

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

MAY 6, 2013

* * * *

* * * *

LEE X. BLONDER, CHAIR

ROBERT GROSSMAN, VICE-CHAIR

J.S. BUTLER, PARLIAMENTARIAN

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

LISA GRANT CRUMP, COURT REPORTER

* * * *

* * * *

BLONDER: Good afternoon, everyone. Can you hear me? This is the May 6th meeting of the University Senate. This is the last meeting of this academic year.

Please remember to sign in when you arrive, give your name and affiliation when you speak, attend meetings, respond to e-mails and web postings, acknowledge and respect others, silence your electronic devices and communicate with your constituency.

Minutes from April 8th, we did not receive any changes. Because there are no

corrections, unless I hear objections, the minutes stand approved by unanimous consent. Are there any objections? Okay. The minutes are approved from April 8.

First announcement, I'd like to announce that Dr. Christine Riordan, Dean of the Daniels College of Business and Professor of Management at the University of Denver has been named Provost. Upon approval by the Board of Trustees, Dr. Riordan will begin in the fall. Welcome to Provost Riordan.

Next I'd like to announce that John Wilson was reelected as Faculty Trustee and his second term commences July 1st, 2013 and ends on June 30th, 2016. Congratulations, John.

Some results of the trustee election from Davy Jones, Chair of Senate Rules and Elections Committee, nursing won the grand prize for participation, 78 percent of nursing faculty voted. Libraries came in second followed by Social Work, Arts and Sciences, Business and Economics, and you can see down the list, the participation.

So we encourage those colleges that have questioned and have participated to please participate in the future. And we thank you all for helping us to get the vote out.

We added one student to December 2012 degree list due to an institutional error.

The Senate Council heard information from the Associate Provost of International Programs, Susan Carvalho, about ongoing discussions between UK and Chinese universities, Shanghai and Jilin. Any future formal actions regarding program partnerships will of course involve the University Senate.

Next, the Senate Council approved a calendar change for four courses for the Freshman Summer Program for the Office of Institutional Diversity's Center for Academic Resources and Enrichment Services to accommodate the summer schedules of these students who are graduating from high school.

I want to wish a farewell and a thank you to departing Senators and Senate Council members. Thank you for all that you do and if you wouldn't mind to please stand, we can give you a round of applause.

Next is my Chair's report. I have a couple things to report. The first is, as you know, the Senate Council sent around a

survey to all faculty to evaluate the President.

The purpose of this is to ensure faculty input into the annual review of the President that is conducted by the Board of Trustees. It will be conducted over the summer.

The survey window was open for two weeks and it closed Thursday, May 2nd. We had a total of 807 surveys that were conceded and we're in the process of analyzing the data and will provide the results in the next few weeks.

In addition, the Senate Rules and Elections Committee has drafted proposed changes to Senate Rule 3.3.0, Procedures for Processing Courses and Changes in Courses and Senate Rules 3.3.3, Procedures to be Used to designate how non-credit bearing courses such as Massive Open Online Courses, MOOCs, will be processed.

This document with changes has been circulated to undergrad and graduate Council, HCCC, and to all of the college faculty councils. And it was also circulated to a group of faculty and administrators who are working on a possible agreement with Coursera, you know Coursera, they're out of Stanford University and they do MOOCs.

The final review will be at the Senate Council meeting, the final will get another review. And we will then send it to the Senate listserv for all the Senators to review and give feedback over the summer. Arts and Sciences has said that they will begin a pilot using the Senate Rule Revision this summer. So we expect to bring the rule as revised to the Senate in September for final approval.

I'd like to have Bob Grossman come up now and do the Vice Chair's Report.

GROSSMAN: Well, it's my pleasure as Vice Chair to give the Outstanding Senator Award. This award is for Senators who best exemplify what we would like all Senators to do: communicate with their constituents, regularly recognizing interests of the faculty, promoting shared governments, and being very active in all these roles.

And we had three nominees this year, but there was one who really stood out and that was Raphael Finkel.

Where are you? Come forward. Is someone going to take a picture?

BLONDER: Yes.

GROSSMAN: So it says, Raphael Finkel, he is recognized for his contributions to the University Senate by showing active and exemplary service on Senate Committees by making notable, substantive contributions on important issues that impact the faculty by consistently giving strong voice to faculty issues on the principle of shared governance and by generating and effecting the Senate's agenda and goals.

So please join me and congratulate. And that concludes my report.

BLONDER: Thank you, Bob. And congratulations, Raphael.

Next we have the May 2013 degree list. We have a recommendation that the elected Faculty Senators approve the corrected May 2013 degree list for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees as recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Would somebody like to make that as a formal motion?

GROSSMAN: So moved. Bob Grossman, A and S.

BLONDER: Is there a second?

ANDERSON: Second.

BLONDER: Discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries.

Next we have approval of the early August 2013 Degree List. Would someone like to make the recommendation that the elected Faculty Senators approve the early August 2013 Degree List for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board?

WASILKOWSKI: So moved. Greg Wasilkowski, Engineering.

BLONDER: Second?

BRION: Second. Gail Brion.

BLONDER: Thank you. Is there discussion? All in favor? This is elected Faculty Senators I should have said. Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

Next we have committee reports. And the first committee report is by Raphael Finkel, Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee on proposed changes to pre-major requirements for the BS in Accounting, BBA in Analytics, BBA in Finance, BBA in Management, BBA in Marketing and BSBE in Economics.

FINKEL: Good afternoon. This is the first of three matters that I'll be presenting to

you from the committee.

The proposal here is to change the pre-major requirements for the Gatton College undergraduate programs, the Bachelor in Accounting, Analytics, Finance Management, Marketing and Economics.

The idea is that students would no longer be required to pass a Microsoft certification test but instead would be required to take, and I assume pass, a one credit course in 105, so a one level course, a one credit which would cover some of those fundamentals.

And the revision to the course itself is perhaps a separate method, I'll speak a bit more on that. But the committee and the Senate Council agree that this seems reasonable insofar as we usually defer to programs to decide what it is that their students need to do as a matter of prerequisites.

A little bit of history on this, about - before about ten years ago, it was required that these students take computer science 101 and then that was dropped in favor of the students taking the certification test. And at that point our enrollment in CS 101 dropped by about 250 students and it was about half of its enrollment. And so now they're dropping the test and putting in a one credit course.

So we were going to object to that. That one credit course, in fact, is entirely material we teach in 101, but only about one third of 101. But since the course already existed and it's just being changed from a pass/fail to a one credit course, we figured that it was a little too late to object to the business course so we withdrew our objection to the business course. And so now we can separate those tuition's back again.

And the issue ahead of us now, in front of us now, is should we approve the change in the undergraduate prerequisite requirements for all these programs so that they no longer require the Microsoft certification and instead require a one credit version of B&E 105.

And the committee and the Senate Council had voted in favor of this.

BLONDER: So we have a motion on the floor, a motion from the Senate Council that the Senate approve the proposed pre-major requirements to the BS in Accounting, BBA in

Analytics, BBA in Finance, BBA in Management, BBA in Marketing, and BSBE in Economics.

Because of this coming from Senate Council it doesn't require a second. Is there discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

Next again the Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee is going to report on proposed changes to the College of Education's Policy on Admission, Retention and Completion of Educator Preparation Program.

FINKEL: Thank you. This is a fairly complicated and large encompassing change. And it's required because of certification requirements, the Educational Professional Standards Board requires certain things to be in place and certain wording.

And so this is a change to the policies for admission, retention, for completion of all of the students in the College of Education, undergraduate and graduate, with respect to initial educator preparation programs. And this goes to Communication Disorders, Music and Art Education, Social Work, World Languages Education, School of Media, Librarian and Career in Technical Education. So it's fairly wide reaching.

There are new sections on various things and I'll briefly summarize for you, really quite briefly, you've had a chance now to look at it. And of course in the committee and in the Senate Council, we did look at each of these and back and forth. We tried to get the wording as consistent as we could.

So the first is to reduce the minimum GPA for students entering the PhD program -- I'm sorry, I got the wrong place here, hold on. Let me get to where I'm supposed to be here. All right. A student must be admitted, retained in, and successfully complete a state-approved education, educator/education program in order to receive a teaching certificate.

Point 2 is that the progress of a student through all the educator preparation programs should be continuously monitored, assessed and reviewed.

Number 3, there are rules for admission both at undergraduate and graduate level, as well as for retention and completion. And these rules are grade point

average rules.

Number 4, there are standards that the candidates must meet before they're allowed to complete an educator preparation program. Core standards, some of them set by the state, some of them set by the college, and some subject specific standards.

