your associate deans, the deans, your faculty colleagues, department chairs. These are the deadlines. So, this feels far away now, but I promise you it won't feel far away pretty soon, so if you are hoping to have a curricular change that will be effective in Fall 2020 these are the these are the expectations. So, if it's a brand new degree proposal it has to be into the Senate Council office by February 3rd. So, what that means is it's already through the Academic Council. So, already through the Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council or HCCC. And -- and those deadlines are really determined by those committees. I'm happy to put you in touch with those committee chairs. But those aren't

SenateMtg 101419.txt

Senate Council deadlines, those are those Academic Council deadlines. So, we need it in our office by February 3rd if it's a new program; March 16th for other proposals which require committee review, which includes certificates, so not a degree program, but a new certificate program, these kinds of things, new departments, if there are any significant program changes, admission changes, things like that. And then April 13th is our new courses and, sort of, minor program changes and -- and other kinds of program changes done. So, please do keep these in -- in mind and -- and share them widely to make sure there is no confusion about these deadlines. I'm super excited about this one. So, tomorrow is the Outstanding Staff Awards ceremony at Kroger Field and one of the finalist for the Faculty Nominated Award is our very own Sheila Brothers. There's only five people who are nominate -- who -- who are finalist for these awards for the entire campus and these are specifically the awards for staff, who have been nominated by faculty, for showing extra support and appreciation on behalf of the faculty. So, I'm just totally thrilled that Sheila is one of those finalists. So, you know, fingers crossed, stay tuned. Okay, that's the end of my announcements. So, Chair's report: Remember there are certain items that the Senate Council can -- actually Senate Council can take on behalf of the Senate, and we only did one of these this month. At the September 16th meeting we approved a change to the -- to the current academic calendar and that change was a change at the request of Kim Taylor, out of the Registrar's Office. So you may or may not know this, but there is a period -- a window every year in both the Fall and Spring semester when

SenateMtg 101419.txt

students, undergraduate students may not change their major and there -- there's sort of lots of -- a variety of historical reasons for this; I think one of which is advisors didn't have the capacity to advise students to change their major. Also some anxiety that students were changing their majors just to get into classes that were restricted to majors and then changing it back, a variety of reasons, so. But we also thought at least some of the reasons had to do with inaccurate things about paper and stuff like that. So, Kim came and asked if we would shorten the window for both the Fall and the Spring when students could not change their major, Senate Council thought that sounded like a good idea and so we approved that change. I actually don't have the dates in front of me, but I'm -- I'm sure we can circulate that, right, Sheila, if we need to. Okay. All right, so -- so here's a big one. Okay. For -- for about a year now the Senate Council has been having a conversation about whether the rules should be changed to permit faculty on phased retirement to participate in the Senate. So the current rule is that because AR 32, which is the rule about phased retirement, the administrative regulation about phased retirement currently says that phased retirement is a reduction from full time status to part time status of faculty. And the Senate rules say that that administrative regulation is interpreted as meaning that faculty on phased retirement can vote in Senate elections, but may not run for Senate and not serve on the Senate. That's the current status. So for about a year we have been thinking about that. We've been talking to the President about it and thinking whether we should consider a change to that

SenateMtg 101419.txt

status. So one thing we thought would be useful we could, sort of, survey more widely what people thought about this rule. On the one hand, we would like to survey the whole faculty, but that's 2,800 people and we're not sure if people would respond and -- and we don't really know what to do with that kind of survey data anyway, so. So -- so, what we're asking you to do is to, in this way, really serve as the proxies for your colleagues. So, we're going to survey the elected faculty Senators as a way to get the feedback from the faculty-at-large. Right. So what we -- we are interested in your views, of course, but we're also interested in the views of your colleagues. So -- so what we're interested in is whether we ought to change the Senate Rules which would allow faculty on phased retirement, excuse me, on phased retirement to service Senators. And this would include both the possibility of continuing the Senate term after you've gone through phased retirement or being elected to the Senate while on phased retirement. Those are two potentially different scenarios and we're interested in your views on both of those. So, what we've done is we've created a survey, as I said, we're -- we're soliciting the input of elected faculty Senators. This is going to be emailed out to you tomorrow or maybe a few days later. And we're -- we actually -- we're going to leave it open, I think, for maybe about two weeks, but what we really want is that -- that second to bottom bullet there. We really want you to consult with your colleagues. We're really interested in you responding not just with your own views about this, but with the views of your colleagues. Now it's going to be a little hard because we -- we have

given you space to give us narrative responses, we've also included that Likert scale, strongly agree, agree, disagree, all of that. So, in a way you have to mediate between the two, right. Give us your best estimate of the representation on those agree, disagree questions, but use the narrative space to describe to us the views of your colleagues. I think that will be most helpful. We're -- we haven't quite decided what we're going to do with that information yet.

It's going -- it's going to guide us. So, we will take the results of that survey and then come back to you with information about next steps. Senate Council will -- will take the information and -- and make decisions, but -- Again, so please do look out for that survey and please do respond. So since we're only -- we're only surveying the 94 of you who are elected faculty senators, your -- your responses really matter and we really care what you think and what your colleagues' think. So, please try to solicit information from your colleagues and -- and please do fill that out. Yeah.

BROWN: Let me ask a question. So, if I understood what you just said --

BROTHERS: Sorry, name, please?

BROWN: Alan Brown, Arts and Sciences. So, the final decision though remains with the faculty, but the Senate Council -- is that what -- is that what you're saying --

BIRD-POLLAN: No, no, no.

BROWN: Or will there be a vote? Meaning, if we're collecting this information, who then gets to act on that information? Or who makes the decision? Is that a Senate decision or is that the Senate Council --

BIRD-POLLAN: No, no, no, no. So, there's a Senate Rule that says that AR 32 is interpreted to exclude phased

retirement faculty from serving.

BROWN:

Right.

BIRD-POLLAN:

So, Senate Rules are changed with a vote of the Senate.

BROWN:

So it would be the Senate.

BIRD-POLLAN:

Yeah, yeah, yeah. So -- so, I think the Senate Council will be guided by the response about, sort of, whether to bring the proposal forward or something like that.

BROWN:

That's what you meant by decisions, okay.

BIRD-POLLAN:

Yes, exactly, exactly. Did you have your hand up?

GROSSMAN:

I did. I was just going to clarify, but you just clarified.

BIRD-POLLAN:

Oh, okay. Okay, yeah. So -- so -- so, I -- I'm not -- I can't lay out for you what the next steps will look like. I don't have that, sort of, what do you call that diagram of choices and all that, I don't have that yet, but -- but I think at this point we're interested in more information. Yes.

CHARNIGO:

Richard Charnigo, Public Health. Is there any written material that's been prepared or that can be prepared to illustrate the possible pros and cons of both sides before opinions are solicited?

BIRD-POLLAN:

So we are soliciting your opinions about the pros and cons --

CHARNIGO:

Okay.

BIRD-POLLAN:

-- so we did not include information about that and partly because we didn't -- we have had a lot of discussion about this with the Senate Council, but part of the goal was to ask for unsolic -- you know, sort of, un --

UNIDENTIFIED:

Unbiased.

BIRD-POLLAN:

-- pure -- pure responses, right. So, we didn't really want to say what the pros -- what we thought the pros and cons were. I'm not even sure there is a unanimous view about that on the Senate Council ourselves. At

SenateMtg 101419.txt

the beginning of the survey you'll find citations to the relevant rules, a little bit of information about the current makeup of the Senate, so some information, which if you want to share that with your colleagues as you're having conversations with them, that would be great, but no -- but no articulation of any particular position with regard to the vote.

CHARNIGO: Okay, thank you.

