

UKSenateMeeting-4-8-13.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

APRIL 8, 2013

* * * *

* * * *

LEE X. BLONDER, CHAIR
ROBERT GROSSMAN, VICE-CHAIR
J. S. BUTLER, PARLIAMENTARIAN
SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR
LISA GRANT CRUMP, COURT REPORTER

* * * *

* * * *

BLONDER: Welcome to the April 8th meeting of the University Senate. Please remember to sign in when you arrive, give your name and affiliation when you speak, attend meetings, respond to e-mails and web postings as appropriate, acknowledge and respect others, silence your electronic devices, and communicate with your constituency. And if you need help with that, Raphael Finkel, is taking copious notes, in addition to the approved minutes that we do post.

First to start with, I need a motion to waive Senate Rule 1.2.3 to allow the Senate to consider the agenda and recommendations for action because some of the supporting documentation was not sent out six days in advance. We had a power failure, that was --

CHARNI GO: So moved. Richard Charni go, Public Health.

WASILKOWSKI: Second.

BROTHERS: Name please?

WASILKOWSKI: Wasilowski, Engineering.

UKSenateMeeting-4-8-13.txt
BLONDER: Is there discussion? All in favor?
Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank
you.

The minutes from March 18th were distributed and we didn't receive any changes. Are there any corrections anyone would like to make at this point? Because there are no corrections the minutes from March 18, 2013 stand approved as distributed.

I have some announcements to make. As many of you know the SACS re-accreditation site visit is this week. The site visitors arrived yesterday on campus and they'll be here through Thursday.

Next, the Senate approved a minor calendar change on behalf - the Senate Council approved a minor calendar change on behalf of the Senate to allow the College of Education Teacher Education Unit to amend the calendar for student teachers each semester to commence on the Monday of the week prior to the official UK beginning of classes. This helps to be in compliance with the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board.

We have a faculty trustee election that is about to begin formally. The petitions - the petition phase ended at noon today and this is going to be followed by an election round. So please look for an e-mail notification coming into your in-boxes and please be sure to vote and encourage your constituents to do so. The term for the elected faculty trustee will run from July 1st, 2013 through June 30th, 2016.

I wanted to thank Shelly Steiner who has agreed to serve as the Senate Council Liaison to the Employee Benefits Committee.

Also I sent an e-mail out earlier today that the UK Campus Master Plan Open House is this Thursday from noon to two in the Student Center and the Sasaki Team will be there to answer questions and discuss the draft. So that will be a great opportunity if you have interest or concerns to go to that open house.

Next I have a brief Chair's report. The Senate Council has developed a survey to send to all faculty to evaluate the President. This was originally discussed in the November 2011 Senate Meeting by Senate Council Member Mark Coyne.

The purpose of the evaluation is to insure faculty input into the annual review of the President that's being conducted by the Board of Trustees. And they will be conducting their evaluation over the summer.

The evaluation that we developed consists of 18 items, there are 16 that are rated on a scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. There's a point you can check if you don't have a comment. And then there's two open-ended questions to allow

people to give comments.

The evaluation is going to be sent out in the next couple of weeks. We're doing this through REDCap which is behind the Med Center firewall. There will be no way for us to figure out who is writing what. So in that sense the survey is anonymous.

We hope to get a high response rate from faculty. It will be sent to all faculty at the University who are full time. A high response rate will ensure that the survey turns up being valid. So once you get it please complete it and please encourage your constituency to complete it.

Bob Grossman has a Chair - a Vice Chair's Report.

GROSSMAN: Hi. You all received an e-mail today from me sent by Sheila Brothers where -- asking to nominate your colleague or yourselves for Outstanding Senator Award. This will be the third year that we're giving it.

Our winner last year was Shelly Steiner, the previous year was Davy Jones. So please nominate any of your colleagues who you think meet the criteria in the letter.

And again current Senate Council members are not eligible, but the person you nominate can have been a past Senate member. They don't have to currently be serving. Thanks.

BLONDER: Thank you, Bob.

We had approved a spot for the Trustee Report, but unfortunately neither of our faculty trustees were able to attend this meeting so we won't be having the Trustee Report today.

The next item on the agenda is the Committee Report. So we have a proposed change to the College of Communication Information Undergraduate Major Entrance Requirements that was sent to the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee. And Raphael Finkel is going to discuss that. Raphael?

GROSSMAN: Are you going to take notes at the same time?

FINKEL: Yeah, disconnect between my hands and my mouth. So this is a proposal to relax the GPA entry requirement for students going into upper division status in various programs in the College of Communication and Information. There are four undergraduate majors affected and two undergraduate minors affected.

Currently, the bar is 3.0 or better, although one of the programs has a 2.6. And they also require an overall GPA - well, the first thing is a GPA bar for those courses, only calculated across those courses that are pre-major or pre-minor. And that is currently 3.0, although in one case 2.6. And the other current limit is that it be a 2.6

UKSenateMeeting-4-8-13.txt

overall GPA across all University courses.

The proposal is actually to relax both of those requirements so that the respecting the pre-major or pre-minor courses is merely that the students pass each of those courses. And as I understand it, passing means a - what is it, is it a C or a D?

UNIDENTIFIED:

D.

FINKEL:

A D? D. And the second, the requirement for the overall GPA goes down to 2.0. Now these are very low bars and so it's important to look at the reasoning for this and the possible repercussions of it.

The reasoning is to reduce the barrier for students to enter the upper division hoping to improve the retention from second to third year.

A small case-by-case study run by the college shows that students who do meet the new bar, but not the old one, actually don't do noticeably worse in their first semester in the upper division. So the hope is that this won't be letting in a lot of people who really won't succeed.

Let me see, I want to look at my own notes here for a sec. So there is wording then, which you can find on page 11 and following in your handout, for what the new situation should look like in the Senate Rules.

And the general policy of my committee has been that if a program wishes to set particular entrance requirements for their upper division, they generally know what they're doing and they hopefully are dealing in a responsible way.

In particular, if there are students who are having trouble, who by this new rule would be allowed into the upper division, we assume that the programs have special facilities in place to mentor those students, to help those students, to assist them if they need it.

So it's a priority for the programs of course not only to retain the students between the second and third year, but then to graduate them.

The disadvantages of this is it will permit some students who, in fact, will never succeed to linger in a major when perhaps they would be better served in some other major. And that's a principle negative effect that we could see.

A positive effect, it will increase retention because the students won't drop out at that point, but they will be at least able to continue for a little bit, perhaps until they graduate. And it might also reduce grade inflation.

Grade inflation is a result of having to give students an adequate grade so that they can continue. And if the honest

UKSenateMeeting-4-8-13.txt

grade is a D, that would prevent the student from continuing into the upper division, maybe one should still get a D, but let the student into the upper division and then assist the student in proceeding.

So our overall, after some discussion, our overall decision was that we would recommend this particular change and leave it then to the Senate to decide.

BLONDER: So we have a positive recommendation from the Senate Council that the Senate approve the proposed change to the College of Communication and Information Undergraduate Major Requirement.

NAGEL: Is there discussion? Questions? Uwe Nagel, Arts and Sciences. I mean I can see that it may reduce grade inflation at the lower division courses, but isn't there a danger that it increases grade inflation at the upper division courses because now you have less - more students, many more less prepared?

And since we have a pressure for retention there is pressure to cause more students than would normally perhaps not have passed?