Number 5, candidates must complete an array of carefully planned clinical experiences, that means student teaching.

Number 6, candidates must complete a state-mandated character and fitness review which will happen at three times during their progression through the courses. And state-mandated background checks.

And lastly, there is a -

GROSSMAN: Not physical fitness?

FINKEL: - what's that?

GROSSMAN: Not physical fitness?

FINKEL: Apparently not. But it's state-mandated, so if it's physical then perhaps it is.

And finally 7, there's a mechanism for appealing negative results of any of those reviews.

So the details are a bit complicated, but the wording we think is consistent and clear and should satisfy the requirements of the accrediting agency and therefore we, in the committee and also in the Senate Council, recommend approval of these changes.

BLONDER: Thank you. So we have a motion, a recommendation from Senate Council that the proposed rules be used to replace Senate Rule Section 4.2.2.3 in the current Senate Rule on admission to College of Education Educator Preparation Programs subject to codification of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee.

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

Next again, Raphael Finkel, Chair of Senate Admissions and Academics Standards Committee will present proposed changes to the PhD Nursing Admission Requirement.

FINKEL: All right. So this is my last hurrah, because as you know, I'm leaving the Senate and so this is the last item that I'll be bringing before you. So let me get my own notes out here.

It's a proposal from the Nursing PhD Program in the College of Nursing. And the proposal is to change admission criteria for those students who enter this PhD program from UK programs, either Bachelor of Science in Nursing or Master of Science in Nursing.

And the rationale behind the change is to unify the admission criteria so that it's the same criteria for entry from either the Bachelor or from the Master's into the PhD program. And so the actual details are firstly to reduce the minimum GPA requirement for students entering from the Bachelor's. It has been 3.5, reducing it to 3.3, which is the minimum for people who enter the Master's. So Bachelor's and Master's have the same minimum GPA requirement.

Secondly, to drop the GRE requirement for entry into the PhD program from either the BSN or the MSN programs.

The reason behind is that the GRE test has not been predictive of success and it does make it difficult for the students in the Bachelor program to come in via the University Studies Program which often - which was supposed to happen at the end of the junior year when students will not yet have taken the GRE. And for the purpose of fellowships which might require the GRE while the admitted PhD students would take the GRE later.

We've already generally recommended in a previous meeting of this Body to drop the GRE requirement for the University Scholar's Program anyway. (UNINTELLIGIBLE) University Scholar's Program. That's the mechanism by which undergraduates can join a graduate degree and double-dip.

And there are, it is available in the Senate Rules that a program may petition to drop the requirement for the GRE. So it's following that provision.

Thirdly, to flush out an existing requirement, just to put it in words now, that applicants must supply a goal statement. And the wording now includes details of what that goal statement should include.

Fourth, to drop the requirement that students must have clinical experience if they're entering the Bachelor's. The requirement will still remain that the students must have a Kentucky Registered Nurse license which is a prerequisite for clinical experience in any case. So just

dropping the higher requirement of clinical experience.

And lastly, to add a requirement for students who are applying for the Master's program, and at least one of the three references should be from a faculty member who has a PhD. That requirement was already in place in the Bachelor and so it's just to make it consistent.

So these changes are all, to my mind and to the mind of both the Committee and the Senate Council, perfectly reasonable. They bring all of the applications into line with a similar set of requirements and so we recommend approval.

BLONDER: Thank you, Raphael. So we have a positive recommendation from Senate Council that the Senate approve the proposal as written.

Is there discussion? Yes?

JASPER: Sam Jasper, Dentistry.

I was just wondering what the reason for dropping the clinical experience requirement was? Is there a specific reason for that? Is someone here from nursing (UNINTELLIGIBLE)?

BROTHERS: Name please?

LENNIE: Terry Lennie, from the College of Nursing.

We have built into the BSN, PhD curriculum now clinical experiences within the curriculum so we don't need to require them before if it's going to be part of curriculum.

BLONDER: Other discussion items? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you, Raphael.

FINKEL: Thank you.

BLONDER: Next we have Herman Farrell, he's here from the Senate Academic Organization and Structure Committee. The first item from that committee is a proposed new Center For Research on Environmental Disease. Herman?

FARRELL: So this is a creation of a new multidisciplinary research center here at UK. And so our review encompassed not only consideration to the infrastructure but the academic program task by that Senate Council who asked us to cover both ends of the spectrum.

Now with regard to that and the infrastructure, we basically took a look at the reporting lines and noted that this was going to be a new MDRC that would report

directly to the Dean of the College of Medicine instead of the Dean for Research.

We had some questions in committee - can everyone hear me - we had some questions in committee regarding the hiring of the new faculty and whether or not the director of the new program, of the new center, would be doing the hiring or the departments where the faculty would be housed. And it was made clear to us that the departments would be doing the hiring.

We reviewed the governance issues of the MDRC. We noted that basically the director would be working with an Executive Council and an External Advisory Council. The Executive Council would be made up of two core faculty members as well as two affiliates.

We noted that the faculty council of the College of Medicine enthusiastically supported this proposal in a letter from John D'Orazio, the Chair of the Faculty Council in the College of Medicine.

Then we corresponded with the Chair of the SAPC, the Senate Academic Programs Committee to get Andrew Hippisley's insight with regard to the academic program issues. This was one of the first times that we had in our committee, at least in the last couple of years, had to review not only the infrastructure but the academic program considerations as well.

The Chair of the SAPC responded with a few questions about the educational goals and how they would be evaluated. We noted in the proposal that there was an indication of a program review. And there were a couple other questions that he put forth, but none of them stood in the way of us making the decision that we were going to vote on the academic program side of things.

And so essentially we voted, we had two votes on the academic program as well as academic infrastructure and we ended up supporting the proposal and it went before the Senate Council who supported it as well.

BLONDER: Thank you, Herman.

So we have two motions, this is the first of two motions. We have a positive recommendation from Senate Council that the Senate approve the proposed new Center for Research on Environmental Disease based on its academic merits.

Is there discussion?

NAGEL: I have a question. How much --

BROTHERS: Name, please?

BLONDER: Name and --

NAGEL: Uwe Nagel, Arts and Sciences.

How much would we invest to create this new center? There's hiring. What will it cost to create this? Do you have an idea?

FARRELL: I don't know the numbers, but we were told that it would be supported by the College of Medicine by the Dean. There's a letter saying that they supported it financially and also it was cleared through the Provost.

BLONDER: Are there other questions or discussion points? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

Now we have a second motion. This is another positive recommendation from Senate Council that the Senate endorse the proposed Resources and Placement of the proposed New Center for Research on Environmental Disease in the College of Medicine for approval by the Board of Trustees.

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

Next again, Herman Farrell, presenting for the Senate Academic Organizational Structure Committee. This is a proposed name change for the School of Interior Design. Herman?

FARRELL: Yes. So this was rather simply a name change. Let me find my document here. So basically it was going from the School of Interior Design to the School of Interiors: Planning/Strategy/Design.

My first issue was how this will actually be presented to others who perhaps would read this and see a rather long name, School of Interiors/Planning/Strategy and Design.

And it was made clear to us by Director Dixon that it would be - that basically, there would be a short one, School of Interiors, that would be used, but also the School of Interiors with the tag line, the colon in between, Planning, Strategy and Design.

We also raised the question whether or not other colleges or schools across the nation followed this, not followed this, but basically had such a long name in their description and it was made clear to us that

this is - there's no unified consensus on the unit name, that this was really the will of the faculty to make clear to applicants coming in as to what it is that the school itself does which is engaging in planning and strategy and design.

So that was essentially the proposal that was brought before us. Our Committee supported it as did the Senate Council.

BLONDER: Thank you, Herman. So we have a positive recommendation from the Senate Council that the Senate endorse the name change in the School of Interior Design to the School of Interiors, colon, Planning, back slash, Strategy, slash Design. Is there discussion? Yes?

PORTER: Todd Porter, Pharmacy.
This is profoundly stupid. This is another one of these stupid name changes that we adopt to make the name longer and somehow it's to make them more attractive.

And if the old school of Interior Design did not incorporate planning and strategy to what they were doing, they shouldn't have been a school. They shouldn't even be in the University.

So by the very sense that you design, of course there's planning, design, of course there's strategy. The name change is idiotic. But we'll rule it because that's all we know to do.

BLONDER: Is there somebody from the school that would like to respond?

REY-BARREAU: Yeah. I understand your -

BROTHERS: Name please?

REY-BARREAU: I'm sorry. Joe Rey-Barreau, College of Design.