BIRD-POLLAN: Yeah. All right, thanks everyone. And if you have questions about that or you want to talk more about it, please don't hesitate to be in touch. Okay. So, Katherine McCormick and I were asked to identify some faculty to participate in the Board of Trustees Annual Retreat which is coming up at the end of this week. I think you might hear more about this from the Trustees themselves either today or after it happens at next month's meeting. It's a roundtable discussion on issues of higher education. In the end, there are about 20 faculty who are participating and the idea will be, at these tables, there will be two Trustees, two faculty members, two staff, and two students at each of the tables, and we're going to rotate three times throughout the day. It's going to be really interesting conversation. Some Senators were nominated, some Senators have agreed to participate, but there were also people who have taught online classes, or people who teach large lectures, people who won research awards, people who have won teaching awards, we tried to diversify the group. We also tried to bring people from all the different colleges. So, a robust effort to identify and nominate faculty and I think we have a great group of people. It's not completely finalized yet, but almost. So, you'll hear more about that soon. And then finally, every

SenateMtg 101419.txt

other Board produces an evaluation of the President and one of the elements is a constituent survey they send out to a variety of groups and they always ask us for names of some faculty who might complete that survey. We nominated three people this year and they were chosen and they completed that evaluation which will end up sent to the Board. In addition, we will send the details about the survey that we sent out to everybody in the Spring; we provide that information to the Board as well. Okay, another think we're trying to improve on. So often our office gets requests for people to be faculty participants on a variety of committees. So, for example, the constituents survey, but it happens with some regularity, and often what we do is ask the Senate Council to nominate people. Since the Senate Council meets every week and the Senate only meets once a month, it seems easier. However, we realized those nine people sitting around the table are nine specific people that don't have the breadth of experience and the network of connections that you all have, so we're going to try this and we're going to see.

Sometimes there's a time problem, it has to happen more quickly, but what we're going to try to do is, is I will send an email to all of you to ask you to nominate people. To the extent possible, describe what the role is and ask you to nominate people hopefully with a, sort of, brief description of why this person would be good in the role. And then those nominations will come to the Senate Council and the Senate Council will make choices and will move forward with that. Yeah?

BARRON:

Susan Barron, Psychology. So, we should ensure that they'd be willing to do this before we put their name

forward?

BIRD-POLLAN: So, it has not been our practice in the past to ask people if they were willing to serve before we nominated them. I think, maybe slightly to the chagrin of some administrators, but sometimes we do send forward names and people aren't willing to serve. But part of the reason we haven't done that is because, number one, it sort of indicates to someone, oh, we thought about you and then you weren't chosen. Well, that's not such a great feeling. And then number two, because we thought, well, if the Provost sends an email asking you to serve on a committee maybe you will feel differently about it than if I say, would you like to serve on this committee. So, so, I think -- I think it's okay. I mean, I think if you wanted to speak to the person -- If you think this person will definitely say no, maybe it's not a great nomination. But I don't know that you have to get them to promise to say yes before you nominate them. So, we'll try that. So look out for emails from me and usually it will, unfortunately, be on a relatively short turnaround. So, I'll ask you to think about it and respond quickly. Even with a name or two. If everybody sent a name or two we would be -- have an embarrassment of riches of nominees. So, I'd be thrilled if you would think about responding to that. Okay, we've -- we've been invited -- the Senate Council and the Staff Senate Executive Committee have been invited to -- the middle of next month -- Aaron Thompson, who is the President of the Council on Postsecondary Education is coming to UK. I think he's spending about 24-hours here. Does that sound right? About 24-hours or so, sort of, doing a listening tour. This is part of the listening tour of, I think, all

SenateMtg 101419.txt

the Universities in Kentucky, and so we're going to get to sit down with him for breakfast and -- and hear a little bit about his perspective on things, and I think share some of our views. So, we're looking forward to that and we will report back on that as it happens. Okay, that is the end of my reports. So, now I'm going to turn it over to our Provost, Dave Blackwell.

BLACKWELL:

Good afternoon, everyone. First, I just want to thank you again for giving me time and to you for giving your time to the service of the University and your colleagues and students and staff. You mentioned Annie coming to talk about the importance of shared governance and while it is a requirement of accreditation that we -- that the faculty have a very strong voice in the direction of a curriculum, it is actually a welcome collaboration. I know I come here every time and express my appreciation for what you do, but it's sincere. Especially as the last couple of weeks I've been working to prepare for the Board of Trustees retreat where we will take the first steps towards the next Strategic Plan for the University, as -- as Jennifer mentioned. Part of my role is to, at least, get the Trustees a high level of overview of progress on the Strategic Plan. I've been preparing that and in -- in reflection and preparation of today's meeting, I noted some of the great accomplishments of the University in the past five or six years under this plan. Including, you know, a host of new and innovative programs. Of course, research expenditures that are -- that are, you know, growing at double digit rate every year, but also growing enrollment and student success. We admitted a record

↑

SenateMtg 101419.txt

freshman class this year, 5,400 first time freshman. Our graduation rates are -- are at record highs. Our retention rates are at record highs. And both -- actually, all of those metrics are at record highs when it comes to under-represented minority students as well. So, a lot -- a lot of great progress, but much of that success, the overwhelming majority of that success is really attributed to the work of our -- of our faculty and, of course, our -- our staff. But this -- this body really helps us to get done what we need to get done to progress and I just want to say, thank you. There are unprecedented pressures with this freshman class. When we think about first time freshman at a record level and then we have record high retention from the first to second year, there -- there are pinch points and bottlenecks. We are trying to get ahead of those or have been trying to stay ahead of those and address those. We have, I think, done -- done a reasonable job with that. One challenge that -- that we have looking forward, and I -- I thought I would mention, is the use of Memorial Hall. So, we have -- we have agreed to discontinue offering courses in Memorial Hall and we started, obviously, thinking about it last Spring. It turned out to be a challenge that we could not meet for this Fall, but we've been working it since then and so starting in the Spring of 2020 there will not be any -- any classes in Memorial Hall. If you think about the number of classrooms that can accommodate that kind of size on campus and think about the alternative, in terms of, offering -- offering times or slicing big sections into smaller sections, it's quite a logistical challenge, but the

SenateMtg 101419.txt

↑ -- the colleges all cooperated while the staff worked together diligently to --to make that happen. And I can tell you that is a meaningful step forward for our African American students, who I still hear from about having to, potentially, confront -- confront that mural. That puts a little bit of extra pressure on us given, again, increased retention in a record first time freshman class. The other -- the other issue that we're facing is -- is mental health. We've had a -- let's just say the number of -- the need for counseling services and disability resources has grown much faster than the rate of growth of the first time freshman class. And those units within the Provost area are -- are over capacity and to some degree, in some instances, actually overwhelmed. So, I -- I know there are -- we are doing our best to, at least, have initial consultations with students so that we can assess how, you know, how serious their problem is and then get them referred to the right place. But once we've determined that urgency, there's still a long -- in some case, a long wait time for services. So we are working to address that. This was, again, unanticipated in response -- you know, as it relates to the size of the class, but it -- but it's an issue that's out there. You know, keep -- keep your ears to the ground and your eyes open. If you see issues with students, you know, please, you know, remember that, you know, part of our duty to report issues that they have and get them referred to the right resources. So a number of issues that have been really percolating the last several months relate to, I guess, a host of issues around conflict of interest, conflict of commitment, outside employment of faculty and,

SenateMtg 101419.txt

kind of, layered into all of this is what I'll just call broadly, international risks. The Federal Government is very intent on addressing issues of -- especially intellectual property being misappropriated from Universities that are getting federal research funding and -- and misappropriated overseas. We've had consultations with the FBI, among others, about these issues. If you read the Chronicle or Inside Higher Ed, almost every week you see a new report of an incident around the country. We are trying to stay ahead of this situation. And I just want to make you aware that we are trying to stay ahead of it. Between the Office of the Provost and the VPR's office and EVPFA's office, we have assembled a group to look, first of all, at our global risks and how we manage our global risks. Even though we primarily have our operations here in Lexington, we have lots of faculty and student engagement overseas. We have lots of collaborations with overseas universities and even overseas governments. And given this heightened scrutiny, we want to make sure that we have the resources in place to stay ahead of -- to stay ahead of any issues. This is just prudent risk management. I don't want you to think that in any way that the University is targeting anyone. We're not in any way trying to inhibit academic freedom, in fact, we're trying to protect it. But we have to be proactive; we have to see what's ahead of us and try to react. And both Vice President Cassis, Associate Provost Roberts, probably some in this room, have been deeply involved with those efforts. You've probably saw the additional conflict of interest form that -- our survey that went out from -- from the VPR's office. You

