

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGOCTOBER2012.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

OCTOBER 8, 2012

* * * *

* * * *

SENATE COUNCIL OFFICE
LEXMARK PUBLIC ROOM
ROOM 209, MAIN BUILDING
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

* * * *

* * * *

LEE BLONDER, CHAIR

ROBERT GROSSMAN, VICE-CHAIR

J. S. BUTLER, PARLIAMENTARIAN

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

LISA E. HOINKE, COURT REPORTER

♀

BLONDER: Good afternoon. I want to call the meeting to order. Welcome to the October 8th meeting of the University Senate. Welcome Senators and guests. Remember please to sign in when you arrive, give your name and affiliation when you speak, communicate with your constituency, attend the meetings, respond to e-mails and web postings, as appropriate, acknowledge and respect others, and please silence your electronic devices.

The first order of business is approval of the minutes from September 10. We received a few changes there in your handout on the back pages which you got on Friday. Are there any other corrections to the minutes? If there are no further corrections, then the minutes stand approved.

I have a series of announcements now. First of all, I'd like to remind people to please respond to e-mails requesting our needs for various committees, particularly academic area

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGOCTOBER2012.txt
advisory committees. These committees make tenure and promotion recommendations, and they're a very important faculty governance exercise. We're going to be asking the Senate Admission and Academic Standards Committee to review definitions, majors, service learning courses, Master's degrees, that kind of thing because these must be in effect as of 12/20/13 to comply with the Council on Post-Secondary Education requirements.

With respect to Health Care College's Council, we haven't had a chair for that council. So the Senate Council recommended to the provost that the chair of HCCC be appointed from the associate dean for instruction in the health care colleges, and that further that this be -- this position rotate for three years among these health care colleges, beginning alphabetically by name of college. We have communicated this to Interim Provost Tracy, and he is amenable to this suggestion and is currently working on it.

The Senate Council approved a change to the College of Medicine calendar which moves the start date for the third- and fourth-year medical students forward one month from starting in July to starting in June to accommodate deadlines involved in application to residency programs. This was a minor change.

I'd like to announce that Alison Davis from the College of Agriculture resigned from the Senate Council. We'd like to thank Alison for all of her hard work. And her term is being filled by David Pienkowski. David is in the College of Engineering.

The Senate Council approved a waiver of Senate Rule 5.2.4.8.1 (common examination) for Professor Robert Grossman. He needed to change room for a final exam and no room with necessary facilities was available during the scheduled time.

Ben Withers from the College of Fine Arts is now serving as the interim associate provost for Undergraduate Education.

The Senate Council has asked the Academic Council, the Undergrad Council, Graduate Council, and HCCC Health Care College of Council to publish by the end of December a specific list of review requirements used during the new program review process. These criteria will be reviewed by the Senate's Academic Programs Committee for additions, amendments, and clarification before consideration by the Senate Council. This might result in a changing -- rewriting the SAPC charge, but that will be evaluated after we see these new criteria.

I want to remind everyone since we might have a number of guests at this meeting that for this academic year this is the voting membership of the Senate. So the 94-elected faculty Senators, one emeritus professor, two faculty trustees, 18-elected student members which includes the student government president, and the following administrators: the Provost, Associate Provost for Undergrad Education, and the Deans of Libraries, Communication, Information, Dentistry, Design, Education, Engineering, Health Sciences, Law, and Social Work. So these -- when we have a vote, these are the eligible people to vote.

I'd like to note that Professor Robert Bostrum passed away on September 27. He was a professor emeritus in the Department of Communications. Dr. Bostrum had a distinguished career at UK and was an internationally recognized scholar in his field. And he served as the chair of the University Senate Council from 1984 to 1985. We have passed a memorial resolution for Dr. Bostrum in November, but at this time, please let's observe a moment of silence. Thank you.

I wanted to talk about the chair's report for today. Our discussion regarding the budget cuts and the Senate Council memo will occur later in the meeting. However, at this time, Bill Swinford, the President's Chief of Staff will speak to us on behalf of the President who's the chair of the University Senate. The President is currently in Atlanta at a conference and is unable to attend this meeting. But he and I spoke on the phone yesterday, and he wanted to express his commitment to shared governance and -- and listening to faculty's concerns. Bill will speak briefly, and then we will have time for questions. I want to emphasize that this does not constitute a formal reply to the memo but rather gives Bill the opportunity to provide a perspective on behalf of the President. Bill.

SWINFORD: As always, I thank you all for the opportunity to come before you. I know you have lots of business to attend to today. This was -- for most of you who are new, a opportunity that we began a year ago for when the President is unavailable to be with you that I would come before you with a general report, talk about things that are going on across the campus and provide you with updates on anything that is concerning to you. Given the concerns that have been raised about the budget for '13-'14 and the budget process that we are currently in, I also spoke yesterday to your Chair, and she urged me to spend a

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGOCTOBER2012.txt
little bit of time with you, talk about the process and where we -- how we got here, where we are, and where we're headed next.

Let me say a couple of things by way of introduction and just say a couple of very important stuff to you. To the degree that we have not communicated well, to the degree we have not communicated often enough as it relates to the budget process, that is my fault as much as anyone else's. I believe that we have communicated a great deal with the campus. The President has been involved in numerous meetings involving faculty to seek input about the budget. So I believe we have communicated a lot, but it is clear we have not communicated enough. And that is something the President is certainly committed to working on. I seek your advice and counsel as we go forward about the best way to do that. An example I will give you is that our colleagues in the Staff Senate, for example, regularly give them the opportunity to talk with their executive committee about issues of common concern. I find those very helpful. And the Senate Staff also, thanks to Chair Adam's leadership, as a Presidential Advisory Committee, that meets once a month to share perspectives, concerns, challenges with me and the President. I assure you that those are open and frank exchange of views, and that I learn a lot from them and changes are made because of them.

Let me say just a little bit about the process related to the budget and where we are. Very quickly, when the President arrived on campus 15 months ago as the twelfth President of the University of Kentucky, he engaged in several months of listening across the campus; that included everything from small meetings with faculty arranged by your former chair, Hollie Swanson, to visits to all 18 colleges and meetings with faculty during each of those 18 opportunities. The President has also met with gatherings of faculty in individual colleges and units when they have invited him to do so, talked about the budget and his plans for the University. In those first six months, the President heard quite clearly from faculty, as well as in consultations with members of the staff, the student body, Board of Trustees and community members, that the challenges that the University of Kentucky faced going forward included a renewal of our infrastructure which the President regularly referred to as tired. That there also needed to be some attention paid to compensation for faculty and staff which because of the economy and challenges of state appropriations, we're not competitive

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGOCTOBER2012.txt
with other institutions. The President was also made aware that it was important, from the perspective of the constituencies he spoke with, to strengthen further the undergraduate experience, including doing everything possible to continue to strengthen the undergraduate population at the University of Kentucky. And so with -- with those things in mind, the President had a retreat with the Board of Trustees where those discussions were aired further about a year ago. And so we began to develop plans about how to go about doing those things to try to strengthen our campus further and build on the remarkable progress that has been made over the last several years thanks, in large part, to the work of the faculty.

As you know when we reached January of this year it became apparent, and more and more clear over the first several months of this calendar year, that state appropriations were going to go down again. And where we ended up by April was down another 19-million dollars, taking us from 335-million dollars to 284-million dollars since December of '07. That's the reality we face. As is often the case, usually the case at universities, we learned that in April. Gave us a very short window to deal with the budget for '12-'13. That included, as you all know, a six-percent increase in tuition, and because of the budget challenges we face, there was no increase in -- in salary across the board for faculty and staff. But recognizing that we needed to begin to develop a better way to approach the budget, the President decided back in April of this calendar year to go on and start having conversations on campus about the budget for '13-'14, which was -- and that fiscal year, as you know, was still 14, 15 months away. But he felt it was important to begin that dialogue across the campus about how we handle the challenges of the dramatic decline in state appropriation while still maintaining fidelity to those things that the campus community at large had said was priority. Again, infrastructure, compensation, undergraduate education, scholarship.

And ladies and gentlemen, that's the process we are in the middle of right now. It was important for those discussions to take place so that we have a framework to begin with. And so the President established a -- a set of tentative, and I emphasize the word tentative, budget markers for discussions that then Interim Provost Tracy could have with each of the deans across the academic unit and Angie Martin and I can have in

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGOCTOBER2012.txt
discussions with the administrative unit. As you know, those markers included cuts that were disproportionate to the administrative units. Those discussions began over the summer, and they are ongoing. The Interim Provost has met with each of the deans to talk about preliminary plans based upon the markers that were established to ask them how they would go about absorbing a cut of that magnitude, but then to have a discussion with the interim provost about whether they could get there or not, what the implications for such cuts would be, and how we work together going forward. All the while as this is going forward, we know that we need to monitor tuition income across the campus as it relates to the class of fall of '13. As you all know better than I do because you see it every day, enrollment is up, that will have implications for tuition which the budget office is currently reviewing. The interim provost intends to go back to each of the deans over the month of October for further discussions about how we make progress. No final decisions have been made. No final decisions have been made. But the President felt it was important back in April, if we were going to plan for 15 months later, to set some parameters for the discussion rather than have the discussion from whole cloth. At the same time as most of you know, the President and the interim provost are visiting each of the 18 colleges again to have further discussions, not only with the administrators in those colleges, but with faculty in those colleges. The process is ongoing. As Chair Blonder said, the President has always believed and reiterated to her yesterday the importance of shared governance, the importance of conversation between the President and the senior administration and the faculty, because we are all in this together; like it or not. We faced a 19-million-dollar shortfall on our state appropriations, meanwhile trying to meet the challenges of building a University that can thrive going forward.

