

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt  
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

\* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \*

February 11, 2013

\* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \*

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

\* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \*

BLONDER: As appropriate, acknowledge and respect others, silence your electronic devices and communicate with your constituency.

After that item, I'd like to mention that Raphael Finkel, Senator (inaudible) takes copious notes on these meetings and any other Senator who would like to have a copy of Raphael's notes, please e-mail him.

I'd like to introduce now, President Capilouto, who's also the University Senate Chair. He will be giving us a spring update. President Capilouto?

CAPILOUTO: Thank you. Thank you, Lee, it's a pleasure to be here. And I wanted to give you, hopefully in a compact period of time, a little update on what's happened here at the University over the last several months and to commend you for making it possible for me to serve as a strong advocate.

First of all, we continue to make progress on our campus living/learning

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

facilities. I think you've noticed there are five different projects underway. Bricks are being laid down across the street at Central 1 and 2, and we have cranes that will be coming on board on the north and on south parts of the campus.

We opened a new research facility at the Center for Applied Research. Our hospital was named the best in Kentucky. We signed a memorandum of understanding, or a letter of intent, to manage Eastern State Hospital and we were sought after to do that by the State of Kentucky.

Our students entertained thousands of people at Phantom of the Opera and our faculty in ways big and small bring life to this campus every day and I'm pleased to be a part of it.

We have a legislative update that I want to share with you. Perhaps you've heard that the House of Representatives approved by a 98 to 1 vote three projects for which we're asking permission to launch and finance with our own funding.

First the Gatton College of Business, a \$65 million project, funded largely by philanthropic means. Next the Academic Science Building, a \$100 million project, two thirds of which will be funded by our Athletics Department. And finally Commonwealth Stadium and the Nutter Training Facility, improvements in those two structures, financed entirely by Athletics and new revenues associated with the project.

It's been terrific to hear throughout the state how there was tremendous support for these and I'd like to share with you why I think our story resonates.

And I've talked to literally hundreds, maybe thousands of people about these projects.

First I think people recognize that we had principle of choices that we made, principles of access and affordability throughout the ballooning tuition increases next year, our commitment to invest in our faculty.

The donor support that was coming forward. I could tell you various stories about people who haven't lived in this state for decades but they are giving back because of the way people touched them when they were students. Quite generously. You'll hear more about these people in the next few weeks.

The partnership with Athletics was recognized as unique financing, is seen seldom across the nation, and I can't discount the impact of the Big Blue Nation getting involved and contacting the legislators about this.

And lastly, I want to recognize a

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

terrific team from folks who work day to day in Frankfort, our lobbyists, our PR Department, friends, members of the Board of Trustees, everybody who got involved in this.

We were able to carry our story to the Governor, the legislative leadership, all the major newspapers, editorial boards, campus. We hope we were able to reach you. Blogs, public radios, sports, news, everybody picked up on the story.

I only feel regret for that person that didn't vote in favor of this project. I understand there are people all over the state looking for this poor legislator. They want to know why he couldn't support it. I even heard rumors that he left his office early this week because he knew people were coming.

Anyway, and this Big Blue Nation United: This communications effort where we turn to thousands of followers who express support. We sent out messages to 47,000 alumni and when I showed up in Frankfort last week people were begging me to turn the (unintelligible) off. But it's not over until it's over.

The Senate has to consider this Bill which I hope they will this week, and we will stay on top of it and appreciate your support.

I wanted to give you an update on some of the topics discussed at our January Board meeting.

First of all, our UK Confucius Institute, there are 430 of these in 115 countries. And thanks to Susan Carvalho and Huajing Maske and many others, ours was ranked the institute of the year. And having traveled to China this summer and watched the incredible vibrancy, the engagement, and respect we have, when I was in China, I certainly wasn't surprised by this (unintelligible).

The residence halls, we have about \$130 million of residence halls that are under construction or will be in the next few months. And we anticipate that the firm that is investing in Kentucky is quite willing to step forward and make a similar investment in the near future.

Our UK Athletics Committee wanted to focus on performance in the classroom by UK athletes and I wanted to share that with you.

And I'll spent a little bit of time. Our Board of Trustees, as I'm sure you are, are quite interested in where this eLearning is going on our campus and around the country.

So first Athletics. There are a few questions that the Trustees wanted answered. Number 1, do our students, student athletes, make -- take advantage of the wide

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

array of disciplines that we have here at the University of Kentucky.

It's not presented in this block, but we showed the distribution of the colleges in which our students are enrolled comparing athletes to non-student athletes and the strong similarity.

We even monitor clustering of student athletes in courses that they take to make sure that, you know, that that is not going on. So we shared that information.

In terms of academic performance there are two immediate ways to measure performance. One that the NCAA developed called a Academic Progress Rate, it's a multi-year average. This tracks progress year-to-year. The cut off point is 930. All of our deans are safely above that.

In fact, we're one of only two universities in the Southeastern Conference that has never had an APR violation. The other one is Vanderbilt.

These are our grade point averages by different sports, you can see those and that certainly generated some interest and some questions.

The most telling outcome measure one wants to examine though is graduation rates. And so when you look at what's happened among student athletes in the last decade, and keep in mind that the most recent information we have on our student athletes and on campus, is it's a six year graduation rate. These are the people who entered in 2006. You know, the 2012 we won't know until at the end of this year.

Okay, but over this period of time, Athletics -- our student athletes have started out at a 45 percent graduation rate and improved to 58 percent. So continuous improvement along the way.

On campus, all of you know these data. We've been pretty stubborn in being able to move these stubborn numbers, excuse me. We have to remain committed to this.

Oh, incidentally this week I had to present to the CPE, Council on Postsecondary Education. They are paying more careful attention to performance measures across all universities. You have to present your progress according to the scorecard that they developed.

I happened this year to present along with the University of Louisville. They have two universities present at a time. And I wanted to share with you because this generated some questions too.

This is the progress that Louisville had made in their graduation rates, starting certainly much lower than we had here, 35 percent. But they've moved up to 49 percent. That generated a lot of questions as well.

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

So what about this online learning? I'll confess that I heard enough about this that last week I signed up for a MOOC. And last night I even had courage to take the exam and got my immediate feedback. It's an interesting kind of experience. It's free. I invite you to do it. You can go onto Coursera and look at some of these and form your own opinions about this.

But Vince Kellen -- the Board wanted to discuss this in more depth. So after the entire meeting is over we had an open discussion of all Board members for a little over an hour to talk about many of these matters; trying to understand where it's all going; what it means for University of Kentucky and so forth.

We recognize, as Vince pointed out, there is continued growth in online learning, although the increase last year was, I believe, the smallest increase in a while.

We recognize the opportunity that people will see in programmatic offerings, but also recognize some of the pitfalls of doing these kinds of things. But I encourage you to further engage in this discussion. It's going to be something that affects all of us.

I also wanted to share with you my gratitude for all the people who participated in the numerous campus conversations we've had. I want to thank Lee and Mike Adams, Chair of the Staff Senate for organizing these.

We also had, you know, those random groups come together and then the Provost and I have met with all the colleges and various student and staff constituent groups too over the past year. And these have been very informative and very helpful.

Update on the Provost search. We formed a committee late in the winter semester. The public website is launched and we've had campus-wide emails you probably all received.

The first applications, the Search Committee recommended to me that we use Witt/Kieffer, a search firm and I agreed. We're contacting alumni, posting articles in the Kernel. The committee has hosted three open forums to get feedback about this. They've evaluating applications.

Through this February/March period, I understand from our Co-Chairs, Drs. Lee and Carlson that there's been good response. The process will work where you would invite a longer list of candidates to our campus. We'd love for them to have an opportunity to look.

During those first meetings we like to ensure the candidate that it's a confidential meeting. They're still looking at us and it's a good way to get people to

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

take a serious look at you.

Certainly after that the process would be very public once you would decide which candidates we were going to seriously consider.

In the campus feedback that I've received at all these meetings, certainly one of the questions I frequently get is about our financial model of accountability.

I have Melody Flowers with me today. She told me on the way over that she's literally conducted hundreds of meetings about this. You see the different sort of components of this discussion. We try to refine our value-based model, regular discussion at Steering Committee meetings, Dean's Council, Budget Office Meetings, and ongoing communications about this ongoing communications about this with an Implementation Team.

We still have work to do. We hope that if we agree on a model that we'd like to use that we would stick with our current model and have this shadow system over here be able to take a look and understand what kind of implications it would have for us if we were to introduce it and to certainly modify it. And that's what you need to do with all kinds of budgeting systems.

So, I'm excited about the opportunities for more transparency and understanding about our budget and thank Melody and Interim Provost Tracy, and all of those who have participated in that activity.

Next I wanted to turn this over to Bob Wiseman to talk a little bit about our Master Plan. We've had some open forums. We've had good feedback through a survey device we used and I want him to talk with you (unintelligible).

WI SEMAN:

Thank you, Dr. Capilouto. I think -- I believe it was at the December meeting we briefed you on our facilities transformation plan that we produced internally last summer.

The Master Plan is a consultant driven process that will conclude later on this spring. It's being conducted by Sasaki, and it's essentially to try to look at the physical nature of the campus over the next 20, 30 years as to where we would grow and how we meet the strategic plans of the University.

So we've had a number of meetings and I'll share those with you briefly here. As you can see we have had a tremendous amount of outreach. We met with every neighborhood association that borders our campus in September, as well as community organizations, as well as the City Planning Staff.

In October we met with the retail owners and merchants, the Deans Council, the

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

Landlord Association. We invited all the Faith Communities that are near to our campus in to talk about their long-range plans and what we could do as well. And then we met with one further neighborhood association.

In November we met with the Greek Community. We discussed here with the Faculty and Staff, Stu -- or Faculty and Staff Forum. We had a Student Forum.