Your point is well taken. The only response that I would have is that you have to be on the front line sometimes to understand how totally confusing to the majority of the public the concept of interior design is. And so there's a very limited range of potential students that we're reaching.

And that is because of preconceived notions in society about what exactly that discipline is all about. And so we are also looking to focus more on the School of Interiors to really match more with the school, the other school in the college, which is the School of Architecture.

So by having design in both the

name of the college and the name of the school of interior design is somewhat redundant, but we feel strongly that this is actually going to be a significant improvement in our recruitment efforts.

PORTER: Todd Porter, Pharmacy.

If somehow adding planning, strategy and design makes it less confusing then I say you go for it.

REY-BARREAU: Well, let me just say that we tried it. We've actually done some research on this and we find that especially male students are much more attracted to that concept.

And that is to a large extent because right now we have about a 97 percent female makeup of our student body and that males are much more attracted to the concepts that are made out in a more clear way through strategy and planning.

BLONDER: Would anyone else like to make a comment or ask a question? Raphael?

FINKEL: Raphael Finkel, College of Engineering.

I don't know of any other college or school that has got a slash in its name. It's really strange. Wouldn't a comma work better? Why go to the effort of a typographic difficulty?

REY-BARREAU: Well, again -

BLONDER: Name and college?

REY-BARREAU: I'm sorry. Joe Rey-Barreau, College of Design.

This was tested to some extent. You have to understand that in design, the way that we perceive things sometimes is a little bit out of the norm. And this is a way of defining the college, (UNINTELLIGIBLE) was a way of really defining more clearly what the focus of the program was by creating a more distinct separation in those two things.

And certainly, the issue of the comma is a valid point, and certainly if necessary, we will consider it.

BLONDER: Are there any other comments or questions? Okay, well let's vote. All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

Next we have again, Herman Farrell, Chair of Senate Academic Organization and Structure Committee, discussing the proposed name change and change of the organizational structure of the Graduate Center for

Biomedical Engineering. Herman?

FARRELL: So this involves a change from a graduate center to a department. Our committee last year reviewed a proposal for a change from a department to a school and we noted then when we were reviewing the GRs that there was no difference whatsoever in the regulations between a school and a college.

When we were reviewing the GRs here, we noted that the rules for a graduate center, at least the definition of the rules of a graduate center, said that a graduate center is equivalent to a department.

And so in our review we wanted to just make sure that the graduate center when it was making its change to a department was really making no real substantive change.

After our review, in looking at the policies and procedures, and also discussing the actual practice of the graduate, the current graduate center, with the director, we noted that there was no substantive change in educational policy or administration.

So we basically looked at this as if it were simply a name change even though it's not a name change, it's also an educational unit change from a graduate center to a department.

So after our review of this proposal which was brought forward because basically it was made clear to us that back in the '70s graduate centers who were biomedical engineering were I guess the rage.

And all of a sudden in the last couple of decades there's been a movement across the country, especially along our benchmarks, of these graduate centers transforming into department and so our UK Biomedical Engineering Graduate Center is just trying to keep up with the trends.

But they're also doing it because it will attract more students. They were noting that because they were not allowed under our rules as a graduate center to offer undergraduate courses, that they were losing some students to U of L and other places. They will be offering courses below the 400 level now as a result.

And the question came up whether or not a major was in the offing and it was - we received correspondence from the Dean of the College of Engineering making it clear that they're interested in eventually

creating a minor in the field of Biomedical Engineering, but there are no additional resources, faculty, staff, and laboratory space that would be required for such an offering.

It also says: I should emphasize that we have no plans at the present to create an undergraduate major in Biomedical Engineering as we feel such a degree is not needed at this time.

And so after this review of this proposal the SAOSC voted unanimously in favor of it and the Senate Council endorsed it as well.

BLONDER: Thank you, Herman.

So we have a positive recommendation from Senate Council that the Senate endorse the proposed change of the organization name change of the Graduate Center for Biomedical Engineering to the Department of Biomedical Engineering.

Discussion? All in favor?

Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you. Thank you, Herman.

Next we have Davy Jones, Chair of the Senate Rules and Elections Committee talking about a reference in Senate Rules to Nonexistent Form an Incomplete Grade.

JONES: Okay. Yes. In the Senate Rules there's a section on I grade and how to handle I Grade.

This was brought to our attention by the Registrar that makes reference to the person who is rendering an I grade having to utilize a form from, a paper form, from the Registrar that certain information about the I grade is recorded on. The Registrar brought it to our attention, there is no such form.

So we don't want to command people to use a form that doesn't exist. So we thought well, let's task Raphael's committee to assess in our current environment what kind of information does need to be collected and preserved on the file in relation to I grades.

And this relates to there's an I grade and some things needed to remediate that, but meanwhile the instructor has retired and left and the new person coming in teaching that course has no idea what's needed to get that I grade off the books.

So we need some kind of record to file to get that situation to fruition. So

what you're seeing up here is the - that's actually the - I'll give most of the credit to Raphael's committee for devising this language here that this is the information that they thought ought to be in this repository.

The Rules Committee suggested adding number 5 there. It went to the Senate Council, they did a few more just grammatical edits. And so what you see in front of you then is what's being suggested to replace the current obsolete language about what information you see stays about I grading will become instead this information.

UNIDENTIFIED: Can we increase the size of the font? We don't see....

BROTHERS: Is that better?

JONES: This information will be filed with the Department Chair so that it's always there for whoever comes on next that's going to wind up responsible for deciding what's needed to replace that I grade. It's very clearly disputed also what's needed to get that I grade.

BLONDER: Questions?

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.

Will the student grade automatically change to a D at the end of that 12 months?

JONES: Yeah.

ANDERSON: Will that continue? Should that be in the rule? I hadn't thought of it earlier, sorry.

JONES: Why did you think - what makes you think there's a problem? This is not - this is not the entire rule --

ANDERSON: Oh okay.

JONES: - I grade.

ANDERSON: Okay.

JONES: This is just about the form.

ANDERSON: Okay, never mind then.

JONES: Nothing else changes.

ANDERSON: Okay, never mind.

BLONDER: Clayton?

THYNE: Clayton Thyne, Arts and Sciences.

(UNINTELLIGIBLE) after this is more for the graduate students. Would that (UNINTELLIGIBLE)?

JONES: No, no.

BLONDER: Other questions?

GROSSMAN: Actually, I have a question.

BLONDER: Yes?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.

It says that standard form is

available on the Senate website. Who is going to create that form and what's the time line for it?

JONES: That's anticipatory language that if this was to pass then very quickly action would be taken to cause that form to come to come --

GROSSMAN: Right, I understand that. But you're using passive tense. So the question is who is responsible for creating that form and when is it going to be done?

JONES: I will get with necessary entities to cause that form to be done as quickly as possible.

GROSSMAN: Okay.

BLONDER: Anne?

HARRISON: Anne Harrison, College of College of Health Sciences.

So do you anticipate that when you put your grade in officially and you put your I that there will be something that pops up that says you can't put your I in until this happens or --

JONES: No.

HARRISON: - this will be a (UNINTELLIGIBLE)

JONES: No. You're aware that on the Senate website one of the many forms there is this.

BLONDER: Yes?

UNINTELLIGIBLE: (UNINTELLIGIBLE), Arts and Sciences.

Is there going to be some provision to inform faculty members about this requirement?

JONES: There will be an initial broadcast after this Senate meeting if this passes. This -- Sheila Brothers has this long list of college contacts that it goes out to so the information will be there.

WATKINS: John Watkins, excuse me, Public Health.

Maybe this is a recommendation for an amendment to the Board members, but number 2, item number 2, would we want to say the course and section number realizing that not all sections are created equally because oftentimes I know from my experience if I don't have that section number it causes confusion.

JONES: That would be appropriate. Would the Parliamentarian accept that friendly amendment?

BUTLER: Is there a motion from committee?

JONES: Yes.

BUTLER: You need to have a motion and a second or the committee cannot accept it.

GROSSMAN: I can do it.

BUTLER: Okay.

GROSSMAN: I move that we add the words and section between the course and number.

BLONDER: Is there a second?

BRION: Second.

NAGEL: Second.

BLONDER: So we vote on that?

BROTHERS: I'm sorry. Who was the second?

BRION: I did. Brion, Gail.

BLONDER: All in favor of the amendment? Opposed? Abstained? Okay, the amendment passes. Are there other questions? Yes.

DIETZ: Henry Dietz, Engineering.
It seems to me this is sort of a patch on the whole idea of this really should be online with all other grading information. So is there a technical reason why we can't have this in the same structure as any grade?