SenateMtg 101419.txt

will also see heightened accountability for outside employment for faculty. It's not that we're trying to inhibit your outside activities; we recognize that those are valuable. They can enhance your research. They can enhance your teaching, but we just have to know what's going on so that we can potentially identify conflicts of interest or commitment, in this context. The system that we have in place for funded researchers is a pretty good system. It catches most of it, but there are some who engage in activities that are outside the sponsored research realm, that we just need to know what's going on. Again, we're not trying to inhibit. We just need to know, and -- and especially when it involves employment outside of UK at an international university. That's particularly sensitive right now. So, I just -- I don't have anything specific to report. All of this is in the works, but, you know, you'll probably hear inquiries here and there and I just wanted you to know that it -- that it's going on. And not that this is part of a theme, but given that over the Summer you probably saw in the press and announcements from the University about a research misconduct case that -- that came out of the College of Medicine. I thought I would try to spend a few minutes giving an overview of what happened in that investigation so that you know the process that we followed and how we dealt with it. And then after that, I thought we'd just throw it open for questions. Fortunate for me, Vice President Cassis is here today and if I mess anything up, I will ask her to correct me, but I think I heard it enough times I pretty much got it. The dates may be approximated, but roughly in

SenateMtg 101419.txt

Spring of 2018 the University received a report from outside the University, and the person or entity giving the report remains anonymous by policy, reporting concerns about some images in a supplementary grant application. These were images of cells. That's about as much as I know about what

↑

those -- I don't think I've ever looked through a microscope in my life, but -- and so the Vice President's office has a process for looking into these kinds of reports when they come up. There is a committee that's formed just look at the report to see if there is any validity to it at all; is there enough evidence to suggest that a deeper inquiry is needed. So that process took place and keep in mind that at every step of the process that I'm describing, the faculty members involved are informed that this is all going on. It's very transparent. And at every stage they are given a chance to respond and provide additional information and data. That group decided that a full investigation was needed. The Vice President's office formed a group of our colleagues, our faculty colleagues who had expertise, some expertise in this area, to do a full investigation. This involved NIH

↑

funded research and so there's guidelines we have to follow there, which included looking back, I think, five or six years -- six years; so looking back six years in the -- in the work of these investigators because as you know, one research project can feed into another research project, can feed into another. So what -- you know, what is the web -- excuse me, what is the web of the network of implication for this potential research misconduct. So there were three researchers under scrutiny. Two were tenured -- two are

SenateMtg 101419.txt

tenured faculty members in the College of Medicine, and in the department of

--

CASSIS: Cancer Biology and Toxicology.

BLACKWELL: Yes, Cancer and Biology. So, the Department of Cancer Biology and Toxicology, so two faculty members and one was a research scientist staff member. The investigative committee worked for almost a year. They looked

at many, many pieces of data, research. I think they examined in detail twelve publications that were selected. They looked at seven grant proposals. And, again, they -- they had access to a lot of the raw data, the images, lab manuals, they interviewed people in the labs, they interviewed the faculty members.

Very, very detailed investigation and based on all that, they produced a report which was about 150 pages in length. That's the narrative report. And then about another 1,400, 1,500 pages of documentation and data. Out of the 12 papers that they investigated, 10 of those papers were found to have issues with either falsifi -- deliberate falsification or -- or really sloppiness, if you will, in the presentation of data and results. So, 10 of the 12 papers. Seven of the seven grant proposals that they looked at had problems with either falsification or -- or

sloppiness. So that report was given to the Respondents. Respondents were represented by counsel. Respondents had an opportunity to review the report and write -- provide additional information. They did that in the form of letters and other data. The investigative committee then looked at all of that information, so the original report, the draft report, the responses from the faculty members under investigation, and rendered a final report which was submitted to

SenateMtg 101419.txt

the vice president of research and I. We, Lisa and I, undertook a, you know, detailed review of the report and all the implications and since these are faculty members and staff members that are -- report to the colleges, to the Provost area, I had to make a decision about this disposition of those three researchers. Based on everything that -- that I read and discussed with Lisa, I decided it would be best for the University that -- that these faculty members be terminated and that the research scientist be terminated. We went through a process of having a conversation with Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure because this -- there were like 60 papers that this research group had worked on in that six-year period. So when we submit our report to NIH there are a number of things that they might come back to us and ask us to do. So, they might ask us to examine another 30 or 40 papers. There were also some ongoing experiments in the lab, so we needed to preserve -- we needed to preserve the lab and the data and, you know, whatever cells might be in there. We couldn't permit those faculty members to have access to those labs or to the people working in the labs because it could contaminate our future investigation and our status with NIH. So we discussed with SACPT a suspension of those two faculty members in -- in advance of -- of that decision being executed and we had -- it's not a formal vote that's required, it's a consultation, with the President because the President is the one who will make that decision, but we all left the meeting with a strong sense that the SACPT was behind -- behind the action that we were -- that we were taking. We then scheduled meetings with the faculty members, the research scientist, the

SenateMtg 101419.txt

graduate students that were effected, the staff that worked in the labs that were effected, because immediately we had to stop -- we had to stop supporting those grants. So those -- those grants were terminated. The labs were locked-down to preserve all of the data and -- and we informed the two faculty members that -- that I would be submitting a statement of charges to the SACPT, which -- which I did a couple weeks later. The research scientist was dismissed the same day. The faculty members are on full pay and benefits pending the outcome of the SACPT's investigative process. And the staff members who were effected by closing of the labs were given the usual 90-day window with pay and benefits, where they would have a chance to find other opportunities and, in fact, the University would try to help them find other opportunities. There were a number of graduate students involved and I think one visiting scholar and maybe a post-doc, something like that. We took steps to place all of the graduate students in other labs with other faculty members. I think the -- I think the visiting scholar is -- is going to be leaving -- will be leaving us. And I think we made arrangements as well for the post-doc. We were -- we tried to very transparent with the campus. We did a press release. We did get a bit of press about it and the reaction, at least that I've heard, has been pretty positive about at least the steps we took, how serious -- given how serious this matter was and also how transparent we were. And I just want all of you to know that this was a very sobering experience both for Lisa and me and all of our teams that were involved with it, but it -- it represents the utmost impensable of the University

and it's probably the most consequential thing I've ever been involved with in my -- in my entire academic career. So, I -- I just want you to know we took it very seriously; we were very careful with our process. And, I think I'll just end there and ask Lisa if there is anything that she would like to add, and if not maybe open up to some of your questions or comments. Lisa.

CASSIS: I don't have much to add. Thank you, for the description. I think my comments are, it was a very difficult year and a difficult few weeks, and while it was a very negative
↑ experience for all of us that were involved in something like this, it was also a time when I think we shined as doing what we needed to do in following our University policies and procedures. So, I mean, it's not something any of us want to talk about or highlight, but it is something that we -- we need to be paying attention to all the time, right. So, that's all I'll add.

BLACKWELL: And I -- I think that I can speak for both Lisa and I, with profound gratitude for that investigative committee. I failed to even describe what they went through.

CASSIS: Yeah, I mean, we -- the -- the team that worked with us, as you may know, these are two separate panels as the Provost described. The first is a two-faculty member inquiry panel. They did quite a bit of work just in the inquiry phase. And then a second panel of three faculty members who worked over the year. When we
↑ estimated their time involvement, it was 200 hours or more in a very short period of time that we looked in the window. So, it was a lot of work by your faculty colleagues to do this for our own institution. So, yes, we thank them very much.

BLACKWELL: Do we have any questions?

BIRD-POLLAN: Any questions for Vice President Cassis or for Provost Blackwell? Yeah.

TROLAND: Tom Troland, Arts and Sciences. Just a question regarding this matter of Memorial Hall. Was any consideration given to offering a different entry and exit option to students who didn't wish to come into the Hall and view that mural?

BLACKWELL: Yes, sir. That was considered and discussed and it evoked memories of different entrances to movie theaters in the early 1960s and we decided not to go down that path.