FINKEL: Yeah. I'm glad you addressed that. But is there someone from the College of Communication who would like to answer this?

All right. I think that's very perceptive and very likely the case. That grade inflation is not a - a - only at the second - only at the sophomore level and this might, in fact, increase grade inflation at the upper level. You're quite right about that.

BLONDER: Can you give your name and affiliation please?

NAGEL: Uwe Nagel, Arts and Sciences.

BLONDER: Thank you.

EDWARDS: Edwards, Education.

I don't think this is necessarily at play here, but what does scare me about the GPA being lowered with this new values-based budgeting where retention is one of the things that is going to be rewarded with more money back to the college.

I'm just a little nervous that other colleges are going to start lowering their standards in order to have higher retention to get more money back. I'm not saying the College of Communication is doing that. That is just a concern to have on board in general with lowering of GPA standards for upper division.

FINKEL: Right. I think this is, in fact, one of the unfortunate side effects, ramifications, of the new budgeting model.

There are several bad effects of that new model and one of them, as you point out, is that in order to be considered a good department, you've got to have a lot of undergraduate students. In order to have a

lot of undergraduate students, you must not fail them out.

Another unfortunate side effect is that there's going to be much worse turf wars as each department, each college, tries to draw students from other colleges by perhaps duplicating courses or by changing requirements so that the students have to take their own course.

I think things are going to get worse before they get better. I think you're quite right about that.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.

With respect to the pressure on retention, that's going to continue regardless of what budget model we have. So that's pressure coming from the government and just in general economics of higher education more than any particular budget model.

BLONDER: Hollie?

SWANSON: Hollie Swanson, College of Medicine.

I think the other thing is that it sends a message and the message it sends is you don't have to try very hard.

BLONDER: Jeannie?

BLACKWELL: I'd like to point out that -

BROTHERS: Name please.

BLACKWELL: Jeannie Blackwell, Dean of Graduate School.

The programs in the College of Arts and Sciences do not have entrance requirements and GPA other than the University standard. And they do a very good job of having excellent programs and taking care of their students.

So I think that we have models around the University where open access to majors really can be a positive force.

LEWIS: Wayne Lewis, College of Education.

Just to reiterate something that Raphael said at the beginning of the presentation in terms of the thinking of the committee, it really has been I think in conversation really wanting to defer, I think from the committee to the judgement of faculty members in individual departments and colleges.

And that when faculty members say that they think that these types of changes should be made for whatever reason, questioning of course and having due diligence, but really kind of giving faculty members and colleges and departments the benefit of the doubt if they believe that's the best thing for their program.

BLONDER: Are there other comments?

CHRISTIANSON: Eric Christianson, Arts and Sciences.

What specific resource is going to be made available to those students who have that lower GPA? It was mentioned that there

were going to be resources allocated to the system and then for those students. Is there any specific discussion of what those are?

FINKEL: What I mentioned was a hope, not a knowledge. We said we defer to the department in the hope and belief that they would provide resources to students to help them through, not that we know what those resources might be. Nor that their proposal has specified any such thing.

BLONDER: All right. Well, let's take this to a vote then. We have a positive motion on the floor. All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

Next we have a report from Andrew Hippisley, Chair of the Senate Academic Programs Committee on the new proposed Graduate Certificate in Autism Spectrum Disorders.

HIPPISLEY: So this is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new graduate certificate: Autism Spectrum Disorders in the Department of Early Childhood, Special Education and Rehabilitation Counseling within the College of Education.

This certificate is going to be interdisciplinary in nature. It's the result of a collaborative - a collaboration between three departments, Early Childhood, Special Education and Rehabilitation Counseling is number one. Educational, School, and Counseling Psychology in the College of Education, and Communication Sciences and Disorders in the College of Health Sciences.

And it's a clear motivation to a national increase - clear response to national increase in ASD cases.

The target audience, these are special education teachers across the state, they must have been awarded a baccalaureate degree from an accredited institution of higher learning to enter the certificate.

In the content of this certificate the emphasis is on the collaboration of families and other professionals. There will be distance learning format, but there will be a special face-to-face institute at the very end of the certificate where there will be practical application of the knowledge required.

This is going to be on campus for one to two weeks. Fifteen credits made up of five courses as well as passing a prerequisite, Applied Behavior Analysis course.

The five courses are Overview of Characteristics and Instructional Strategies for Individuals with ASD, Advanced Instructional Strategies for Students with ASD, Communication, AAC and Technology for Individuals with ASD, and a seminar in Psychological Consultation in the

UKSenateMeeting-4-8-13.txt

Schools, and then the on-campus institute.

There's a faculty structure in place. The certificate will be administered by the Department of Early Childhood, Special Education, and Rehabilitation Counseling. The faculty will be joined from the other three departments mentioned above. The Director of the Certificate will be Victoria Knight.

BLONDER:

We have a positive recommendation from the Senate Council that the Senate approve the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Autism Spectrum Disorders in the Department of Early Childhood, Special Education and Rehabilitation Counseling within the College of Education.

Discussion? Comments? Questions? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

Next again Senate's Academic Programs Committee, we have a new proposed new Minor in Journalism Studies presented by Andrew again.

HIPPISLEY:

So this is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new Undergraduate Minor, Journalism Studies in the School of Journalism and Telecommunications within the College of Communication and Information.

The minor being proposed is (UNINTELLIGIBLE) of the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication. The point is that as journalism shifts to a traditional media platform, information gathering and dissemination techniques are changing and these changes have become important to students of education who want to train as media advisors, for example.

In the form of a minor, journalism studies will be an important addition to a degree in education.

More generically, skills in writing and journalistic style on print and online design will add value to the portfolios of students of a range of majors at UK.

So what's being proposed is 18 credits. There are four 3 credit core courses, 2 would be the lower level: Introduction to Journalism, Writing for the Mass Media, 2 are upper level: Diversity in the Mass Media and Mass Media Law.

Students then that take six credits from a range of electives and these include History of Journalism, The First Amendment, Internet and Society, Ethics, Special Topics in Journalism, and three iterations of a course on Layout and Design, each of those iterations is worth one credit.

The student learning outcomes of the model are carefully aligned with the accrediting body and they include understand and apply principles of freedom of speech,

UKSenateMeeting-4-8-13.txt

understand concepts and apply theories in the use and presentation of images, amongst others.

There is an assessment plan in place including surveying graduates for job placement, starting salaries and overall student satisfaction.

The infrastructure is going to be that of students by their major so the Faculty of Record on the major will be Faculty of Record on the minor.

BLONDER:

We have a positive recommendation from Senate Council that the Senate approve the establishment of the new Undergraduate Minor in Journalism Studies in the School of Journalism and Telecommunications within the College of Communication and Information.

Is there discussion? Comments? Questions? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

Next again, Andrew Hippisley, Chair, Senate's Academic Programs Committee, proposed new Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Second Language.

HIPPISLEY:

So this is a recommendation that the University Senate approve for submission to the Board of Trustees the establishment of a new MA program, Teaching English as a Second Language in the Department of Modern and Classical Languages, Literatures and Cultures, which I'll call MCL, within the College of Arts and Sciences.

Kentucky has over 15,000 English language learners and there's a clear need for instructors for them.

A Masters in TESL is offered by Murray State, Georgetown, and Asbury, but as a state flagship institution, we need to offer one ourselves. That's the motivation.