And we have an Advisory Committee that is composed of folks from across campus. We have a number of faculty on it, a number of -- the University Senate has a representative in Alice Christ. We have several deans on it and we have a number of administrators on it.

We met with them and briefed them, got their input. And then we have an Executive Committee that is essentially composed of the President, Mike Carr, Mitch Barnhart and some others, that are the senior level, to get their input on it.

In December we held something very interesting that I'll touch base on briefly which was a North Campus Charrette we conducted in cooperation with the City and the churches on the north end.

And then in February just last week, we held a Community Open House in the College of Pharmacy where our consultants were in town and showed our boards and our plans. And as of this afternoon all of the slide show that we presented to campus is up on the Master Plan website so you can tap into this in detail.

The website before I get into it, is an open-ended exchange. You can have input, you can see everything we've done and the minutes from all our meetings.

One of the things that Sasaki did which is interesting, I won't turn it on but it's interactive, you go by hours of the day and each spot on campus will light up as to the number of students that are present at that hour on campus.

I don't think it will come as a surprise, campus population peaks Tuesday at two p.m. We did click on Friday afternoon late and I won't share that. But it's a fascinating thing.

And what that will help us do is determine where we might put coffee shops, where we might put student amenities and other things like dining, going forward. So it's a handy tool.

The Master Plan presented two concepts and I won't deal at length with either of them, you can go on and look at the website. The purple circles that you see are recommendations for limiting traffic into campus.

The Newtown Pike extension is going to greatly impact campus and one concept is

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt  
to close Upper Street and Limestone. Another concept, Concept 2, which I'll share in a minute, keeps Upper open.

The Administration Drive, we have looked at how that whole entry into our campus will change and long term do we want that entrance to remain or should we make that a little different.

The yellow boxes are probably the more interesting aspects of how we close or modify traffic patterns on campus to pedestrianize campus. Rose Street has effectively been closed to cross campus traffic.

Now the question is can we limit it in the heart of our campus where the student and faculty crossings have the greatest impacts. So we've had preliminary conversations with the city as well about that.

We're also looking at Washington Avenue as a potential site to close to everything but emergency vehicles and disability parking and some service traffic as opposed to a real traffic unit.

And then we're looking at building a loop around Cooperstown which would effectively be the campus bypass in some way.

The red boxes have several concepts, particularly the Kerwan Blending area. Consultants talked with us about three concepts.

One is we keep Kerwan Blending as it is and renovate which is a tough challenge given the structure of the building, but they gave a concept of doing that.

The second one was to leave the tower, to tear the low rises down.

The third was the demolition of the entire site and a replacement of the entire site.

Second plan, when you go on, details all of those a little more. The one I would highlight is the one on North Campus where we looked at Good Sam going north to downtown. Long vetted concepts try to link campus with downtown was the bulk of our mutual advantages.

As I say, we met with the city planning staff, with the churches in the neighborhood and the Neighborhood Association and some major landowners to say going forward how can we keep talking and mutually benefit all of us with some faculty and/or upper class and graduate student housing was one of the concepts that was discussed; a more mixed use in that area.

Finally I would just say that everything we've talked about with the neighborhoods, with -- internally, is on our website and that is the site. And you can just look up UKY Master Plan and you'll find it. But it has all the notes, all the maps,



SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt  
and all the charts plus the interactive  
population of campus which is fun.

So with that, I'll turn it back to  
Dr. Capilouto.

CAPILOUTO: I wanted to close with a couple of  
experiences that have been tremendous over  
the last few weeks and I think reflect so  
positively on some of the things we have  
ongoing here at the University of Kentucky.

First of all, we were invited by  
the National Cancer Institute to compete for  
NCI designation. It will be a nice feather  
in our cap.

It is terrific that we are 1 of 60  
Centers for Clinical and Translational  
Research. And it would be a great addition  
to, I think, our reputation if we were to  
achieve this status.

I told the visiting committee that  
there were several reasons I thought they  
should consider the University of Kentucky.  
The first was we've invested in  
ourselves.

Over the past several years, I  
think, since 2009 there's been \$114 million  
invested in human capital and infrastructure.  
Part of it is state supported money in terms  
of the new laboratories in the College of  
Pharmacy building. Some is from our  
successful health enterprise. Some by the  
Office of the Provost and some by generous  
donors.

But we've invested in ourselves.  
And we think we're worthy of their  
investment.

I also said we had a culture of  
collaboration here. We're one of the few  
universities, you hear me say this often,  
that has the array of disciplines and  
colleges on a contiguous campus.

It was, I think, powerful that  
several of the schools and their deans were  
there, represented by their deans all day  
throughout the site visit.

Third I said, we have a history  
about addressing our problems. And I think  
to me it's being rooted as a Land Grant  
University.

We lead the country in cancer  
deaths, 41 of the 54 most distressed  
counties, both on economic measures and  
health measures, are in this catchment area  
in the Appalachian region.

And so I'm encouraged. I couldn't  
stay for the final end of the site visit, but  
I heard that -- this doesn't happen all the  
time -- but the site visit being applauded.

So I want to thank Dr. Evers and  
an incredible team. That group rehearsed  
three times. And made me go through it three  
times. And they were just hitting home run  
after home run for some tough questions  
during the several hours I was there. And

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt  
they should be commended.

Last Friday I was happy to participate with the Governor and other legislative leaders as we announced the National Center for Innovation in Education.

We were able to attract Gene Wilhoit back. Again what excites him is being on a campus like ours where he has a community of scholars who whom to collaborate on issues facing P-12. Gene is a national leader. There's \$1.4 million in initial grant.

Eli Edwards was there. He participated in the ceremony. I think he would agree with me that there was a lot of energy in the room and I appreciated all the faculty who were there in Frankfort for the announcement.

We need our students to be better prepared in Kentucky. We're now at the epicenter of some terrific work that will be going on and watched nationwide.

And then the biggest treat for me was our basketball game last week, we had our dinner for our Great Teacher Awards. And I'm quoting Armando here, all of the responses by the recipients were touching, but he said we have to teach our students to become their own best teachers.

And I think that sums up a lot and it was gratifying to participate and recognize these outstanding teachers. It certainly holds the key for our future.

With that, Dr. Blonder, I will open this up for questions and close in thanking you again for tremendous work. I know I share lots of data about what we do, but I tell more stories.

One story I'll get to tell again, we had a student here at the University of Kentucky who we lost last year. And I called the parents last year and they told me how our Dean of Students and our Vice President of Student Affairs and so many people had reached out to them.

But they also told me about a faculty member that stood in line at a visitation to speak to them and how it helped bring closure to something that was very unsettling.

That faculty member and I would exchange emails over the last year, but I had never met her. I met her at a holiday party this year.

And she had maintained so much contact with that family that now they want to send their daughter here so I met with them in my office this morning.

And to hear what they say about you and your colleagues is the biggest delight you can have in your college profession.

I thank you and I'm happy to answer any questions you might have.

BLONDER:

Bob?

GROSSMAN:

Bob Grossman, A and S.

So what are the current plans for the Academic Science Building in terms of what disciplines and also the range of activities that will be going on in that building --

UNIDENTIFIED:

Pharmacology.

GROSSMAN:

-- especially in terms of will there research space?

CAPILOUTO:

Sure. I'm going to let Bob Wiseman comment on that. I'm not trying to dodge it, but here's what I will tell that will help you. You had this moment in time when you could put all of this together. All right? And you know, you got to understand, I'm sure you do, in Kentucky now, it's a narrow window of time.

And you know, that General Assembly, they meet every year but they really only get into budgets every other year and all. So we saw this opportunity in a non-election year to charge through with something that we thought would work.

So I told them it was going to be shovel ready. That's as far as I could go because we got lots of planning to do. But I'll let Bob talk about some of the initial thoughts.

WISEMAN:

I think the first step is we have not planned it yet. I think that's important to say.

As I've told the President, I don't think there's any more important building on this campus over the next number of years to get right.

And the Provost and I have had a couple of conversations, but the first step needs to be assembling a group of folks from the disciplines to plan the concept of the building.

You figure out the concept before you hire the architects, before you do any of that. That's the next step on the plan and I have not heard yet from the Provost who the team members are. But that is the first step is to get that concept and all going. After that we're going to be touring some modern facilities to see what works, what doesn't.

And it's a real challenge because it's not -- I viewed and I said to the President, this isn't a replacement for Chemistry Physics, per se, it's 40 years in the future. What's that supposed to look like.

So it is not planned and that's starting now and there will be a team.

CAPILOUTO:

I will say that the initial assumption is that it certainly would have research space.

We said in the presentations we made that given the scale of the building, it's unlikely we could finish it all in the

first phase, so there may be shell spacing.

But I'd rather be positioned so that we could move quickly in the future. I do think NSF and NIH will come back. It's going to be important to have the facility and the talent in what I think will be an opportunity.

BLONDER: Other questions for the President?

PRESIDENT: Yes?

BRION: What do you think the vote in the Senate's going to be --

BROTHERS: Name please?

BRION: Gail Brion, College of Engineering. If you had to place a bet, what would you bet, 50/50, 60/40, or a landslide?

CAPILOUTO: One vote will do for me. One vote margin and I'll be happy.

I think there's lots of excitement about this. You know, when we met with the leadership of both the House and Senate and the Governor, these folks came together and have been very supportive and worked with their membership.

Each caucus has a different set of issues they have to deal with.

I'm real pleased that they've agreed to try to do this early in the session because in a little while they'll start arguing with each other and we don't want to be in the middle of it, but they're committed to getting it done soon and I hope we can (Inaudible).

SWANSON: Hollie Swanson, College of Medicine.

So when we think about going through this budget process and we think about all the other universities that have already gone through it, what are the most important lessons that we can learn from them about what we can anticipate?

CAPILOUTO: Elaborate on that. Who are the other universities that have gone through exactly what? Sorry.

