

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

SEPTEMBER 14, 2015

* * * *

* * * *

ANDREW HIPPISEY, CHAIR

KATHERINE MCCORMICK, VICE-CHAIR

KATE SEAGO, PARLIAMENTARIAN

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

LISA GRANT CRUMP, COURT REPORTER

* * * *

* * * *

HIPPISLEY: I'd like to call the meeting to order, please. For those of you who are new, we use clickers and sign in sheets in the back. Your name should be on it. For those of you who may have forgotten about that, your name will be on it, on the back. You'll need that to do all voting, including this vote which is: Are you here today? I usually at this point give you about a five second count down. So you deliberate and you've got five more seconds. Five, four, three, two, one. We have a majority. Okay. So just to -- I'll only do

this once this entire year just to remind you that we use Robert's Rules of Order, which can be a little bit fussy and slightly tedious, but the point is, it just means that there's an order to the discussion and debate.

I really emphasize the second point. Whatever you feel, how emotional you feel about the argument, please be civil to everybody here, and everybody will be civil to you. Be a good citizen in the chamber room. But also, be a good citizen, if you have emails from me about suggestions to nominate committees or Sheila sends you an email to look at transmittals, the good citizen is to look at these things and do your civic duty as a senator.

And part of your civic duty is just to make sure you return that clicker at the end. We only have one for your name. We don't have a replacement.

Okay. So there actually was a very slight correction, which I just received just now, from the minutes from May the 4th. And that is, it said that the minutes were from Monday, February 9th. So we corrected that just now.

Other than that, no other corrections were received. So unless there are objections now, the minutes from May the 4th, 2015 will stand as approved as distributed by unanimous consent.

So I am delighted that we have new senators. And these are elected faculty senators, and there are also students and that's very important.

I urge the students to be vocal at certain times. If it's a student issue and you feel a student voice is needed, please do be part of the debate and part of the vote, of course.

The President invited all senators, old and new, to his home on September the 15th, that's tomorrow between 4 and 5:30. This is a very good chance for you to meet each other in an informal setting. So I encourage you to come, and I do encourage you to RSVP whether you are coming or not.

I'd like to heartily welcome Jann Burks, if she's here? Jann, are you here? She's the new Staff Senate President and she is an ex-officio member of this body.

And there may be a cooperation that we will have. With the staff senate,

particularly with regard to the committee on finding an ombud.

I'd also like to welcome the new SGA president, Austin Mullen. I don't know if he is here. Austin, are you here? No, he's not here. But he's welcome.

Last one thing, there's going to be a meeting in Louisville to have a discussion, for a few hours, on reimaging higher education. Phil Kraemer is going to be going and so is Hollie Swanson and so is Roger Brown. If anybody else wants to go with them, I'll organize a car and pay for it for you to go. Just please email the Senate Council Office. And if you want more information about it, please email Phil Kraemer.

BRION: What day is that?

HIPPISLEY: That is September the 29th. What day is that?

UNIDENTIFIED: It's a Tuesday.

BRION: Thank you.

HIPPISLEY: Over the summer, I have been looking with a team at a new replacement for eCATS. And this was very secretive for a while because we went through an RFP and we weren't allowed to say anything, and now I can.

A company called DIGARC has now been contracted, and they have a system called Curriculog. And we are going to rebuild what we had and it's going to be much, much, much, much, much better. And it will go by sometime in this session. I don't know when exactly, but be on the lookout for that.

A few deadlines: This is being a good citizen of the body. You can make sure that your colleges know about these deadlines.

If somebody wants to have serious consideration for a proposal and stand a chance of it being passed, March the 31st is for any new program or a change to organizational structure, such as a new department or new department's name.

April 15th is for all courses and program changes.

I'm really grateful to our subcommittees. And especially to chairs. And it wasn't much arm twisting to get some new chairs on these committees. Here they all are. Here are the committees, at least some of them. And thank you so much, chairs,

for agreeing to do this.

I am at your availability if you'd like to discuss with me anything about your committee going forward. There are a few initiatives that some of us have already discussed.

These are more chairs. So thank you very much, all chairs.

One thing we're lacking is a chair for the Senate Advisory Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure. And that's in process.

Okay. So I -- you will hear from Senate Council Office, solicitations for nomination all year round. But a couple are coming your way very soon. One thing is it's the Senate's job to identify members of the UK Core Committee. It's in the rules and it's very important to do that.

But please think thoughtfully and carefully about who you think would be a good person to represent faculty on that committee. Likewise, for the University Honors Program Committee.