BROWN: Alan Brown, Arts and Sciences. I'm curious about -- going back to the research misconduct. I'm curious, could you just explain -- describe just a bit more, not -- not much, just how this came to light, who discovered this, what are the channels and mechanisms in place for this sort of thing to come to light because it seems like finding a needle in a haystack, unless someone's combing through that research?

CASSIS: Well, I mean, you can -- you can imagine -- yes, you're -- you're exactly right. I mean, all of the productivity and scholarly activity in this institution, I mean, it would be, you know, we're not the FBI; it's way beyond -- and that's not we're here to do is -- is try to police through that material. So, as the Provost described, this was actually a report to us from another institution where the particular respondent group had provided data that was within a grant. This institution had, I think in some ways maybe, intermittently scanned their grant applications using certain types of software, which we -- we also used during the investigation of this particular case, and there they had some issues of concern. So they, just

SenateMtg 101419.txt

like an institution should, they notified us that they were concerned over data provided by the investigators from UK into this grant proposal. We had been working over the last five to six months, I commissioned a group across campus specifically to work on, how do we approach responsible conduct and research. We inventoried everything that we had at UK. We benchmarked other institutions and we now have an implementation strategy that you'll be seeing come out. It's not that we did not have in place things, we did, but we wanted to make sure that we don't -- you know, we try to help people. We don't want this to happen here. Sometimes we can avoid it by giving them resources and things that they might need to -- to eliminate this as a possibility. And so that's what we'll do; and part of that includes changes in whistleblower policies and how people can report to us anonymously making it easier. You know, it's very difficult when you're a trainee in someone's lab to report your mentor. You can -- you can understand that. So, these are all issues that we'll -- we're going to try to work on. We're benchmarking all of that. Trying to make it better.

BIRD-POLLAN: Any other questions?

BROTHERS: Yeah. This is actually back to the Memorial Hall issue --

BIRD-POLLAN: Your name?

BARRON: Susan Barron. So, does that -- are we not using Memorial Hall for anything now?

BLACKWELL: It can be -- it will be used for events, but nothing that requires anyone to attend. So the -- the whole issue was that the students that had class there, essentially --

BARRON: Had to go.

BLACKWELL: -- I mean, they had to go.

BARRON: And nothing else is going to change?
The wall or mural or anything?

BLACKWELL: Well that's a longer term conversation, so it is a -- I think it's fair to say that the University will be looking at, overall, how we use and deploy Memorial Hall going forward. Our intent is not to never use it again, but we have to think of a way to use it where, you know -- the President basically said, we're not going to destroy this piece of art, and given the way it's situated and it's a fresco, I mean, I -- it's just -- there's no way to -- to move it to another place. So I think the idea is longer term for the University to think about how we re-deploy it, but it -- it will never be for anything that's someone is required to attend. But other University events may use it.

↑ BIRD-POLLAN: Yes.

CURWOOD: Anastasia Curwood, Arts and Sciences. What about some of those other student demands that came out of the Springtime protest, are those pending still?

BLACKWELL: So, I'll -- I'll answer your question. Are there any more questions about the research misconduct? Then I'll let Lisa take the seat. Thank you, Professor Curwood. Yeah, I just -- I just reviewed the status of -- of those. I'm not going to remember the whole list ideally, but with -- I think, with the exception of Memorial Hall not -- they demanded what we destroy the mural, but we seem to be in a good place with the -- with the students on how we handled that so far. The other outstanding issue had to do with the Lyman T. Johnson graduate fellowships and accounting for how those are deployed and -- and the decision criteria and the growth and resources in that area. We got part of the way there by the summer

↑

SenateMtg 101419.txt

and then the -- the group of students, you know, dispersed for the summer as -- as normal, and they're just -- they're just kind of re-grouping right now. So, we'll be -- we'll be readdressing that issue with them and the only outstanding issue relates to how -- they -- they were looking for some standardization and more accountability for the activities of the diversity officers in the colleges and more uniformity. And, we, again, had started down a path to address that but they again asked that we defer working on that one until this school year. I know that Vice President Fiest-Price and her team have already been working with deans on some of that anyway, outside of the student protest issues, so that's -- that's still to be resolved. But we're -- we're really just now regrouping with -- with that group of students to keep a dialog going and I think -- in fact, I met with them on Friday and I'll just say, they're overarching concern -- you know, you -- you talk about the eight demands and -- nine demands, whatever that was, but the big picture is those students don't feel safe. That's -- that is the bottom line. And if -- if there's a group of students on this campus that don't feel safe, then we're never going to get up to the top of that hierarchy of needs where we're -- we're trying to advance inclusion and belonging at -- at a more deliberate level. And -- and so that much has come out of those conversations. And I'll continue to work with them, Kirsten Turner Associate Provost for Student Academic Life, Office for Institutional Diversity will continue working with that group of students. What I will say is the engagement was very positive and I think anything that we

↑

can do to bring those marginalized students more toward the middle is going to help every student on campus. And so, I look forward to continuing that work.

BIRD-POLLAN: Okay. Thank you, Provost Blackwell.

BLACKWELL: Thank you all very much for your attention and questions.

BIRD-POLLAN: I may have another, sort of, Provost-like presentation on the agenda as well, so -- but not yet, not yet. Okay. Our next report is the Vice Chair's report.

OSTERHAGE: I don't have anything.

BIRD-POLLAN: Nothing to report. Our parliamentarian isn't here, so he doesn't have a report. Our Trustee's report.

BLONDER: So since our last Senate meeting we had a Board meeting and I just want to say a few things about that. We had the annual investment retreat and it was reported to us that the endowment value, as of June 30th, is 1.5 billion dollars, which is up 65 million over the last -- previous 12 months. We also discussed in the executive

committee the process of the President's evaluation, which Jennifer has already mentioned. The final report on the President's evaluation will come through in December. He is submitting his own self-evaluation, and then the results of the interviews and the surveys that the three -- faculty, staff, students, et cetera, fill out will come to the Board and then we do our evaluation individually. We approved the August degree list. We have new committee assignments. So I'm on Academic and Student Affairs, Finance and Human Resources and University Relations. And we elected Bob Vance as the Chair of the Board, Jennifer Barber is the Vice Chair, Cammie Grant is the Secretary and Chief General Counsel Bill Thro is the Associate -- Assistant Secretary. And we also have

SenateMtg 101419.txt

three new chairs of committees. So, Bob Vance had been Chair of Health Care, now it's Barbara Young. She had done it previously. Rachel Webb is the new Chair of Academic and Student Affairs because Angela Edwards rolled off the Board and Kim McCann is the new Chair of Finance. And as has been mentioned, we have the Board retreat this Thursday and Friday. One of the things that's on the agenda is a presentation by Sally Amoruso, who is a Chief Partner Officer at the Education Advisory Board, and she's going to be presenting on setting the course for student -- the student of tomorrow, and then we will have breakout sessions. And all this takes place at the Woodford Reserve Room at Kroger Field. So, that concludes my report.

GROSSMAN: Yeah, I'll -- I'll just add, I'm on the Academic Affairs Committee, also Student Academic Affairs Committee also, and also University Relations Committee, but I'm also on Health Care Committee. So if you have any comments, concerns, praise to offer for any of those that needs to brought to the Board, just let -- let me know. If it's a health care thing, then either of us for Academic Student Affairs. The new Chair of the Academic Student Affairs, Rachel Webb, was previously on that committee when she was student government association president about, I don't know, 15-20 years ago?

BLONDER: I don't think it was that long.

BLACKWELL: No. Maybe less. Maybe 10-15 years ago she was student government president, but she's on the Board as Alumni Representative. Any questions?

BIRD-POLLAN: Okay. So, the next item on our agenda today is from Associate Provost for Internationalization, Sue Roberts, who's here in her capacity as Chair of

SenateMtg 101419.txt

the Implementation Team for the Blue Ribbon Panel of Graduate Education. So here is Sue Roberts.