A TESL Masters will be a first step towards public school ESL Certification. As such it will support in-service teachers who want to add a Teaching English as a Second Language specialization.

There is at UK currently a vibrant center for English as a Second Language and this fortuitously provides an excellent training ground for students on this proposed Masters.

So this will be a one year to one and a half year 36 graduate credit degree program and it will conclude an internship primarily within that certification of Second Language, and that internship is worth 9 credits.

The curriculum is built around seven principles. These include: inquiry into the research of core disciplines, for example, linguistics, understanding diversity in the classroom, sensitivity to social complex in which the teaching takes place, and experiential learning.

There are 27 credits of required

courses and these are divided into three different areas. The first area is Linguistics, this is 12 credits. Introduction to Linguistics for Teachers, Literacy Development in the ESL Classroom, and Second Language Curriculum and Assessment, and a choice of either English Grammar or Grammatical Typology.

Second focus category is Second Language Learners, this is worth 9 credits. Second Language Acquisition is one course. Culture, Cognition and the Second Language Learner is another one. And then finally, a relevant course from either Education, Linguistics or MCL.

Third, Pedagogy, worth 15 credits, Second Language Teaching Methods, specifically Young and Beginning Level Students, then a choice of Theory and Practice of Second Language Teaching, Language Teaching Methods 9-12, Adults and an ESL Internship, as I mentioned before, worth 9 credits.

There's a carefully put together Faculty of Record. Francis Bailey will be the Director of this program and other members of his team will be people brought from MCL, Hispanic Studies, College of Education and Linguistics.

There is a careful assessment plan. They will look at candidate performance and program effectiveness, both are in place, and they will carefully use a standard set of TESL objectives to align with the assessment.

BLONDER:

So we have a positive recommendation from Senate Council that the Senate approve for submission to the Board of Trustees the establishment of a new Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Second Language in the Department of Modern and Classical Languages, Literature and Cultures within the College of Arts and Sciences.

FINKEL:

Discussion? Raphael?
Raphael Finkel, College of Engineering.

HIPPISLEY:

Am I correct that this is a one year program for 36 credits?
This is a one to one and a half year program, 36 credits, correct. And there's going to be use of the summers on either side to make up the 36.

FINKEL:

Otherwise 36 sounds like an enormously heavy load for a one year program.

HIPPISLEY:

Part of it, remember, the 9 credit internship which can be spread out over the summers, but also can be spread out during the semester activity.

These students will train, do internships, within the Center for English as a Second Language, which is offered year round.

But I think Francis Bailey may be here. Maybe he can answer that question even

- better than me.
- BAILEY: Yeah. I think more likely it will take 15 months. We plan to start people off in the summer, fall and spring courses, and then they take a 9 credit internship in the second summer.
- BLONDER: Other questions?
- FINKEL: On a different topic - Raphael Finkel, College of Engineering. This is the sort of thing which properly ought to be in the College of Education. And I see this as an example of what I was mentioning before of a turf war where because one college didn't grab the ball and dropped it, another college has picked it up and has thereby gained some students at the expense of a different college. Am I right about this?
- HIPPISLEY: Well, actually, Jeanmarie, who is the head of MCL, will speak to that.
- ROUHIER: Jeanmarie Rouhier, Arts and Sciences, MCL. We developed the Master of Arts in Teaching World Languages and developed this program in conjunction with the College of Education. They have - we have a long-term working relationship with them and they were fully supportive of this procedure. In fact, we have a rep here from College of Ed who can speak to the history.
- PERRY: Hi, I'm Kristen Perry, from Curriculum and Instruction in the College of Ed. I can sort of speak to the history because most of that happened before I came here. But I can attest that Dr. Bailey has worked very closely with the College of Education. He's compiled a committee of faculty in the College of Ed who had been working with him on developing this program and we're fully supportive of that. So I don't know if there's anything else I can speak to, but there has been close collaboration. My understanding is that years and years and years ago, language teaching may have been taught in the College of Ed, but that's not been the case for quite some time.
- HIPPISLEY: I was going to add to all of that, just at the intellectual level, I mean, MCL teaches languages as second languages. So in a sense it's a natural place to put this MA, which is teaching a language - teaching students how to teach a language as a second language. So intellectually and competently it lines up with the Masters in Teaching World Languages.
- BAILEY: Ernie Bailey, College of Agriculture. I guess when that - that last part was the question I had is, it's hard for me

UKSenateMeeting-4-8-13.txt
to get my head around this being the subject matter of the College of MCL.

I mean I'm a geneticist in veterinary science, what do I know about this, but I mean teaching lang - the students who are there learning the languages, it's not necessarily teaching them. It's a different skill, it's a different interest. And I understand why it fits in there, but I want to know to what extent it distracts from the admission of that department.

Are we served if this change goes through?

ROUHI ER: We have specialists in my department - Jeanmarie Rouhier, A and S, Modern and Classical Languages. - who are anthropologists, sociologists, history and literary specialists, five linguists, and theoretical linguists, to name a few.

The people in this program specialize in second language acquisition, they have degrees in second language acquisition and were hired to enhance MATWL and TESL.

And the curricular piece comes from the culture of the languages the students are studying as well as techniques of the second language acquisition as well as broader educational theory courses (UNINTELLIGIBLE).

O' HAIR: Mary John O' Hair, Dean of College of Education.

We are definitely in support. We work closely with our colleagues in Arts and Sciences. And remember to be certified, all programs, we work with six other colleges in terms of certification efforts. And it floats through the College of Education onto our Educational Professional Standards Board.

So we're very much, as Dr. Perry mentioned, very much in collaboration with the College of Arts and Sciences and I think it's a good example of that kind of work.

BLONDER: Are there comments? Well, we have a motion on the floor. All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

Next we have a proposed new Graduate Certificate in Power and Energy that was reviewed by the Senate Academic Programs Committee and will be presented by Andrew Hippisley.

HIPPISLEY: So this is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Power and Energy within the College of Engineering.

This certificate is partly in response to the 2009 US Department of Energy strategic plan which was to make America a world leader in clean energy and (UNINTELLIGIBLE) efforts of UK's own 2009 (UNINTELLIGIBLE) strategic plan.

UKSenateMeeting-4-8-13.txt

It's a direct consequence of UK winning a \$2.5 million grant to develop educational programs in power and energy. And this is administered by the new Power and Energy Institute of Kentucky.

There will be - it's proposed that there will be 15 credits from five courses, four of these are (UNINTELLIGIBLE), Electric Power Economics and Public Policy, Electric Power Generation Technologies, Electric Power System Fundamentals, and Power and Energy Experiences.

Students then choose one course from a list of related courses including, for example, EE 699, which is Power System Analysis Using Advanced Software or CE 672, Landfill Design.

There are a careful list of student learning outcomes including understanding and describing professional legal electrical generation sources, understanding and describing electrical distribution systems, understanding and describing methods of controlling electrical power generation.

The faculty involved come from a variety of programs and these include Electrical and Computer Engineering, Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering, Chemical and Materials Engineering, and Mechanical Engineering.

The Director will be Dr. Yuan Liao and he will be appointed by the Dean of the College of Engineering.

The student learning outcomes will be assessed as will the program itself, and regularly reviewed by the faculty and the associated Advisory Boards, including an External Board who will give industrial perspective on the material covered and the quality of the students coming through.