SWANSON: Well, changing from, you know, I know you don't want to call it an RCM based model, but when we go to that type of accounting system, you know, so we have in our mind what's going to happen, but we don't know yet. We really don't know what reality is going to look like and so how can we help bridge that?

CAPILOUTO: Well, I can -- I'll share with you that you don't know what reality looks like now because it's all in big black box somewhere.

So you're going to have some more information than you've ever had about our budgets here on campus. And I think that -- that will be a welcomed experience. It will invite I think more informed comments that will be helpful to administrators both at my level and at the college level.

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S.

I'm wondering if we could get back to the Academic Science Building for a second. I mean, I just have to say I've spent years of my life talking to architects and -- and planning committees about space for Biology which in the end didn't come through because of the ability to get funds for medical school kinds of things.

And I'm wondering, you know, as I -- as I see kind of this plan -- the plans for this, what had first been thought of as room for Chem Phys, changing a little.

I'm wondering if you can sort of commit some space to -- to those departments because there only seems to be, from the history of this type of thing, there seems to be something that motivates these things, but our history on campus is really that we kind of get away from that as this project proceeds.

CAPILOUTO: I'm certainly not going to commit space because I hope you appreciate that would be way premature. I'm committed to a process that's going to invite a lot of input.

We proposed and costed out a 260,000 square foot building, right Bob?

WISEMAN: Right.

CAPILOUTO: We've got lots of discussions that need to take place on this campus. I hope you'll respect that. I just don't know.

But I am convinced that, you know, the -- when it comes to our student populations and how we're trying to best serve these students, how to have the optimal classrooms both in size and flexibility and technology, the College of Business and the Chem Phys Building represent the second and most third heavily utilized buildings on campus. And that's why I thought it was important that they would be targeted to get that space completely.

I think we need to have lots of discussions about that and also the research capabilities and designs in those buildings.

DEBSKI: Right. So Chem Phys still remains a priority and that -- I mean, there's an intersection of how to get the money for the building, right?

CAPILOUTO: Intersection of how to get the money?

DEBSKI: Yeah. Where the money can most easily come from.

CAPILOUTO: What do you mean by that?

DEBSKI: So funding for the other levels of the building? Is there --

CAPILOUTO: Sure. Here's the -- so right now, you know, it's a \$100 million project. We have \$65 million from Athletics. The balance of that right now we hope to bridge through two mechanisms: Philanthropy. Now that we have some momentum and we can show people that we get things done. I'm encouraged by

that.

And then the other piece, the discussions we've had about our budget where we carved out money to cover debt service. The Legislature wanted to know, how you going to pay for this? And we're able to say, here it is in our budget. So that's that.

I think that we're pretty sure we can't complete the whole building. But that's fine. Get the shell up and the space. We'll have to -- I hope even that the state budget starts to rebound some and they want to get into capital projects and maybe they'd be in position to finish the space.

So there's the capital side and then there's the question of what goes on in that space and I think we need to be open to discussion.

BLONDER: I think we have time for one more question. Is there someone who hasn't yet asked a question who would like to?

Gail?  
BRI ON: Gail Bri on, College of Engineering. The new budget model that we're going to, does being on that budget model have perhaps prevented us from having this \$22 million that was squirreled away or would have shown up or where did that money come from? Could we get some more of it? And how's it going to be spent?

CAPILOUTO: Well, the \$22 million that, you know, in the revised budget came from a couple of sources. One we reduced the amount we were going to dedicate to debt service for capital projects by \$5 million. That translated into \$65 million of capital. We're fortunate to be able to make that gap up now with funding from Athletics.

We still have \$135 million that we budgeted for to use for capital.

The vast majority of the money, I don't have -- it's either 12 or \$16 million, came from enrollment growth. So if you want to know where more of it is, if we were to retain, instead of graduating 60 percent of our students, if we graduated 68 percent, we'd probably have \$20 million in recurring funds a year.

BLONDER: Thank you very much, President Capi louto.

CAPILOUTO: Thank you.

BLONDER: Okay. The next item on our agenda is approval of the minutes from December 10. We've received no changes to the minutes that were circulated, so because there were no corrections, the minutes of December 10, 2012 stand approved by unanimous consent.

Next item: I'd like to announce that this is the last Senate meeting for Michelle Sohner, the Senate Sergeant at Arms. Michelle, would you mind coming up here, please?

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

Michelle began serving as the University Senate Sergeant at Arms when she was hired to work in the Ombud's office in 1990. And we have a plaque that we'd like to present to her.

And I'd like to ask for the Senate Council Chairs to please come up here and let's have a picture with the five Senate Council Chairs.

And we have a number of people here, thank you so much.

And the past Ombuds, are there past Ombuds here? The current Ombud?

Okay. Thank you.

Next on the announcements, I'd like to welcome our three new Senate Council members, Alice Christ, College of Fine Arts, Andrew Hippisley, College of Arts and Sciences, and David Watt, College of Medicine. They began their terms in January and they will continue until December of 2015.

I have a number of additional announcements. I had mentioned I think in December that we were going to try to pilot using clicker technology. However, upon further investigation it's proving to be a lot more difficult than we had anticipated so we are going to table the idea for now and perhaps revisit it later.

Next announcement is that Connie Wood, College of Arts and Sciences, Department of Statistics, was elected to be the next Vice Chair of the Senate Council following Bob Grossman whose term ends May 31st. Connie's term will run from June 1st, 2013 through May 31st, 2014.

We wanted to just mention that the ad hoc committee on ex-officio members and their voting rights that we put together last semester is resuming meetings this semester.

Also, as a reminder, due to changes in the Senate Rule that the Senate approved last spring, the Health Care Colleges Council will no longer review graduate courses or programs unless there's a clinical component.

And the Senate Rules and Elections Committee is working on a litmus test that we can then use to program into eCATs so that there's no confusion about this.

The Senate Council appointed two additional faculty to the Senate Academic Facilities Committee. Those two people are Scott Wright, Fine Arts and Ryan Hargrove from Ag. They will -- they are serving -- they've been appointed to the Student Housing Academic Advisory Committee that's chaired by the Vice President for Student Affairs, Robert Mock.

As I understand, that committee is going to be looking into living/learning communities in the new dorms and other issues. So we have two representatives now

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

that are on that committee.

Also, just to report to you that the Senate Council members had an informal chat with Board Chair Britt Brockman. No business was conducted during that chat.

I, as Chair, approved two additions to the degree list on behalf of Senate Council and the Senate. These two students were eliminated due to administrative -- were not on the list due to administrative error.

Also, the Senate Council approved a small change to the 2013/2014 calendar for the Grad School. The last day for candidates for a May degree to sit for a final exam changed from April 18th to April 19th.

Some follow-ups. The Senate action on the BA/BS Foreign Language and International Economics, that's the FLIE program, the CPE had not -- was not notified to discontinue the FLIE program so it was still in their degree inventory. As a result, it's been reactivated, it does not need to go to the Board of Trustees as we had thought in December.

eCATS, as you know, is still in the first year of a pilot. We've recently discovered that some courses are arriving in Senate Council months after the last Council had approved them.

This is not the norm, but it is occurring so we're trying to work with the programmers to figure this out. And I just wanted to report that to you.

The Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement, G.T. Lineberry, appointed an advisory group. And the advisory group consists of faculty that were -- some of whom were nominated by Senate Council and some of whom were nominated by the dean. And the Senate Council Chair is an ex-officio member.

Also, Ms. Brothers is taking a five p.m. class this semester so she will be leaving Senate meetings shortly before five and Vice Chair, Bob Grossman, will kindly do the minutes in her absence.

As the President reported, I wanted to mention the faculty members that received the 2013 Great Teacher Award, Karen Badger, College of Social Work, who is a Senator. Roberta Dwyer, College of Ag, Samuel Franklin, Medicine, John Grove, Ag, Armando Prats, A and S, who is also a Senator, and Gerald Smith, A and S.

For my Chair's Report, I met with the President and discussed the Ad Hoc Committee on Multidisciplinary Centers and Programs report that Bob Grossman will be talking about later in this meeting.

The President was very receptive to the report and very interested in it and he is going to look comprehensively at the report and share it with other individuals to get input.



SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

As of today, the Ad Hoc Committee, Bob Grossman's report, is simply informational. We're not going to be taking any action on it at this point.

Now I'd like to have John Wilson come up. He's going to give the Trustee Report.

WILSON:

Thank you, Lee.

I will be brief today and I will use a couple of minutes to respond to questions that folks have.

I recently sent an email to faculty. And I'm using email -- if you haven't received it then there's something wrong with my email and I would appreciate knowing about it.

If you are receiving it and you'd rather not have email then tell me that too, I can edit that as well. I think it's important to continue those forms of communication.

You should know that what I send you is also sent to each of the Board of Trustees. It's part of the information process and that's important.

I would urge you to communicate with me -- to me, your concerns and issues. I'm continuing my process of going around to the colleges inviting in-person faculty input and I found that particularly beneficial.

So if your college -- if I haven't been to your college yet it is probably on the schedule. If I have already visited you and you want me to come back, I could do that as well. So feel free to ask.

I have a couple of minutes, I know we have a busy agenda. If anyone has questions or comments, I'd be happy to...

BLONDER:

Questions for John? Thank you, John.

The next item on the agenda are the proposed May 2013 Honorary Degree Recipients and Jeannine Blackwell, who is Chair of the Honorary Degree Committee, will conduct this.

BLACKWELL:

Thank you. Thank you, Lee. And thank you Senate and Senate Council for hearing us on the nominees.

These are the nominees that we presented at the May Commencement. First I would like to thank the Honorary Committee, the joint committee, on Honorary Degrees and (inaudible).

This committee is appointed by the President and the University Senate, so there are members from each as well as several ex-officio members. And I Chair the committee.