ROBERTS:

Thank you, Chair Bird-Polan. Thanks everybody for being here for this presentation. I'm going to summarize, using a few slides, the report that was given to the Provost this summer resulting from a charge that we were given earlier in the spring semester. And that charge was to help the Provost develop a plan to implement the Blue Ribbon Panel Report on Graduate Education. You can see the members of the implementation team here. And several of them are here today, so if you'd just raise your hands if you're here, it might help people to see who their colleagues are who helped with this team. It was a group of people who are very experienced in Graduate Education. Very committed to the University of Kentucky and their success. It was a pleasure to work with each of them. Here is the actual charge that we received from Provost Blackwell. As you can see he wanted us to give some guidance in the form of priorities. The Blue Ribbon Panel was exhaustive. It was a document full of great ideas and suggestions, but it was also quite lengthy and not -- it wasn't a quick study in terms of, what can we pull out, in terms of priorities. So, he asked us to take another look at the report and come up with those recommendations. He also asked us to link our recommendations to the Blue Ribbon Panel's recommendations themselves, and also to the Strategic Plan, the one that we're living under right now, and also to some general items that were coming from a SACS review that had been received when we sat down to do this work. We met with several folks as part of our -- our

SenateMtg 101419.txt

↑

deliberations, but mostly what we did was studied the Blue Ribbon Panel report and considered how we might operationalize that or suggests how it could be operationalized. So what we came up with in the end were six recommendations and they fell into two kinds of categories. The first group we thought of as structural concerns or structural issues that needed to be addressed. And the second group, loosely could called operational issues, and these are things about the actual work of the graduate school. The first group of issues is more about how graduate education sits in the University as a whole. How the Dean of the Graduate School is or isn't in certain regular channels of communication with natural allies, as it were, in the mission of promoting excellence in graduate education and research at this University, but we also added the number one, which may seem possibly obvious in away. It's what the Blue Ribbon Panel is all about. And we concur, heartedly, that graduate education should be prioritized. We made it it's own priority because it is not an easy thing to do because it entails, kind of, shifting the conversation. Not just about resources and how those are going to flow and how investments are going to be made or not, but it also involves changing the conversation a little bit. And here I want to be clear that we don't recommend that the University stopped talking about the things or celebrating the achievements that have been -- been remarkable on the front of undergraduate education or research or, indeed, service. Rather we wish to see a similarly ambitious and farsighted and inclusive conversation about graduate education also. So, that's part of that number one there. So, let me just go quickly

↑

SenateMtg 101419.txt

through each one of these priorities, and in each case what we've done here is try to link to the Blue Ribbon Panel and to the Strategic Plan, and perhaps the SACS, and we've tried to summarize it in these slides. The full report I believe was distributed to the Senate and it is -- it's a public document at this point. It

also includes, by the way -- I think you also brought a matrix.

BIRD-POLLAN: I think we posted both; is that right, or did we not?

BROTHERS: I don't think I posted the matrix.

ROBERTS: Okay. Well --

BIRD-POLLAN: But this is all posted with the agenda.

ROBERTS: Basically, the point of this presentation and the point of making all these things successful is so that you can consider the recommendations and give input to the Provost as he moves this forward in the next -- in the next little bit. Anyway, so number one, making graduate education a priority. What will that entail? Well, that will entail very high level conversations. So it will entail the President's engagement. Dr. Cassis and her office. Dr. Eric Monday and his office. It entails very high level conversations about how, realistically, is best to organize support for graduate education at UK going forward. Of course, it also will involve engaging Deans, Associate Deans, Research especially, Associate Provost, and so on -- and faculty, DGSs being a particularly important constituent group. And here the Implementation Team sincerely recommends that the message be about the imperative to focus on graduate education. And we think this is rather urgent because graduate education has been somewhat put on the back burner for the University as a whole. So we've concentrated very

hard on our retention numbers. We've concentrated very hard on research. We've concentrated on diversifying faculty, and so on and so on. We haven't had a major focus, lead from the top, on graduate education. And we believe that's detriment, not just to graduate education itself, but of our research agenda and also our instructional agenda since graduate students are intimately involved

↑ across the undergraduate curriculum as TAs, and also our research agenda since they're in our labs; they're in the field doing work with faculty all the time. So this is an urgent priority as the team saw it. Number two, you would think, well, we could have set hiring a new Dean first of all, but actually I think before any attempt can be made to recruit the very best hand into the position of -- of a new permanent Dean of the Graduate School at UK, we need to make sure that that person -- that he or she is coming into a role that's attractive, that promises success, right, and gives that person a foundation to build the best graduate programs and the best portfolio of programs, the best suite of -- of initiatives that we can here at UK.

↑ So that person needs to have a place that positions him or her for success in that regard. So we thought it very important that the new dean have a seat at the table, as it were, at various executive meetings; that there be good channels of communication between that person and the offices that govern and lead research on this campus and so on. So, this is kind of a governance issue, I guess; kind of, organizational issue, as well, and that's why we put it in the more, sort of, structural concerns. You can see some of the other things we -- we

SenateMtg 101419.txt

suggested here. We're suggesting these things; not making them ironclad must, but more like things to be considered. And this is something that we hope will be taking off as soon as this report is out there and soon as people have had a chance to give the Provost their feedback. And then, of course, comes number three, which, as I said, could have been number one, but we decided these other things were too important to do after the fact, and to stand the best

↑ chance of hiring the best person, we need to do some homework, basically. We would like to see a national or international search for a new visionary dean. Someone who's empowered to come and lead UK to the next -- into the next era of graduate education. I want to say this is no disrespect at all to those who have served diligently and with a lot of wisdom as interim deans of the graduate school. Including Dean Jackson, who is still doing that job now. So those folks have done, as far as we can tell, amazing work given resource constraints and given their interim status, but it has been difficult for them to make headway without clear mandates and clear, kind of, fresh starts, as it were. We're hoping that's, kind of, what this will give. We also would like to see some additional support -- support staff hired into the graduate school. One quick note, we didn't weigh-in on

↑ the, should grad school change its name, issue which was something the Blue Ribbon Panel stressed. To us, that was less important than fixing the, sort of, structural position of the grad school than -- than the name, but that, I guess, could be revisited. We would like to see, as we -- we indicate here, a proper, you know, full fledged national or international

search for this person. Now, priority number four is perhaps the one that we spent the most time considering because it's the most complicated, and anybody who was on the Blue Ribbon Panel, and I'm sure many of you were, I think can relate to that or anybody that's been a DGS or has been in their college's research areas or, indeed, has been in the VPR's office, will know that this is a very complicated situation. And it was a clear to us that a couple of things have happened. One is that the Graduate School itself has not seen

↑

its operating budget increase. Actually, it's kind of, at best, stayed still, and in real terms, it's gone down relative to the rest of the University and relative to the costs of doing business, as it were. So that's a problem; that's not a way to -- that's not an investment. At that point it's kind of, by neglect, benign neglect perhaps, it's been disinvested in. So that's an issue. The second issue has to do with tuition and the way in which graduate student tuition is handled, especially for those who are on TA-ships and RA-ships and so on. And without getting into the weeds on that, there are many, many complicated ways that that money flows. There were different attitudes about those funds; whether they're real or not real, you know, and all the rest of it. The truth is that right now we're, kind of, stuck in a rigid system that doesn't give the

↑

leadership of the Graduate School, much less the colleges really, any real leeway to make strategic investments. So, we need to somehow make that system fairer, if it's possible; to make it transparent, but also to make it one that can have some flexibility so that resources can be

deployed in strategic directions. Right now it's very difficult to do that because we're kind of locked into a system that doesn't seem to work that well, but that is -- is hard to -- hard to rethink. But that's, perhaps, the most difficult of our -- our priorities to actually do anything about, but we sincerely hope that there will be attention at this -- on this topic. And we feel -- I've said this before, I'll say it again, I don't think the Provost likes me saying this, but I'm very glad he's a finance professor because I feel that somebody who understands the complexities of finance and financial flows through an organization as complicated as UK is a good person to lead that -- that effort. The last two priorities, which I'll go -- I'll go quickly through, have to do with support for graduate education at UK. And the first thing that everybody on the team agreed on, in this regard, was to do with the data on graduate education at UK. We haven't done a very good job in collecting data consistent over the years and then paying attention to it; to investigating it for what it's telling us about the quality of our graduate programs, about the success of our graduate students after they leave UK, or even at UK then beyond. So all these things are just crying out for attention. Especially, if you want, again, to be able to strategically invest, we need to have data to base those -- those decisions on. So the Graduate School has some data analytics capacity. They've tried to build it as best they're able, but it still falls quite far short of what would be needed to -- to run an ambitious graduate school at a major research university. So we would support putting some investments into

personnel and, perhaps, systems in that -- in that area. And the last priority on our list is to provide student support or student services support. Now, this is an interesting one. The Graduate School has made huge strides in this area, actually, despite the fact that they've been somewhat constrained by not having a permanent dean, and so on and so on, and there have been tremendous set of initiatives brought forth, many of you probably know about these, that have helped grad students with things like career paths, understanding what it takes to be a successful academic, and so on and so forth. And there's a new space for graduate students in this library on the fourth floor, I think?