BLONDER:

We have a positive recommendation from Senate Council that the Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Power and Energy in the College of Engineering. Is there discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

Next we have Andrew Hippisley, Chair of the Senate Academic Programs Committee presenting a proposal to offer a BA in Social Work via the Extended Campus in Hazard. Andrew?

HIPPISLEY:

This one's a little bit different. So this is a recommendation that the University Senate endorse Expansion of the Hazard College of Social Work program at the UK Rural Health Center at Hazard to include a Bachelor of Arts in Social Work.

So some background: The College of Social Work is already active at this UK Center for Excellence and Rural Health, at Hazard, Kentucky because it has a Masters in Social Work there.

UKSenateMeeting-4-8-13.txt

Meanwhile, ECU were running a Bachelor of Social Work at this center but pulled out and at that point UK were invited to fill the gap.

So the aim and motivation is to create greater access to social work undergraduate education in the Commonwealth. Students at Hazard may be pursuing the Associate in Applied Science in Human Services degree and these students have specifically requested that there be a Bachelor of Science in Social Work at Hazard because of geographical obstacles in obtaining it elsewhere.

As at the UK Main Campus there will be 120 credits. At Hazard students can trade in gen ed college prereqs and core professional and two upper division electives to total 61 credits.

So really what this amounts to is the last two years of the Bachelor of Arts in Social Work here in Hazard at the Hazard location, 59 credits.

All the courses and student learning outcomes will be identical to what goes on at UK as will the assessment plan.

The course format will mainly be face-to-face and faculty will be used in Hazard to help with this on-site teaching. They'll also use these ITV classrooms when they have a class going on here at UK which is beamed to Hazard in real time.

There are plans also to develop distance learning hybrid format and on-line courses for some of the electives. And these are in process right now.

The Faculty of Record will be that of Faculty of Record for the BA in Social Work here at UK. In addition they will hire a Student Affairs Officer, who will be located at Hazard, who will act as a kind of primary advisor.

BLONDER: Are there questions?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.

So I support this proposal but I was just curious. You said ECU had had a program there but pulled out. How long ago was that and do we know why they pulled out?

HIPPISLEY: Is there a member of Social Work who --

SUTPHEN: Richard Sutphen, Social Work.

(UNINTELLIGIBLE) why they pulled out. I think it had to do with there was internal department dynamics and we weren't made privy to that. We were responding to the need and also that we have a Master program there so that helps with a feeder program. And the faculty made it contingent that this would be a self-supporting program.

GROSSMAN: How do you measure that?

SUTPHEN: How do you measure that?

(UNINTELLIGIBLE).

HARRISON: Anne Harrison, College of Health

Sciences.

I might have missed this, but I realize there's a Masters program there so there are full time faculty at the college, at the Center for Rural Health?

HIPPISLEY:

Yes.

HARRISON:

Who also will be there full time?

SUTPHEN:

Yes. They were the ones who I think heard the request from the students in the first place. Social Work has a presence, a strong presence there already.

FINKEL:

Raphael Finkel, College of Engineering.

Do I correctly understand that the last 61 credits would be taken at Hazard but the students would get a UK degree?

BLONDER:

Jeannine?

BLACKWELL:

Jeannine Blackwell, Dean of the Graduate School.

These would be UK credits. It's a UK degree and all the course work is UK course work taught by UK faculty. It's just at a different location.

FINKEL:

Thank you.

BLONDER:

Are there other questions?

PRATS:

Armando Prats, A and S.

Andrew, when you were reading this you said University Senate, you didn't say approved, you said endorsed. Does it make a difference for the record?

HIPPISLEY:

We did discuss this very quickly. Davy Jones just left I think. There was a reason why he advised endorsement rather than recommendation, approved. Approved. Does anyone remember?

BLONDER:

Is there anyone from the Rules Committee that has a comment on endorsed versus approved for this motion?

HIPPISLEY:

It was set for the Senate Council on Monday so if anybody was at Senate Council on Monday, they can help too. Connie?

WOOD:

Connie Wood, Arts and Sciences.

I'll take a stab at this. But I think it is approval. You have to have approval in order to offer campus off-site which is what Dean Blackwell was just explaining.

It is a UK degree, but it's offered off-site. (UNINTELLIGIBLE)

BLACKWELL:

And so it's not the approval of the degree because the degree already exists, but it's the modality of offering that you're approving.

WOOD:

It's not a new degree therefore it is the modality.

HIPPISLEY:

The expansion implies it's the modality of --

UNIDENTIFIED:

Right.

HIPPISLEY:

-- expansion.

BLONDER:

All right. So we have a direct motion. Anne?

HARRISON:

Anne Harrison, College of Health

Sciences.

This kind of - this is kind of picky, but I think it might be important. It's not the Rural Health Center, it's the Center of Excellence in Rural Health. And they just actually officially changed that of from for. And they thought that was really important, so it seems to me that you might want to (UNINTELLIGIBLE) Center of Excellence in Rural Health.

BLONDER: So do we need an amendment?

HARRISON: We do.

BLONDER: So you would like to propose an amendment?

HARRISON: I'd be glad to throw a proposed amendment that we change the name from the UK Rural Health Center to the Center of Excellence in Rural Health in Hazard.

BLONDER: Is there a second?

BRIAN: Second.

BLONDER: All in favor --

GROSSMAN: Is there clarification first?

BLONDER: Yes.

GROSSMAN: Are we keeping it UK?

HARRISON: I think it's okay to have the UK there.

BLONDER: Yeah.

GROSSMAN: Okay. I just wanted to know so we don't have to change it again.

HARRISON: Well, actually, I'm not sure about the UK.

BLONDER: Well, let's leave it there.

GROSSMAN: It is a UK Center though? It's not an independent center like -

HARRISON: Well, ECU had their program there so I suppose it is a Center of Excellence in Rural Health.

BLACKWELL: Just put it in the official name.

HARRISON: I will rephrase the amendment to say the College of Social Work Program at the Center of Excellence in Rural Health at Hazard.

BLONDER: Okay. Is there discussion of the amendment? All in favor of the amendment? Opposed? Abstained? The amendment passes so now we go back to the original motion which is now amended.

A positive recommendation from the Senate Council that the University Senate approve the Expansion of the Hazard College Social Work Program at the Center of Excellence in Rural Health in Hazard to include a Bachelor of Arts in Social Work degree. All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you, Andrew.

The next item on the agenda, there is a change to the Governing Regulations I ("The University of Kentucky") and this is paired with the next motion which is Create a New Governing Regulation.

We have Marcy Deaton and T. Lynn Williamson, Office of Legal Counsel, to present this to you.

WILLIAMSON:

Probably a year and a half ago President Capilouto wanted a broad-based committee at the University to look into what happened at Penn State and what kinds of things that we might do at the University of Kentucky to lessen the possibility of something like that occurring here. So it's a broad-based committee chaired by Dean Turner, Dan O'Hair and Vice President of Human Resources, Kim Wilson.

There are various subcommittees of that committee and some of the functions of that committee are still meeting. And now a new University Risk Management Committee continues to look at those things.

We spent a year and we're still trying to figure out how many different varieties, how many different kinds of activities we have with youth on our campus all year long. And it's a significant challenge. So there's a lot of that stuff still going on.

One of those committees was to look at the document Ethical Principles and Code of Conduct. Ethical Principles and Code of Conduct was approved by the Board of Trustees in 2004 as a result of the National Sarbanes Oxley Act that put capital, principles in front of corporations, and most universities adopted something similar to that. So that document was passed by the Board in 2004 and had not been revised since then.