Okay. A number of colleges are having their periodic review and we will need to fill the committee. These are the reviews and these are all the colleges. So that email will come very soon as well. If you can send a name and maybe just one sentence as to why, that's also very helpful.

Something that happened over the summer is the sudden creation of an unconscious bias work group. Unconscious bias is the idea it's okay to have an unconscious bias. And the idea is that we are bias, all of us. We just don't know sometimes.

The group here that has as its mission to address this issue to make any (inaudible) implicit and have a more diverse, inclusive campus as a result. Claire Hart is the sort of staff person doing that.

If you are interested in diversity, inclusion, and the whole question of implicit or unconscious bias, please contact Claire, because this group needs more and more involvement.

Kaveh?

TAGAVI: Who is appointing this committee or is it a committee?

HIPPISLEY: It's a work group. I think the President had asked maybe Terry Allen to think about this as something the University

should be involved in.

The committee was created as a kind of work group. Nothing's happened yet; it's in its infancy. But this is the time if anyone is interested. Start suggesting names of people who can talk about it or how -- suggestions on how we can change the culture of the University to be more inclusive and diverse.

I'm very pleased that Mary Arthur, Liz Debski, and Todd Porter are doing another year as senate representatives on three academic councils. So thank you very much to all of them.

And I'm delighted that Kate has agreed to stay on as parliamentarian. Thank you, Kate.

So these are some of the things that I did in the summer. I approved a couple of calendar changes. A couple more from Pharmacy. And offered provisional approvals for around 50 courses and 6 programs.

Senate Council, on behalf of Senate, approved the 2015 degree list, as well as putting somebody in their right list, when they were in the wrong list, due to administrative error. Normally, Senate does this, but there was a clash of dates between when the Board meets and when they needed the list.

We had, at the end of our Senate Council meeting on Monday, a real lengthy discussion about access to this particular committee, the Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

This is a committee that hears cases of alleged violation of academic freedom, privilege, academic privilege, and tenure. It's (inaudible) absolutely anybody in the University who is a faculty member.

And there was real concern that administration, if they were to take away email privileges from a faculty member, then you're in a situation where how can you then access a committee like this to appeal your privilege, if your access is denied.

So this was a real dilemma and Senate Council discussed it at length. And we thought the best thing to do was to charge the Senate Rules and Elections Committee to look very carefully at not just the Senate rules on the role of this body, but also, the governing regulations on how exactly it is

that Senate and faculty can go from being having their privileges suspended to appeal against this body.

So they're going to look at this from the idea of making sure -- there isn't a rule in there already -- making sure that there is a rule that fits. It can never happen that while trying to appeal privileges, you're blocked from appealing your privileges.

So that committee will report back to Senate Council and we'll report back to this body.

Okay. I'm going to hand over to the brand new, or nearly brand new, University Senate secretary, who is Katherine McCormick. At least say hello.

MCCORMICK: Hello.

HIPPISLEY: Okay, that was quick. And now I'm going to hand over to our parliamentarian, Kate Seago.

SEAGO: For those of you who might be new or maybe want a little refresher on what the parliamentarian's role is and what does a parliamentarian do: Basically I'm here to advise the presiding officer on matters of procedure. Not content, but the procedure. In other words, helping to interpret Robert's Rules.

The parliamentarian procedure is drawn from Robert's Rules of Order, newly revised, except where our own rules override it. And there are a couple of cases where Senate Rules, University Senate Rules, override Robert's Rules, or custom can to prevail.

This is to let you know who is eligible to serve as parliamentarian. This is my third year, and I'll be happy to have somebody come in to replace me.

Generally, during the meeting, my role will come up if somebody raises a point of order. In other words, a point about the procedure that's going on. Any member of the assembly can indicate to the Chair that he wishes to raise a point of order.

This could be a question or concern about the rules of the Senate or Robert's Rules. And if you have a question, do try and raise it as early in the discussion as possible so we can get it addressed and not have to backtrack.

And for more information, we have a little parliamentarian (inaudible) on it.

So just a general outline of Robert's Rules and how to do things, and we have a link to the different motions that people may introduce.

And so some of them do involve majority vote, some of them two-thirds majority. Some may require seconds; some not. And that table kind of addresses that issue.

And in addition to helping Andrew out, if people do have a question before the meeting, they want to bring something, I'll be more than happy to walk you through it.

Thank you.

HIPPISLEY: Thanks, Kate. And with Robert's Rules, there's one nice little rule there, if you think the debate is getting tediously long and it's time to move on, you can call the question. I encourage that.

I'd now like to hand it over to our Faculty Trustee, John Wilson.

WILSON: Thank you, Andrew. I wanted to give a brief report and then take questions that any of you might have.