UNIDENTIFIED: Fifth.

ROBERTS: Fifth floor, sorry, but these are -- these are kind of -- these are important steps, but they're small steps really for a student body that is over 8,000 graduate students at the University of Kentucky in diverse programs. Everything from professional masters to PhD's across the board. So we have diverse students encountering diverse problems. Mental health is a real issue for graduate students. It's not just undergraduate students who are having mental health crisis. So, we need to support these students with different support services or at least tailor support services. It's not a one size fits all deal. And that's why we also think perhaps a graduate student ombud would be an appropriate direction. Grad students are often in difficult positions. They're not just students. They're not just quibbling about grades. They're also, and I'm not saying that's what ombuds do, but, they have other sets of concerns to bring to the table that have to do

SenateMtg 101419.txt

with employment, relationships with their supervisors, relationships with team members who may or may not be other students or faculty members, and so on. So, it's a very complex world in which they live. And then the last bullet point here under the, what, is to do with the graduate student council. I was approached by President Hamilton of the SGA just before this meeting, informing me that this was a new item to him; that he was unaware of this; and that -- that he didn't appreciate that, kind of, appearing in this format, but what we heard from the graduate student council is that they would like to be playing more of a role in supporting graduate students and in working with the graduate school to develop programs for the graduate students success at UK. And there was some issue there about fees, student fees. I'm -- I'm not sure that I'm equipped to go into the -- all the detail of that, but that's what that was -- that's what that intended right there. Okay, so I think that's the last slide? Yes. So, I'll just go back maybe to the first one and if time permits -- do we have time?

BIRD-POLLAN: There is time, uh-huh (AFFIRMATIVE).

ROBERTS: Okay.

BIRD-POLLAN: Yeah, yeah, yeah. So questions or observations for Associate Provost Roberts? Yes.

BRIAN: Gail Brion, College of Engineering. I'm -- I'm curious, I'm seeing a lot of support and staff, but I -- I go to the graduate housing, especially for the married graduate student housing, and I was wondering, I didn't see anything about where we're -- how we're going to upgrade those facilities to help house these students, because we've done a tremendous job housing undergraduate students, but our graduate student

housing, particularly for people that are -- that have come with their families, is -- is about from the 1950s.

ROBERTS: Yes. I happen to know, outside of this report actually, but in my other job as Associate Provost, I happen to know that one of the major problems with Greg Page and the Graduate Student and Family Housing has been the wifi. That's been, actually, a very serious issue and that has been addressed this semester by -- by Housing. Yeah, I think that's certainly a good point. We're far enough we could add that to our -- to the Provost list of things that people have been giving feedback on. We didn't pay much attention, you're right, to graduate student housing in this.

BLACKWELL: This was based on what was in the Blue Ribbon --

ROBERTS: The Blue Ribbon Panel.

BLACKWELL: -- Panel report --

ROBERTS: Yeah, sure.

BLACKWELL: -- so what -- some of these suggestions that are -- that are coming out, we're really just summarizing what's -- things to consider from the longer report.

BRION: I'm just looking at number one, prioritize graduate education --

ROBERTS: Yeah.

BRION: -- you know, providing them safe and up-to-date housing is important.

BLACKWELL: I completely agree.

BRION: Thank you.

BIRD-POLLAN: Yes?

FIREY: Abigail Firey, Arts and Sciences. You mentioned that the funding for the Graduate School has fallen behind over the years. And I think I saw a slide that mentioned recommendation for a 10 percent increase. Does that -- how far does that go in closing the gap or getting us ahead of the losses that have accrued?

↑

ROBERTS: Thank you. So, we didn't do a forensic, you know, accounting thing, to go back and calculate like, what's the actual shortfall or where should it be -- be now or anything like that. The 10 percent was kind of meant as a stop-gap reset. Like good faith. Like, lets put a little bit more in, you know, a little bit more. That means a real commitment to graduate education. And then let -- then lets, kind of, reset the -- the ground level. So, I don't honestly know if it would make -- if we went and did a historical thing, it would end up being 10 percent, I suspect it would be -- the gap would be more. But it's kind of a reset. Given that we're in a resource-constrained institution, it's kind of similar to good faith, I guess.

BIRD-POLLAN: Any thoughts, comments or questions?

BRION: Gail Brion, College of Engineering again. I'm very, very happy to see this focus come about. Thank you for your service.

↑

ROBERTS: Oh, thank you. Well, it was really -- the team was really great. So, I thank all of my colleagues on -- on the team and also thank you to the Provost for asking us to do this because it was a very positive sign of interest in graduate education. So, thank you for the time.

BIRD-POLLAN: So, I suspect that the Provost and Associate Provost Sue Roberts and her team would welcome your feedback in an ongoing way. So, if you have additional comments beyond what you shared today, I think you can go ahead and share those going forward. Okay. So, we've asked a couple of our committee chairs to come and make reports. So next on our agenda is Deborah Chung, who is the Chair of our Senate Library Committee, to report on the activities from that committee.

CHUNG: One of the major things that the

SenateMtg 101419.txt

Senate Library Committee does is participate in the library's

↑ alternative textbook grant proposal reviews. And this program provides grants to UK faculty to support the adoption and the creation of new content, open course content such as alternative textbooks or UK library's license resource as replacement to traditional commercial textbooks. And UK instructors, including faculty and lecturers, are eligible to apply for the grant. And to date, the library has funded four rounds of these grants starting from 2016, and the Senate Library Committee has been involved in the review of the proposal since then. I don't think that they're set in stone to be recurring, but they have occurred, and with my -- in my conversations with the new dean -- library dean, Doug Way, they're going to occur again this year. Likely the announcement is going out in early spring. This past semester went a little late, in my opinion, in March and we're reviewing

↑ applications/proposals all the way into the end of April. We received a total of 25 submissions. There are two categories for the first time this year. Category one, for adoption of existing content. Category two, for creation of new content. We received 16 proposals for category one and 9 for category two, and five grants were awarded to each category. And those faculty members were from College of Ag, A & S, Communication and Information, Engineering, Medicine, and Nursing. And just a couple figures of interest. The cumulative number of students benefitting from the program is approximately 7,000 plus students, with a total of student savings of an estimated -- of more than 939,000. And some things that the grantees did with the -- the money

SenateMtg 101419.txt

-- we don't have reports from the most recent grantees/awardees, but from the 2018 participants adoption of alternative textbooks, and also changing to using open course materials, and also developing a site to provide supplementary resources, creating new online homework and also replacing a commercial textbook for -- by putting together important documents, cases, statutes, and personal notes together. So, that's about it.

BIRD-POLLAN: Excellent. Are there any questions for Professor Chung while she's up here? I just want to say thank you for serving as the chair of this committee because a lot of our committee chairs, you know, (inaudible) in anonymity, so I like the opportunity to let people come and talk a little bit about what they're doing with their committee. Are there any members of the Library Committee here today? Well, thank you all for all of your work, we really appreciate it. Thank you.

CHUNG: An email will going out shortly to the Library Committee. Dean Way and I are trying to figure out a day that we can meet first. I'll send out a message to you all, thank you.

BIRD-POLLAN: Perfect. Thank you. All right. Our next committee chair is Aaron Cramer, Chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee, here to talk about a new PhD program.