Again, I'll end where I started, to the degree we have not communicated well, to the degree we have not communicated effectively, that's on me as much as anybody else. And I'll take responsibility for that. I believe we've communicated a lot. But I seek your counsel on how we communicate even better going forward because the only way to get there, ladies and gentlemen, in shared governance, and to try to figure out to build this University going forward, is for the faculty and senior administration and

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGOCTOBER2012.txt
in particular the President, to be able to communicate with one another, reasonably, honestly, and fairly. The President has reviewed the -- the memo that was developed by your leadership. He looks forward to the opportunity to continue those discussions with you, to continue discussions in the colleges. Much of what was contained in that memo I think that he is hearing as he's going to the college meetings, and hearing as he talks with faculty around the campus. So that's what -- I wanted to give you a little bit of sense where we are and how we got here and remind you the President's commitment to shared governance going forward. As has been our habit in the past, I'd be delighted to take questions about that, about where we are, or about anything else that is on your mind, and again, I appreciate your time.

BLONDER: Thank you, Bill. Are there questions? Hollie.

SWANSON: Bill, I think that --

BLONDER: Give your name and college.

SWANSON: Hollie Swanson, College of Medicine. One thing that would be helpful is if we had some idea of how -- how the cuts are impacting the academic piece because we -- we hear a lot of stories, and it's really hard in a -- in a university, complex university like ours, to try to envision that.

SWINFORD: Thank you. That's -- that's fair and we haven't done good enough of that.

As the President meets with each of the colleges and meets with these faculty groups, I assure you that notes are taken, that the President and the interim provost review, as we move forward. But you're right, we ought to put out information to the campus and certainly to the faculty of -- of things that the President is hearing as it relates to the impact on undergraduate education, graduate and professional education, the research mission of the institution, engagement; all those things get covered in those discussions, and certainly we ought to -- we ought to provide those to you on a regular basis.

BLONDER: Eli.

EDWARDS: Eli Edwards, College of Education, student. It seems that there's a lot of variation between the colleges on what information is presented to them? I come from a college where the dean is pretty transparent, and she sends everything to us that she knows. But I know that there are other colleges where that doesn't necessarily happen. So is there a way that people can access this information if their deans aren't as

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGOCTOBER2012.txt
transparent? Is there a way that, you know, maybe it's not relied so much on the deans to send out the information, but -- I don't know what to say, but is there a way that everyone can access it?

SWINFORD: Thank you for that. That's a really good question. I -- I do think that, in terms of the amount of information related to the budget that's being shared with college leadership, has been remarkable compared to maybe previous years. I do agree with you, from the feedback I received, that it is uneven. I will encourage the Interim Provost to talk to the deans about how we make sure that the information filters down as appropriate so that people in the colleges that do make decisions, and as you all absorb what we're trying to accomplish, and as you provide feedback, have the same sort of information, you're right, and we just haven't done a good job of -- of setting a series of expectations, I guess, about how that gets shared; you're right; you're right.

BLONDER: Greg.

WASILKOWSKI: Greg Wasilkowski, College of Engineering.

I understand that some significant decisions has already been made allocating a significant portion of the budget to various causes like dorms or loan to the College of Medicine. Can these decisions be revisited and rediscussed?

SWINFORD: I apologize. What was the decision you were referencing?

WASILKOWSKI: Concerning allocation of some resources of the budget.

GROSSMAN: One of the things he mentioned, the 20-million dollars -- the 20-million dollars for debt service is one of the things he mentioned. The other thing he mentioned was the 87 million dollar loan to the Medical Center.

SWINFORD: Okay, okay, thank you, Dr. Grossman.

Let me take those in two pieces.

The first related to the -- the loan the University made to UK Health Care, that loan has been made, and that loan was made some time ago. And UK Health Care is paying that back. They're paying that back with interest. But that is not a decision that can be undone.

WASILKOWSKI: What is the interest rate?

SWINFORD: That's an answer I should know.

I do know that it's higher than we would have gotten from our overnight investments. This is one of the things, ladies and gentlemen, when there are questions like this, and it's -- it's an important question because it's a lot of money, I'm

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGOCTOBER2012.txt
sensitive to that. And she's not here so I can freely commit her, I'm sure that Angie Martin or the Leadership of UK Health Care would be delighted, by invitation from this body, to come back and walk you through the loan, why it was made, the interest rate that's being charged, pace of payback, all those things. I'm sure they would be delighted to do. Okay. And then the second part? I apologize, Dr. Grossman --

GROSSMAN:
SWINFORD:

The debt service --
Okay, good. As you all know, in the '12-'13 budget -- now, again, distinguish between '12-'13 and '13-'14 for purposes of our discussion. '12-'13 is locked in. (Unintelligible). As we go forward, the President has put out a planning number related to the debt service pool, but those are the discussions we're having right now. But I will tell you, ladies and gentlemen, as it relates to that debt service pool and I know there's a lot of concern about that, I understand that, but the fact of the matter is, and I think I stressed this when I've been with you before, the traditional approach that the University of Kentucky and all universities in the Commonwealth and most universities across the country take, is come up with a good idea for your next academic or research building, send the bill to Frankfort, and wait for them to pay for it. As you know, we have not gotten any capital investment from the State of Kentucky for this biennium or for the previous biennium. And given the economic and political atmosphere we find ourselves in, the earliest possible moment that the State of Kentucky will commit to any capital for the University of Kentucky is July 1st of 2014. That's the very earliest. And given the debt that the Commonwealth of Kentucky already sustains, given increased skepticism here and across the country about debt, it is -- we are hopeful but not terribly optimistic that there will be an investment in capital. And if it is true, and I believe that it is, that we need a substantial investment in our infrastructure to strengthen further the University of Kentucky, and your traditional venue is no -- is not available in the short term, we've got to make some decisions about trying to find a way forward. And as somebody who attended the University of Kentucky from 1984 to 1988 and took Chemistry 105 in the Chem-Phys Building and recognized the challenges of that facility then, that's an example of the challenges we find ourselves placed at now. So again, that -- the decision about the investment for '13-'14, the debt service pool, has not been finalized, but I

can assure you the President is deeply committed to finding a way to rebuild the interior -- the interior of our campus because it so desperately needs it.

BLONDER:
CHRIST:

Alice. Name and college.
Alice Christ, College of Fine Arts. It bothers me a bit that all of these decisions are being asked for at the level of deans and below that, departments and programs, for cuts and then the process for reallocating any resources and preventing any cuts is directed only from the top. This body is the Senate of the President. This is his Senate. And we have a whole sequence of standing committees, and the ability to create committees ad hoc. It seems to me it might be useful to use this body as a university-wide communication point, then presumably not only from the top down, but to take members of some advisory committee constituted here to those units, so that members from other units can understand what's happening in units that are not their own. Does that seem like a possibility?

SWINFORD:

Certainly. There are all sorts of ways to get at this. I think that's a very good suggestion. One of the things that frankly has puzzled me a little bit during the last several weeks is that the President was here three weeks ago. Now, it may not have been the presentation that everyone had expected or had anticipated or hoped for, but -- but that's an opportunity for dialogue with the President directly because he was here. Now, if we create a mechanism or can create a mechanism, I don't know if you have an standing budget committee -- if memory serves way back, at one point there was either a faculty -- a University Senate budget committee or there was a joint committee between the University Senate and the Staff Senate -- I'm looking in the back, I think Chair Adams remembers that as well -- that's something that could certainly be reconstituted at -- at the will of this body, and if -- if that is a mechanism that you would like to use to provide feedback from the President and senior administration as budget decisions are made, absolutely. But that's -- I want to be careful because I think that is this body's prerogative to make decisions about if it's a committees, or it's a committee of the whole, if you want to invite the President back, if you want to invite your provost back or me back to have that discussion, you know, that's fine. But I'll leave that to you all, but certainly any process that you come to that you think is reasonable as a mechanism to increase

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGOCTOBER2012.txt
and strengthen dialogue, we're absolutely
for it.

BLONDER: We have time for a couple more
questions. John.

WILSON: John Wilson, College of
Medicine. Dr. Swinford, I appreciate your
-- your administration, the President and
interim provost, commitment to flexibility
in meeting the budget guidelines.

UNIDENTIFIED: Right.