Bob and I had sent you a letter and the letter fully covered three issues. The first was our suggestion, which mirrors the suggestion of faculty trustees, staff trustees, Senate Council Chair, staff chairs, that the issue is related to ensuring a non-hostile environment for all University, including all the University community.

It would be facilitated if we actually had a faculty and staff ombud who would not report to the administration but to actually report to the Board of Trustees. In essence, an independent person.

I do believe this would be important. The longer I have served, the longer I believe that it is important. And it is something we urge faculty to urge their administrators to help move this forward. I think it's beyond time that we do something. Yes?

BRION: Could that person also serve as legal counsel for faculty?

WILSON: Many people have made suggestions about how this would look. I think that has to be very carefully decided by itself. I would not mention an opinion as to what that should look like.

I just think that, if anything, the experience at universities like North Carolina, where internal investigations find

one thing, and then external investigations find another, is a little bit of the notion that somewhere in the process, you need to have a third party to (inaudible).

The second thing we talked about in our letter to our colleagues related -- was related to some of the administrative actions surrounding the Paul Kearney case.

The President is -- disagrees with some of the things we put in that letter. And he has asked that because he could not be here today because of a Jewish holiday, and neither could Bob, for that matter, he asked that we postpone any discussion of that portion of the circumstances until October.

It's also true that at present, things are still under investigation with the administration about some of those issues. And so in some sense, it would be premature. But the President of the Senate and the President of the University is owed the courtesy of attending when he feels very strongly about some of these issues.

I would not be willing -- it would be inappropriate to take questions about that part of our letter.

The third component was related to action by the Board of Trustees at the previous meeting, which we wanted to highlight as something we thought help affirm some basic faculty rights, we found very important to affirm, and we wanted to keep you fully informed about that.

We met, the Board of Trustees met in Hazard over the previous weekend. We had a wonderful meeting in many respects in terms of the contact with folks from Eastern Kentucky who value the University so highly.

And it was a pleasure to see the possibilities that they see in their partnership with UK for economic development and for that region. It was an absolutely, wonderful, hospitable time with the folks from Hazard, (inaudible).

Things that happened at the Hazard meeting: We have new officers that were elected to the Board.

I want to take this time to highlight Keith Gannon. A variety of circumstances have made it impossible for him to continue as Chair of the Board of Trustees, and so I wanted to take this opportunity to thank Dr. Gannon for all his work for the University. He will remain on

the Board, but will not be Chair.

He served as the Academic Affairs Chair, and he served as the Chair of the Board of Trustees. And in all those instances, he was absolutely willing to make sure that faculty views were promulgated and made known.

It's with great appreciation, I want to express my appreciation for his efforts on behalf of the University, and especially on behalf of the faculty.

Connie?

WOOD: My interactions with Keith Gannon in my role as having run the survey on the faculty evaluation of the President, I certainly concur with your remark and also add my thanks to Keith Gannon.

And because of that, I want to move that we consider a recommendation of appreciation which would read as follows -- and Sheila, it's in your email.

BROTHERS: Thank you.

WOOD: The University Senate expresses its sincere appreciation to Dr. Keith Gannon, 2015-2016 Chair of the University of Kentucky Board of Trustees, for his significant effort to support a shared governance at the University faculty. During his tenure as Chair of the Board's Academic and Student Affairs Committee, Dr. Gannon ensured that the recommendation of the Senate were fully considered on their merits.

As Chair of the Board, Dr. Gannon clearly articulated the Board's determination to seek faculty input on issues of governance and to protect the ability of individual faculty members to exercise their academic right as conferred and protected by the Board.

The leadership exemplified by Trustee Gannon enabled the University Faculty to confidently and successfully accomplish the University's educational mission in and instruction, research and service.

HIPPISLEY: So we have a motion on the floor --

BRION: Second, Gail Brion.

HIPPISLEY: We have a second. The motion is now on the floor. Would anyone like to comment on that or add to it or discuss it?

ROHR: I have a question.

BROTHERS: Name please?

ROHR: Why did he step down as chair? Can you elucidate on that part of the background?

WILSON: I'm sorry. I didn't get the first part of your question.

ROHR: Why did he step down as being the chair?

WILSON: I think it would be only appropriate not to speak for Dr. Gannon. But it would only be appropriate to say that a variety of issues, not a single event that (inaudible), but a long time set of circumstances that made it functionally impossible for him to continue. That's about all I can say.

HIPPISLEY: Any other questions or suggestions?

I just would like to add to that, too.