So I chaired a committee that looked at the Ethical Principles and Code of Conduct and we came up with some revisions that have now gone through several of the committees that look at ARs and GRs, and made some proposals to tighten, strengthen, Ethical Principles and Code of Conduct for getting people to report, encouraging people to report, and making it easier for that to happen. But also putting out the principles that we want to be compliant.

So there's several recommendations that came forth. I presented them and they were approved by that committee and Marcy will talk about those and the history of how this came about.

DEATON:

Thank you. I think one of the things in your package was the actual subcommittees report. I didn't know that until I looked at the agenda today. You have it.

So the biggest thing for me that they suggested that I think is really important is that the Code of Conduct and Ethical Principles be moved out to its own document. As it is now it's kind of scary in GR I, among a lot of other things, all of which are really important in the definition of the University and outline of all our colleges, when they were established, how it's appropriate to use our facility within

the list of Code of Conduct.

So to do that, I chaired the Administrative Regulations Committee for the University, T. Lynn is also on, and it's number XIV. It doesn't lessen it's importance. We talked about making it 1 and 1(a), or 1 and 2, then you have to remember everything.

So we said no, you know, some of the regs are - just because GR II is about the Board doesn't make it any less important than GR I.

So the new one becomes XIV. So what you have in your package looks kind of messy because what I wanted to show you -- I copied the regulation twice and for the one that will stay as GR I, struck out everything that's going to move. And then for the new XIV, I struck out everything that stays. I don't know if that was the best way, but that's what I did.

So in the new GR I, what's left is the definition, our programs, the vision, mission and values that are established by the Board, then things that were already there, our statement on diversity, shared government, order of communications, use of facilities, political activity, tobacco, solicitation of funds and campus sales. None of those have any real significant changes in the wording of those that aren't in the new sections.

But what that leaves us with, this GR I, is who are we, what are our colleges, how do we use our campus. So it makes sense when you look at it that way.

Now in GR XIV, which is what the team of sub-committees set out to work on, is the actual Ethical Principles and Code of Conduct.

The most significant additions there were to add a new section about compliance responsibilities for the University, compliance responsibilities for all of us, for faculty and staff, as well as the fact that University will protect Whistle Blowers, and then the truth, honesty, and integrity section.

And those are all toward the end of the new GR XIV document. I don't know what page they are in your handout, but in mine those are on page 11 and 12 of the document highlighted in yellow, those new sections.

BLONDER:

So we have two motions, this is the first motion. I just want to mention that Marcy and T. Lynn came to Senate Council twice and these were thoroughly vetted.

So the first motion is regarding Governing Regulation I, and the recommendation from Senate Council is that the Senate endorse the Proposed Changes to Governing Regulations I.

Is there discussion? Are there

questi ons?
HARRI SON: Anne Harri son, Colle ge of Heal th
Sci ences. I thi nk there's a mi stake on the
wri ting of the - the re wri ting of Governi ng
Regul ati ons I.
DEATON: I'm happy to know about that before
we -
HARRI SON: Yeah. I'm sure that's what it is,
but when you look at the page, you start the
A. Statutory Definition -
DEATON: Uh-huh.
HARRI SON: And you go 1., 2., and then what
happened was you struck out the footnotes and
then rewrote that footnote on page 3.
DEATON: Uh-huh.
HARRI SON: And on page 3 you listed the
colleges and you have little notes to self,
it looks like -
DEATON: Yeah. Then -
HARRI SON: - so we did and we coul dn't find
our college.
DEATON: Okay, that's really important.
HARRI SON: We thought that's probably a
mi stake. I haven't gone through those Board
DEATON: mi nutes yet. Okay.
HARRI SON: Do you see where Public Heal th is
on that list?
DEATON: Yes.
HARRI SON: I thi nk that needs to be changed to
the Colle ge of Heal th Sci ences. Then the
hi story that fol lows is the hi story of the
Colle ge of Heal th Sci ences.
DEATON: Okay.
HARRI SON: And when you have renamed Public
Heal th, you need to strike that out.
DEATON: It's not Public Heal th, okay.
HARRI SON: And then Public Heal th is now a
separate college. Colle ge of Publ ic Heal th,
establi shed May 4, 2004. Did I say that
right, John?
WATKI NS: Yeah.
DEATON: Okay. Perfect.
BLONDER: Name please.
WATKI NS: John Watki ns, Colle ge of Publ ic
Heal th. I concur with what Ann did just
talk about too. And it sort of begs the
questi on whether we're ready to endorse the
proposed changes or that we perhaps somehow
recommen d that we endorse the actions towards
the end but recommen d that this goes back to
(UNINTELLIGIBLE) for thorough vetting. That
may include deans of colleges and other
personnel.
DEATON: I - just to make sure all these
dates and college -
WATKI NS: Yeah.
DEATON: - establi shments are correct?
WATKI NS: Yeah. Because I'd hate to put
some thi ng in here then -
DEATON: Ri ght.

WATKINS: - have to go back and re-amend the amendment.

DEATON: I checked them actually down through the College of Design and about where you are is where it got confusing, I will admit.

WATKINS: Yeah.

DEATON: And the Libraries is confusing (UNINTELLIGIBLE). So I do think that it's close enough that we should perhaps - we want this to go to the main Board meeting so I can't - I don't want to hold up the entire document.

But I think that I could double-check all these, I've been pulling the actual Board minutes from 1947 and 1956 so I'll have the right history. And I can send that back out somehow to you or we could share, somehow yet it a little more informally to make sure it is correct.

WATKINS: To the extent --

DEATON: Yeah. I have all of those printed up until about the last several. Just a suggestion. If you have any better suggestions let me know.

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing. Is what the - the Centers for Public Health, were you saying perhaps send it to the deans of each of the colleges and just ask for verification --

DEATON: Yes.

ANDERSON: Of their college?

DEATON: Yes, I can do that.

ANDERSON: And that would be easier than sending it to the Senate Council, I would think.

DEATON: Okay. Absolutely.

BAILLEY: Ernie Bailey, Agriculture. The College of Agriculture was re-named earlier this year, is that (UNINTELLIGIBLE)?

DEATON: That is not in here yet, but I know about that. I already have that (UNINTELLIGIBLE).

BLONDER: Any other comments? Yes.

EFFGEN: Susan Effgen, Health Sciences. So do we have an amendment to add our college back into this document?

DEATON: We'll add your college.

EFFGEN: But I think they have to vote on it if it's an amendment.

BLONDER: What I'll - let me see. The Board meeting is - the next Senate -

UNIDENTIFIED: The meeting is May 6.

DEATON: Okay. The Board meeting is May 14th.

BLONDER: We could postpone this discussion until May 6th and you could bring it back to the Senate at that point with all of these changes or we could amend the motion and vote today.

GROSSMAN: I'd like to propose an amendment to the motion rather than making Marcy come

back, which is to endorse the proposed changes with the modifications suggested during the discussion today.