JONES: When you electronically enter an I something pops up that this form --

DIETZ: Right. If something pops up, fill in the blank.

JONES: That would be great. It takes resources to cause that to happen.

DIETZ: As opposed to the people you have that maybe (UNINTELLIGIBLE).

BLONDER: Bob?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.
Part of the problem here isn't to - because the person putting in the I needs to fill out the information. The issue is the next person to teach the course having no way of knowing that an I was assigned earlier.

It's the idea that by keeping this information in the department, the Chair who is responsible for assigning teaching duties will be able to look and see are there any outstanding Is that will be able to inform the next instructor that this issue needs to be dealt with.

JONES: Yeah. In the absence of the electronic buzz, the Chair is responsible.

GROSSMAN: But even more to the point, the electronic buzz won't go - I mean when you fill out your I and then you go on sabbatical, there's no way for your successor to know that you filled out that I because - unless they -

UNIDENTIFIED: That could be forwarded too. It's not hard to do.

GROSSMAN: If you know who is going to be teaching the next semester and if the system does.

BLONDER: Eli?

EDWARDS: I think it would be - Eli Edwards, sorry, Education.

I think it would be quite rash to ask IT to develop something in their own form system so that would be a conversation for a later day.

PRATS: It seems to me --

BLONDER: Name and college.

PRATS: Armando Prats, English Department.

It does seem to me that the subsequent teacher would not necessarily have that student in class anyway. I mean so it's not as if the Chair can - it's not as if that teacher inherits that by virtue of teaching the course after the original version of the course. So the student just simply knows that he or she needs to do this much work because that's what the form is requiring.

JONES: But somebody has to be the instructor who puts the grade change.

PRATS: Then it's - it's not the Chair?

JONES: Whoever the Chair is going to assign to be the instructor of record for that purpose for that course for that student has to have the information for whoever's being stuck with that assignment to know what is required and to the student still.

BLONDER: Bob?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.

Armando, sometimes you're right, but sometimes the condition for completing the work is giving a seminar in front of the other students in the class. And that might need to happen the next semester. Sometimes the requirement is taking the final exam for the next semester's course. So these are things that the next instructor sometimes needs to know. It happens in our department all the time.

BLONDER: Ben?

WITHERS: Ben Withers, Undergraduate Education.

Back when I was Chair of the Department of (UNINTELLIGIBLE), we had an instructor who passed away, he was deceased. And because we had the old form we were able to go back and there was a student that

hadn't (UNINTELLIGIBLE), we were able to say (UNINTELLIGIBLE). I've also seen instances when students have protested that they did (UNINTELLIGIBLE) and we were able to go back and show them where they signed the form, and said yes, indeed, that's what you agreed to do. So it is something that it does help us out on the rare occasion (UNINTELLIGIBLE).

BLONDER: Let's go to the motion which was
- oh, yes?

NAGEL: Uwe Nagel, Arts and Sciences.
I mean whenever I assign an incomplete, and then I do put in what it takes to complete the degree but then I (UNINTELLIGIBLE).

JONES: But that person may die, that person may retire.

NAGEL: Yeah. Hopefully it happens much less frequency than assigning an I grade.

JONES: I agree. But for the student who is in that situation, in that 100 percent situation so we have to have the record there so that everybody can see it.

NAGEL: I'm not disputing the record, I'm just wondering who is responsible for actually reporting the grade change.

JONES: The Chair.

BLONDER: One more.

PRATS: Armando Prats.
At the risk of being wrong again, what about the possibility that when the student turns in the work there's nobody actively teaching the course. In other words, could this be expanded in some respect to say, for example, put it on a chair's committee, like an undergraduate committee or a graduate committee or something like that? In other words, the student, the next semester the student completes the work, there's nobody teaching English 330, for example, what happens then?

JONES: The Chair would become the instructor then.

BLONDER: Okay. So we have a positive recommendation from Senate Council that the Senate approve the proposed changes to Senate Rule 5.1.3.2 that was amended. So we need a motion to approve the proposed changes to Senate Rule 5.1.3.2 as amended.

BUTLER: It's a motion from committee. It's on the floor. It was amended. It's still on the floor.

BLONDER: Okay. So we just vote then.

BUTLER: Absolutely.

BLONDER: All in favor? Opposed? Abstained?
Motion as amended carries.

Next, Andrew Hippisley, Chair of Senate Academic Programs Committee will present the proposed new undergraduate Certificate in Peace Studies.

HIPPISLEY: This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new undergraduate certificate, Peace Studies within the College of Arts and Sciences.

The aim of this certificate is to develop in students an interest in issues of peace and justice from the level of the individual to a more global level and to develop in them skills in conflict resolution and peaceful communication.

It's a real response to conflict in various forms including war, the workplace, and the family.

The certificate will empower students to respond effectively to conflict at these multiple levels and they will do this by bringing together existing earlier courses into a coherent peace-making focus.

So there are around 400 colleges and universities that offer peace related programs. This will be the only one like it in the SEC.

There will be 12 credits. It will begin with an Introduction to Peace Studies and it will conclude with a Peace Studies Capstone Seminar and both of these are new credit - courses worth 6 credits. And in between those two students will choose 6 credits from a list of existing courses that are deemed to reflect one or more of these following focal areas to at least 50 percent. Peacebuilding, an example of that would be CLD Leadership Studies, Peacemaking SW 511 Genocide, Promoting Understanding, ANT 340 Development and Change in the Third World, and finally Addressing Global and Regional Pressures, for example, FOR 230, Conservation Biology.

Each student, and this is important, each student will have a special Peace Studies mentor. As a certificate it has a detailed list of student learning outcomes which can be assessed. These include demonstrate knowledge of the theories associated with Peace Studies, demonstrate knowledge of how the study of peace influences society.

Programmatic objectives will be assessed and assessment will include employability in the peacemaking fields as well as student retention rates because of this important component of mentorship. They're going to measure whether this makes a difference in retention.

There is an identified Faculty of Record with rules of voting rights revolving in and out of the Faculty of Record organization. And there's a program director.

BLONDER: Thank you, Andrew.

So we have a positive recommendation from Senate Council that the Senate approve the proposed new Undergraduate Certificate in Peace Studies within the College of Arts and Sciences.

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

Next item, again Andrew Hippisley, Chair of Senate Academic Programs Committee will present the proposed new University Studies Program, BS in Accountancy and MS in Accountancy.

HIPPISLEY: So this is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new University Scholars Program: Master's of Science in Accountancy in the Von Allmen School of Accountancy within the Gatton College of Business.

There are a number of entry requirements and these include the completion of 90 credits, 3.2 GPA overall or an ACT score of 26 or 600 GMAT.

Six graduate credits from the undergraduate level can be transferred to the graduate degree. The proposal has an assessment line in it and this will be based on enrollment. There's an estimate that this new University Scholars Program will bring in an additional 15 to 20 students, so that will be measured.

BLONDER: Thank you.

So we have a positive recommendation from Senate Council and from the Committee that the Senate approve establishment of a new University Studies Program of a BS and MS in Accountancy in the Von Allmen School of Accountancy in the Gatton College of Business and Economics.

Discussion?

CHRIST: Alice Christ, Fine Arts.

I think there's a typo in the proposal in (UNINTELLIGIBLE) University Scholars so we can just amend that. Amend it to University Scholars.

BLONDER: Is there a second?

UNIDENTIFIED: Second.

BLONDER: All in favor of the amendment?

BROTHERS: I'm sorry. Who was the second?

ANDERSON: I seconded.

BLONDER: Did you hear the second?

BROTHERS: Yes.

BLONDER: Okay. All in favor of the amendment? Opposed? Abstained? Okay, the amendment passes.

Anything else about this? Any other questions?

Okay. So we now have a positive recommendation that's been amended. All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries as amended. Thank you.

Next we have Andrew presenting a proposed new BA/BS in Information Communication Technology. Andrew?

HIPPISLEY: So we have a recommendation that the University Senate approve for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new BA/BS program: Information Communication Technology in the School of Library and Information Sciences within the College of Communication and Information.

A little bit of background here. What's being proposed here is training in the application of proposed design, development of information communication technology.

Most ICT programs in Kentucky emphasize design and development, it is important.

Suitable job destinations for students graduating from the program would include software application specialists, computer network professionals, database and systems administrators, IT security officers, et cetera.

The main aim is to expose students to the theoretical underpinnings of ICT as well as practical applications of technologies.

Moving on to the content, there is a prerequisite, that's the Microsoft Competency Certifications for Word, Access, Excel and PowerPoint.

And then to the degree itself, there will be various required courses and a few of them are Information Literacy and

Critical Thinking, General Information Sources as well as Information Services Issues in ICT Policy.