Keith, I think, may be the first Senate Board of Trustees' Chair who actually attended Senate Council Retreats. It was something that he really wanted to do. And he spent a good hour discussing with us, his view of the importance of shared governance. And I think his view was if we don't get it right at a university, then what's going to happen to the country. That's kind of how he looked at it.

In my view, he was -- always deferred faculty issues to faculty experts and was in constant contact with John and Bob and me on a variety of issues. So I would like to affirm what Connie said.

BROTHERS: I'm going to do the voting slide.

HIPPISLEY: So we're going to now, unless there's any further comments, we can now vote on this resolution.

BROTHERS: We've got to open up one more.

HIPPISLEY: Okay. I'll give you five seconds.

Five, four, three, two, one. So 71 for and 7 abstain. Thank you.

WILSON: Are there any other questions?

HIPPISLEY: Lee?

BLONDER: Lee Blonder, Medicine. John, were other officers elected?

WILSON: Yes. I think many of us are familiar with the new Chair, Britt Brockman, who was Chair previous to Dr. Gannon. And he has come to Senate Council when he was Chair. And I expect that he will be willing, very willing to interact fully with the faculty.

CB Akins is the Vice Chair. And the Executive Committee consists of Barbara Young, Mark Bryant and Bob Vance. And the Secretary of the Board is Kelly Holland.

Other questions?

HIPPISLEY: Liz?

DEBSKI: Liz Debski. I was very

appreciative of the letter that you and Bob sent to faculty, then it seemed that there was another event that happened after that. (Inaudible).

WILSON: Sure. Following that letter, some additional things happened which raised issues related to whether that (inaudible) dictates of the Board were really being followed in the way that was intended.

Those issues are currently under discussion. And Bob and I have responded to the administration and asked for clarification on those things.

Once that process is completed, once again, we will keep faculty fully informed on what is taking place.

WASILKOWSKI: Greg Wasilkowski, Engineering I would like to ask something about this ombud. I know that in the past a number of faculty and staff bodies expressed need for such office. And also Senate Council was in favor of having this. Where is the obstacle?

WILSON: The administration does not feel that it's necessary, nor wise, to have an ombud. I will not speak for their -- they can speak for themselves.

Thank you very much.

HIPPISLEY: Thank you, John. Okay. I'm delighted to move on to the next part of business which is honorary degree nominations. Susan Carvalho, who is Dean of the Graduate School, cannot be here. But luckily for us, the Associate Dean of the Graduate School, is here, Brian Jackson.

JACKSON: Thank you. Good afternoon. As the senator mentioned, Dean Carvalho is currently out of the country. She asked me if I would present the nominee for honorary degree and I'm delighted to do so.

The committee was chaired by Dean Carvalho, it had representatives from the College of Arts and Sciences, from Libraries, from Agriculture, Fine Arts, Medicine, and from the College of Education.

The nominee that the committee came forward with was a software engineer, Mr. Matt Cutts, and the recommendation is for Honorary Doctor of Engineering.

A little information on Mr. Cutts: He is a native of Kentucky, from Morehead. And in 1995 received dual degrees in Computer Science and Mathematics and maintained a 4.0

GPA throughout.

During his tenure at UK, he was the recipient of many awards, including a Singletary Scholarship, Gaines Fellowship, he was inducted to Phi Beta Kappa, an outstanding graduate in the College of Engineering.

He subsequently moved on to the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, where he received a Master's in Computer Science in 1998. Again, a recipient of prestigious awards, including an NSF Fellowship and a Link Foundation Fellowship.

In 1999, he joined a small company by the name of Google, one of the first 100 employees of the company. He then rose very rapidly through the ranks, and in 2004 headed the Webspam group. And he's gone on from strength to strength in that arena since.

But he has developed many critical initiatives in search engine strategy, including safer web searching for families and children, improved ranking schemes, and most recently, developing procedures for search encryption.

Mr. Cutts has also gone over having one of the most viewed TED talks, "Try Something New For 30 Days", and it ranked 39th on the all-time list among 2000 TED talks. He's had something like 6.4 million views of this talk.

And in 2012, he was inducted into the UK College of Arts and Sciences Hall of Fame.

This was excerpted from a very strong letter of recommendation from Wes Brent Seales, the Chair of Computer Science. But it was accompanied by equally strong and enthusiastic letters both from the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Dean of the College of Engineering. Plus, a very key letter of recommendation from Amit Singhal, who is one of the Senior Vice Presidents of Search at Google.

So in summary: The recommendation or nomination of the committee is Mr. Matt Cutts for an Honorary Doctorate of Engineering.