ANDERSON: Second.
UNIDENTIFIED: And deans modifications.
GROSSMAN: And any deans modifications.
BLONDER: Is there a second?
ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, second.
BLONDER: Okay. So we have an amendment on the floor and it's been seconded. Did you want to --
HARRISON: I wanted to know what the amendment said again, if we could just read, say the amendment again.
GROSSMAN: So instead of a period at the end of this, we'll replace it with a comma, subject to changes mentioned on the floor during this discussion and suggested by deans with respect to their colleges.
BLONDER: And we have a record of the discussion. So that's - we had an amendment and the amendment has been seconded. Should we vote on the amendment?
GROSSMAN: Just for the record I would like to just clarify that the soliciting the input through deans does not give them carte blanche to change anything they want.
DEATON: They'll have to align with the Board minutes from whenever these things happened, yes.
PRATS: Armando Prats, A and S.
Would corrections, needed corrections, work instead of changes?
UNIDENTIFIED: I like corrections.
GROSSMAN: Sure. I have no problem with that.
BLONDER: So do you want to restate the amendment?
GROSSMAN: Sheila, could you read it back, please?
BROTHERS: I'll try. It would say: the proposed changes to Governing Regulations ("The University of Kentucky") subject to the changes mentioned on the floor - subject to the corrections mentioned on the floor during discussion and mentioned by deans regarding their colleges.
BLONDER: And the person who seconded this?
ANDERSON: I seconded that.
GROSSMAN: It's Debra.
BUTLER: J. S. Butler.
I guess I'm the parliamentarian when I'm saying this, if you're trying to figure out who I am. Are all these changes that you proposed to allow in A. 2, B., or are you proposing the changes elsewhere (UNINTELLIGIBLE)?
GROSSMAN: It's just with respect to this section regarding the list of colleges.
BUTLER: In other words, A. 2.
HARRISON: 2 B.
BUTLER: A. 2, and B.
GROSSMAN: A. 2, yes.
BUTLER: Allow changes in A. section 2.

GROSSMAN: Yes.
BLONDER: Did you want to amend the amendment?
BUTLER: Yes. I move to add that (UNINTELLIGIBLE).
BLONDER: So Sheila, do you want to re-read the amendment as amended?
BROTHERS: Motion, comma, subject to corrections mentioned on the floor during discussion and mentioned by deans regarding their colleges in Section A. 2.
BLONDER: All right. Do we need a second to that?
UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.
BRION: I second.
BLONDER: Okay. So now we're going to vote. Is there discussion of the amendment to be amended? Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Okay, the amendment carries. So we have to go back to the first amendment?
BUTLER: Yes.
BLONDER: So the first amendment is Bob's amendment and we need to vote on that. And is there any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Okay. The amendment carries. Now we're back to voting on the main motion, which Sheila had just read the whole motion as amended. Is there any discussion of the motion as amended and amended? All in favor of the motion as amended twice please raise your hand? Opposed? Abstained? Okay, amended amended motion carries. Thank you very much. Now we're on XIV. So the recommendation from Senate Council is that the Senate endorse the proposed new Governing Regulation XIV, Ethical Principles and Code of Conduct. Is there discussion of that?
GROSSMAN: I would just like to point out that if we choose not to endorse this we will not have any ethical principles at all. I strongly recommend that we endorse this.
BLONDER: Any other comments? Okay. All in favor of this motion? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you very much. Next we have a discussion of the sequester and grant funding by the Vice President for Research, Jim Tracy.
TRACY: Good afternoon. Thanks for having me this afternoon. Before I start on the topic of the day, I want to call to your attention to the request for information that came out last week from the National Science Board. The National Science Board with the policy, the advisors meet with the National Science Foundation, they are trying to fight Congress, all the numbers were confirmed by the Senate. They also advise the President of the United States and the

Senate on science issues.

This is your chance, and before I sent this out to the campus, I wanted to bring it up to you. This is your chance to comment, if you're a principle investigator with a federal grant from federally funded research, to identify those policies and institutional requirements that increase your administrative workload.

This is a very serious effort on the part of the Task Force, it's co-chaired by Artie Bienenstock of Stanford and Kelvin Droegemeier from the University of Oklahoma, who is the Vice Chair of the National Science Board, to collect information.

We'll have this posted on our web site and I would encourage all individual investigators to comment. The more people that speak up, the better chance we have of having things changed in Washington.

So sequestration. Because Congress failed to devise a \$1.2 trillion deficit reduction plan by March 1st, the provisions of the Gramm Rudman Hollings Act of 1985 went into effect on March 1, which triggered an \$85.3 billion automatic across-the-board cuts in the discretionary portion of the federal budget. Remember that's only about 25 percent.

Those cuts are split 50/50 between defense and non-defense functions. So if there was any glimmer in this whole thing, is that it was not all put on the non-defense.

It's important to understand that these reductions are permanent reductions unless Congress acts to reverse them.

Moreover, sequestration is scheduled to continue through federal year fiscal 2021, that's September 30th, 2021.

Starting in fiscal '14 and in years subsequent to that, the annual reduction will be 109 billion instead of 85 billion.

The Science Coalition has estimated that the cumulative effect on academic R&D will be \$94 billion over the next 9 years.

In case you can't read it, the caption says: It says here to remove the engine.

Clearly, the Science Coalition, of which UK is a member, and other organizations, including the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities, the Association of American Universities, and others, have been trying to convince Congress that R&D is indeed the engine that drives the US economy.

But we got caught up in the battle going on about whether Congress would act on the deficit or not. When it was proposed over a year ago everybody said sequestration is such a horror that Congress would never let it happen. Well, they decided to go ahead.

UKSenateMeeting-4-8-13.txt

It's important to understand what forces were in play on March 1st. First of all, the Government was operating under a Continuing Appropriations Resolution or CR. That means that they're operating under the previous fiscal year's budget.

Under those terms some agencies like NIH, which is our largest source of grant funds, would approve no more than 90 percent of the previously approved budget.

So if you had a \$250,000 a year grant from NIH you're only getting 225 under a CR.

The other thing that happened is that the sequestration, or the fiscal cliff as it was being called in the media, was supposed to start January 2nd.

As a consequence when the federal fiscal year started on October 1st, agencies quit making new awards. They held them back.

And finally, as is normal behavior when times get tight fiscally, investigators quit spending their cash quite as fast.

So this was the situation on October 1st, or I'm sorry, on March 1st when sequestration went into effect.

Since that time, House Bill 933, the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act in 2013 was passed.

It was started in the House by Representative Rogers of Kentucky. It then went to the Senate. Well, the Senate version led by Senator Barbara Mikulski, a Democrat in Maryland, restored some funding.

Out of fear of not getting this done before March 27th, the House accepted the Senate version and it was signed by President Obama on March 26th. This funds the federal government through September 30th.

Now, the good news in this is that they actually passed some final appropriation bills for some agencies, among these the National Science Foundation, the Department of Energy Office of Science, NASA and the Department of Defense.

Unfortunately, NIH did not fair quite as well and NIH continues to operate under a Continuing Resolution, as does the Department of Education, the Department of Justice, and a bunch of others. So it's a mixed bag.

So what's the impact of sequestration and the modification from H.R. 933? NIH has been required to take a \$1.55 billion permanent reduction of its \$31 billion budget.

It's complicated because Director Francis Collins had given each institute and center director wide latitude into how to implement the cut for those centers and institutes. Some of them may choose to reduce the number of new grants, others will

UKSenateMeeting-4-8-13.txt

renegotiate the scope to diminish the scope and diminish the awards.

We already know that because of the Continuing Resolution, ongoing grants will get no more than 90 percent of currently funded budgets.