The three Honorary Degree nominees that have come forward from our committee and have now been heard by the Senate Council are Deborah A.P. Hersman, for the Doctor of Humanities, Robert Milton Huffaker, for the Doctor of Science, and Jamal Mashburn, for the Doctor of Humanities.

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

Deborah Hersman is the Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board and has served on this Board since 2004. She is a nationally recognized transportation safety advocate and she holds degrees from Virginia Tech and an MS in Conflict Resolution from George Mason University.

She was the on-scene investigator in August 2006 of the crash of Comair 5191 at Bluegrass Airport. And in that regard was recognized for building original collaborative effort in the Bluegrass for dealing with the grieving families.

She has continued her engagement with families, families of the victims, and a memorialization of those victims, including her presentation at the dedication of the sculpture in the UK Arboretum that was just last year.

She has been a travel safety advocate of creating initiatives to focus attention on child passenger safety and to traffic victims, distracted driving, which none of you all do, and uses her expertise to study fatigue and stress on truck drivers, including leading a convoy of trucks to Louisville to address the Kentuckians for Better Transportation.

Robert Milton Huffaker is the Founder and CEO of Coherent Technology Incorporated and developer of LIDAR technology.

Now many of you scientists in here can tell the group much more eloquently than I what this is. It's light detection and ranging, an optical remote sensing technology that has many, many, many uses and is the core concept for much of the detection and ranging used by NASA and other operational systems. It's like a core technology for the modern world.

He was the Founder of Coherent Technologies which is a company focused on using the LIDAR technology to aid aircraft in turbulence detection and environmental airport monitoring.

And this was going back to the '50s as a matter of fact, and he has since that time become an entrepreneur and business supporter aiding fledgling startup companies in early developmental stages by investing in them and helping them develop stable business plans to ensure long term success.

He's a philanthropist and community leader. The Cofounder of Second Step Program and Forward Steps Foundation and another foundation on realizing aptitude.

And what these foundations do is they help young entrepreneurs and others who are struggling to establish themselves in the world of scientific research and startup companies.

And he has been a longtime

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

benefactor of the University of Kentucky  
Departments of Physics and Astronomy,  
providing support and advice for their  
students.

Jamal Mashburn, just in case you  
haven't ever heard of him --

-- oh and I forgot to say about Dr.  
-- Mr. Huffaker, that he has his BA in  
Physics from the University of Kentucky and  
was -- had graduate studies here as well in  
the late '50s and early '60s.

Jamal Mashburn, of course, played  
basketball here at the University of Kentucky  
from 1990 to 1993 and then went on to a 13  
year career in the NBA playing with the  
Dallas Mavericks, Miami Heat, and the Hornets  
in Charlotte and New Orleans.

But his Honorary Degree is --  
nomination has been put forward because of  
his work in philanthropy and as an  
entrepreneur.

Jamal Mashburn endowed the Mashburn  
Scholarship Fund at the University of  
Kentucky in 1993. And this scholarship fund  
identifies students in the ninth grade and  
tracks their progress, mentors them until the  
point that they are awarded full scholarships  
to UK or BCTC, and these are students  
primarily from under-represented minorities  
that are local students.

He's the founder and Director of  
the MAP Foundation and the Mashburn Family  
Foundation. These non-profits focus on youth  
mentoring and support for latchkey children  
and children of alcoholics and single  
mothers.

He is a current Board member of the  
National Forest Foundation. He's tall enough  
to work with the trees.

And during his NBA career, he was a  
literacy advocate and served as the New  
Orleans Hornet's Team Up spokesman and All  
Star Reader for the Hornet's Read to Achieve  
Program.

So these are the three nominations  
that the Joint Committee put forward to the  
Senate Council and I will now turn it over to  
Lee, who's the Chair of the Senate Council.

BLONDER:

Are there any questions for  
Jeannine? Okay. We have -- we have a  
recommendation that the elected Faculty  
Senators approve the three honorary degree  
candidates in their degrees, Honorary Doctor  
of Humanities, Honorary Doctor of Science,  
and Honorary Doctor of Humanities, for  
submission through the President to the Board  
of Trustees as the recommended recipients of  
honorary degrees to be conferred by the  
Board.

Is there any discussion? This is  
elected Faculty Senators only voting. All in  
favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries.

I'd like to remind you to please

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

keep this confidential until such time as the Board approves the nominations. Thank you.

GROSSMAN: When is that supposed to be?

BLONDER: May.

BROTHERS: March.

BLONDER: March.

Okay. The next item on the agenda is the Proposed Final Approval for the One-Year Masters in Public Administration and One-Year Masters in Public Policy Program. This is a calendar change, there's no academic change. Is Merl Hackbart here or Dwight Denison? Great. Dwight will give background.

DENISON: Good afternoon. As the DGS of the MPA and MPP programs, I welcome the opportunity to introduce a proposal for the One-Year Accelerated Program for the MPA and MPP Degrees, that's Masters of Public Administration, Masters of Public Policy.

Our traditional MPA degree requires four semesters with summer internship. The accelerated program will facilitate completion of the same requirements in a year.

This is made possible by moving to an eight week block for the majority of the courses, with a few courses being offered in two summer sessions.

The capstone course and the internship activities will be distributed over the year.

The motivation to offer the one year program arises from two primary factors. First, several top programs in public administration have one year programs including the Ford School at the University of Michigan, the Kennedy School at Harvard, Syracuse University and the University of Colorado at Denver.

The one year program will help the Martin School move forward and maintain our competitive (unintelligible) administration and public policy.

The second factor is that graduate tuition has increased significantly in recent years making it more difficult for us to compete with our competitor applicants -- I'm sorry, our competitor universities for top applicants without significant resources for scholarships.

The one year program costs significantly less in terms of tuition and living expenses and students will embark on their careers earlier.

The proposal for a one-year MPA Program has been in development for several years with full participation of faculty in the development of the plan. Several of those faculty members are here today.

Faculty members of Martin School have worked hard to build a reputation of academic excellence and the faculty clearly

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

does not want to implement a one-year program unless we can be confident that the program quality will be maintained.

The proposal that you see before you has been approved by the Martin School faculty, appropriate Senate sub -- Senate sub-committees, as well as the Senate Council with a motion for Senate approval.

With the Faculty Senate's approval the one year MPA program would position the Martin School to be more competitive in attracting our top applicants and expand our capacity in the MPA and MVP Program without compromising on quality. Thank you.

BLONDER: Are there questions for Dwight or the other members? Raphael?

FINKEL: Raphael Finkel, College of Engineering.

Are any of these blocks only four weeks long or are they all eight weeks long?

DENISON: There is a summer term that is four week. The majority of them are, you know, the regular eight week blocks as we do that. And then there are some two week periods of time that focus on -- where we do follow up on the capstone and wrapping up the internship. It would be just before graduation.

FINKEL: Let me ask about the four week term. There is a Senate Rule that the maximum allowable load to be carried during a summer term for graduate students shall be four credit hours for a four week term.

DENISON: Will this proposal violate that? The way that we have set this up there will be -- if you look at Table 4, we have after that summer term there's four credits for the (unintelligible). We will have a one year -- I'm sorry, we will have one course which is PA-621 which is three credits. We will have a portion of 624, will meet during that time and then we will have a portion of another course, 681 which is one credit ethics.

So depending upon how you count, we actually have five weeks for five credits as that's kind of working through there.

If one wanted to get real technical, I suppose we may have -- well, I think that we met the letter of that (unintelligible).

This was a point of discussion for Senate Council. And in negotiation with them, this is one of the things that came out, that we would take several classes from that 622 which is an Information Systems course and we would move that to the week prior. So we'd move some of the class sessions right there.

FINKEL: Thank you.

BLONDER: Other questions?

BAILEY: Ernie Bailey, College of Agriculture.

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

In the proposal it says that you would like to assess a program fee. What is the status of that?

DENISON: Status maybe can be referred to Dr. Hackbart because that would be -- until we -- until we get approval -- we haven't received formal approval of that. But we had some discussion with the Provost Office.

BAILEY: So the Provost Office would have to approve that?

DENISON: That's my understanding.

BLONDER: Other questions? Okay, thank you. We have a recommendation from Senate Council that the Senate approve the calendar for the Proposed One-Year Master in Public Administration and a Proposed One-Year Master in Public Policy in addition to the traditional two-year program effective immediately.

Is there discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries.

Next on the agenda -- is Andrew here? Yes. Andrew Hippisley, Chair of the Senate Academic Programs Committee is going to present the Proposed New University Scholars Program, BA/BS German and MA German.

HIPPI SLEY: So this is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new University Scholars Program for the Masters degree in German Studies within the Department of Modern Classical Languages Literatures and Cultures which I'll call MCLLC from now on, within the College of Arts and Sciences.

MCLLC is home to four MAs including French, Classics and German Studies. The first two currently at the University's Scholars Program allow UK students to seamlessly progress from BA to MA and complete the MA in five years.

Up to 12 credits can serve towards the BA or the BS and the MA. These courses must be at a 500 or 600 level. For the 500 level courses student must take the extra graduate assessment requirement; extra question on an extra exam.

What is being proposed therefore is a parallel arrangement for the German Studies students.

The requirements to enroll on the University Scholars Program, the current BA/BS students in German will have to meet the minimum GRE and GPA admission requirements for the MA in German Studies. That is to say a GPA of 3.5 for German and 3.204.

Admission is open to students who have completed or are currently enrolled on at least four upper levels of our German courses and the German language proficiency is above Intermediate High.

Admission is not automatic

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

nevertheless, because all cases will be reviewed by the MA German Studies faculty.

The program will be evaluated by record keeping, records will be kept of the successful students who completely completed the MA at the University scholars level.