HIPPISLEY: So we have a motion that the elected faculty senators approve Matt Cutts as the recipient of an Honorary Doctorate of Engineering, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended recipient of an honorary degree

to be conferred by the Board.

And I can't remember if this needs a second or not. It does.

BROTHERS: It needs a motion and second.

HIPPISLEY: I need someone to move it and someone to second it.

WHITAKER: I'll move it. I'm Mark Whitaker of the College of Arts and Science.

ROHR: Second.

HIPPISLEY: The motion is on the floor. Any discussion? Comments? Hearing none, vote. I'll give you a five second count down. Five, four, three, two, one.

What Sheila is about to do is something very clever. Of those 81, some cannot vote for this particular thing. It's only elected faculty. So she's going to magically subtract a few people from there and -- okay. There are 66 legal votes, are there. One legal opposed. Motion carries. Thank you, Brian.

I'll just add quickly, this is secret. I know it's a public meeting, but we don't want -- we want for this body to keep the nomination to themselves at this point.

Okay. So we're going to move on to a rule change proposal. The background for this is we now use the clickers; we have done for a year. But a bit of housekeeping, we want to reflect this in the Senate Rules that the records of the votes are kept in the Senate Council Office.

If someone wants to find out who voted for whom, then they make a request to Senate Council Office.

So we thought the appropriate place would be SR 1.2.3, and we've added the language. There it is, and you had a chance to look at it, also, six days ago or so.

So this needs someone to move it and a second. Name?

LEE: Chad Lee, College of Ag.

HIPPISLEY: Second?

TAGAVI: Has this been suggested by a new committee?

HIPPISLEY: This is suggested by the -- well, this was discussed in Senate Council. It's a recommendation from Senate Council.

TAGAVI: Doesn't that mean that -- that doesn't need to be moved or seconded; right? No, not even that.

SEAGO: On a recommendation? Oh, so the recommendation from a committee, then no, it doesn't have to be moved (inaudible).

HIPPISLEY: It's a recommendation from Senate Council. So it's on the floor already. Any discussion or questions?

DEBSKI: Liz Debski. So it hasn't been to the Rules Committee, is that what you're saying?

HIPPISLEY: It's not from the Rules Committee.

TAGAVI: It has been.

HIPPISLEY: It has been, yes.

WOOD: It has been.

HIPPISLEY: It has been. Sorry. Liz?

DEBSKI: I'll start. Liz Debski.

So it says, that first page, you crossed out as a paper document so you don't actually need the however. It could just start "as the" because the however referred to the electronic versus the paper. So that would be the first thing.

And then the second thing would be can we have some reason for why there should be detailed records kept and available to people? I'd just like to know the justification.

HIPPISLEY: Do you (inaudible)?

WOOD: I believe it's state law.

DEBSKI: Is it state law for the Board of Trustees? Senate Council doesn't have votes like that, why does Senate?

HIPPISLEY: Yes?

CROSS: Al Cross, Communication.

This is a public agency. How we vote should be a public record.

DEBSKI: It doesn't cover the Board of Trustees?

HIPPISLEY: Connie?

WOOD: It covers the Board of Trustees in those instances where they take a vote. You'll notice that -- I don't know, John, do you want to take this one? No. In most instances, where they are in open meetings and action of public agency, yes. But I think if you read the minutes of the Board of Trustees, you'll see that most of their work is done by unanimous action.

WILSON: I would just add, Liz, it is required. And I think as you'll know from the previous meeting, most votes are unanimous. When they are not unanimous, the Chair will let the record show that Trustee Wilson voted no, or Trustee whoever voted no. That part is officially in there. It is supposed to be.

HIPPISLEY: Any other questions?

FERRIER: Wally Ferrier, B and E.

Is this a relatively new state law?
Because prior to our using the clickers,
there was no individual voting accountability
or record.

HIPPISLEY: We were out of sync with state law
before we voted in this mechanism. Although
we could tally the votes, we could say 44 for
and 3 against, what we couldn't do was
identify who were the 44 and who were the 3.
With the clickers, we can do that.

Staff Senate does it, and so does
the Student, so we were the ones who were
behind.

Any questions?

TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi.

I wasn't going to bring this up,
but since there is already one addition of
change, I just noticed, this implies that
only action items need to be preserved.

Is that intentional or should that
be every agenda item? It doesn't have only
things we have voted on that we are supposed
to keep.

HIPPISLEY: Which are you referring to here?

TAGAVI: A copy of the documentation
supporting each action item voted upon shall
be appended.

HIPPISLEY: That's been there since
(inaudible).

TAGAVI: It should be every agenda item, not
every action item. So if you are open to
changes, maybe you should change that now
that we have the opportunity.