It's a big hit. It's a big hit to individuals. Francis Collins says as many as 2500 fewer grants may be given for the balance of this year. That's 25 percent of all the grants that NIH awards.

We just don't know what each center and institute is going to do yet.

The National Science Foundation still has to reduce 350 million from their budget, but their budget was raised so that the cut turns out to be 2.9 percent rather than 5.1 percent.

Subra Suresh, Outgoing Director of NSF, said that they will maintain all existing grants without cutting them and they will not lay off NSF employees. That means fewer new grants will be awarded in the year.

The original estimate was 1,000 fewer grants, now we're hearing it may be 500-ish. But nonetheless, some people are not going to get funded.

Just as another example, the Office of Science and the Department of Energy has had to take a \$245 million reduction. And they have put out an announcement that they may not be providing out year funding on multi year awards. We don't know which ones will be impacted.

Some agencies have been very slow to provide any guidance at all despite requests from the academic community. So what we're doing to advise the campus community, we're posting the notices at the end of our web site and the link is shown there.

All right. That's the federal '13 budget, we're funded through September 30th. What's the outlook for federal '14 that starts October 1?

President Obama is expected to deliver his FY14 budget request to Congress on Wednesday. It was due on February 4th, by law. He ignored the law because he wasn't ready to do it yet. And apparently there's no penalty for violating that particular law.

We're not quite sure what's going to happen, but by all means, now that sequestration is off the table, now that we know the Federal Government will not shut down in the balance of this year, we're starting the new budget dance in Washington.

The House has already come out and said that they will not support the President's budget even though they haven't seen it yet. And on top of all that, we have issues of still have a deficit reduction, gun control, and immigration to deal with.

UKSenateMeeting-4-8-13.txt

So the best political pundits in the country are thinking that Congress is going to kick the budget down the road like a can until we approach October 1st and another deadline. So it's very possible we will live under another Continuing Resolution beginning September 1st.

In fact, there's some cynics who believe we will never pass a permanent federal budget again, we'll just live under CR forever.

The bad news for us is that there is no relief in sight for Research & Development. There is no discussion about increasing R&D funding.

The other thing, although I'm really focusing on research, starting in federal '14, there will be a bigger impact on student financial aid, and continuing impact on healthcare reimbursement to medical centers.

So that's the situation in Washington. What about back here in Lexington?

As you know, the University of Kentucky Research Foundation budget is based on the Facilities & Administrative costs or F&A or indirect cost, income that we receive.

To remind you, F&A income is a reimbursement for expenses already incurred by a university in support of the research enterprise. And importantly, F&A is only realized, we only get the dollars, once the direct costs are spent.

So I said earlier that investigators are slowing down their spending, that slows down the rate of return of our revenue.

Now, we are still in fiscal year '13, we're trying to project what the budget is going to be for the foundation in fiscal year '14 and we impute that from recent awards. And over the last 20 years my office, before my time, has been pretty good at estimating. We've come pretty close most years.

Finally, it's important to understand that federal funds make up 90 percent of the F&A income and half of it's from NIH.

How do we spend the UKRF budget? In fiscal year '12 that ended last June 30th, we expended about \$48.1 million on campus. Thirteen percent of that went to Central Campus expenses. The biggest share is debt service on (UNINTELLIGIBLE) and now on the Bio-Pharm Buildings.

Research Administration occupies about 19 percent, that's how we support the research enterprise. And about two thirds, it varies slightly from year to year, is returned to Faculty & Academic Units either directly in the F&A return or indirectly in

research support.

The single biggest chunk of that is start-up and new faculty. In fiscal year '12 we spent almost \$12 million on start-up and faculty.

Here's the history of F&A income from the past four years and projected for the current year. You'll remember that in fiscal year '09 is when the ARRA law was passed, the Stimulus Bill.

So the peaks that you see in FY10, '11, and '12 reflect the increased grant activity we had as a result of Stimulus. Those grants have all now ended.

And we're sort of back to where we thought we were going to be in fiscal year '09 until we start dealing with the realities of the current budget system, budget cycle.

As of the end of March, F&A income is on budget. We projected just about \$45 million and we're projecting annualized, about 45.2 as of this morning.

Unfortunately, fiscal year '13, non-ARRA federal awards are running 6 to 8 percent below what they were in fiscal year '12. So we've got less money coming in for direct costs and less for new grant costs.

The best we can project right now is that the impact of sequestration for the balance of our fiscal year through June 30th may lower these awards by an additional 5 to \$8 million.

That is a ballpark guess. Until we know what individual institutes and centers at NIH, or what NSF is going to do, we won't know for sure, but I can tell you that number is consistent with what other universities are projecting from the cut in their federal awards.

So decreased awards will impact the FY14 UKRF Budget. Right now we're projecting an anticipated F&A income of 38 to \$42 million, by comparison in FY12 that was a little over 50 million.

Our obligations and commitments, things we have already committed to pay, we're required to pay, like debt service, at the end of February was \$46 million. So we're looking right now, and fiscal year '14 hasn't started, at a shortfall between 4 and \$8 million in the UKRF Budget.

So given that I consulted with the Provost, the Deans, the President and the EVPFA about what we should do.

Beginning March 1 these are the interim actions that we can take. We're going to honor all formalized commitments. So any faculty member that has a commitment to start-up going out in the future, we have the money to cover it.

I know that there's at least one public institution that has pulled back on existing commitments, we are not. Let me

reassure you, we are not.

But we have paused in making new commitments for the UKRF Budget until we have a better sense of what the fiscal year '14 revenue is going to look like. Not we're stopping, we're pausing.

We're going to continue to provide full research support and I've ordered a limitation on all expenditures in Research Administration and Operation.

Normally, we try to send people from OSPA to one professional development meeting a year, we're not going to allow that kind of travel. We're not going upgrade computers. It's small, but we think it's important that we try in whole.

If this continues, I will order a permanent reduction to research operation's budgets.

And with that, I'll take any questions or comments you have.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.

Just a quick question. What percentage of that, of the pie, should apply to -- they include research support and --

TRACY: Uh-huh.

GROSSMAN: What percentage of the blue part is start-up?

TRACY: Okay. Now you're going to make me do math off the top of my head.

GROSSMAN: Sorry.

TRACY: No, no, that's fine.

GROSSMAN: No, not that one.

TRACY: No, I know.

GROSSMAN: Yeah, there it is.

TRACY: So two thirds of 48 million, 36 million, so it's a third of all the money that we spend is supporting start-up.

GROSSMAN: So it's about half of the blue pie is start-up.

TRACY: Yes.

GROSSMAN: Thanks.

SWANSON: Hollie Swanson, College of Medicine.

So a number of the departments, including mine, are hiring new faculty now as we speak. So what does that mean with respect to their start-up?

TRACY: So number one, you're in the College of Medicine. The College of Medicine gets a block grant at the start of the year. They've already got their FY14 money. How that's going to (UNINTELLIGIBLE) and the departments.

So I can't tell you specifically. But that allocation of funds has already been set aside.

SWANSON: Okay.

TRACY: What we're doing is not following up on any new commitment as of March 1.

BRI ON: Well, I'll follow-up on that. Gail Bri on, College of Engineering.

We have a faculty hire that we're

negotiating in the College of Engineering as we speak. Start-up or no start-up?

TRACY: If we have already issued a written letter of commitment, it will be funded. If not, we will hold the request and we will deal with the request as funds become available on an academic priority basis in consultation with the Provost.