The 300 level ICT in Society, Introduction to Databases, Information (UNINTELLIGIBLE). At the 400 level, Consumer Behavior, and there will be an internship in ICT as well.

The program is divided into two areas of - two emphasis areas or what we call options, which have their own requirements. The first one is the ICT Commercialization and it has two requirements, ISC 161, Introduction to Integrated Strategic Communication, ISC 361, Media and Database Management. And then students choose two from a set of courses which include e-Commerce Regulation, Web Publishing and Design, Media Management and Entrepreneurship.

Then the second option is Technology Management and students will have to do IS 202, Technology for Information Services as well as ICT Systems Analysis and then they choose two from a group of seven courses including Technology Security, Information IT and Strategy and Telecommunications Network Management.

There are about 12 student learning outcomes listed. The -- I won't read all 12. I'll say that they include understand history of ICT and its importance in society, understand basic ICT hardware and software technologies, and apply principles, concepts and skills within a particular area of emphasis, for example.

There is a good plan to assess these SLOs and there's also a distinct plan to assess the program as a whole, including the employment record of the graduates because it's a strong emphasis on employability as a motivation for this proposal, so employment record of graduates as well as surveying employers to see if they're okay and happy with the UK graduates.

There is a Faculty of Record in place. The Director will be the Director of the School of Library Science (UNINTELLIGIBLE). And the Faculty of Record will be all SLIS members, and only SLIS members. Members will have voting rights.

BLONDER: Thank you. So we have a positive recommendation from Senate Council that the approve for submission to the Board of

Trustees the establishment of a new BA/BS program in Information Communication Technology in the School of Library and Information Science within the College of Communication Information.

Is there discussion?

CALVERT: I'm Ken Calvert, I'm the Chairman of Computer Science.

And I apologize for coming in at this point with some concerns. The reality is that I saw this full proposal less than two weeks ago when my colleague, Greg Wasilkowski, who is on Senate Council sent me a note and said hey, we just voted on this proposal which includes a required course called Intro to Database Systems, Intro to Database.

We teach a course called Intro to Database Systems, said -- they said that they talked to us about it. Is that right? I said I don't remember that.

So I've spent two weeks digging into that and it turns out we were sent an outline of the required courses back in the fall, which looks pretty different from -- well, it looks fairly different from what's in here, okay? Particularly, the Intro to Database course was not in here. It was not in what we were sent in the fall.

I want to say we're not here to -- I'm not here to submarine the proposal, but I do have some concerns about the proposal that I would like to speak to and thank you for letting me bring those up.

The main concern is that I -- I -- it's hard to tell from the proposal sort of where the boundary is between what we do and what this program is going to do.

I am not opposed to an information technology program, in fact, I think it's a good idea. We need something like that. I hope that we can work together for a mutual benefit.

My concern is that some of the benefits and motivation for the programs that are being used to motivate this sound a lot like computer science. For example, under the -- in the proposal form under the objectives, the broad -- it says broad cluster of occupations that fall within the ICT arena include software and application programmers, computer network professionals and a long list of others. But there's no programming in this program at all.

Under the proposal form on question number 14 the question is, is there a specific accrediting agency related to this program. They said no, but in fact, the Accreditation Board of Engineering Technology does accredit information technology programs.

So I don't - I'm not sure why that doesn't apply to this. I'd like to know why that is. And again, I apologize for not talking to Jeff Huber before this, okay? I think part of that is my fault. But again, I don't think it's entirely our fault.

As I say, the specific thing that I think we have a problem with is the requirement of Intro to Databases course which sounds very similar to the Introduction to Database Systems course that we teach.

And then many of the jobs that are listed, they have a long job analysis, but many of those according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for example, Computer and Information Research Scientist, the BLS says a PhD in Computer Science or related subjects is required for most Computer and Information Research Scientist jobs. Computer Systems Analyst, a Bachelor's degree in a computer or science field is common although not always a requirement. Some firms hire analysts with business or liberal arts degrees if you know how to write computer programs. Information Security Analysts, Network Architectures - Network Architects, same kind of.

So those are - those are the concerns that I have. I --

BLONDER: Why don't we - would someone like to respond? Is there someone here from the program?

O'HAIR: I'm Dan O'Hair. I'm Dean of the College of Communication and Information.

We have vetted this program for over a year now. We contacted Computer Science. We have five deans that are on board with this as to how do you apply technology in an information and communication perspective.

I think it's a fair question that Ken raises about boundaries, but we are not in the business of programming. And the fact that there is only one course that he referred to that might have some overlap, I think speaks to the issue that this is a fairly independent type of program.

Our strategic plan in 2009 asked

the college to go forward with a technology degree and this is the result of it. It took almost three years to vet it with industry. We vetted it with our advisory board, we vetted it with colleges. We vetted it with the self-study committee that came in from Rutgers and Florida State, which both of which are Communication and Information Colleges that have this very degree.

And so we felt like that we had done our homework. We don't intend to overlap at all with Computer Science.

And the third point about jobs, these were merely illustrative of the kinds of things that the Bureau of Labor Statistics mentions whenever we punch into a search that asks about Information Communication Technology.

BLONDER: Okay. I'd like to open it to the floor to see if other people have comments.

EDWARDS: Eli Edwards, Education.

Has the course ICT 301 Introduction to Databases been approved through the course transmittal process or is that accrediting? Like is it already a course?

BROTHERS: I think it has. Hold on, let me check.

EDWARDS: So I guess if it has already been approved then I'm not sure about the question related to the course.

BROTHERS: Yes. ICT 301 was approved as of April 17th. Sorry, that's wrong. It's as of April 30th.

BLONDER: Are there other discussions? Other people --

PRATS: I have a question. Armando Prats. Cannot this program require a course in Computer Science or does it have to be really an entirely different course. I mean why can't the program require a course in another department?

BLONDER: Would someone like to speak to that from the program? The question was why couldn't this program require this course? Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED: I'm not from the program, but if it's already been approved, you know, it doesn't matter anymore, right? It's already approved.

BLONDER: Well, it's approved.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah.

BLONDER: The course itself is approved.

NAGA: Uwe Naga, Arts and Science.
I thought this is a degree in

the College of Engineering okay, but now there is not even a course taken in the College of Engineering. But on the other hand you advertise this is a good course, it's very related to the Computer Science, related jobs are good. So I think there should be other coordination between the two colleges to make this more coherent. (UNINTELLIGIBLE) unifies resources instead of potentially (UNINTELLIGIBLE).

BLONDER: Yes?

DIETZ: Henry Dietz, Engineering.

I think the point that Ken was making about there being a lack of programming there is really what's bothering me about this because even though it doesn't seem to have any programming that I can discern, it talks about jobs that are primarily programming. So it seems like it's a little bit of a misdirection (UNINTELLIGIBLE).

BLONDER: Yes?

BUNTIN: Will Buntin, I'm the Assistant Director of the School of Library and Information Science.

Again we pulled some of the job descriptions from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and there was a separate category specific to development in terms of software. We did not include any of the jobs from that area. So the jobs that we included does not preclude people with a programming background having those jobs.

I think at the same time, it doesn't preclude students from a program like ours (UNINTELLIGIBLE).

One example that I've used before is in my previous life I worked in private business and they had an IT department that had programmers. But I was the one in the marketing department actually who understood technology, used technology and understood what marketing needed and what IT needed in order to come up with a (UNINTELLIGIBLE).

So in that role I played sort of a - not even a translator, but someone who could take multiple pieces from the different areas even though I could not sit down and design (UNINTELLIGIBLE) from scratch, I still understood the basis for what it (UNINTELLIGIBLE) integrity.

So again, I want to emphasize, this isn't a degree about programming. And I think that we made a good and honest effort

to include the types of jobs that we thought were particular, and you know, if there is one or two of those that we need to edit out, then we have to do that.

BLONDER: Yes, Terry?

CONNERS: Terry Conners, Agriculture.

I have a question why this is in the BA/BS program because it seems to me this might potentially be an enrollment management issue, tell me how - tell me why that's incorporated that way? Why is this a BA/BS program and not one or the other?

O'HAIR: We have students in our college that will pursue a communication degree or I information science degree, et cetera, that prefer the option of going to a more liberal arts approach or going more a science approach and the requirements are different.

CONNORS: Do you think this might be something where you have a 72/25 percent shake out in the future and it might be better to simplify the approach --

O'HAIR: I mean that's a good question. It's sort of difficult to know going in. We would probably consult the other ICT programs in the country to determine if one is (UNINTELLIGIBLE) from the other.