WILSON: We now have one year which --
where we should have data where you could
demonstrate how flexible you were in
meeting the first set of guidelines. I
think for many of us we see the promises as
useful, but we need data to demonstrate
that those promises have been fulfilled in
the first year and are -- so that they will
be fulfilled in the second year.

SWINFORD: That's fair. Dr. Wilson, I
appreciate that.

Again, the challenge that you
face is this: that it was finalized in mid
April of this year that our budget for
fiscal year '12-'13 was going to go
backwards, from a state appropriations
perspective, by 19 million dollars. And
for economic and political, and all sorts
of reasons, we wanted to see where state
appropriations were before we set tuition
for '12-'13. So the process was inevitably
truncated, and that's unfortunate. I think
if -- as you heard the President, and if
you look back at his experience at Alabama-
Birmingham, before he came to the
University of Kentucky, where he served as
provost, you would know the very last thing
he would be interested in is an across-the-
board cut to the institution because that's
not terribly strategic. We were forced
into a position because it was mid April,
two-and-a-half months from the beginning of
the next fiscal year, to make those
decisions. That's why the President
decided that the best approach for the
University, given the challenges that we
faced, was to begin the process for '13-'14
that same April. Now, I don't blame you at
all for saying, you know, trust by verify,
to borrow a phrase, and -- and that's
completely fair.

The President started with in
mid-April a series of tentative parameters
that went across the board, and that's
where the discussion began with the interim
provost and the deans and then within the
colleges.

The other place we got to get to,
as you all know, and again, I don't think
he's here so I can -- I can speak freely on
his behalf and commit him, we also have
running parallel to this which creates
unfortunate confusion, that we are trying

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGOCTOBER2012.txt
to transfer ourselves to a different budget model which is much more decentralized in its practice. And Interim Provost Tracy is leading that discussion. Again, I think it is very appropriate for this body, either as a committee as a whole or a particular committee established by this body, to invite the interim provost to get into details of how that budget model works. And so we -- part of our struggle is we're trying to -- to do two things at once, and that's difficult; there's no question about it. But the current economics make it necessary to do those things. But again, I appreciate that, and I don't blame anybody for saying I want to see it before I believe the -- the flexibility. I don't blame you at all for saying that. Thank you.

BLONDER: Questions, other questions?
BERRY: I just want to raise a point that

I think --

BROTHERS: Name please?

BLONDER: You need to --

BERRY: David Berry, Arts and Sciences.

I think many faculty see as somewhat misleading. We hear that the state has cut the budget by approx -- their budget by 19 million, but when you spoke earlier and on two occasions when I heard the President speak, he talks about 50 million since 2007. But I have to presume that a big chunk of that was taken care in previous budgets. Do you need to cut 50 million in this budget?

SWINFORD: And I apologize for the confusion on that. Yes, if you look at December 2007, our budget was approximately 336-million dollars. Now, it's at 284. As you all know because you felt it, we had been -- had seen our state appropriation reduced by bits and chunks. The 19-million dollar hit we took this past time was the largest single hit we've taken. Now, you've raised a very important point, that it's not as if we are absorbing a 50-million dollar reduction in state appropriation this year.

Well, I'll tell you what from my perspective how we got here, and I'm one of the people that was in the room when these decisions got made during the previous administration. As the budget was getting reduced, and as the economy tanked in a way that we had not seen in eighty years, the hope, and it turned out to be a false hope, the hope was that the economy would begin to rebound; that we would get back to where we were, and it would -- it would occur in fairly short order, in a two or three year period, hopefully. So as the cuts were being made in Frankfort, out of necessity -- and there's a whole other conversation

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGOCTOBER2012.txt
we can have about the challenges that they face in Frankfort related to Medicaid, education, pension, that are not going away. A lot of the mechanisms that the University used to try to absorb those reductions were one-time fixes or short-term fixes because we, like a lot of universities across the country, I don't have the data, but I suspect most universities across the country, assumed the economy was going to rebound and state appropriations were going to rebound with it. Ladies and gentlemen, we were wrong about that. The State of Kentucky got a couple of years of federal support to prop up higher education spending which kept us part of the way there. It kept us at a little over 300-million dollars for a couple of years. And that was on the basis of ARAA funds from the federal government, and the hope was that sustains you until the economy picks back up again. Well, again, it -- it didn't happen the way we had anticipated or hoped. And so you're right, we did not absorb 50 million dollars this biennium, this reduction, but a lot of the fixes we put in were one-time fixes that we can't go back to. And so now the challenge is we face a correction in the way we approach our budget because I don't know that there's much optimism that state appropriations to the University of Kentucky recover in a dramatic way, even in '14-'16. I hope I'm wrong. I've been wrong along the way since December 2007, and I hope I'm wrong about that, but I don't believe that we're going to recover (unintelligible).

BLONDER: I think we're going to have to move on, but thank you very much, Bill.

SWINFORD: I appreciate your all's time very much. I appreciate and look forward to continuing our dialogue, see how we get there together. The President is fully committed to that dialogue, that it's ongoing; whatever mechanism most appropriate from this body for communicating with the President as we go forward, we'll appreciate as well. We'll have continuing conversations. It's something we ought to be able to have directly with one another. I think it doesn't serve the University's purpose as well if we have these discussions through the newspaper. I hope that's something we can avoid going forward. I think friends and colleagues can have blunt discussions and disagreements and we can get people together, but we need to do that when we are together rather than doing it out in public. But I appreciate your time very much and look forward to talking with you again.

BLONDER: Thank you. Okay. Moving on with our agenda. We have a Vice Chair report on the agenda, but we don't have a Vice Chair report. So we'll move on. Trustee report, John Wilson.

WILSON: Thank you. This will be very brief as we have a discussion of very important issue at the end. What I want to do is thank the faculty as a whole for the tremendous level of input from the faculty that we have received about the communications we've sent you and about the issues raised by the Senate Council. Thank you so much for caring about our ability to complete our shared mission of research, teaching, and service. We need to continue communicating to the broadest possible University community how much we care about what we're able to do, the quality work we're able to do, and how this budget impacts -- will affect our ability to fulfill those missions. So thank you very much. There are many issues of importance besides the budget cuts. There's significant issues of shared governance. There's the new budget process. And there's the inability to integrate fully the three missions of research, teaching, and service that is our flagship University's mission. We encourage you to converse with us again and repeatedly. You can call us and we can talk with you on the phone. You can e-mail us so you can communicate through our (unintelligible). Please continue to do so. Thank you for your support in our endeavors to try to communicate what we really care about, our ability to serve our students and to serve our research, teaching, and service missions.

BLONDER: The next item on the agenda is a proposal for a new Master of Arts Administration. I just want to make one comment. Andrew Hippisley is going to present this, but this came to the Senate in April with a positive recommendation. However, there were questions about who would comprise the graduate faculty and where it would be housed, so over the last few months many people have worked on it and I will now turn the discussion over to Andrew who will explain the rest.

HIPPISLEY: Again, treat as if it's a brand new program, I'll tell you some of the details -- brand new proposal so tell you some of the details now. So this is a recommendation that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new MA program, Arts Administration to be housed within the College of Fine Arts. So motivation for the program is a dramatic growth in the arts industry outside of the

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGOCTOBER2012.txt
usual suspects like Chicago, New York, San Francisco, and rather in little small towns, the local arts venues giving more opportunities for jobs in the industry. Currently there are about 1.3-million people employed in the arts industry, and it's growing.

The degree is actually a development of an existing UK bachelors degree designed specifically to train art administrators to help meet the demand for them. It's a degree that's been designed for a specific career, and the proposal outlines good evidence that there is a demand for this career and evidence of this degree offering a significant career boost.

So what we have in place already: College of Fine Arts already host one of the nations best BAs in Arts Administration. Eighty to 100 full majors are attracted, many of them international; have to reject many good prospective students because it's so popular. Many have gone on to related careers or graduate-degree programs and these programs are ones in Columbia, Harvard, and Edinburgh. Amongst the graduates they have famous people such as the manager of Taiwan's National Orchestra, and the manager to The Music Box in Edinburgh.

Tell you a little bit about the degree program itself. The aim is to train students in effective managerial leadership within arts organizations. And it requires conceptual and cost analysis skills, knowledge of (unintelligible) policy, laws and ethics and an understanding of current technologies. The degree has 36 credit hours, two at the 500 level. Some courses are, for example, fund raising techniques, the arts and law, marketing research for arts organizations. There's no thesis, but instead a capstone course called AAD 750. The -- the (unintelligible) all courses are online. New personnel will be hired to help resource it and make it go. There will be a course designer. There will be some part-time faculty and an administrative assistant. This is all paid for by the profit of the new program, and they predict at the time it was 400, but now it's more like \$600,000 annually.

My committee, SAPC, felt the proposal was (unintelligible) and we fully endorse it.

BLONDER:

So we have a recommendation from the SAPC that the University Senate approve for submission to the Board of Trustees the establishment of a new Master of Arts in Arts Administration degree program within the College of Fine Art. It doesn't require a second because it's coming from

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGOCTOBER2012.txt
committee. Is there discussion? All in
favor? Opposed? Abstain? Motion carries.
Thank you, Andrew.