CRAMER: Hi. This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new PhD degree in Arts Administration, in the Department of Arts Administration within the College of Fine Arts. The proposed PhD program seeks to address the perceived critical need in the U.S. for scholars in Arts and Cultural. There are currently only

SenateMtg 101419.txt

two universities that offer comparable specialization in the area of Arts and Cultural research. UK would be the first university in the country offering Arts Administration degrees at the BA, MA and PhD levels. The

degree program is intended to be offered in an online format for both courses and student mentoring, with most students currently working as Arts and Cultural professionals. The program requires the previous completion of a master's degree and it requires a further 42 hours of coursework plus research. The proposers anticipate a natural recruitment pipeline from their MA alumni and that graduates will have opportunities to work in state and local arts councils, federal, state and local government agencies, art services organizations, large arts organizations including museums, performing arts organizations and arts centers, economic and community develop organizations and think tanks. An initial cohort four students growing to 16 students is anticipated.

BIRD-POLLAN: I think we have Rachel Shane here from the Arts Administration Department, as well. So, before we debate the

motion, are there any questions of fact about this new proposal for either Aaron or Rachel? Any questions? Okay. So, then we have a motion from the committee that the University Senate approve, which will then submit this on to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of this new PhD program in Arts Administration, which will be in the Department of Arts Administration in the College of Fine Arts. Any debate on that motion? Any debate? Okay. Then we'll open this for voting. Final votes. Okay. Motion passes. Okay, great. Thank you. All right. Our next committee chair is Jim

SenateMtg 101419.txt

Donovan, who's the Chair of the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee, here to make his annual report.

DONOVAN:

So this year I thought I would start off by a brief refresher of just what retroactive does. I know a lot of long-term serving persons recollect, but perhaps new people are unaware of what this committee does. So within living memory of some -- somebody who's a current serving member, this body created the right for students who have experienced major disruptions of life such that it impacted their performance during the semester, to come before us and ask that it be wiped clean; that they receive with -- dusters for the whole semester. The listed reasons that were given to us to guide our decision making from this body was that the student would have had to have incurred a serious injury or illness, a serious personal or family problem, serious financial difficulties, or permanent disability verified by the DRC and diagnosed after the semester. I will have to say that last issue has never come up in my term of service, so we basically operated under the first three. And the operative word in all of those is, serious. So we -- they come, they tell us their story, we decide whether it's serious enough -- whether the story they're telling us reasonably impacted their academic performance for a semester such that it warrants this extraordinary dispensation. So, you see in the figures of our annual report that we are -- continue in our increasing caseload of these appeals. We -- we think that word is getting out more. More people are hearing about this as an option, because many of the student narratives we hear about -- because we often ask, well, why did you not withdraw, you know, you had

SenateMtg 101419.txt

this problem; why didn't you withdraw, why did you wait? And a lot of times they did not know about any of this until catastrophe had just fallen upon them. So, word is getting out, so the caseload continues to increase. We have submitted to a sub-set of y'all, our ideas of some ways to make this more manageable for us because we want to -- the rules say we're supposed to respond to this within a certain time frame, and so we do feel bad when we have carry-over files because we have so many. So, we're trying to -- to find ways to get this done in a way that benefits the student so that they are able to plan whether they should enroll the next semester or not. So, I expect at some point you all will be hearing about some of the brilliant suggestions that we have offered. So, other than that, if you have any questions I'll be happy to regale you with war stories.

BIRD-POLLAN:

So, as Jim mentioned, there's been a submission already of a report for some rule changes, and that is currently with the Admissions of Academic Standards Committee. One of the things that have, sort of, been carried forward from last year. So, if that committee approves those changes and forwards them on, you'll see that in the next -- sometime in the next couple of Senate meetings. But are there questions for Jim in the meantime about the work his committee does or the increasing number of students? Yes.

BROWN:

Roger Brown, College of Ag. Is it still true that students who are approved for retroactive withdrawal receive a tuition reimbursement for that -- their tuition being paid during that semester? And if the answer to that is, yes, do you suspect there is any strategic operation here where a student has the option to withdraw during the semester but

SenateMtg 101419.txt

doesn't do so because that would automatically trigger the tuition reimbursement?

DONOVAN:

My understanding on the first question is that there used to be a separate process after the withdrawal to then go before somebody else to ask about the tuition reimbursement, but they basically have folded these together because they basically require the same paperwork, so that if we grant the withdrawal, my understanding, is

↑ that the tuition reimbursement then follows as a consequence. We like to think that we are savvy readers of files and anytime that something appears as is trying to game the system, even it reads on paper as, you know, technically correct, you can kind of read where they're sometimes trying to game it. So, if we can catch that, if we believe that this is not a sincere request, we'll definitely take that into our consideration when rendering a final decision. We're not, you know -- although sometime -- we're not rubberstamping, you know, they've ticked off all of the formal reasons for -- to get the retroactive withdrawal. You know, in my opinion, that opens the gate for them to have a legitimate request and then it's up to the judgement of the Committee as to whether it's actually warranted in this individual case. So, if we can detect gaming, we will respond to that.

BROWN:

All right. Thank you.

BIRD-POLLAN:

Any more questions or comments for Jim? Yeah.

KENNEDY:

Michael Kennedy, Emeritus. You mentioned the caseload, could you put a number on that?

BIRD-POLLAN:

It was attached to the agenda.

DONOVAN:

So, last year there were 198 files submitted to us, which we approved 157. And I'll point out -- so that's

up from 2010 which is the first year on the cumulative report of 93, so we're basically doing about double the workload of -- as when the committee was first constituted, but the committee itself has not changed, so -- and the rules have not changed, so we've basically, kind of, out -- outgrown the -- the structure and procedures which were originally instituted, and that's the motivation to suggest some tweaks.

KENNEDY: Thank you.

VASIL: Martina Vasil, College of Fine Arts.

Since you've been serving for a while you said on this, have you noticed an uptick in either depression, anxiety or mental health issues for reasons for the appeal, or what kind of trend have you noticed? If there is a way we -- we can do something before they get to the point to come to you.

DONOVAN: I'm going to say yes to that. The -- the -- I think we're seeing a lot -- we're definitely seeing a lot more diagnoses. Whether we are seeing more as a percentage of, you know, we're seeing more absolute numbers. We're not -- we haven't done the math, I guess, to see whether we're seeing more as a percentage of requests. Most of the time when the student is saying, I talked to my faculty member; I was having a problem, the stories they're telling are the faculty member has tried to work -- work with them to solve this, but often they've either initiated that process too late or -- or they can't -- they cannot function even under the amended terms. So that, you know, so an incomplete will go undone, you know, it just -- so sometimes it just does not work out. So, obviously, we're seeing the cases where -- we are not seeing the cases where it did work out. So, the view that we get is particularly

pessimistic.

BIRD-POLLAN: Okay. Thank you very much, Jim, we appreciate your work. So Jim wants you to think of him fondly when you those rule changes. All right. Final committee report, Bill Smith, Admissions and Academic Standards.

SMITH: Just want to say that Jennifer is very persuasive and I had a weak moment, that's how I ended up here. We have a proposal from the College of Pharmacy to change some of their entrance requirements or one of their entrance requirements and some of the guidelines for academic progress. This originally came in two separate proposals, we asked them to merge into one. And the rationale -- they requested that PCAT be dropped as a requirement for admission. And the rationale was based on a weak correlation to performance in the PharmD program, substantial cost to students (including under-represented minorities) and other benchmark programs dropping the requirement. The other part of the motion concerns the academic progress. Currently published academic progress guidelines do not reflect the student assessment for the new Doctor of Pharmacy curriculum that they're getting ready implement in the Fall of 2020. And so, thus, it is necessary to update the student progress assessment process documentation.

BIRD-POLLAN: Okay, great. So, we also have Frank Romanelli here from the College of Pharmacy to answer any questions. So, before we debate the motion, are there any questions for either Bill or Frank? Any subsequent questions about the proposal? Yes.

SHAIKH: Bilal Shaikh, Arts and Sciences. I just have a question as to how many other universities across the country have eliminated the PCAT as a requirement?