BLONDER: Bob?

GROSSMAN: Yeah. I guess I think that concerns raised by Computer Science are valid especially given that the consultation process appears to have failed. I think that some more consultation between those groups is warranted. So I would like to propose to table this motion and then if the Senate --

BUTLER: Do you wish to table, which means we don't talk about it anymore, or return it to committees, which means we do?

GROSSMAN: Return to committee.

BUTLER: Okay.

GROSSMAN: I propose to return it - I move to return it to committee until such time as the School of Library and Information Sciences and the Department of Computer Science actually have the discussion. And there's also these issues.

WASILKOWSKI: I second. Wasilkowski.

BLONDER: Okay. Is there discussion? We have a motion on the floor that's been seconded. Yes.

PORTER: Todd Porter, Pharmacy.

We already discussed this, this specific issue in committee. I don't think anything will be different. The committee

doesn't have anything to do on this. You asked that it be more specific. We need a delineation of what you want from these two departments. We've already discussed this and we are satisfied that it is sufficiently different from Computer Science than it is justifiably (UNINTELLIGIBLE). Am I right, Andrew?

HIPPISLEY: Yes. That's correct.

NAGA: We just learned that now we have two courses Intro to Databases, which I view as a mistake that you made. You shouldn't have two courses with the same content whatever you call it.

BLONDER: Are there other comments because we have a motion on the floor that's been seconded. Yes?

LEDERER: Al Lederer, Gatton College.

BROTHERS: I'm sorry. Name, please.

LEDERER: What?

BROTHERS: I didn't hear your name.

LEDERER: Al Lederer, Gatton College.

BROTHERS: Yes. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED: Could you speak up, please?

LEDERER: For years, for years we had a database course in our college very similar to the new course being planned without programming. We had a range of them that's similar to the one today and it was eliminated a couple of years ago in failure of something that was (UNINTELLIGIBLE). We had a question of computer programming, there are a course and a major, and the students who wanted to take the computer programming, they could take it with the Computer Science Department. (UNINTELLIGIBLE). And many of them took the computer programming and came out stronger for it.

BLONDER: Yes?

EDWARDS: Eli Edwards, Education.

I think that I don't agree with the tabling because I don't think that the --

BLONDER: It wasn't tabling. It was a motion to return --

EDWARDS: - or the return to committee, sorry, because I don't think that the program as a whole and its passage should necessarily get hurt by this. I think that an amendment, some other way might be more appropriate, but I just don't think the program should be stied just because of this one thing.

BLONDER: Well, we have a motion on the floor that's been seconded so should we bring that to a vote?

BUTLER: If the motion returning to committee fails a motion to amend may then be made.

BLONDER: Okay. So all in favor of returning this to committee as moved by Bob Grossman and seconded, please raise your hand. All in favor of returning to committee.

BROTHERS: Raise them high, please.

ANSCHER: Thirty-two.

BLONDER: All opposed to returning to committee? Abstained?

ANSCHER: Twenty-five.

BLONDER: Forty-five?

ANSCHER: Twenty-five.

BLONDER: So the motion passed. So this is going to returned to committee then.

UNIDENTIFIED: Just let me say we're (UNINTELLIGIBLE) the entire year.

PORTER: Was there more than one person that counted those hands on that vote?

BLONDER: We can take a re-vote. All right. Let's re-vote. All in favor of the motion to return this to committee please raise your hand.

BROTHERS: I got 31.

ANSCHER: I got 31 this time.

BLONDER: Thirty-one. Okay. All opposed?

BROTHERS: I got 27.

ANSCHER: I got (UNINTELLIGIBLE).

GROSSMAN: All those numbers are lower than 31.

BLONDER: All right. So the motion to return to committee is passed and so this will be returned to committee. Thank you.

PORTER: May I ask the charge to the committee? Unfortunately I'm going to be on the committee again next year. I want to know what (UNINTELLIGIBLE).

GROSSMAN: Well, in my motion I said return to committee so that the two colleges that are at loggerheads here can have an opportunity to discuss it, to discuss the program with one another and hopefully come to some kind of accommodation. Pretty much a peace conference.

BLONDER: All right, thank you. Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED: I just wanted to say I didn't know we were at loggerheads. Today is the first time we heard any objection from Computer Science even though we've contacted them. So I don't know what the loggerhead would be. I'm willing to drop that --

BLONDER: We've already discussed this. We've just this discussed this. We had a

motion and the motion has passed. We have to move on.

Next item on the agenda is Ruth Beattie who is Chair of the UK Core Education Committee. She'll be discussing UK Core Senate Rule Language changes to Senate Rule 1.4.3.0 and 5.4.3.2.

BEATTIE: The implementation of the UK Core back in the fall of 2011 has necessitated some change in language of the two mentioned Senate Rules. Basically the removal of language dealing with the old (UNINTELLIGIBLE) program and the insertion of the language related to the UK Core Requirements.

So Senate Rule 1.4.3.0 deals with the composition and the function of the UKCEC, the UK Core Education Committee, and Senate Rule 5.4.3.2 deals with the actual general education graduation requirements for students.

There is one correction to be made on the document that you have in front of you on the second page, item 5 and item 6, Dean of Undergraduate Studies should be replaced with Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education.

BLONDER: So we have a positive recommendation from Senate Council that the Senate approve the proposed changes to Senate Rule 1.4.3.0 and 5.4.3.2 with those corrections.

Do we need an amendment to do those corrections?

BUTLER: Did you amend the written text that was --

BEATTIE: I just amended what was the handout.

BUTLER: Oh.

BEATTIE: So I amended it right now.

BUTLER: A motion.

BLONDER: So we need a motion to amend as Ruth just described.

WASILKOWSKI: So moved.

BLONDER: Is there a second?

CHRISTIANSON: Second.

BLONDER: All in favor?

BROTHERS: Who was the second?

CHRISTIANSON: Second, Eric Christianson, Arts and Sciences.

BLONDER: All in favor of the amendment? Opposed? Abstained? Amendment carries.

So now we have a recommendation that the Senate approve the proposed changes

as amended to these rules. All in fav -- is there discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you, Ruth.

I don't think the President has arrived yet so if there are no objections I will continue to the next agenda item. No objections?

Okay. The next agenda item is the proposed changes to Senate Rules regarding Graduation Composition and Communication Requirements. And there are two changes and Ben Withers is going to present them.

WITHERS: Hello. Good to see you all today. When I was appointed the Interim Associate Provost, it was brought to my attention that there were three or four major items that needed the attention of the Associate Provost and in particular, to be brought to the Senate Council and the Senate.

One of them you just passed, the UK Core implementation even though we approved that back in 2011, it's still not encoded in the Senate Rules. The other was the Honor's curriculum and the Honor's faculty, we approved that earlier on this year.

The two remaining items, the foreign language proficiency, we identified faculty to serve on the chair, sorry, serve on a committee in the fall to deal with the issue of foreign language deficiency here at UK.

And the last is the one that's in front of us today and that's the changes to the old graduation writing requirement which we now propose to call the Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement.

In the very old sense, I've been a shepherd of other people's work. This has been an item that's been under consideration in Undergraduate Education since at least 2009. The old writing initiative lost it's funding and we began to throw it away and also at the same time we were considering changes to the USP for the new UK Core.

Those two things have prompted then Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, Michael Mullen, to appoint an Ad Hoc Committee to figure out how we might be able to connect the Graduation Communication Requirement more directly with UK Core and find a means to support it.

Since 2009 there's been a great deal of work. The Ad Hoc Committee was chaired by Deanna Sellnow, who also worked on

the QEP and represented a broad cross-section of faculty from across the campus.

That work was brought to the Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee who sent it on to the Senate Council, this is in 2011 and in 2012. The Senate Council asked that certain changes be made to that document a year ago, back in March, February and March.

Unfortunately, Associate Provost, Mike Mullen, left before he could complete those so I took up that charge in the fall.

What you have in front of you is a revised document that is related to the Ad Hoc Committee's work. It was revised by Roxanne Mountford, in the WRD program based upon that earlier committee's work. And then sent back to the Ad Hoc Committee who looked at that revision, gave their blessing to it and then as instructed I brought that back to the Senate Council for their endorsement, which was in January of this year.

The Senate Council endorsed that work and suggested that we put that proposal in a format of the Senate Rules, that you have in front of you today, that's been sent to you.

Essentially, this new - these new rules ask for the creation of an advisory committee broadly represented, appointed by the Senate Council Chair on the recommendation of the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education that would report to the Undergraduate Council and they would be responsible for vetting any proposals that come forward for this new graduation requirement.