Is Herman Farrell here? Okay.

If there are no objections, I'm
going to reorder the agenda and Herman will
be here soon I think. We're now going to
hear from Sonja Feist-Price, the academic
ombud. She's going to give the report for
2011-2012.

FEIST-PRICE: Thank you. Good afternoon. I'd
like to begin by thanking Professor
Blonder, Senators, and guests for allowing
me an opportunity just to provide a brief
report regarding the academic ombud office
and the services that we provide. For
starters, I'd like to recognize Michelle
Sohner who really completed her last
official report for the academic ombud
office. She's been the assistant to the
ombud for 21 years, and so I just wanted to
say thanks to Michelle publicly for the
work that she's done.

Okay. So what I'd like to do is
just talk about some of the high points
regarding the services that are provided in
the ombud office. And so as I talk about
the services provided I'll speak regarding
offense charges and non-offense --
non-academic offense charges. And so with
regard to -- with regard to cases handled
by the ombud office that are -- that
exclude the academic offenses, we handled
352 in the year of 2011-2012. Most of
those issues were related to grades and
concerns regarding grade issues. And most
of those students were seniors that
contacted the ombud offices. With regard
to academic offense cases, we handled 177
academic offense cases. Of this number, 28
students contacted the academic ombud
office, and 11 of those students appealed
the -- the decision as it relates to their
academic offense. And most of these
students were first-year students. So as
it relates to the total number of students
that we sent to the University Appeals
Board, it was a total of 28 students. And
among these students, 17 were related to
grade-appeal issues, and 11 were specific
to academic offense appeals. With regard
to plagiarism appeals, there were six cases.
Three of which were upheld; three were
denied. Cheating appeals, there were five.
Three were upheld, and two were denied.
And also as it relates to the grade
appeals, 14 were upheld; three were denied.

One of the -- every ombud brings
something unique to the academic ombud
office. One of the things that I brought,
especially as it relates to some of the
clinical skills that I have, has to do with
mediation. And so in my capacity as the

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGOCTOBER2012.txt
academic ombud, I mediated 24 issues with students and instructors as well as instructors, department chairs, DUS students, and administrative staff and students. Of the 24, 17 were between students and instructors. And in each case, we had a successful outcome. So in a nutshell, that's an overview of some of the services that were provided by the ombud office. And I welcome any questions or comments that you might have.

JONES: You -- what was --
BROTHERS: Name, please.
JONES: -- being upheld -- Davy Jones, Toxicology.
What was being upheld in your mediating? The faculty member's position or the appeal of the student?
FEIST-PRICE: Very good question. It was the student's appeal that was upheld.
BLONDER: Yes.
BUTLER: J. S. Butler, Graduate School.
So you had a table of three years and counts of types of cases. I typed them into Excel and Stata and did a psi square test and -- and there was significant difference across the years, so it would appear to me increases and decreases were in fact significant increases and decreases. I have no idea what that means because I don't deal with that sort of thing. I just wanted to tell you I did a task with your data.
FEIST-PRICE: Oh, okay. Thank you.
BLONDER: Other questions?
GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A&S.
The -- in terms of academic offenses, there's two sort of kinds of appeals. One's the appeal of the guilt, and the other's the appeal of the punishment. And I was just wondering when you're talking about the academic offenses that went to the Appeals Board, were those all appeals of the student's guilt or were some of them saying, yes, I did it, but I don't deserve such a bad penalty?
FEIST-PRICE: They -- they were both. They were students that appealed the severity of the sanction, and then there were some students that appealed the overall offense. And so unfortunately I didn't tease those out in the report, but I would be happy to do so.
GROSSMAN: It would -- it would be helpful in the future.
FEIST-PRICE: Sure. Thank you.
PEFFER: Sean Peffer, Business.
What's a successful mediation?
What -- you said that these were all successes. What -- what do you mean a successful mediation?
FEIST-PRICE: So -- oh, I'm sorry.
PEFFER: Yeah, who's position winds up or

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGOCTOBER2012.txt
it winds up in the middle or how do you grade if it's successful?

FEIST-PRICE: Well, what I grade as successful is sometimes the -- the decision of the instructor isn't changed, but whenever people sit around a table and have an opportunity to hear each other's points of view and understand their context, it is perceived as a success. And so whenever we ended those conversations, even though the outcome may not have changed, one's ability to hear the other person's point of view and also be heard, is considered, you know, a success. And so as a result -- as a result, the conversations ended in a positive note. And so it didn't mean that the outcome was changed, but the ability to communicate and be heard and to -- to hear the other person's point of view. From that perspective, I believe that to be a success.

BLONDER: Other questions? Thank you very much.

FEIST-PRICE: Thank you.

BLONDER: Herman -- is Herman here?

FARRELL: Yes.

BLONDER: Okay. We're ready. Okay.

Herman's going to be talking about the Senate Academic Organization and Structure Committee recommendation.

FARRELL: Thank you. I apologize for being late. I've got a class that I teach.

So basically this is a name change of Department of Merchandising, Apparel, and -- and Textiles -- can everyone hear me -- to the Department of Retailing and Tourism and Management. And then it's also a transfer of the BS in Hospitality and Management Program from the Department of Dietetics and Human Nutrition to the proposed new department of Retailing and Tourism. Basically, this proposal comes to us from the faculty of -- of the College of Agriculture and particularly the affected parties. This transfer which affects not only the program, but faculty as well moving from one department over to another, has been supported by the School of Human Environmental Science -- Sciences. All departments affected, faculty counsel -- and the faculty counsel of -- of Agriculture.

On the substantive side, this proposal is in line with the strategic goals of the School of Human Environmental Sciences as set forth in the -- in the proposal. It's also in line with similar mergers in similar programs at the University of Tennessee and the University of North Texas. Most of -- I'm quoting from the -- the proposal -- that it will also position them in -- in the furtherance of teaching, research, and engagement in

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGOCTOBER2012.txt
the retailing, tourism management field.

There's a over -- the overlapping course content was evident for both of these programs when we decided to merge them or bring them together, transfer of students is -- is the correct word.

What we'll see as a benefit of this is more faculty productivity, streamlined, and increased because of the sharing of research, teaching, and service responsibilities. Students will also benefit from the interdisciplinary courses that will be subsequently offered as well as the exposure to diverse faculty, as well as collaborative projects.

In the proposal itself we were provided with a list of collaborative projects that have already been committed to and completed by faculty across the different departments and working not only with faculty, but also students as well. I thought that was a really neat example of how this is already a proposal that was working without the structure in place and now the structure is in place where it can work even better.

This was a proposal that languished within the Senate Council for -- not Senate Council, but University Senate Office for a while. When it was brought to us this summer we were told to move quickly and urgently as a result of the fact that it had sort of fallen through the cracks. So my committee worked rather rapidly on this proposal by facilitating a conversation with all of the faculty members that were affected as well as administrators. And again, we found it to be a model proposal and so no issues of concern. When it was brought before the Senate Council, it was restyled because when it was brought before us, it was suggested that it was a merger of the two departments and -- and substantively revised so that it reflects this notion of a -- of a name change as well as a transfer of -- of a department from -- from -- of a program from one department to the next.

So overall I would say that this proposal is probably one of the best ones that my committee has seen in a while; may hold it up even as a model. They followed many of the guideline questions that we proactively set forth on the website, questions that we have concern about proposals. And so we unanimously supported it as did the Senate Council.

BLONDER: Are there questions about this proposal for Herman?

BUTLER: J. S. Butler, Grad School.

Is the word management missing from the end? Because it's Retailing and Tourism Management? It says, Department of

Retailing and Tourism. Is --
BLONDER: I can surely recommend --
BUTLER: -- the word management missing?
BROTHERS: Yes, it's just --
BLONDER: -- take a --
BROTHERS: -- missing the word --
BLONDER: -- recommendation from --
BROTHERS: -- management at the end.
BUTLER: Okay. It's missing the word
management.
FARRELL: Yes. It's missing. It should --
it should be Department of Retailing and
Tourism Management; is that correct?
UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.
BUTLER: Okay. Thank you.
BLONDER: Other questions?
FARRELL: I can read it.
BLONDER: Okay. Is this motion --
BUTLER: You -- you can simply request
unanimous consent to change -- to add the
word management.
BLONDER: Okay. I'd like to request
unanimous consent to change the word
management.
AUDIENCE: Add.
BLONDER: To add. Thank you.
Okay. So we have a motion on the
floor from the committee. The motion is
that the Senate, number one, endorse the
proposed name change of the Department of
Merchandising, Apparel, and Textiles to the
Department of Retailing and Tourism
Management. Did I get that right?
AUDIENCE: Yes.
BLONDER: And two, endorse the transfer of
the BS in Hospitality and Management
program from the Department of Dietetics
and Human Nutrition to the proposed new
Department of Retailing and Tourism
Management.
AUDIENCE: Management.
BLONDER: Management. Okay. Is there is
discussion on this motion? All in favor?
Opposed? Abstain? Motion carries. Thank
you.
GROSSMAN: Now, that's shared governance.
BLONDER: Okay. The next -- the next item
on our agenda is I'd like to introduce the
new associate provost for Faculty
Advancement, G.T. Lineberry. He's faculty
in the College of Engineering, and he just
assumed this position, and he's going to do
just a brief statement about the position
and his vision for the position, and then
we'll have some questions.
LINEBERRY: Thank you. I promise it'll be --
it'll be brief. I had been a UK faculty
member for 361 months when I was offered
the position of associate provost for
Faculty Advancement; a position that I have
had for 21 days. I remain a faculty member
in the Department of Mining Engineering,
and I've now worked at UK 52.7 percent of
my life.