BLONDER: Any questions for Andrew regarding this? Okay. We have a positive recommendation from the Senate Council that the University Senate approve the creation of a New University Scholars Program for BA/BS, MA in German.

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

Next, Andrew Hippisley, Chair of Senate Academics Programs Committee will present suspension of admissions to Master of Science in Nursing.

HIPPISLEY: So this is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the suspension of admission into an existing graduate program, the Master of Science in Nursing in the College of Nursing.

This follows directly from the professional body's position statement that the entry level for advanced practices nurses should be the practice doctorate. Their professional body is the American Association of Colleges of Nursing.

The MS Nursing faculty voted to comply with this suggestion first in 2008 by stopping admission into the MS and secondly in December 2012 to suspend the degree program all together.

BLONDER: Are there questions regarding this suspension?

KOVASH: Mike Kovash, Arts and Sciences. So there's a still a PhD program in nursing, is that correct?

HIPPISLEY: Right.

KOVASH: And students who enter a PhD program who have trouble typically in other departments, then follow the Masters degree route; will that still be open to those students?

HIPPISLEY: I believe it will not be.

KOVASH: Yes, no?

UNIDENTIFIED: He said no.

HIPPISLEY: I said no. But is there a nursing person here?

HOWARD: Pat Howard, Interim Dean, College of Nursing.

If I understand the question it is will Master students still be admitted to the PhD program?

KOVASH: No. Will PhD students still have an alternative to get a Masters degree if they don't make the grade in the PhD program?

HOWARD: No. My understanding, the PhD Program Committee has eliminated that step. They will not -- I mean, for all students who are currently enrolled, yes. But they are

also moving from BSN to PhD.

KOVASH: I guess the route to Masters is a bit different from what I was speaking of.

HOWARD: Okay.

KOVASH: In my department, we have a lot of students who enter the PhD program who don't meet the grade.

HOWARD: Correct.

KOVASH: They do satisfy the Masters requirement and leave with a Masters degree, but they don't enter into the Masters program. Will that option be available to nursing students in the PhD program?

HOWARD: No, it -- it will -- it will not be.

KOVASH: Thank you.

BLONDER: I think Jeannine Blackwell had something she wanted to say. She's Dean of the Graduate School.

BLACKWELL: If I may say something, the MSN is a practitioner Masters degree and because of developments in nursing nationwide, that has moved to a doctor of nursing practice. The MSN was never a fallback position for the PhD which is a research degree exclusively and so they could not fall back to a practitioner Masters even if they (inaudible).

HOWARD: In other words, the PhD curriculum does not contain the course work necessary to sit for certification and practice (unintelligible).

KOVASH: So this is a MSN degree (inaudible) not an MS degree, is that right?

HOWARD: Master of Science in Nursing, yes.

KOVASH: Right. Okay. Thank you.

BLONDER: Are there other questions?

BAILEY: Ernie Bailey, College of Agriculture.

In the notes -- source document says that the results of vote on suspension were reported January 13, 2012; 60 percent of the college graduate faculty were in favor of the motion and that's not an overwhelming number. What -- why were 40 percent presumably opposed to it?

HOWARD: Quite frankly, I think that there -- anytime that there's transition, I think that there is concern about that. That's the only -- that's truly the only answer that I can give to you.

We have been very successful. University of Kentucky is basically the initiator of this program; it's been modeled throughout the country. And I would say that our faculty are much more receptive to it now. That's truly the only answer that I can give you in a straightforward manner.

BLONDER: Okay. Thank you.

Other questions? Okay. We have a recommendation, positive, from Senate Council that the University Senate approve the suspension of admissions into the Master of



SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

Science and Nursing Program.

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

Andrew Hippisley, Chair of Senate Academic Programs Committee will now present the proposed suspension of admissions to the Master of Arts in Library Science.

HI PPI SLEY: This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the suspension of admissions into an existing Graduate Program, Master of Arts in Library Sciences in the School of Library Information Sciences within the College of Communication and Information.

In the last six years, of the 600 graduates in Library Science -- Library Sciences, we had only one MA student, the rest being MS --MSs. So it was seen as a pointless (unintelligible).

BLONDER: Questions?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S. Given there's been only one person in this program in the past ten years, I don't understand the purpose of suspending it, rather than just deleting the program.

BUNTIN: Will Buntin, Assistant Director for School of Library and Information Science.

(Unintelligible) had actually consulted with the Graduate School and one of their recommendations was to pursue suspension of the program to give it time to get any other information or data from any other stakeholders at which time we do decide to finally close the program if that's (unintelligible).

BLONDER: Other question? Okay. We have a recommendation that's positive from the Senate Council that the University Senate approve the suspension of admissions into the Master of Arts in Library Science program.

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

One more. Andrew Hippisley, Chair of Senate Academic Programs Committee is going to present the Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Instructional Communication.

HI PPI SLEY: This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new graduate certificate in Instructional Communications in the Division of Instructional Communication within the College of Communication and Information.

A little bit of background. Instructional Communication is a prominent discipline within Communication. It has its own journals. It's about teaching and learning the communication process with the goal of (unintelligible) teaching effectiveness and (unintelligible) learning.

By instruction, this does not mean it's confined to the classroom. It should be interpreted in different contexts such as the

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

instruction of health care setting,  
instruction in risk and crisis situations and  
workplace negotiators.

In fact, the way it's interpreted  
is any situation where there's an instruction  
of communication intersection.

There's a need for this. Very few  
places in the United States offer a program  
in this partly due to retirements of the  
instructional communication experts or quite  
often what happens is instructional  
communication faculty end up in  
administrative positions.

So now there are only four places  
that offer a degree, University of Utah,  
Texas State University, San Marcos, West  
Virginia, and University of Nebraska.

Since 2007, in this University more  
than 33 percent of dissertations have focused  
on Instructional Communication. Ten faculty  
in Communications are trained in this field  
and many live in the new -- newly developed  
Division of Instructional Communication.

So the infrastructure is there.  
The Graduate School does have something  
similar but not exactly a certificate in  
College Teaching and Learning, aimed at  
future college faculty, but what is being  
proposed is not restrictive in this way only  
in terms of its level and its context.

It's imagined that graduate  
students at UK as well faculty at UK and  
other community members will be interested in  
this certificate.

There will be 12 credits. Students  
chose four courses out of a possible seven.  
These are new courses. They include courses  
like CJT 616, Foundations in Instructional  
Communication, CJT 636, Assessment and  
Evaluation Methods in Applied Communication.

The format of these courses is  
everything, traditional, online, and hybrid  
as-needed.

BLONDER: Are there questions regarding this  
proposal?

FINKEL: Raphael Finkel, College of  
Engineering.

Will it be possible for a student  
to complete the certificate solely by  
distance learning?

HIPPISLEY: That's an excellent question and we  
have (unintelligible).

SELLNOW: No. They wouldn't be able to do it  
solely by distance learning at this time.  
As-needed will be (unintelligible).

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.

So you have a list here of graduate  
certificate associates, are those the people  
who will have the authority to make changes  
to the program? Do they have the responsible  
faculty for the program?

SELLNOW: Yes.

GROSSMAN: Okay. And the second question I

have is -- I haven't had a chance to read where they are all located, but it seems like Instructional Communication should have a paramount of involvement in the College of Education.

SELLNOW: We have an endorsement from those in education with a similar interest.

GROSSMAN: Okay, thanks.

BLONDER: Are there other questions?

WATKINS: John Watkins, Public Health.

Is this certificate available to non-degree seeking students or only actively enrolled degree seeking students? I'm thinking about the marketing (unintelligible).

SELLNOW: Yes. We have a similar degree in --

BROTHERS: Name please?

SELLNOW: I'm sorry. Tim Sellnow, Associate Dean for Graduate Programs, College of Communications.

Yes.

BLONDER: Are there other questions?

Okay. We have a recommendation that's positive from Senate Council that the Senate approve the establishment of the New Graduate Certificate in Instructional Communication in the Division of Instructional Communication within the College of Communication and Information.

Is there further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you. Thank you, Andrew.

Next on the agenda is Raphael Finkel who is Chair of the Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee and he's going to present first Proposed Changes to Admissions Requirements for Human Nutrition and Dietetics Undergraduate Programs in the Department of Nutrition and Food Science.

FINKEL: Good afternoon. Since I always give people a hard time I hope you give me a hard time on this one or in general.

So there are two things I'll be presenting. The first one now is Human Nutrition and Dietetics, their undergraduate program.

This program is requesting that a GPA requirement be instituted for students to declare the major. That they have to take a certain number of courses beforehand, the pre-major courses and do well enough to get that.

These pre-major courses include four chemistry courses, a biology course, and two courses at the 200 level in the department itself.

And they wanted a 2.8 GPA. The reasoning behind this is that students who don't have a 2.8 GPA (unintelligible) that students who don't have 3.0 GPA tend not to succeed in this program.

At some point the students need to

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

take a practicum, an internship. These are competitive internships and students who have a poor GPA don't get the internship and therefore don't complete the program, never get their certification.

The problem has been that Human Nutrition and Dietetics has been something of a dumping ground for students who fail out in other scientific areas and are not going to succeed in this one either.

So the idea therefore is to institute a, not very high, a 2.8 hurdle. I did ask people in Human Nutrition where do those students actually go if they don't succeed and the answer is they usually go to sciences, communication, education, kinesiology, psychology, not biology in particular, when the students leave the department because they realize that science is not their strong suit and that they're better served in a non-science field.

So the last thing I want to say is that both ECU and WKU, Western Kentucky University, have such requirements. They set the bar at 2.5 and a 3.0 respectively. Not everyone does but these two do.

And so the committee reported to the Senate Council with a favorable recommendation. You can see the entire proposal in front of you in the handout around page 51. And so we also propose this. Questions?

SWANSON: Hollie Swanson, College of Medicine.