The graduation requirement itself is modeled in some ways on the old GWR but provides much more flexibility in that it asks every unit to identify a course or assignments in their own unit or to partner with another unit to identify the same that totals 4,500 words of writing with no restrictions on what that writing may be, just the full 4500 words and a ten minute oral presentation or visual presentation at the discretion of the unit.

So writing is the backbone. That's the one thing that must be there. And the other two modalities are to be decided by those units.

All of those assignments at the suggestion of the Senate Council are to be in

English for that specific part of this requirement.

Part B of the GCCR says that the units that identify these courses are the ones that are responsible for assessment. There's not a detailed discussion of assessment there because it's difficult to come up with an assessment scheme based upon the differences within the units, within the flexibility that the units have to identify what their GCCR will be.

And then it requires that that assessment result be reported to the Advisory Committee who will be responsible for making sure that there is a commonality, that there's a basic standard across the University.

Those are the basics of this proposal. Again the idea is that there are three modalities to reflect the UK Core modalities and the comp and communication courses. This parallels neatly with the QEP, Presentation U, which provides faculty development funds and other assistance for the development of these courses so that they dovetail.

The one caveat that I would point out as we go forward is that I asked the Senate Council, and the Senate Council agreed to this, that this would not become finalized in official document until we could show that we could actually implement this.

In other words, we were basing this on the way that we operated with the UK Core, where we design, we created design principles, we created a framework for UK Core, and then the Senate gave us a year basically to show that we could get that work done.

So I'm suggesting that our future Associate Provost would come here or perhaps the Provost herself, as Subbaswamy did with UK Core, to address these issues at this time next year or even earlier.

In terms of implementation we would have next year to have these discussions. It will become an official part of the Senate Rules the fall following, that is 2014, and then the first time that we would need to offer these classes or most of these classes would be in 2015 for the students, the incoming students from 2014 would become sophomores and therefore would become eligible to meet the requirements of the

GCCR.

BLONDER: Thank you, Ben. So we have a positive recommendation from the Senate Council, this is for the proposed changes to Senate Rule 1.3.3.5.1., Advisory Committee for Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement.

So the recommendation is positive from Senate Council that the Senate adopt the changes to the Senate Rules as outlined in the proposal. Yes. Discussion?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.
Can you go through those implementation dates again because I think we should incorporate them into whatever we pass here today.

BLONDER: So the next - this is the next recommendation. Does that answer your question?

GROSSMAN: What was the first?

BLONDER: We have two different motions.

GROSSMAN: Yes, okay.

BLONDER: The second has the dates.

GROSSMAN: Yes. That answers my -

BLONDER: Okay.

GROSSMAN: So the changes to the Senate Rule as outlined for it is just for the committee itself?

BLONDER: Yes.

GROSSMAN: Okay, yes.

WITHERS: The two motions are like Oreos and I'm the cream filling in the middle.

BLONDER: Are there other discussion items? Questions?

GROSSMAN: That's a really bad --

WITHERS: Bad metaphor.

BLONDER: Questions? Discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries.

WITHERS: Thank you.

BLONDER: We have another motion, don't go away.

GROSSMAN: What happened, Mr. Cream?

WITHERS: I'm melting, I'm melting.

BLONDER: This is our second motion, positive recommendation from Senate Council that the Senate approve the proposed changes to Senate Rule 5.4.3.1 and charge the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education with reporting to the Senate on the success of the program at the end of the 2013/2014 academic year with an implementation date of fall 2014. Yes?

GROSSMAN: Okay. Now question: an implementation date of fall 2014, so this will apply to students who are admitted in

fall 2014?

WITHERS: To the people who are governed by the fall of 2014 bulletin, that calendar year, who would be freshman at that time, right. Then we call for this to take place so that the students would complete this after they are sophomores. So that gives us a year after that for further implementation.

But we have to give them that advanced warning, when they get to the University we have to give them that advanced warning.

GROSSMAN: So the implementation date refers to the entering date of students for when this program will first apply?

WITHERS: Right. When it first becomes official.

GROSSMAN: Okay.

WITHERS: And of course the difference with UK Core is that that implementation date corresponded precisely with the offering of all the courses because we had to. We had to have the course (UNINTELLIGIBLE).

BLONDER: Yes?

NAGA: Uwe Naga, Arts and Sciences.

I have a question for you.

Occasionally we have very smart students who take very advanced courses as a freshman. Would they be forbidden to take or finish this requirement because they are not a sophomore?

WITHERS: The devils are in the details and this is one of the reasons why I asked that we be able to start putting together the Advisory Committee to start meeting and considering this because it would depend on precisely what assignments and how a unit decides to - to begin this program.

So you can notice the wording in the documents says that students should complete it after their sophomore year, right? The intention there is that all writing should not be concentrated in the freshman year, the incoming year. We want students to be writing and to get revisions, to get feedback, when they're juniors and seniors as well.

So the wording there is that they can't complete it, but that doesn't necessarily preclude that someone could not take a course identified by the department in their freshman year, right? They could take a course in their freshman year that partially met those requirements.

Because remember what we're saying is that the 4500 words does not have to be in a single course. It can be if you want to. And if you notice, psychology, many other departments basically in the current GWR list nearly all their 400 and 500 level courses as meeting that because they're already writing that much in one course.

But another unit could come in and say I want 1,000 words as a freshman, 2,000 as a junior, and another what would be left, 1500 as a senior. So there is the potential for the overlap and we did not preclude that.

The instruction that we got from the committee, the instruction that we got from the Ad Hoc Committee, the instruction that we got from Senate Council, the lesson that I learned from reading the minutes of Senate Council last spring when Mike Mullen presented this to them was that flexibility needed to be a key cornerstone here.

Flexibility that doesn't throw the baby out with the bath water, hence the idea that we do have a certain number of words there, 4500 words, that everyone should be aiming for.

A long winded answer, but does it?

NAGA: Yeah. I still have a question.

WITHERS: Yes.

NAGA: I appreciate the flexibility but doesn't it mean that no student could get a degree just in two years?

WITHERS: I have not seen a student in two - in three years, yes, but not in --

NAGA: (UNINTELLIGIBLE).

WITHERS: I think that would be another issue. If we got to the place where we had a student who is about ready to graduate in two years there are ways to provide individual exceptions for this.

NAGA: Okay.

WITHERS: The important thing here is we not legislate from -- yeah. Right.

BLONDER: Davy?

JONES: (UNINTELLIGIBLE) get into the legislative record here because we get something from the Ombud, what did this rule mean. In terms of the success of the program, what's going to be referred to as the success of the program as distinct from what's being implemented in the fall of 2014?

WITHERS: I think that the - this is the Senate Council's language so I'm parsing a little bit. But what they wanted someone to

do, what I suggested was that the Associate Provost come back to that Body, to the Senate, and say are we able to implement this just the same way that we did with the UK Core.

There was the exact - not exactly the same wording but very similar wording when the Senate passed their final version of the UK Core they said okay, but come back in a year and show us that you can afford it.

JONES: Does it have the same meaning then if it's reporting to the Senate on the feasibility of implementing the program, is that what the success of the program means here?

WITHERS: I would see that, but I'm not the one that put the words there. But yes, I would see that.

BLONDER: Hollie?

SWANSON: Hollie Swanson, College of Medicine.

Using that example, if you remember that was in December when Mike Mullen presented that, what he did is outline the plan and give it a little feasibility and so for example, we had the number of classes and he predicted how many seats would be available in each class.

WITHERS: Those are the kinds of things -- how do I say that? Without a firm prescription from the Senate it will be difficult to get that kind of information from the units.

We need a prod that would help the units recognize that this needs to be done so that we can go to them and say how do you want to do it.

Once we understand how many of them want to identify a class that's a Capstone (UNINTELLIGIBLE), how many of them want to spread things out over a period of time, how many people are going to be requiring a class, or wanting to require a class in English, a WRD, or any other place. Then we can come back with that information.

So certainly I would see that's part of what this feasibility success report would be. Can we do this? Is it - are we able to do it? What are the impediments? Can we solve it? That's what that statement a year from now would be.

BLONDER: Gail?

BRION: Gail Brion, College of Engineering. Since we're all going to be doing it

differently, I assume that the way that we decide to implement this would all have to be coded into the degree (UNINTELLIGIBLE) and this is a tremendous of resources. Could it be possible that in a year with the new Provost that we're not going to implement this program as kind of happened before?

WITHERS: I think my first answer to that would be is that the faculty are the ones in charge of the curriculum. If you want this to be implemented then we need to make a statement that it should be implemented and push it forward.