In short, really what I want to do today is basically tell you a little something about the Office for Faculty Advancement. Let you associate a face with an office; tell you a little something about the philosophy that I'll have in -- in managing this office, and then maybe just close very briefly by giving you some priorities maybe for the first year or so of my term.

In short, the Office for Faculty Advancement is located in 205 Frazee. Is the interface between our 2291 full-time and 422 part-time faculty in our educational units and administrative offices. And so the overarching responsibility is really just to support the full range of faculty career progression at UK.

I view the office as a customer service center. And so my philosophy is going to be quite simple: I want everything that we do to lead to the advancement of the individual faculty member; enabling her or his advancement to continue to occur to reach maximum potential.

It's my hope in the years that I have remaining here that UK become a -- becomes a net importer of talent and not an exporter of talent, and to do this by applying effective, proactive measures for enhancing our faculty recruitment and retention efforts. And I said I was here 21 days in this position, but what I see is for the first year is to meet with each dean on his or her own turf, to continue or establish professional development programs in the office, at least until we see how effective those are in meeting the University's goals, objectives, and we have about 10 of those. We want to evaluate the existing programs and services from the perspective of where we hope to be in a decade. I want to visit all related campus entities and set up good working relationships, HR benefits, legal counsel, security, so forth. I've got to understand the new administrative structure that's been set into motion, and we can begin making use of the recommendations of the executive summary report by the Committee on Review, Reward and Retention. I think that's known as R3.

In the longer term, I'd like to be able to name an office of -- for faculty advancement faculty advisory group. So some of you may be asked to serve on such a -- on such an advisory group. We want to broaden the professional development activities to include associate and full professor ranks and not just focus entirely on assistant professors. We want to

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGOCTOBER2012.txt
continue to look for ways to remove obstacles from faculties -- faculty members' way so that they can maximize their skills. And what I'd like to see is development of a campaign to garner more national and international recognition for our fine faculty.

So in closing, I invite you to come visit us in 205 Frazee Hall. I look forward to continuing my UK services as professor of mining engineering and for now, at least, as associate provost for Faculty Advancement. And by the way, I'm very thrilled that the office is no longer Faculty Affairs; it's Faculty Advancement. And so I had nothing to do about the change, but I -- when I saw it, I felt like I'm going to apply for that position. I love the title. It is the -- the Office for Faculty Advancement, 205 Frazee. Thank you.

BLONDER: Questions?

ANDERSON: Yeah, I have a question: Could you backup to --

BROTHERS: Name, please.

ANDERSON: I'm sorry. Debra Anderson, College of Nursing. Could you backup to one thing you read about you're going to meet with the deans?

LINEBERRY: Uh-huh (AFFIRMATIVE).

ANDERSON: Would you meet with faculty at the colleges?

LINEBERRY: I'm going to -- I'm having someone in my office request the meeting of all the deans. And when I do that, I would like for them to bring a group of faculty in with them.

ANDERSON: I would hope that that would be just part of the invitation; not -- not the hope, but that that would be --

LINEBERRY: Okay.

ANDERSON: -- deans and faculty.

LINEBERRY: Okay. Sounds good. Good suggestion.

ANDERSON: Thank you.

LINEBERRY: And none of those have been set up.

ANDERSON: Right.

LINEBERRY: I'm still teaching this semester, so a lot of this is having to be pushed forward into January.

BLONDER: Other questions?

BRION: So what do you see --

BLONDER: Name and college.

BRION: I'm sorry. Gayle Brion, College of Engineering.

So what do you see is your, you know, five years down the road, what is your vision? What has happened?

LINEBERRY: I think some of the professional development programs that we're having, we haven't really looked at them from a standpoint of how effective are they in

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGOCTOBER2012.txt
meeting institutional goals and really leading to the success of the institution as a whole. So one thing I would like to do is to look to see how can we improve the -- and what can we do about faculty that are beyond the assistant professor rank? People are living longer. They're working longer. And so I don't want to forget faculty that are in their 20th, their 30th year of service. So I'd like to begin to see how we can continue advancing our careers of our faculty beyond just the promotion and tenure status. So I think that's one of the focus areas.

Another one I'm truly passionate about is getting more national recognition and international recognition for faculty to improve our rank, you know, reputational ranking. And I'd like to work with the deans and the chairs in getting the University in National Academy, those types of things, whatever makes sense for the particular discipline. Twenty-one days....

JONES:

Davy Jones, Toxicology.

Is your role in, let's say promotion and tenure, more of a policy or -- your predecessors were sometimes used by the chancellors and provosts substantively, you know, vet this stack of promotion dossiers. Are going to have an impact like that on individual cases?

LINBERRY:

We'll see in January. You know, that's a -- when I interviewed for the position, it was my understanding that I would be a bridge between the administration and the faculty member. And that I would have to review each and every case, you know, and certainly some cases are more difficult than other cases, and offer a recommendation to the provost about the dispensation of that particular case. So that -- that was my understanding at the time that I sought the job.

BRIAN:

I'm sorry, one more. Gail Brian, College of Engineering.

You and I come from the same college, and I was wondering if your faculty advancement would also include providing more leadership opportunities for female faculty and especially those that perhaps are lingering at the associate level which is one of the things we found in our report. Will you be looking at ways to provide opportunities for female faculty to move up administratively.

LINBERRY:

One of the areas that I'm looking into is to see whether we can do more programming to better prepare chairs, center directors, deans, and to -- with a commitment to diversity in those regards. And so absolutely; a good organization ought to have that kind of diversity.

BLONDER:

Other questions? Thank you very

much.

LINEBERRY: Thank you.

BLONDER: The next item on the agenda is the proposed change to the Senate Rule 1.3.1.2 and Senate Rule 1.3.1.3 pertaining to the election of Senate Council Officers. And Vice Chair Bob Grossman is going to be presenting this. Thank you.

GROSSMAN: Do we have anything prepared?

BROTHERS: No.

GROSSMAN: No. Okay, so it's in your -- in

your handouts then, pages 47 to 51. You can turn to those. So the Senate Council has established a subcommittee, I believe, to look at how the Senate Council chair was elected. There were -- there was some proposals floating around in the Senate Council. I believe once there was a discussion of some of those proposals that came to the floor; there was no action; it was just a discussion. And one feeling that members of Senate Council had was that there wasn't enough input from the Senate as a whole on the election of the Senate Council chair. The -- the Senate Council chair is not the chair of the Senate. Actually, the President is the chair of the Senate. But the Senate Council chair acts -- is the acting chair of the Senate when the President isn't here to take on those duties. And certainly the Senate Council chair is one of the most visible faculty members on campus. It's probably the -- the highest ranked faculty member who is not also an administrator. And so we felt like there -- rather than a body of eight or nine people sitting around a table choosing the Senate Council chair on their own, the sense was that the Senate as a whole should be more involved in choosing the Senate Council chair. And so that's the origin of the changes that are proposed to the rules; is to seek more input from the faculty Senators as to who they think would make a good chair and asking the candidates to tell the Senators what they plan to do as Senate Council chair. And then there's also a provision that if the Senate Council, after hearing the input from the Senate, and talking about it among themselves, can't come to a decision as to -- as to who should be the next Senate Council chair, then the election gets thrown to the Senate. Not the House of Representatives. So are there any -- I'd like to open the floor to discussion.

BLONDER: Questions for Bob?

GROSSMAN: Seeing no questions, I'll call --

-- oh, yes.

BAILEY: I have a question.

GROSSMAN: Name and --

BAILEY: (Unintelligible).

GROSSMAN: -- college, please?