So it seems to me that what we're seeing is a trend and what I would ask is for you to stare into your crystal ball and ask whether or not requirements such as psychology and family studies now want an increase in their GPA of 2.8 to 3.0 and then so on and so forth.

FINKEL: I can stare at you further than the crystal ball. I think in the future what we'll perhaps need is a general studies major for such students that's composed perhaps of the equivalent three minors for students who, in fact, can't meet the bar for the 300 and higher level courses for any major.

I do expect this will happen, especially given our increased attempts to get undergraduate students. I can't see that happening without increasing the number of perhaps under-qualified students or students who will have difficulty with some of our technical subjects. And after all, all of our subjects are technical.

So yes, I do see in the future, psychology and others, wanting to put a similar bar in and I think we'll need to adjust and provide something for those students.

SWANSON: Is there anything we can do now to either better prepare or help flag these

FINKEL: students and divert them before?  
Yeah. It's always a problem at what point you can divert the student. Students come in thinking that they're pretty good and they'll be able to survive and then they take a course and they don't get a good grade and then they take another course and they maybe don't get -- it takes a while before they can be convinced, but at least there's a point at which we can say no.

By the way, I should point out that this proposal has certainly brought about what about the repeat option and it has something to say about that. What about people transferring.

And so all the cases I think have been covered properly by the proposal as to how we can help these students.

Part of that falls on the undergraduate advising teams.

BLONDER: Are there other questions? Yes.  
BAILEY: Ernie Bailey, College of Agriculture.

In reading it there was an inconsistency, the reason this being proposed for making this change was not that the students were incapable of completing the upper division courses here but in order to -- they have limited resources and to improve the quality of the --- so they wanted to restrict the program.

And then the inconsistency is down below: The students can appeal if they've been rejected if they can demonstrate that they could accomplish. And that's consistent, that last part's consistent. But what you're saying, you're saying, yes, we have evidence that the students aren't (unintelligible) but their premise here for doing it is in order to cut down the students in the program.

BASTIN: I'm Sandra Bastin, the Chair of that department.

And it's an accredited program. With a credited program before they can go on to whatever they need to do, in this case, they have to be able to complete a competitive internship.

Once they complete the internship then they actually sit for a registration exam just like an M.D. would, (unintelligible). So if they can't -- our department has increased from 350 to 550 in the last three years.

And competitively they can't get these internships if they're less than a 3 and we can't provide anymore resources than we've got unless you all want to also put on here that we need about four more faculty as well.

But we need, somehow we need to make sure that these kids that are in the program can actually succeed in the program

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

otherwise it's going to ruin our program and people won't want to come here at all because you can't ever get an internship.

BAILEY: How many students would you anticipate?

BASTIN: None. Because most of them have lower than that. We had a 2.4 at this point, most of them have lower than that and they have to -- most in chemistry. They can't -- just can't pass chemistry and organic chem.

UNIDENTIFIED: If the student has Cs in those courses and (unintelligible).

BASTIN: Ds are (unintelligible) they have to have a D or better in the pre-majors and then they have to maintain a C throughout in their (unintelligible).

UNIDENTIFIED: Sound like you need a new building.

BLONDER: All right. We have a positive recommendation from Senate Council that the Senate approve the proposed changes to admission requirements for Human Nutrition and Dietetics Undergrad Programs in the Department Of Nutrition and Food Science. Is there additional discussion?

All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries.

Our next item is again Raphael Finkel Chair of Senate -- Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee and this is a response from that committee from the Senate Admissions and Academic Standards on the SACSCOC Residency Language, Senate Rule 5.4.1, Residence Requirements.

FINKEL: So SACSCOC has given us some suggestions on it's not clear that we want always to bow down to what the accrediting agency wants us to do. On the other hand, to some extent we can't fight them.

So they were complaining that we're not compliant with a rule that a minimum of 25 percent of the credit hours for our degree must be taken while a resident at UK.

And our rules set almost that but not quite. Our rules said that among other things, that at least 25 percent of the credits must be taken from the University, but it didn't say what taken from the University means specifically.

And so the committee then tried to define what it should mean taken from the University. And we decided something like this and you have it in your handout, page 53 or so. A course taken from UK means a course with a UK number instructed by a UK instructor.

It does not include courses taken elsewhere with credit transfer to UK, courses taken abroad, except for courses taught by UK faculty, credits achieved by examination or courses taken through the National Student Exchange.

It does include courses delivered

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

by correspondence or distance learning. So we tried to be -- we tried to cover all the bases there.

Now today I spoke actually with the coordinator of the National Student Exchange and I need to tell you about that.

The National Student Exchange, it's new to me, is a means by which undergraduates across the country and Canada can take courses at other institutions that participate in the Exchange.

The way they do it is they take a course with a UK number, that number would be, let's see, NSS 5333, and I didn't write that down, they take it for one credit. Then they take credits at some other institution which then get transferred.

It's a nice idea for students who have a particular interest in an area that we don't cover well and they can get coverage somewhere else.

The problem is that many of these students wish to do it not for more than 25, I mean not for 75 percent of their credits, it's only for one semester or two, but they often want to do it at the end of their college curriculum, that is in their fourth year.

And unfortunately, the way that we have presented this, the rule that the National Student Exchange and Study Abroad will not apply even for the .3 which says a minimum of 30 of the last 36 credits.

And so the motion you have in front of you, I would be willing to contemplate an amendment. Now since this is not what the committee agreed to someone actually would have to make such an amendment, it would have to be seconded.

But let me just tell you what the wording might be if you should choose to make such an amendment.

Courses taken under the Study Abroad and National Student Exchange Program for which students pay their tuition to the University of Kentucky are considered as courses taken at UK for the purposes of Rule 5.4.1 (3), minimum, a minimum of 30 of the last 36 credits and for graduates to be conferred to commencement honors at the time of award of their degrees.

So the part that you see in red that's been crossed out at the bottom of that of page 54 we would partially restore just with respect to the third piece which is a minimum of 30 of the last 36 credits, we would I think reasonably allow those credits to include credits taken either abroad because many of our students do study abroad during their senior year although junior year is more typical, and to include credits taken by the National Student Exchange.

There's a misprint the actual

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

current wording which says National Exchange Student, but it's National Student Exchange.

So I guess that's all I have to say, but I'm hoping someone will make the amendment.

CARVALHO: Susan Carvalho, Associate Provost for International Affairs.

And I just heard about this half an hour before the meeting. So I'm cautious because, for example, a senior who would go abroad will pay one hour of tuition to UK but might also pay tuition, for example, to the Sorbonne or Oxford. There's a program called Euro Scholars Research Program Abroad that seniors do.

So they'll pay tuition abroad. They'll pay maybe for 9 credits or 12 credits there, one credit at UK, how does that work with your amendment?

You said students will pay their tuition, the tuition?

GROSSMAN: Point of order, there's no amendment on the floor, until there's an amendment on the floor and seconded, there's no point in discussing it.

BLONDER: Yes. Your point of order is well taken. Would someone like to make the amendment?

STEINER: I move that we -- Shelly Steiner, Biology.

I move that we table it until next meeting and come back in some kind of form we can all understand.

BLONDER: You want to put it on the table and a date to bring it back.

STEINER: The next Senate meeting.

BLONDER: Is there a second to that motion?

WASILKOWSKI: Second, Greg Wasilkowski.

BLONDER: Discussion about the tabling to the date? We can't discuss the tabling itself according to Robert's Rules, but we can discuss the date that we're going to bring it back here.

EDWARDS: Is there like a date that this -- is this like a dire need or anything that needs to go through very soon or is there -- like what's the latest that you all think we should do it?

BLONDER: Is there a SACS person in here that can answer that question? Jeannine?

BLACKWELL: It is too late for the February Report to go in. But if we're making good progress toward a solution, that April. March (inaudible).

BLONDER: Okay. So we have a motion on the floor to table this further discussion and bring it back to the Senate March 18th meeting and that was seconded.

Is there any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries.

FINKEL: Thank you.

BLONDER: Next we have Bob Grossman who



SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt  
chaired the Ad Hoc Committee on Multi-Disciplinary Centers and Programs who will give a brief report. This is -- there's no action required at this point, but Bob will tell you.

GROSSMAN: All right. So thank you all. These are going to through the recommendations. The actual document is in your package so I'm just going to give a summary on some of the highlights.

These are the members of the committee, I'd like to thank them all for their work.

So our charge was to review the current academic organizational structure of MDRCs but not just MDRCs, all interdisciplinary programs, MDRCs, IIPs and Graduate Centers. Those academic units that do not fit within the traditional college structure of the University and then have proliferated over the years.

And asking whether our current regulations best fit the needs of the University, of the Academic Mission of the University.

One thing you will see we would not discuss is how to review MDRCs and how to humanely euthanize them when they have no longer served their purpose.

That is an issue that is of very great interest to University administrations all across the country because of the proliferation of these kinds of centers, but we didn't get into that and I believe that there are other people who are -- other committees that are currently looking at that question.

So this is the current landscape, we think, of our interdisciplinary units. There is a -- there are about 68 MDRCs on campus and these range in size from giants such as the Markey Cancer Center and the Center for Applied Energy Research to centers that pretty much seem to consist of one person, one faculty member plus a graduate student or a staff member. All over the map.

There's a list of these at the Vice President for Research website, but it is not a complete list nor is it a completely accurate list as there are centers on that list that are not even at UK, for example, the (inaudible) in Somerset is on that list.

I think someone just did a web search for center at the University of Kentucky and just put everything on that list that popped up.

The list of Interdisciplinary Instructional Programs is derived by my sending emails out to the deans of the various colleges and then letting them know. And most of the deans responded, but not all, so there may actually be a few more than that. And of course they may have missed

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

some in their accounting. But the IIPs cover certificates, professional degrees, majors, minors, everything.