So do you have a letter? If you don't have a letter, there's no money there.

BRI ON: There's been no letter signed that I received.

TRACY: Then there's no money at this point. We would encourage you to talk to them, but we can't make any additional commitments.

We cannot drive the UKRF Budget deeper in debt. The Board of Trustees has not given us permission to (UNINTELLIGIBLE).

SWANSON: Am I allowed a second question? So one thing that you haven't talked about is how this could affect our graduate students.

TRACY: How would it affect your graduate students? Well, I think first of all, if you look at a decreased award from NIH or NSF, say you lost 10 percent from NIH, that's 25,000, that's in my mind, that's about a graduate student. So that's one way it could impact it.

We have already provided, and we've already committed, the \$4 million that we give to the graduate school, that's already committed for FY14. That's already there.

Those commitments are made well ahead of time. So when I said we had 4 to 6 million in obligations and commitments, that's already there for '14. Who knows what FY15 will look like at this point.

BLONDER: Other questions? Davy?

JONES: What does the --

BLONDER: Name and affiliation.

JONES: Davy Jones, Toxicology. What does the reduction, the operations in your office mean in terms of support for the activities of the MDRCs that report to you as their primary academic -

TRACY: Right now we've committed all the support that we need for fiscal year '14 for all the activities and research support that we do.

So '14 we're good. We're just not making additional commitments beyond what we've already made at this point. But we will be operating at a deficit.

So to be quite open with you, we the excess funds that we received particularly in fiscal year '11 and '12, we squirreled some of that money away which is going to cover the shortfall.

We won't be able to do that for more than a couple of years before we're out of money.

UKSenateMeeting-4-8-13.txt

GROSSMAN:

Bob Grossman, A and S.

The situation in the research faculty is particularly precarious currently. And so I was wondering if there are any discussions as to providing some - although hopefully there would be bridge funding for some of the research faculty or are we just - how are you going to lose the students there if the grants expire, they don't get a new one or?

BLONDER:

I believe they would have to be given one year notice.

GROSSMAN:

They'd have to be given - is the case, they have to be given one year notice after their grants expire? And if they get a new grant during that time they are able to be kept on, is that?

TRACY:

That's my understanding. But where the bench funding will come, I don't know. That is a serious issue.

I will tell you if you look actually at the salaries of research (UNINTELLIGIBLE) faculty on this campus, more of it comes from University funds than you might suspect. Obviously we're in a tough position for all bridge funding.

This is an unprecedented situation across the country. I don't think I've seen in my career, and I'm almost 40 years now, a time when the prospect that - okay, it's going to be tight for six or eight months before the (UNINTELLIGIBLE) will start up.

This is the first we're actually looking at a substantial decrease in support for R&D across the country. We are now, the United States, as a whole, at the lowest percentage of the GDP for R&D that's been since World War II.

But the disappointing thing, if you look at the total grant making activity in the federal government, mostly block grants for cities, states, tribes. What we know as R&D is less than 5 percent of the total. So we're a bump to them.

The other thing what I heard in Washington which blew me away is that Congress now considers the million dollar budget cuts, because we're dealing with a 4 trillion dollar budget, up or down a few million dollars means nothing to them.

So when I meet with our members I try to point out what a million dollars means to the University and the students.

One of my real concerns unrelated to research since our new budget cut (UNINTELLIGIBLE) is that one out of four students at UK gets a Pell Grant. Pell Grants are federally funded so the true academic year '15, '14, there'll be no change.

But if sequestration continues after that there will be cuts substantially. What we don't know is whether they'll keep

the dollar amount of the Pell Grant the same and give fewer awards or cut the size of the Pell Grant. Either way, it's going to impact those students that are on the (UNINTELLIGIBLE) college, which could then impact enrollments.

We also don't know because federal employees who say if you're a contractor for the Department of Defense, and there's quite a few of them in Kentucky, those people are going to be furloughed for at least 14 days in fiscal year '13, '14.

How many of those will be unable to send their kids to college because of that furlough, we don't know yet.

So it's not just R & D that's being impacted. It's affecting everybody.

BLONDER:
SWANSON:

Are there other questions?

This is somewhat unrelated. Hollie Swanson, College of Medicine.

But it just triggered a thought about the vets, the returning vets and their educational grants, have those also been cut?

TRACY:

So far they're not. The VA has been fully funded and it's my understanding that President Obama is proposing an increase in the VA budget. I don't know where the money will come from to pay for that, but that's what's been leaked in the budget that will come out on Wednesday.

BLONDER:
TRACY:
BLONDER:

I'd like to ask a question.

Sure.

The indirect costs that you deliver back to the units and to the colleges, what is the status of that?

TRACY:

For '14 it's all coming back. It's already been budgeted. We're set there.

BLONDER:
TRACY:

Okay. And then after that?

Well, after that we may be under a new budget model and under that budget model the colleges will get credit for 100 percent of their F&A and then we would be taxed for administrative costs. But they're still -- we're still -- the Executive Committee is still talking about how it's going to be handled.

JONES:

A while back, you told some of us --

BLONDER:
JONES:

Name and affiliation.

Davy Jones, Toxicology.

- that Washington was on the verge of having a major change in circular A 21 which is where our (UNINTELLIGIBLE) comes from. What's the status of that?

TRACY:

So let's see. I'm going to forget the date of these. Early February the Council on Financial Assistance Reform or COFAR, released what is being called the omnibus circular A81 because of taking eight circulars and putting them into one. That would include A110, which is the administrative side of academics, A21, the costing, and A133, the audit.

UKSenateMeeting-4-8-13.txt

That whole 278 page document was published in the federal register, mid February. The Council on Governmental Relations, COGR, which represents 190 research universities, there's a team of about 35 people working on a draft response to that. That's supposed to be released in the next 8 to 10 days. I'm on one of the COGR committees and we'll be looking at that.

In the long run I don't think we'll see many changes, there may be a few positives, a few negatives. But it's probably going to be another year or two before that's actually put into effect by R&D. And we'll keep you all posted.

If you want to read it and comment on it, you're more than welcome too. Other comments?

BLONDER:

Any other questions?

TRACY:

Let me assure you, we will put up dates on our web site, if anything breaks we'll get the word out on campus. And as you've got concerns, send them to me. We really want to support the research enterprise and keep them going. We have to figure out how to do it efficiently and (UNINTELLIGIBLE).

BLONDER:

Thank you very much.

TRACY:

Thank you for having me.

FINKEL:

Is that web site available? Do you got the URL?

BLONDER:

Okay. We've reached the end of the meeting. And the next meeting is May 6, it's in the Lexmark Room not in this room. Please remember that. And that will be the last meeting of the academic year. And I need a motion to adjourn.

WOOD:

So moved.

GROSSMAN:

Second.

BLONDER:

All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. See you next month.

UKSenateMeeting-4-8-13.txt
C E R T I F I C A T E O F S E R V I C E

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY)
COUNTY OF HARRISON)

I, LISA GRANT CRUMP, 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 I was not present at said proceedings; that said proceedings were transcribed from the digital file(s) in this matter by me or under my direction; and that the foregoing is a true record of the proceedings to the best of our ability to hear and transcribe same from the digital file(s).

My commission expires: April 6, 2015.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 6th day of June, 2013.

LISA GRANT CRUMP
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE-AT-LARGE
K E N T U C K Y
NOTARY ID 44052