BROTHERS: Name?
BAILEY: Ernie Bailey from the College of Agriculture. I was just curious on the last section --
GROSSMAN: Uh-huh.
BAILEY: -- about the chair-elect; are we talking about that as well?
GROSSMAN: That is part of the change is on -- at the very end, page 51 there's a -- there's a section that's underlined.
BAILEY: Can you explain why -- I guess the question I have is why the chair-elect is a non-voting member especially since early on you identify all nine elected people as voting members of the council?
GROSSMAN: That is an excellent question. Davy, would you like to --
JONES: The -- the -- the purpose of -- of this part here is more emphasizing getting the Senate Council chair-elect ready to assume. It's already elsewhere in the regulations; it cites it right here, the person is ex officio nonvoting. The emphasis of this was the expectation that the outgoing Senate Council chair, in that five month it -- there's an overlap, will -- will allow the incoming Senate Council chair to shadow and -- and -- and learn -- learn how the office operates so that they can be very effective from day one, the moment they start. So that's the -- the purpose of that last clause; the shadowing clause.
GROSSMAN: But it is true that -- that a member of Senate Council upon becoming Senate Council chair elect loses their vote for the next five months?
JONES: It -- it depends on where the person is.
GROSSMAN: If their term has not ended?
JONES: Yeah. If their term on the Senate Council hasn't ended, then they're -- they're still a voting member of the Senate Council. But you can have a person who's elected Senate Council chair at -- at the end of their three-year term so there's that five-month gap right there in which they're -- they're ex officio nonvoting at that time.
GROSSMAN: Okay. So I think the concern is, if I can paraphrase Ernie, if he'll let me, this -- this last sentence says -- doesn't say what you just said.
JONES: If you want to make it more clear, you can put something at the end. Is a nonvoting member unless their Senate Council term has not yet ended; something to that effect.
GROSSMAN: Hollie.
SWANSON: Hollie Swanson, College of Medicine.
Couldn't we just delete that? That'd make it easy.

JONES: Yes. It -- it is cross referencing another place, but you -- you could -- we could stop it there.

GROSSMAN: So -- so can I have a motion?

SWANSON: May I make motions?

JONES: Yes, you are a --

GROSSMAN: Let's have Ernie because he -- he proposed -- he --

BAILEY: Well, I -- I move to delete that last line as redundant.

GROSSMAN: The last sentence? The last full --

BAILEY: Right.

GROSSMAN: -- sentence?

BAILEY: Yes.

GROSSMAN: Okay. We have a motion.

BAILEY: In the chair-elect's capacity as an officer of the Senate Council, et cetera, because it's -- it's -- it's open to multiple interpretations. It's redundant with respect to the (unintelligible) document.

GROSSMAN: We have an amendment, a proposed amendment. Can someone second it?

WOOD: Second.

GROSSMAN: Connie Wood from Arts & Sciences seconded that. Any discussion of the amendment? Okay. All -- all in favor of the amendment, raise your hand, please. Is there anyone opposed to the amendment? Okay. It passes. Any abstentions? Sorry. Okay. Amendment passes. All right. Back to the main motion. Are there -- is there any other discussion on the main motion? Yes.

FOX: I just have a question. Charles Fox from Agriculture. The timeline you have on page 49 (unintelligible) is that nominations will be taken in November, and time to write statements and then a two-week review period, and then the vote in December. It seems like everything is very rushed. Is that enough time?

JONES: We -- we -- we did a practice on this last year. You want to get started in early November, and the election typically takes place in the middle of December, there's enough time to walk through it.

GROSSMAN: And typically election of the Senate Council chair takes place after the last Senate meeting in December. So we're all ready to go on holiday, but we have to do this last business.

BLONDER: Is there other discussion? Comments? All right. Well, we have a motion on the floor. A recommendation from the Senate Council that the University Senate approve the proposed changes to Senate Rule 1.3.1.2.A, Senate Rule 1.3.1.3.A, and Senate Rule 1.3.1.3.C effective immediately.

GROSSMAN: As amended?

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGOCTOBER2012.txt

BLONDER:

Yes, as amended. Is there discussion of this? All in favor? Opposed? Abstain? Motion carries.

Thank you, Bob.

Okay. We have the next item on the agenda is a proposed change to the name of UK Core Committee to the UK Core Education Committee. In May 2012, the Senate approved establishment of a new standing committee known as the UK Core Committee which is the acronym was UKCC. However, there were many concerns raised that the acronym is too easily confused with the acronym for UK Computing Center. So we have a recommendation from the Senate Council that the Senate change the name of the UK Core Committee to the UK Core Education Committee. This doesn't require a second. Is there a discussion? Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstain? Motion carries. Thank you.

Okay. Now, we're going to be moving to the discussion on faculty response to UK's financial situation and anticipated budget cuts. We, as you know, we conducted -- the Senate Council conducted two forums. And we announced these forums via mass e-mail to all faculty. The first one was Tuesday, September 25th, and we had about 26 attendees. And the second was Friday, September 28th, and we had about 70 to 75 attendees. And we also set up an anonymous comment board on the Senate Council website so that people who wouldn't be able to come to the forums would be able to feel free to anonymously post comments. The comments are visible to everyone, and there's no login required.

So the focus of the forum, and we put up a slide about this, was the impact of the first and anticipated second round of budget cuts on the University's academic mission, more specifically, UK Core, undergraduate and graduate education, and the ability of faculty to fulfill research, teaching, clinical, and service missions. And I want to go over just a little bit of background, explain the impetus. The impetus for these forums was that faculty, including chairs and other administrators, were approaching the Senate Council members and the chair, expressing alarm at the impact of the cuts on academic programs. Rather than invite small groups of faculty to attend Senate Council meetings, we decided to create an opportunity for campus-wide discourse to enable us to better understand the experiences and the concerns and to communicate these to the President and the interim provost. As you know, we summarized the information gathered at the forums and then the

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGOCTOBER2012.txt
comments we received in a memo to -- from the Senate Council to the President and interim provost dated October 4th, which was last Thursday. And we copied this memo to the University Senators. We identified a number of themes in the memo, and we made several recommendations. These are the recommendations. I'm just going to go through them. I think you're all familiar with the -- the themes that we identified which I mentioned: impact on graduate education, impact on undergraduate education, impact on promotions, tenure decisions, the perception that the crisis was partly created by the President's allocation of the budget, concerns about the library, concerns about positions -- academic positions, ability to do research, these kinds of things. Concerns that increasing the number of undergrads at the same time that -- that the budgets were being cut in departments that support them was an issue. So we, based on the forums, the input that we had, made these recommendations. The first one was to halt the second round of budget cuts to the academic units. That's proposed at this point, it's my understanding, that's about 4.2 percent which amounts to about 16-million dollars. The second recommendation to follow up is to consult with an advisory committee selected by the Senate Council to provide viable, informed, and mutually acceptable budgetary guidelines for future decisions as they impact teaching, research, and service missions of the University. As was mentioned in the memo, in addition to communication, one of the concerns was consultation. It's not just a matter of communication. It's a matter of consulting in depth with faculty who are in the trenches, doing the teaching, doing the research, doing the service about the direction that this University should go with respect to the academic mission. So that was an important part of the recommendation. The next recommendation was to promote the values. And these are hyperlinked which is the underline. Espousing our governing regulations, particularly mutual -- mutual respect and human dignity, and diversity and inclusion in all personnel actions. Continuing we ask that the President direct that the President direct that, in the spirit of shared sacrifice, the highest paid administrators take salary cuts. For example, the top administrators at UC Riverside took a voluntary five-percent pay cut during the budget crisis of 2009. We also ask that the President eliminate the current practice in which UK contributes

the entire 15 percent of the annual retirement benefit for select executives which the discretionary authority of which is granted them in AR 3.1, IV.C. Instead, we're asking that the President require such administrators to contribute the five percent of the annual salary to their retirement plan out of pocket like the majority of faculty and staff do. Finally, we ask for a point-by-point response to faculty, staff, and students regarding the concerns expressed in the memo.

So what I'd like to -- I'd like to move on, and I -- having given a summary of this and these events, and in order to facilitate the most effective use of time, I'd like to entertain a motion regarding this memo and then have discussion subsequent to that. Connie.

WOOD: Connie Wood, Arts & Sciences and Senate Council. Resolution, I'd like to propose that the University Senate endorse the recommendations contained in the Senate Council's letter of October 4, 2012 to President Capilouto. We request that the Senate take action on each recommendation and ask that the President report to the University Senate on the actions taken to implement -- implement the recommendation.

BLONDER: Is there a second?

Second.

AUDIENCE:

BRION:

Second.

BROTHERS:

Can you -- can you read that one more time?

WOOD:

Here's a copy of it.

BROTHERS:

That'll work.

BLONDER:

Do we need to read that out loud again?

BRION:

I think there's -- yeah, confusion over who's supposed to take action.

JONES:

Yeah. The President obviously -- -- the President.

WOOD:

No, it's the President.

BLONDER:

Yeah,

WOOD:

Yes.

BLONDER:

We'll reread it. So we have a motion that's been seconded on the floor, and Sheila is going to reread it.

BROTHERS:

That the University Senate endorse the recommendations contained in the Senate Council's letter of October 4, 2012 to President Capilouto and requests that the President take action on each recommendation and asks that the President report to the University Senate on the actions taken to implement the recommendations.

BLONDER:

All right. I'd like to hear discussions for and against this motion.