Interestingly enough, there's only one that I think is currently recognized as an official, as Davy Jones put it capital I, capital I, capital P interdisciplinary instructional program and that's the Honors Program.

All the others are just kind of there, they're called little i, little I, little p, interdisciplinary instructional programs. I'm not sure exactly what the difference is, but there you go.

We currently have six graduate centers, only two of them are currently under the auspices of the Graduate School, the Patterson -- the Patterson and Martin Schools.

There are four others are currently housed in colleges and some of them are either have become departments or about to become departments or considering becoming departments.

So we did a survey of all of the directors of all the MDRCs and IIPs that we were able to identify and we have about a 50 percent response rate for this, which is amazing, and I thank all the directors who took the trouble to respond.

And pretty much people were pretty well satisfied with the current arrangements although there was a desire for some more flexibility on the part of some of the directors to pursue their academic missions and I'll talk about these are some of the problems that both the committee identified and that came up during the survey of the directors.

And one of the biggest problems is the rigid distinctions that exist in the rules between MDRCs, graduate centers and IIPs. For example, graduate centers in the rules are stated as they deliver graduate instruction, but it doesn't say that they're permitted to do undergraduate instruction and it's beyond me why we should say, oh, you're in a graduate center, you can't teach an undergraduate course.

Another example, MDRCs, their mission is primarily research, but as we all know, research is done with post docs and graduate students and undergraduates and that means that there is instruction going on in these MDRCs. And if there's instruction going on, who is in charge of that instruction and how is that -- are there policies related to, for example, making sure that post docs get the appropriate kind of education that we expect them to get.

The federal government is more and more looking at post docs as students like graduate students and undergrads.

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

So those are some questions. There's nothing in the rules about MDRCs and how they fulfill their instructional mission.

And finally, IIPs, there's no definition of the -- in the rules about who was responsible for an IIP. How do you define the faculty who are responsible for the IIP? There's just a big blank in the rules at that point.

So there's also a problem for research faculty. Currently, the rules prohibit research faculty from being appointed to MDRCs and the -- that leads to a problem in that research faculty, if a person at an MDRC wants to -- gets a grant and wants to hire some research faculty or wants to promote someone to research faculty, they have to appoint them in a home department.

And so they appoint them in a home department and a year goes by and then it's time to assess them or promote them and this person hasn't interacted at all with the people in the home department.

And so they say, wait, who is this person and how are we supposed to assess their progress. So that's been a continuing problem in some of the larger MDRCs.

And finally, there's this problem of defining what, when a center is an administrative unit and when it is an educational unit.

And this is one I'll, as you'll see later, that we did not, are not able to resolve to either our satisfaction or the satisfaction of the Senate Council. But it's something that we'll have to talk about some more.

So we made some proposed changes to the regulations and one of the more important ones that we proposed is that we will allow -- we propose that tenure-ineligible faculty, which are usually (unintelligible) will be allowed to have their primary appointments in MDRCs when the director of that MDRC is a tenured faculty member. And there's a typo at the bottom here.

So not all MDRCs have tenure, have tenured faculty as directors. I've been able to identify two staff members who are directors of MDRCs, they have an adjunct faculty appointment somewhere.

Apparently, I'm supposed to take notes and talk at the same time. I don't think that's going to happen. If someone would like to take notes, feel free.

So if the director of the MDRC is a tenured faculty member then we propose the tenure-ineligible faculty will be able to have their primary appointments in them.

Now this leads the question of what about promotion in tenure, well, not tenure matters, because these are tenure-ineligible faculty, what about hiring,

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

promotion, disciplinary things, those kinds of things that faculty -- that involved faculty, they're usually overseen by the Provost.

Some of the MDRCs are under the Vice President for Research. Our regs currently say the VPR report to the Provost, but last year the President changed the reporting of the VPR so that the VPR reports directly to the President and so you no longer have a line of authority from these faculty that go through the Provost.

So what we are proposing is that the VPR must report to the Provost at least on faculty personnel matters. Now if the President wants the VPR to the President directly on other matters like animal facilities and -- and things like that, that's fine, but we're saying that if we're going to have this -- we're going to have tenure-ineligible faculty in MDRCs then on faculty matters the VPR must report to the Provost.

Second, this is a little bit long, but what I've taken here at the top is the definition of the faculty of an MDRC. So it consists of a director and consists of faculty who have formally assigned instructional research or service duties in the unit. This is code for DOE, distribution of effort, formally assigned.

As you guys know, DOE is honored as much in the breach as it is regularly and we wrestle a lot with the question of DOE as you'll see later.

But anyway, what we decided to do was put in this second phrase to say faculty members with either secondary appointments or assigned researchers or service duties by their DOE.

So this means, that I, for example, could be appointed by the Markey -- could be given a secondary appointment in the Markey Cancer Center and then I don't have to worry about changing my DOE, I would still be a member of the Markey Cancer Center.

So a lot of -- when I started this process I thought MDRCs were forbidden to offer courses. It turns out they're not forbidden to offer courses, there's nothing in the rules that say MDRCs can't offer courses.

As far as I know, the Senate has never approved that an MDRC should offer a course. But we propose that they actually be explicitly permitted to offer both graduate and undergraduate courses and certificate programs. And that are not duplicative of courses or programs offered elsewhere.

The Senate is still going to have a finger on this. The Senate can still no we don't think you should offer this course or this certificate because, you know, it's

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

already being offered in this other area, you need to cooperate with them if you want to offer something. But we saw no reason why they should be academically prohibited from doing it.

There does need to be a definition if you're going to have people responsible for -- if you're going to offer a curriculum as in a certificate program, you're going to have to have a subset of the faculty of the MDRC responsible for that certificate program. So the director in conjunction with the faculty will define those faculty responsible for that.

Current here -- this is again DOE. Currently if I say -- if I want to put down, oh, I'm putting 20 percent of my effort in CAER, okay, (inaudible) has absolutely no say over whether I put 20 percent DOE in CAER. Okay. As long as Mark Kornbluh approves of it, it's done.

So we're actually proposing that what DOE, the faculty will either increase or decreases that the director does have a say in it.

This will also hopefully lead to better reporting of distribution of effort in centers. There's currently no way to find out who has how much effort in what centers.

Okay. We asked Heidi Anderson's office to get that information for us. She said, sorry, I can't do it because there's no uniform reporting mechanism for it.

So this is something that the -- a task that needs to go to the administration to create the uniform DOE reporting system for centers and make sure that deans and chairs and faculty follow the rules about it.

Okay. I already mentioned the core faculty of IIPs are not defined in the rules so we propose a definition of IIPs. And what we decided was the faculty who have shared the instructional duties of the program in the past three years. And that seems like a reasonable thing. So if you haven't taught a course in the IIPs in the last three years, you're out.

And then the exception is for the Honors Program where the Senate has already defined a committee that is responsible for that particular program.

And then DOE again, okay, if an IIP is teaching courses and you're teaching a course in that IIP, you should have some DOE reflecting that. And if the -- if you want to change that DOE or your chair says, no, I want you back here because I need you to teach this course, there needs to be some negotiation between the director of the IIP and the chair about, you know, how we're -- they're going to manage that faculty member's time.

Graduate centers. Again, the

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

graduate centers, all it says it delivers graduate education degree programs. Nothing about research and nothing about undergraduate instruction either.

So here we're giving graduate centers permission to offer undergraduate courses and undergraduate certificate programs and the dot, dot, dot, is again as long as it's not duplicative of other offerings.

And we also created a definition what is a graduate center which really wasn't in the rules at all other than it delivers graduate education.

Okay. Change to definition of educational unit. All right. This is one that we really wrestled over and this engendered a lot of discussion in Senate Council. The currently, the rule, there's a distinction made in the rules between administrative units and educational units. And it's an educational unit if there's at least one full time equivalent of DOE. See again this is a sign that's for DOE. So if there's at least one full time faculty member's DOE in that unit.

DOE changes from year-to-year so some years something might be an educational unit, next year an administrative unit, next year an educational unit again, just depending on changes in circumstances from year-to-year.

So we decided to make a proposal to change this definition, we're going to say well, let's keep the DOE definition or have at least N and for N we just came up with four because it seemed like a good number, tenured or tenure-ineligible faculty that have secondary appointments in the unit which is -- I mean we didn't come out and, you know, it wasn't totally random, it just seemed like four seems like a reasonable to have a center. You really (inaudible) faculty involved to have a center.

UNIDENTIFIED: Do the secondary appointments have a percentage associated with them?

GROSSMAN: No. There are no percentages associated with secondary appointments. There are no -- there are no percentages. There's primary appointments and secondary appointments. There's no percentages associated with that.

So this would do -- the second part of the definition would there's no worry about percentages at all. It's if you -- if you say wanted to teach a course in CAER, be involved in CAER, you got a secondary appointment at CAER, that would count you as a faculty member.

Let me just point out, there are some units on this campus that are clearly doing education, research, teaching, service, some of which are have huge research

programs, lots of graduate students working under the (inaudible) and there are no faculty who have DOE assigned to those units except for administrative purposes. Okay?

So the DOE definition because people, we, don't pay any attention to DOE except when it's time to run a grant, because we don't respect what DOE is supposed to be doing, that -- those units are not defined as educational units which means they're not reviewed every five years and there are other implications as well.

UNIDENTIFIED: It would bother me not to have some percentage with that secondary appointment. I know I have to have at least 20 percent appointment within the College of Public Health where I have a secondary appointment in order to have voting rights.

GROSSMAN: That's a DO -- that must be a DOE that you're referring to not an appointment. They're different things.

UNIDENTIFIED: Well, it's within the college. For them to have given me an appointment with voting rights --

GROSSMAN: They want you to have 20 percent DOE in the college, right.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

GROSSMAN: And look this is going to have further discussion. There's no question about it. This is a really thorny issue right here.