HIPPISLEY: Okay. Well, don't forget, the
minutes tell you absolutely everything that
happened. It's just a way of --

TAGAVI: This is --

HIPPISLEY: The minutes are going to be there
no matter what. A copy of each action is a
separate document, which is a subset of --

TAGAVI: The minutes talks about what we
did, what we did not do. It doesn't
necessarily say what are the content that we
may be discussing.

HIPPISLEY: It absolutely does. And there's a
transcript of the entire meeting, too. So
this is a abstraction of something that's
already there.

So can we - would this be, voting
be all right if we entertain the deletion of
"however" as an editorial change?

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

HIPPISLEY: Everyone said yes to that. All
right. So here we have the editorial change

of "however" being deleted and the sentence starting with (inaudible), any further discussion?

Hearing none --

DEBSKI: I have another question. With this detailed records, it's a little vague to me.

So are you saying that so a person can request a voting record of any individual faculty member on the past couple five years, something like that, or are you saying that on a particular action item you could get the vote of every member?

HIPPISLEY: Yeah. The request would be phrased, there was a vote on such and such.

I want to know who voted for it and who voted against. That's the sort of request (inaudible).

DEBSKI: One would imagine, but it doesn't really -- the wording doesn't really say that. I mean, it doesn't exclude the first possibility that one could get the voting record of an individual faculty member for a number of years going back.

HIPPISLEY: Connie?

WOOD: I think the intent here -- because Senate Council Office has got to keep a record of who voted what on each item. To get the kind of information that you're suggesting, Liz, an individual would have to make a request for the voting records for all the items and then compile that information themselves. The Senate Council Office is not required to provide that information.

HIPPISLEY: Detailed records of electronic voting.

WOOD: They're not required to search their records to figure out how someone voted the last five years. But they could request a voting record for every item that has been voted on in the past five years, except we've only had clickers two, so then they could compile that record themselves.

But that's not the function of the Senate Council or the Senate.

HIPPISLEY: Gail?

BRION: Is there ever any situation where these would not be available? It says available on request. Is there ever -- it's kind of implied that you may be able to say no as well? I just --

HIPPISLEY: The requests are normally made public records at this time. So let's not go crazy on --

BRION: -- freedom of information, okay.

HIPPISLEY: Yes, sir?

CALVERT: Ken Calvert, Engineering.

I haven't been here for a couple years, but is this effective going forward from here or is this -- I don't know whether clickers have been around for -- somebody said a couple years.

HIPPISLEY: Just one year. It's just one year, so it can only be effective actively since September (inaudible).

Phil?

KRAEMER: Phil Kraemer, A and S.

Isn't that an indication, though, because it's a state law, the best we can do is with the technology on those days, because if the technology doesn't work, are we going to be obligated to record individual votes?

HIPPISLEY: Right. So they no longer - we escape from the electronic vote. Any other questions?

KRAEMER: If all laws were so convenient...

HIPPISLEY: Any other questions, comments? Okay. Hearing none, on "however" is deleted.

I'll give you a count down. Five, four, three, two, one. The motion carries 75 for, 6 opposed and 1 abstain.

And we'll move on to the next business. I would be delighted to invite -- is John Herbst here? Okay. I will invite John Herbst to talk about this particular addition to SR 5.2.4.7.

HERBST: It's a pleasure to be here this afternoon. Let me also introduce Drew Crawford, who is a recent graduate of UK and now enrolled in the Graduate School in the College of Business and Economics. She serves as the graduate assistant that handles coordination and logistics for commencement for the committee. And Dr. Terry Malone, who is a long-serving member of the Commencement Committee. They've volunteered to assist with answering any questions that you all may have.

Is Sean Cooper here? Sean worked with us on -- he's from the Registrar's Office, and he was going to try to make it this afternoon, but I guess he did not.

I think the motion for the change in the Senate Rules is pretty self-explanatory. Let me give just a brief history of this.

This year -- well, let me start, several years ago, you all may -- some of you may remember that we voted to start a

December Commencement Ceremony. The first three years were on a trial basis.

I appeared before the Senate to report, happily, that the success in the December ceremony was really beyond what many expected. In fact, this last year for December, we were at standing room only, in the Coliseum, for the undergraduate ceremony.

As a result of that, and as a result of the amount of construction and loss of parking spaces in the area of Memorial Coliseum, the decision has been made to move commencement exercises to Rupp Arena for December.

Many of the comments in the survey we received from both degree candidate participants, as well as family members, and members of the faculty and staff and student body, have been very positive, with the exception of just a couple.

One, obviously being the weather. It's unpredictable in December. We figured there's not much we can do about that.