PRATS:

Okay. Can -- since -- since we were just talking about not only asking for -- oh, Armando Prats, English

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGOCTOBER2012.txt
Department. I'm sorry. For -- we -- we were asking for consultation. It seems to me that as it is phrased the President is perfectly within his rights to just simply communicate this to faculty as a done deal. As to point one for, example, I did this or I did the other. Is it possible, I -- I don't know at this stage, to engage the President in -- in consultation so that he knows where these concerns come from and perhaps seeks the advice of faculty instead of just simply telling the faculty what his decisions were.

BLONDER: Well, that's one of the items in the memo, the second item is consult with a Faculty Advisory Committee selected by the Senate Council. So I -- I think that would serve that one.

PRATS: Well, if he -- if he makes a decision on that, namely, I'm not going to consult with the, you know, advisory committee, then -- then at least a slight amendment to the resolution --

BLONDER: Okay.

PRATS: -- would -- would suggests, it seems to me, that the President would take it into consideration to consult the faculty.

BLONDER: Would you like to propose --

PRI CE: No. I don't have the -- the words in front of me, but it's just fairly simple.

BROTHERS: Would it be helpful if I put this on the screen?

BLONDER: Yes. Bob.

GROSSMAN: Yeah, just with respect to Armando's comment, first of all, I think if -- if the President says, no, I won't consult, we're -- we're all in really big trouble anyway. And second, I think you can keep your Senate Council's feet to the fire in terms of are we keeping the -- the President's feet to the fire in terms of consultation? This is not the end action, and then we'll all just go back to our offices and hiber -- and go back into hibernation. So I -- I think the -- the message is clear, and I think we will -- I know that I will, at least, continue to try to convey to the President and the other administrators that consultation is not just a matter of communicating, nor is it just a matter of listening. It's a matter of dialogue.

BLONDER: Yes.

COHEN: Alisia Cohen, from the College of Communication and Information.

I support this and the reason why is that I think that one of the themes that came out earlier is that we would like the President to consult and to consider diverse faculty as much on cuts and growth as there is right now faculty input on

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGOCTOBER2012.txt
planning regarding the new budget model so I'm seeing a lot more interdisciplinary focus over there and then a lot more, kind of, sideways listening going to colleges and units. Everyone has a story to tell about the woes of the budget, but I don't see the strategic planning on cuts and growth coming from the faculty so much in a University-wide way. So I'd really like that.

JOHNSON: Julia Johnson, College of Arts & Sciences. I think that the phrase, take action is -- is maybe problematic. I mean, let me -- I think that that is sort of an invitation for the President to say, I've taken action on this, and this is what I've done. So I think it should actually request that the President consult with the faculty Senate or maybe not consult but some other wording. I think take action is really not a good phrase there.

ANDERSON: Perhaps we could --

BLONDER: Name and --

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing. Request that the President would -- would consult -- under consultation with the Senate take action (unintelligible)... that's grammatically incorrect. But -- but somehow incorporate consultation and take action so that taking action with consultation of the Senate.

BLONDER: Liz.

DEBSKI: Liz Debski. It may be as simple as respond to each recommendation would do; next part covers it.

BLONDER: Other comments from Senators?

WOOD: Connie.

WOOD: Connie Wood, Arts & Sciences. In response to Liz's question. Originally I had drafted it with respond and then I figured you don't always get a positive response. Therefore, the language was changed to take action.

DEBSKI: Yeah, well, we (unintelligible) we might not always get a positive reaction, but at least with the last part we get to hear about it.

WOOD: That's right.

DEBSKI: Yes.

BLONDER: Greg.

WASILKOWSKI: Wasilkowski, Engineering. I think that as far as I'm concerned is very good text because please remember that one of the recommendations is consultation so that is taken care of. And in this case, we ask President not to just sit quietly; just tell us what he did and why.

ROGERS: Jeff Rogers, Arts & Sciences. I think the -- the intent of the -- the -- the recommendation and the report are very clear as a whole. I think we could sit here all night and tweak the details, but I think as a whole the intent is very clear.

I strongly endorse (unintelligible).

BLONDER: Katherine.

MCCORMICK: Katherine McCormick, College of Education.

Connie, was there any discussion about timeline that the President report to or --

BLONDER: There's no mention of timeline in -- in this --

JONES: Did the memo request a timeline?

UNIDENTIFIED: No.

BLONDER: Other comments, questions.

PEFFER: Sean Peffer, College of

Business.

BROTHERS: I'm sorry, your name, please?

PEFFER: Sean Peffer. What if he comes

back and says -- because there's some specific stuff, and he can come back and say, no, I'm not taking a salary cut. No, I'm not going to do this 15 percent. I'm kind of curious before I vote on -- this is -- this, I guess, act of war is not exactly the right way of putting it, but it is a very stringent, you will do this, and I'm wondering if that -- and I'm wondering if that is where we are, if that's really the message, the thing we want to do right now. Because you're telling him to hop through -- this letter is telling him to hop this hoop, this hoop, and this hoop. He can either come back and say, no, or he can come back and say, I did it. I read it as very adversarial -- as relatively adversarial with specific action, which I understand you get to, and I don't know maybe we are, but are we at that stage yet? That's just a question for people to think. I'm not sure what the answer to that is.

BLONDER: Gail.

BRION: I would like to suggest that we -- one of the things -- Gail Brion, College of Engineering. One of the things that I've seen over the past year is this President has not taken this Senate's advice. Even the recommendation as stated in the -- in the governing regulations on administrative changes that have to be voted on and at least commented on by this body. So I would like to suggest that we put something in here that talks about, and requests in the spirit of shared governance a response to this. I think that -- we're -- we're not asking him to do it just all alone. We're asking him to do it with this body included. And he is going to report on the actions taken to implement these recommendations. But I would like to see shared governance with respect to -- in this recommendation. I don't know. (Unintelligible).

BLONDER: Do you want to make an amendment now?

BRION: I wanted to make a friendly

amendment.
BLONDER: Well, there's no such thing as a friendly amendment. You can make an amendment.
BRI ON: I'd like to make an amendment to put, and request that the President take action -- how should we say it -- with the spirit of -- in the --
BLONDER: In the spirit of shared governance.
BRI ON: In the spirit of shared governance on each recommendation.
UNI DENTI FIED: With a spirit of shared governance.
UNI DENTI FIED: In the spirit of shared governance.
BROTHERS: Hold on just a second.
BUTLER: (Unintelligible) a motion necessary. Senate Council's letter -- anything that appears in the Senate Council letter is, in fact, a motion already by reference.
BLONDER: It's not letter; it's memo.
BUTLER: Well, memo.
BLONDER: No, but we have it up here.
WOOD: I will accept a friendly amendment.
BLONDER: Stated in the memo.
BUTLER: (Unintelligible).
BLONDER: Okay, so we understand -- can you repeat that?
BUTLER: Mine?
BLONDER: Yeah.
BUTLER: The motion makes reference to the Senate Council's --
BLONDER: Memo.
BUTLER: -- memo. Anything that appears in the Senate Council memo is therefore incorporated in this already by reference to that; it does not need to be repeated.
BLONDER: Well --
BROTHERS: All right, let me get in here.
UNI DENTI FIED: Letter or memo?
BROTHERS: You want this in (unintelligible)?
AUDI ENCE: No, no.
BLONDER: So do we have an amendment or not on the floor?
UNI DENTI FIED: In shared governance --
BLONDER: Bob.
GROSSMAN: I would like to propose a difference amendment than -- I would like to -- I would like to actually change the first take action on each recommendation. I would like to request that the President respond to each recommendation. And -- and the reason is that the President might have good reasons to refuse to, for example, ask -- ask people to take a pay cut. And so I -- I think in the spirit of shared governance, we need to have a give and take. And certainly, it -- it's appropriate for the President to say, no, I

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGOCTOBER2012.txt
think this is extremely inappropriate, and I just -- I will not do it and -- despite your recommendation. However, at the same time, at the end of the second sentence as part of the same proposed amendment, where it says, on the action taken to implement the recommendations, or his reasons for not -- for not implementing any recommendation.

SWANSON: Or explain his rationale.
GROSSMAN: Or explain his rationale -- or explain his rationale for not implementing any of the recommendations. And -- and I think that is more of a -- of a respectful -- firm yet respectful way of saying, we want dialogue and this is what we think. So I propose that amendment.
BLONDER: Is there a second to this amendment?
WASILKOWSKI: Second. Wasilkowski, Engineering.
BLONDER: Okay. We need to have a discussion on the amendment.
FOX: Charles Fox, from Agriculture. I don't it should say implement any of the recommendation because then doesn't have to respond if he doesn't implement any rather than just --
GROSSMAN: I -- I don't think that's what it grammatically means, but I'm willing to accept a --
BROTHERS: You just want to change the language?
FOX: For not implementing one or more of the recommendations.
GROSSMAN: That's fine.
FOX: Or any one of them.
DIETZ: Actually, wouldn't it be better to just move the explanation along with (unintelligible) so you don't (unintelligible). Let's say something like --
GROSSMAN: Rationale for not implementing --
DIETZ: Alternatively, the explanation for not implementing each recommendation.
BLONDER: Is this an amendment to the amendment or --
GROSSMAN: Can I amend my own or just wordsmith it a little bit. Just change, of the, that's up there now to, a -- for not implementing a recommendation.
UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.
GROSSMAN: Done. There we go.
BLONDER: Well, I'd like to hear from this gentleman.
DIETZ: Sorry. I was just saying I think it would be stronger if you move the rationale and go to the implementation rather than saying recommendation twice, but -- so something --
UNIDENTIFIED: (Unintelligible) after implementing.
BLONDER: Or a comma after recommendation.
UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah, something like, taken to

implement or the rationale for not implementing the recommendation or each recommendation actually. I think it's better to be explicit by saying each recommendation.