Certainly the new Provost will have a lot of leeway in terms of resources, et cetera, that are directed toward it, but there's no way that we're going to get those resources unless we first ask for what we want.

BLONDER: So we have - Hollie?

SWANSON: Hollie Swanson.

I was wondering whether we should amend that success of the program to read implementation of plan? I don't know if I'm allowed to.

BLONDER: Yes. Yes. You can make a motion to amend it.

SWANSON: I move that we amend the recommendation to be that instead of discussing the program on the implementation plan on the program.

JONES: Second, Davy Jones.

BLONDER: Okay. Is there discussion of the amendment? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Amendment passes.

All right. Let's vote on the motion as amended then which is that the Senate approve the proposed changes to Senate Rule 5.4.3.1 and charge the Associate Provost for Undergrad Education with reporting to the Senate on the plan - at the end of 2013/2014 academic year with an implementation date of fall 2014. All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

WITHERS: Thank you.

BLONDER: And the President, the Interim Provost, the Vice President of Facilities are here and the Chief of Staff to the President. So President Capilouto, we'd like to turn it over to you for end of the year remarks.

CAPILOUTO: Thank you. I wanted the opportunity to drop by before I know many of you leave campus for the summer to express my gratitude. Yesterday Lee assisted me as we

handed diplomas to 2500 people who find those three ceremonies to be quite meaningful. I'm glad to see Eli in the audience and I think you agree with me.

BLONDER: And he graduated and he's here.

CAPILOUTO: And it was a powerful day and it's made powerful because of all of your work. Once the general assembly finished its work I took the opportunity to go to class here on campus.

I attended several things that I wanted to share with you. I think the first was an afternoon arranged for me, or evening, with PhD candidates, many of whom I saw Sunday, who took about ten or fifteen minutes to share the research that they were doing and that was exciting.

I then attended a class, biochemistry class taught by Dr. Butterfield, he had been asking me to do this for awhile. It was outstanding.

He had over 30 students there. They were from all over Kentucky, but all over the world. And the way he was able to bring the what can sometimes be dry world of biochemistry to a real world application in a field where he is conducting research, Alzheimer's, was fascinating. And that he knew the story about every student in the room, it was made up of graduate and then junior and senior students.

He was able to bring to life the research that had been going on in his lab and then at the end closed with a slide of everyone who had made all that research possible, who had been partners. That was great.

Last weekend, this room, we had a tremendous presentation that I think offers an example of how we differentiate ourselves from other universities in this country. It was an NSF supported activity where we brought together, and it was led out of our College of Design, but at least four colleges were represented, Education, Engineering, Business and Design.

These students broke into teams representing those four colleges. And they paralleled work we were doing on our Master Plan. Bob Wiseman, who is here today, presented information to them along the way and then they picked four areas dealing with sustainability and our campus, came up with approaches, did an analysis, collected

primary data and then posed some fascinating solutions.

As part of the theme of our Presentation U, our QEP, they all had to make their ten minute presentation. They included oral presentation, certainly some PowerPoint type material, I wouldn't say PowerPoint, a video presentation that they had to produce as well.

I think it was an incredible demonstration of what you can do in the way of an educational experience here at UK that you can't do many other places.

Lastly, I treated myself to our production of Spring Awakening. Did any of you see that? That was just outstanding.

The lead actress at the end when she was receiving a sustained standing ovation, she began to cry. And I told her and her father, she made me cry.

It was a powerful play about how issues of decades ago are still issues today and how we as adults have something to learn from our children. So that was tremendous and I want to thank you for making those kinds of things possible.

I also want to thank you for what I know was a year of achievement in terms of some of the things that we said we would work on together. We made a pledge to access affordability by limiting the increase in our tuition to 3 percent.

I think we set the tone for the state, many other universities were going to go much higher than that. I think the Governor weighed in and many others and said 3 percent would be the ceiling.

We said that we wanted to work on competitive salaries and so we do have that 5 percent plan that we will implement July 1st for faculty and staff.

And we're well on our way to restoring infrastructure on campus that we're going to need to be that thriving residential campus infused with technology.

Our recruitment of students remains strong. It's still early for next year. I don't know how many of you saw the article in this morning's front page of the Wall Street Journal. It talked about, focused largely on private universities. Their recruitment, which was tailing off, the price points that are now involved in those recruitments that make it difficult for them to be as

successful unless you're the very top elite.

Their discount rates are increasing, it means they're increasing their scholarship levels and all.

As I read an article like that it reminds me again how a top flight research land grant university, public, offers something that differentiated by what we do but it is at incredible values. So that is certainly exciting.

We're going to show you something about our residence halls that will graphically demonstrate the kind of campus we're creating today.

We will have underway, we'll break ground probably in the spring, Bob, the renovation and expansion of our College of Business, our plan for the Science Building continues and of course we did include in our bond issue request renovation of the football training facilities and Commonwealth Stadium. So all that will be underway in the coming year.

I also want to share with you that this drumbeat I hear, as I do articulate the incredible things we do here. There is still this constant drumbeat about accountability for what we do.

A couple of weeks the Chronicle of Higher Education joined along with some people that have put out the reality check website so that you can pick and compare universities when you're trying to make a selection of where you want to attend.

And they report and feature graphically retention rates, costs, net costs, all those kinds of factors. You know the President of the United States, the day after his State of the Union Address, on the White House website, it has the same kind of information so that you can compare universities. This information is permeating our state. I know Ryan Alessi on his website here in Kentucky now has done a comparison of universities throughout Kentucky. So more and more consumerism about what we offer and the value that we offer.

I think it's incredibly good, but it also is a reminder to me that that outstanding teaching that I had the opportunity to experience is what keeps us incredibly competitive.

I'm encouraged by what I see going on in area of research even in a tough

climate. I do think that there will be returned investments.

I noticed the President is starting to speak favorably again about investments made through NSF and NIH. I think we've got a new Science Building, we should be in position when that economy pool returns to respond.

So I want to thank you for all of this incredible work. I wanted to share with you a video. Do you have that ready? Our private partner and the public private partnerships has developed this for presentation. We will leave it in after it's edited some to be used as part of our recruitment efforts for students.

So these buildings are all under construction now.

(VIDEO PRESENTATION)

CAPILOUTO: So those lights on the top of the building will be able to change blue. We'll save that for very special occasions when students and faculty have incredible days of achievement. We'll recognize it that way.

We just toured some of our Trustees and others, the facility that is being constructed, to give them an early look. That will be completed June 30th and we look forward to hosting many of you there.

Just to let you know about the demand for that space, there's 600 beds in those two facilities. We had, this year, 2400 applicants for those 600 beds. We - we will have more than any university we can find, more learning space within these facilities.

We have to use those opportunities to achieve what I think we all want and that is the most positive outcome you can have and that is graduation.

I don't know, Lee, if we can shake more than 2500 hands, that was pretty taxing yesterday. But I would love to be pushed to 3500 on a day like that. It's the right thing to do. And I think each percent increase in retention offers us revenues of well over \$2 million. And so it would help solve many challenges that we face that unfortunately do cost money.

But thank you for all your incredible work. Thank you for the honest discussions we've had this year. I'll be here all summer if you have any other advice that you'd like to offer. I'm entirely

available. So thank you very much. If you have any questions, I'm happy to take any questions.

BLONDER: Yes. Questions for the President?

PRATS: When does Bob Grossman get his sun screen? When is that planned for?

PRESIDENT: Monday.

BLONDER: Other questions?

CAPILOUTO: Okay. Thank you.

BLONDER: Before we adjourn, Provost Tracy, this is our last Senate meeting of the academic year so I think we'd like to thank you for your work as Interim Provost.

TRACY: Thank you all. It's been a very fun year and hopefully we moved the ball forward a little bit and I look forward to working with Dr. Riordan in the next year.

BLONDER: Thank you very much. So our next meeting is September 9 and I will need a motion to adjourn.

WASILKOWSKI: So moved. Greg Wasilkowski.

BLONDER: Is there a second?

CHRISTIANSON: Second.

BLONDER: Okay. All in favor of adjourning?
Have a wonderful summer.

C E R T I F I C A T E O F S E R V I C E

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY)
COUNTY OF HARRISON)

I, LISA GRANT CRUMP, the undersigned Notary Public in and for the State of Kentucky at Large, certify that the facts stated in the caption hereto are true; that I was not present at said proceedings; that said proceedings were transcribed from the digital file(s) in this matter by me or under my direction; and that the foregoing is a true record of the proceedings to the best of our ability to hear and transcribe same

from the digital file(s).

My commission expires: April 6, 2015.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
hand and seal of office on this the 18th day of July,
2013.

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