The second one, I just addressed, is the lack of parking in the immediate vicinity of Memorial Coliseum.

And the other comment that we received most frequently was in terms of the timing of the ceremonies.

Because of the timing of the end of the fall semester, many of you know that the commencement exercises are held on Friday, the last day of final exams. One of the things that we found very challenging for people is the fact that there is significant travel time for families and relatives to make it to the commencement exercises and then return home at a reasonable hour.

In the past, we've held the December ceremonies at 1 p.m. and 6 p.m. What we would like to do is have the ability to change those times to be a little bit more friendly to the degree candidates and their families that have to travel extensively.

So that is the basic reasoning behind and I would be glad to entertain any questions you all may have. Yes, sir?

WILSON: John Wilson, Medicine.

The question of parking, Memorial Coliseum is also used by women's basketball. Are there arrangements made for parking for women's basketball that could be used for graduation?

HERBST: I'm not sure what the plans are for

women's basketball this year. In past years with women's basketball, we've had the parking structure, which we also used for commencement, as well as the parking behind the Coliseum.

And we used to have the student center lots. The student center lots are offline now, so I don't know what provisions they're going to have for that. So I can't answer the question.

MALONE: John, I was told that they were going to primarily try to use the large structures, but I don't know if that's where they've ended up. That was what I heard previously.

WILSON: The reason I ask is that certainly is at least as large a crowd as graduation, if parking is a major consideration in making this move.

MALONE: The one advantage is the majority of people coming in for basketball do know the area. And when we have people coming in for graduation, they're clueless and they're trying to find places, and they don't know where they're looking.

HERBST: Yes, Connie?

WOOD: Connie Wood, Arts and Sciences. I am going to have to speak against this. Let me explain why. I think it's too flexible in that the position is that the student only be on an approved degree list, this in no way -- I'm speaking mainly on undergraduates here -- this in no way guarantees that that student is going to complete that semester.

Also, and therefore, I think you're putting an undue burden on the instructor of record because anybody who is on the degree list can, and somebody can put their name on the degree list, if they get their name on the degree list, then, in fact, they can have their exam rescheduled. I think you're putting an undue burden on the instructor.

Also, I think you're creating a problem by moving the times of the commencement. Because is it correct that it's 6:00 with the undergraduate commencement, which did not conflict with the final exam schedule.

I think you're creating a problem that you're trying to solve.

HIPPISLEY: Just before we go on speaking for and against, we haven't put the motion on the floor yet and I think maybe this is the time

to do that.

WOOD: Well, it came from Senate Council,
it doesn't need --

HIPPISLEY: It came from Senate Council, it
doesn't need -- is that right, Kate?

SEAGO: Yeah.

BRION: I just wanted to ask a question
about - Gail Brion, College of Engineering
-- why is it Friday and not Saturday for
holding commencement? I mean, it used to be
held, didn't it, on Saturdays?

HERBST: No. With the initiation of the
December ceremonies, they've always been on
the Friday of finals week. And I guess the
main consideration was the fact that people
were still here and there's like a mass
exodus with the upcoming holidays.

BRION: I was wondering why it couldn't be
held on a Saturday.

CRAWFORD: I think, personally, for students
that they did their finals, they're ready to
go home.

But especially for graduation, if
you're a graduate, you want to be able to
walk up to the stage without having to wait
another day closer to Christmas. Especially
if you have to travel long distances, you
know, you can graduate on Friday, go home.

This is why we're trying
(inaudible) the earlier degree, so that it
makes catching a flight or not driving
through the middle of the night, or they
might not leave until 9 p.m. and have to
catch a flight out leaving Saturday. It will
be pushing them closer to Christmas
(inaudible).

HIPPISLEY: Thank you. Joan?

MAZUR: Just a point of order. This was
put on the Senate Agenda by Senate Council
but not with a recommendation. So we do need
a motion.

SEAGO: Yeah, I'm sorry. She's right.
I've gotten myself confused.

HIPPISLEY: So let's do that now. So the
motion is to revise SR 5.2.4.7. with which
the additional paragraph which allows third
reason for a conflict legitimately to happen
between scheduling that's outside of exams
and (inaudible). Does anyone want to move
it? John?

WILSON: John Wilson, Medicine.
I'll move.

HIPPISLEY: Second?

WEBB: Second. Bruce Webb, Agriculture.

HIPPISLEY: Yes?

CALVERT: Ken Calvert, Engineering.