UNIDENTIFIED: I do too, yeah.
GROSSMAN: So what do you want to change it to?
DIETZ: Okay. On the actions taken to implement, comma, or rationale for not implementing, comma, each of the recommendations.
COURT REPORTER: What's your name?
DIETZ: Oh, Hank Dietz, Engineering.
COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
BLONDER: All right. So we have --
BUTLER: Right now we -- there's a motion on the floor that Bob had made and the wording and the little discussion (unintelligible) your words, they are now your words.
GROSSMAN: They are now my words. I couldn't have expressed it anyway.
BUTLER: So we have motion on the floor and (unintelligible).
BRION: Call in question on the amendment.
BLONDER: We have a motion on the floor, at least the wording, and we had it seconded.
KELLUM: (Unintelligible) do we want (unintelligible) in shared governance --
BROTHERS: Name, please?
BUTLER: Becky Kellum, A&S.
At the very beginning that in the spirit of shared governance (unintelligible).
BLONDER: We should probably vote on this, and then we --
BUTLER: That's out -- that's out of order. We have a motion to discuss the amendment.
BLONDER: Okay. So we are discussing the amended motion that's been seconded.
BUTLER: That's right, the amendment (unintelligible).
BLONDER: Okay. Is there any discussion with it? Okay. We're going to vote on the amendment then.
BUTLER: Changing the words.
BLONDER: Yes, changing the words. All in favor of this amendment? Opposed? Abstain? Okay. The amendment carries.
BUTLER: Yeah, that's -- those are the words.
BLONDER: Okay.
BUTLER: (Unintelligible) shared governance.
BLONDER: Yes. I don't believe that shared governance is in this memo, so -- so in the spirit of -- in the spirit of shared governance has to be in there somewhere. So where do we put that? Where do you want to put that? Does someone want to make an

amendment to add shared governance?
BRI ON: I'll make an amendment to add shared governance (unintelligible).
(AUDIENCE TALKING AT ONCE)
BRI ON: That -- no, because we're endorsing it. Request that Capilouto and requests that the President, comma, in the spirit of shared governance, comma, respond to each recommendation.
UNI DENTI FIED: Yes.
BLONDER: Okay. So that's an amendment. Is there a second?
CHRIST: I second.
BLONDER: Okay. Spirit of shared governance.
BROTHERS: Okay, who seconded?
BLONDER: Okay. And we have an amendment and a second. Is there a discussion of this amendment?
DI ETZ: Hank Dietz, Engineering. I think this is fine except it's getting to be one long sentence.
(AUDIENCE COMMENTS)
DI ETZ: So maybe after response to each recommendation, put a period there, and then start the next sentence as, and further asks.
UNI DENTI FIED: Out of order.
BLONDER: I'm sorry, we can't do that.
DI ETZ: Can't do it? Has to be one sentence.
BLONDER: We have to do shared governance first.
BUTLER: You can add a few words (unintelligible) two things (unintelligible) --
BLONDER: Is there any other discussion of this added shared governance in that? All in favor? Opposed? Abstain? Okay. The amendment carries.
DI ETZ: Now I get to do it.
BROTHERS: Okay. What was your name again, please.
DI ETZ: Hank Dietz in Engineering. So I would suggest to put a period after response to each recommendation. And then say, further we ask, or something like that.
UNI DENTI FIED: Further, and the Senate asks.
DI ETZ: Yeah, further, and the Senate asks.
BLONDER: Okay. Is there a second to that? Let's get it up here first.
BUTLER: Actually, we need a second.
BLONDER: Oh, we need a second.
COHEN: Second.
BLONDER: Are you a member of the Senate?
COHEN: Yes.
BROTHERS: Okay, name?
COHEN: Elisia Cohen for Alexander (unintelligible).
BROTHERS: I'm sorry? There are -- there are no senatorial rights given to proxies.

I'm sorry.
UNIDENTIFIED: Is there someone else from the
--
FOX: I'll second.
BROTHERS: Someone --
FOX: Charles Fox from Agriculture.
BLONDER: All right.
(AUDIENCE DISCUSSION)
BLONDER: All in favor? Opposed?
Abstain? Motion carries.
Okay. Now, we're back to this as
a main motion. And the main motion reads:
That the University Senate endorses the
recommendations contained in the Senate
Council's memo of October 4, 2012 to
President Capilouto and requests that the
President in the spirit of shared
governance respond to each recommendation.
Further, the University Senate asks that
the President report to it on the actions
taken to implement or the -- or rationale
for not implementing each of the
recommendations. Do we need a vowel before
rationale? No?
(AUDIENCE DISCUSSION)
BROTHERS: The second for the --
BLONDER: Are you seconding?
BRION: I will. I second it; Gail Brion.
BLONDER: All right. So this is our
motion.
GROSSMAN: There's a comma after
implementing, the last -- very last
implementing.
BLONDER: What?
GROSSMAN: Oh, no, I'm sorry. My bad.
BLONDER: Okay. So this is our -- our
motion on the floor.
BUTLER: (Unintelligible).....
the main motion is on the floor, and is
ready for vote so --
BLONDER: So now we're ready to --
BUTLER: Oh, other discussion
(unintelligible).
BLONDER: Is there further discussion?
DURHAM: Rick Durham from Agriculture. I
just wondered so that the letter, the memo
was given to the President last Thursday.
Are we jumping the gun to force his hand on
this without giving him ample opportunity
to respond to the memo? Should we delay
this a month to give him opportunity to
respond first to the memo and then if it
requires further action if his response is
not quick enough?
BLONDER: Davy.
JONES: There's no timeline here.
DURHAM: No, but there's a -- there's an
implied force of hand here. And he could
respond in his own freewill without us
requiring him to.
JONES: Not without insulting us in
the spirit of shared governance.
BLONDER: I think the issue is -- the memo

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGOCTOBER2012.txt
from the Senate Council -- this would be
from the Senate --
(AUDIENCE DISCUSSION)

BLONDER: Yes. So this is an expansion of
who actually -- the endorsement of the
recommendations that were in the Senate
Council memo. The Senate Council memo
(unintelligible) 13 people
(unintelligible).

BRION: I do think -- Gail Brion, College
of Engineering. I do think that the lack
of time line is problematic and perhaps we
could ask by the end of the semester before
the start of the next year. I mean,
otherwise, it leaves it open for a response
for as long as possible. And -- and were
there any other (unintelligible)?

BLONDER: Mark.

COYNE: Mark Coyne, College of
Agriculture. I believe that given the
memo or given the dispensation
(unintelligible) that it would have been
(unintelligible) Senate Council
(unintelligible) that we are waiting for a
response.

BLONDER: Other discussion? Liz.

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A&S. I just want to
go back to your point and -- and -- and Tim
Tracy told us negotiations over the budget
cuts are taking place during October. And
so if we waited till the next Senate
meeting to see what the response was, the
process is over. It's actually already
done.

BLONDER: Greg. Give your name and
college, please.

WASILKOWSKI: Greg Wasilkowski, Engineering.
I think that perhaps we there is explicit
timeline in this memo (unintelligible).
You don't need anything more specific.

RABEL: Bob Rabel, A&S. I -- I'm not
that cynical that the President will look
at this and say, oh, there's no due date,
ha, ha, ha. I mean, (unintelligible) delay
forever till my retirement the report on
the action. I -- I think the memo is very,
very clear. And -- and I don't think we
need to -- again, if we need to worry about
whether the President is going to say, ha,
no time line, so I don't have to do any,
and what does it mean the word his? I
think we're merely (unintelligible) anyway,
and we'll be talking about this again.

BLONDER: Julia.

SMYTH-PINNEY: Julia Smyth-Pinney, College of
Design. I talked to a lot of my colleagues
(unintelligible) I've never seen a faculty
more upset and energized about these issues
(unintelligible) Senate Council
astoundingly well written for such a short
effort. And I would urge to give our full
support to the memo through this
(unintelligible).

LHUKSENATECOUNCILMEETINGOCTOBER2012.txt
BLONDER: Thank you. All right. I think we're ready to bring the vote. All in favor of this motion, raise your hand. Opposed? Abstain? Motion carries.
All right. So this is our last item of business, so may I have a motion to adjourn?

AUDIENCE: So moved.
BLONDER: Thank you all very much.
(END OF DIGITAL FILE)♀

S E R V I C E

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

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.
IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 15th day of March, 2013.

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