And this was our suggestion. We understood all the problems associated with this suggestion and when it came to Senate Council, Senate Council pointed out all the problems with the suggestion. And we said yes we agree, but look at all the problems with the current rule. And so this has got to be an ongoing discussion.

I think if DOE were honored more then this would be less of a problem, but we were trying to get around that problem.

Okay. Some things not to be changed. The first -- this is what we were just talking about, educational unit and administrative unit.

Tenure eligibility (unintelligible) MDRC director, we did not change that. It's still -- it's still that a director must be a faculty member, but there's no definition of what kind of faculty member. So they could be an adjunct faculty member.

No one is required to change what they do or who they report to currently. Okay? This is really important.

What we're trying to do, you know, we've got the ship of the University moving forward and we're trying to maybe change the angle a little bit, but we're not doing a dislocation of the ship.

So no one needs to change what they're doing currently. We're not moving anyone from this unit to that unit or

anything like that.

And again, the Senate will always be reviewing any course or program proposals.

And then I talked about the reporting already. If our proposal goes through there won't be -- the difference between a graduate center and a department will be more of what degree rather than essential fundamental difference.

We already have that. There's no difference between a school and a department that anyone can define other than some people know they look at a school and they know it's a school and not a department. It will be similar with the graduate centers.

This is an issue that is already on the books or in the hopper for the University. Currently research faculty cannot get any of their salary from state funds, but there's also a federal policy that they can't have 100 percent of their effort on a grant because if they want to write the next grant they can't be paid on the current grant for that time. And so how do you pay them that extra 10 percent.

So this is already something people are wrestling with and if research faculty are going to be involved in any classroom instruction, you know, that's not going to come from grants.

So this is something that the University will have to wrestle with and finally I'm talking about some of the DOE problems.

So just if you're wondering, the Senate Council received the report in December and then forwarded it to the administration for it to come up with its own version of a proposal for GR VII which -- Governing Regulation VII, and when they come up with their proposal they hopefully, based on ours, will come back to Senate Council then come to the Senate for approval.

DIETZ:

Hank Dietz, Engineering.

Could you give me a simple definition of what a secondary appointment in one of these organizations is?

GROSSMAN:

Well, they all have different names for it. Some of them say faculty associates, some of them say members.

But you know, if you have a -- if your primary appointment is in, you know, civil engineering and then you could have a secondary appointment in agricultural engineering. It's, you know, where that faculty decides whether they want you to be a member of their faculty and you give a seminar and write a proposal for --

DIETZ:

I understand that for departments, but we're not --

GROSSMAN:

It will be similar.

DIETZ:

-- department.

GROSSMAN:

It will be similar.



DI ETZ: Is there a specific document or  
specific --

GROSSMAN: Not now because this is just a  
suggestion. But --

DI ETZ: Okay.

GROSSMAN: But we're proposing to formalize  
that process for the -- if that proposal that  
I told you about, the definition of the  
faculty goes through then we'll need a more  
formal way of doing these secondary  
appointments.  
Currently there's no -- currently  
there's no formal -- since everyone ignores  
DOE, okay, there's no real way of telling who  
the faculty are who are involved in any  
center except they're up on a web page  
somewhere.

BLONDER: I think we're going to have to stop  
the discussion at this point because it's  
almost five and we have one more agenda item.  
But this will come back at a later date to  
the Senate. If you have specific issues you  
want to discuss with Bob, please email him or  
give him a call.  
Next item on the agenda is Susan  
Carvalho, Associate Provost for International  
Affairs and she's going to be talking about  
education abroad course approval and an  
update on the administrative regulations and  
I have to find your thing here.

CARVALHO: I'm glad to be here to report on a  
question that Senate Council raised last  
year. This is about courses that already  
exist on the UK books that have been approved  
by the Senate and then a faculty member  
decides to teach that course abroad. For  
example, French 202, they want to pack it up  
and take it to France, or any other course  
that has been approved.  
And the question was, was that --  
what is the oversight? What is the academic  
oversight for making sure that the learning  
outcomes are being met in a compressed format  
in a distance -- at a distance problem, the  
library for example, what is the path to make  
sure that there is oversight.  
And the proposal was that it goes  
through the Senate, every course. And that's  
not practicable for many reasons.  
So what we agreed to was a process  
where education abroad, under my direction,  
would ensure that each course that goes on  
the road will be approved at the college  
level by the college curriculum or  
educational policy committee. The same route  
that new courses are approved through, but it  
would stop there.  
My office will act as a gatekeeper.  
So my office does not grant approval for the  
academic part of the courses, but simply  
makes sure that the faculty member has  
followed the academic approval process of his  
or her own department and college.

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

So the agreement was that we would try this for three years and see how it works. And so this is the first annual report on how that went. And so I'd like to just outline for you the process that Education Abroad has put in place under Director, Dr. Tony Ogden and Assistant Director Abbey Hollander, who is here and came to us from Arts and Sciences where she was well familiar with the approval processes.

So this is the Education Abroad website where faculty go when they decide they want to teach a course abroad. They see this program development overview and they start filling out a proposal form.

So this is the page they go to and you see here Education Abroad, UK sponsored proposal for a new program. So that's a proposal form that they fill out.

And this is a piece of that form. You know, we ask where do you want to go, what are you going to do there, and have you followed your curriculum approval process.

So you can see that the curricular committee approval form must be submitted two months prior to program departure and it's submitted to Education Abroad and it requires signatures.

This is the form, the curriculum approval form. This is the suggested format if colleges have a format they prefer, we don't require use of this form.

I certify that the course listed above has been reviewed by the college's curriculum or Ed Policy Committee, they sign, the college curriculum or Ed Policy Committee signs and then it is turned into our office. So that has worked.

We have rapid growth in the number of programs that take a UK course abroad and this is last year's number, 41, that's up from about 12. So we're happy with that.

How many are in planning stages now?

HOLLANDER: Fifty-three.

CARVALHO: Fifty-three for this summer.

HOLLANDER: For the year.

CARVALHO: And if you go to the Education Abroad website, uk.edu/ea and look under the faculty cap, there's a full enrollment report you can (inaudible) down in all kinds of ways to see what is being taught abroad. So we hope that has sufficient oversight, sufficient transparency that you all feel that the original course learning outcomes are being honored and also reviewed. Questions?

WATKINS: John Watkins, Public Health, if anybody is interested, I guess.

Is there any record of proposals that have been sent to your office that were basically rejected because of failure to meet

learning objectives or inadequate resources?  
And I've got a follow-up question to that.

CARVALHO: I think there are committees that ask for more information at the college level just the way it happens with a new course proposal.

So if a syllabus isn't complete enough the committee would ask for more information. But I don't know that anybody's been rejected. Do you, Abbey?

HOLLANDER: At that stage they don't typically come to us, we get them when they've been approved. So we're not really engaged in the full approval process within the college.

WATKINS: The follow-up question is is that I noted on there and you pointed it out, that proposals come in two months before departure of the program?

CARVALHO: There are so many pieces. This piece has to come in two months before.

WATKINS: That piece. Would it be fair to the students to have it that close to the departure date because what if something happens and it could not be approved and the student that's been planning for six months to a year to be studying abroad now doesn't have an approved course?

HOLLANDER: Part of the original approval or program proposal process required the dean's signature, an associate dean, the chair, and a faculty member's signature. So there is a preliminary sort of pass-through those channels.

What that original proposal doesn't do is go through the college curriculum committee and so it has preapproval from the chair and the associate dean or whomever it is deemed appropriate by the college, and then the curriculum committee is the follow-up process the two months prior.

No program is advertised on -- as a sponsored program by UK that hasn't been approved by those positions.

CARVALHO: And the second part of this is that a new AR was approved last fall, fall of 2011, and since it was a new AR we were asked to come back and report on how it went.

This is AR4.9 International Education Travel, which said basically, and there were copies outside, that any international group travel involving students that is represented as sponsored by or approved by the University of Kentucky must go through our office which ensures that any course has appropriate oversight, that students have medical and evacuation insurance, that we know where they're going, that their dean knows where they're going, and that risk management questions have been asked and assurances received about who is going to drive the vehicles and are they going wind surfing, wind sailing, parasailing. Too risky for me.

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt

So that has not been entirely without push back from groups who have been going abroad for a long time, scuba diving in the Bahamas, et cetera, without oversight. And nothing has ever happened.

But we have two imperatives here, protect the students and protect the institution and so our legal philosophy here is stay in the middle of the herd, don't get in front, don't get behind.

So we talked about this AR in 2008, 2009, we would have been at the front of the herd, so we didn't do it. By 2011 we were falling to the back half of herd nationally and you just can't afford to be there.

So one benefit of this has been that now we can be gatekeepers for academic oversight because we know who's going where. There are many other benefits.

Most of the push back is due to the fee mechanism. Students when they register with us, even if they're going not for credit, for example, the choir touring Europe not for credit, they do have to pay \$50. And their travel medical insurance. Travel medical insurance is cheap, \$50 is not nothing, but there is infrastructure behind all of this risk management and the business model was that that would be paid for by the travelers rather than spread out across all students. So that is the system that's in place.

So that's the AR. The only change we've seen the need to make is in the wording of the malpractice coverage for those who do healthcare work abroad. Other than that, it will go forward unless there are questions, objections, or comments.

BLONDER: Comments? Questions? Thank you, Susan.

Okay, let's see here. I need a motion to adjourn.

UNIDENTIFIED: So moved.

BLONDER: Thank you very much. The next meeting is March 18th, during spring break which is the second week of March.

♀

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 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 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: January 27, 2015.

SenateMeeting-2-10-12.txt  
IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my  
hand and seal of office on this the 7th day of August,  
2013.

---

LISA E. HOINKE  
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE-AT-LARGE  
K E N T U C K Y  
NOTARY ID 435798