BIRD-POLLAN: How many --
SMITH: I'll defer to Frank.
BIRD-POLLAN: How many --
SMITH: How many -- how many other university programs have dropped the PCAT requirement?
ROMANELLI: About ten.
BIRD-POLLAN: Any other factual questions for Bill or for Frank? Yes.
FANUCCHI: Laura Fanucchi, College of Medicine. Is there --
BROTHERS: I'm sorry, what was your name?
FANUCCHI: Laura Fanucchi. Is there another standardized test?
BIRD-POLLAN: Is there another standardized test?
SMITH: Is there another standardized test?
ROMANELLI: No.
FANUCCHI: No.
↑ BIRD-POLLAN: So, pharmacy applicants will now not be required to take a standardized test as part of the application process.
SMITH: They have other -- other parts of their process for vetting potential students.
BIRD-POLLAN: Any other factual questions about the proposal? Okay. We'll let you sit down now, Bill. So, now we have a motion from the committee that the Senate approve the College of Pharmacy requests to eliminate the PCAT as a requirement for admission to the PharmD program and then update the academic progression guidelines in support of this curriculum and as a result, the Senate Rule changes will have to be edited to reflect these two substantive changes to the policy. So, is there any debate on that motion? Any debate? Okay, seeing none, then I will open voting on that motion. Any final votes? Submit your votes. And motion passes. Okay, great, thank you everyone. Okay. So, the last thing on our agenda has to do with our new curriculum approval process. So, we've been working on this for two years. Lots of you in

SenateMtg 101419.txt

the room have heard various conversations about it before. It is cumbersome the way we have done it historically. So, notice what you've had to do is open PDFs. Those same PDFs have been sent around via email through multiple levels of committee review, they've been updated, changed, resent, versions get lost in the mail, in the ether. We're changing that now. The other thing that we're changing is that -- if you notice, that PDF document that gets attached to emails and sent all around, is one giant document. Sometimes, as in the case of the PhD in Arts Administration today, I don't know what was it, 100 pages long, 150 something like that, sometimes there are reports of 300 pages long by the time all the

↑ attachments are there. We find that to be cumbersome; reviewers find that to be cumbersome; it's difficult to find what you are looking for; it's difficult to find the information. So at a meeting about two or three weeks ago the Senate Council approved the creation of a new set of processes of program approvals. This is using Curriculog. So if you've ever looked at a course proposal, at least in the last couple of years, you've used Curriculog to look at that course proposal. So, if you get Sheila's email about Senate transmittals and you decide and actually go and look at the courses that are being proposed, that's you where you've found them, in Curriculog. You've logged in using your UK ID and you've found the course proposals on there. We're now going to do the same thing for programs. So, when you get a program proposal like you saw today from Aaron and Rachel for the PhD in Arts

↑ Administration, that will no longer be a PDF attachment to an agenda, it will be -- you go to Curriculog. You look

SenateMtg 101419.txt

at the Senate agenda on Curriculog and you find the proposal in there. I think this is great from the perspective of proposers because it breaks everything out into smaller pieces. It's great from the perspective of reviewers, if there's one item you especially care about, it will be easy for you to find it. Also, if we discover that there are things we want to change about our forms or something we think is unclear, we will be able to change one piece of the form rather than the document which has ballooned to 300 pages. So, we're really excited about this. After two years of work, we are working out the final kinks. It was supposed to be done in early September. I am super not tech savvy. I have relied entirely on Sheila and Stephanie and Jonie, admins and a few other people from around campus to do the technical side of these things and we're working with Digarc, which is the company that -- that controls Curriculog, as well as some IT folks here at UK. It is -- it's going to be great really soon. Like really, really soon, so we're excited because the Senate Council has already approved it. So, as soon as we get these final kinks worked out it will go live, with the expectation that after a certain date any new program proposals or any program changes will have to come through using Curriculog and using our new set of -- of documents. So, hold tight with that date. As soon as we have decided -- as soon as we realize we can go live, we will -- we will let you know what that date is. But we also have a video. Sheila and I made a little welcome video to show you the way it works and we're real excited about that. So, we haven't sent that out yet either because we don't want to

SenateMtg 101419.txt

get you all excited and then say it's not live yet. So once it's really live we will send out our video. You might have started to get some emails that tell you things like, weekly Curriculog update, something like that. If you don't want to get those emails all the time, we need to change what your default settings are. So there are default settings in Curriculog. You all are now users of Curriculog since you will have to go into it to look at these proposals. We're creating a little how-to sheet about how to change your notices, so if you don't want get those notices all the time, you won't have to. You will change that and we will show you how to do that. And we're going to send that out to you at the same time that we send out all this other information. So, we had hoped we would be live by today so that we could do more to, sort of, celebrate this big new change; we're not quite there yet, but we will be very soon and -- and we're pretty excited about it. So, what we're really hoping for is lots of feedback from you, especially, over the course of this first year as we make these changes. You know, anytime you're using it, if you see anything at all that you think could be improved, you want to provide feedback, send it to me, send it to Sheila. We are excited to hear from you. Yes, question?

JONES: Davy Jones, College of Medicine. So, in future Senate meetings, what will be the hotlink to?

BIRD-POLLAN: It'll be to Curriculog and you'll log into Curriculog. And that's where you'll find -- you'll find both the Curriculog form with the, sort of, narrative questions that are the basis of it, and then the attachments, which will include things like what we're calling the curriculum workbook that

SenateMtg 101419.txt

will have all the details about the curriculum plan for the program, things like the faculty of record form. All of that will be attachments which will be inside of Curriculog. So you will have to log into Curriculog in order to see the things which have been, until now, as PDF attachments. But it will be great, you guys. It will be totally great. Yes?

BROWN: Roger Brown, College of Ag. Is that going to work well with the archiving process in the future when Curriculog goes away and people 20 years from now want to see these proposals and look at them, is that also consistent with open records for people outside this body who want to look at those proposals?

BIRD-POLLAN: So, that's a good question. We've been doing it over courses for a couple years now, so we're going to have to think about that. We're going to have to think about the archive question. Do you have any quick answers to that?

BROTHERS: Well, for the amount that we paid Curriculog for these services, they better be available for the next 10, 20, 30 years. We currently have the system setup so that only users can -- so only somebody with a UK linkblue address or linkblue ID can log in and see it. That's an administrative setting that we can change. The other thing is if somebody wants to see something that's not readily available to them, I mean, I know this -- this is not ideal, but they simply can ask and we will provide it with them. But if it turns out that we need to open the system up for anyone to look at, then we can do that if need be.

BIRD-POLLAN: Yes?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Trustee. One thing you might consider is the paper trail. Like in electronic voting, there's

SenateMtg 101419.txt

always a -- you're supposed to have a paper trail as well printed out. I know you don't want a lot of PDFs around, but once the proposal is complete, print out a PDF and store it somewhere and then it will be available in the future for people to see. You won't have to open the system.

BIRD-POLLAN: Do we have any factual questions right now? So, stay tuned. You will get an email from me soon which will have a link to that video information about how to log into Curriculog for the first time. And, hopefully, sometime in the next few meetings you will start to see programs which you will log into Curriculog in order to review. We're pretty excited about that. Okay. So, now is our time for items from the floor. Are there any items from the floor? Okay, hearing none, I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

GROSSMAN: So moved.

BRION: Seconded.

BIRD-POLLAN: Bob Grossman, Gail Brion second.

Okay, then we can vote on that. I will see you all next month. Thank you all very much.

(MEETING ADJOURNED at 5:00 p.m.)

STATE OF KENTUCKY)
COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

I, LISA E. HOINKE, the undersigned Notary Public in and for the State of Kentucky at Large, certify that the facts stated in the caption hereto are true; that at the time and place stated in said caption, the meeting commenced and the foregoing is a true and accurate record of said meeting.

My commission expires: May 18, 2023.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 1st day of January, 2020.

LISA E. HOINKE, COURT REPORTER
NOTARY PUBLIC ID# 622471
KENTUCKY, STATE-AT-LARGE

SenateMtg 101419.txt