I'm probably going to vote against this also, but I think you have to define conflict. The other cases in the Senate Rules are quite clear about the condition for rescheduling (inaudible). But suppose an exam ends at 3:00 and the graduation is at 3:30, is that going to be a conflict in regards to the student has to be down there at 2:30 or whatever? You have to have a very precise definition of conflict, otherwise, it's going to lead to problems.

HIPPISLEY: Are there any students here who would like to talk for or against this? Yes? Can you identify yourself?

GOWER: Yes. Rebecca Gower, College of Health Sciences, SGA.

I don't understand the reason completely for this. But I would also speak against it just from the fact that I am from ten hours away and if this were me (inaudible), a Saturday commencement would be so much easier for parents traveling that work.

Other families that would want to come (inaudible), if they were having a flight on Saturday morning or driving in even later on Friday night and getting a motel, that would be so much more doable for so many families that will have to make it to the University of Kentucky, rather than trying to get off work. Trying to travel during the day, you're traveling on Thursday to get here on time for that commencement (inaudible).

HIPPISLEY: Thank you. Are there any other students here who would like to speak for or against?

ROARK: Becca Roark, College of Education.

This may not be (inaudible), but I do work in retail and that is the Saturday before the holidays. It will be a madhouse.

Personally, I think that it would be much more beneficial to have it on Friday. Having it that Saturday is crazy with traveling. The way people are traveling across the country to spend that whole week with their families, and then also to get their last minute shopping done. I know it sounds trivial, but Lexington will be out the roof.

HIPPISLEY: For 3:00 or 6:00, do you have a comment on that?

ROARK: I don't have a comment on that.

HIPPISLEY: Yes?

WHITAKER: Mark Whitaker, Arts and Sciences.

Just a numbers question. Do you have any idea of how many students are likely to be affected by this (inaudible)?

HERBST: Yes. The Registrar's Office did run an analysis on the number of finals, especially in upper level courses. And I think you're going to -- Dr. Malone, do you have that today? We expect it to be very minimal. I believe it looks like 1.8 percent.

MALONE: I believe that number is between 1.8 and 2 percent.

WOOD: We want a raw number.

WHITAKER: So that's 2 percent of what number of the total number of students taking exams?

HERBST: That's correct.

WHITAKER: So then you're talking about 2- to 3,000 students.

MALONE: Of those that are graduating, yes. I mean, that's what I mean. It's 1 or 2 percent.

WHITAKER: So how many, on average, graduate in December?

HERBST: That participate in the ceremony?

WHITAKER: Yeah. Graduate.

DEBSKI: Yeah. Graduate and then how many participate? Two numbers.

HERBST: I wish Sean was here because I'm not sure I have the total number, the total number of graduating students.

MALONE: These are the numbers of participants.

HERBST: Okay. The undergraduate ceremony last year was 846.

DEBSKI: Liz Debski.

But I guess the point -- I thought of this when Connie said her remarks. Basically, there's always students who don't participate, right? And so that also does not say the student has to be planning to participate in the commencement ceremony. It's a conflict even on the schedule. Right?

So that also is something that needs to be addressed, I think, in the language, going back to other points that people have made about defining conflict.

HIPPISLEY: Any other comments?

MALONE: One thought is that they do sign up for graduation for participation. Now, that doesn't mean they have to participate, but they do have to sign up. And that would be another number or another marker, if you

wish.

HERBST: The other thing that I would mention in terms of people that are eligible to participate, they actually have to apply for a degree through the college and be approved by the Registrar's Office, or certified by the Registrar's Office, that they're eligible.

HIPPISLEY: Anyone want to speak for or against the actual concept itself, rather than the technically that this person or that person (inaudible). The student would be legitimately graduating and is on the list and would like to go at 3:00, but they have an exam at 3:00, accommodation is made. I think this is the concept behind this. There's all sorts of language there that could be amended, but the actual concept itself -- Connie?

WOOD: Andrew, the concept is not what we're voting on. What we're voting on is what it says as the current rules exist, which by having the undergraduate commencement at 6:00, there is no conflict. So the conflict is being created by changing the time.

UNIDENTIFIED: Right.

WOOD: And so that whole issue as to whether we should do that and create this issue is a very serious issue.

HIPPISLEY: All right. That's what I'm trying to get a response to that issue, of creating this third conflict. There are two conflicts already.

WOOD: Why create a conflict?

HIPPISLEY: Lee?

BLONDER: Lee Blonder, Medicine. Can you describe to us, and maybe I missed it, but how was it decided to move from 6:00 to 3:00 or whatever? Was this -- were people polled about this? Or how did this --

HERBST: No, it hasn't been finally decided yet. This is a proposal. What we wanted to do was bring it before Senate before we finalize any of those decisions.

BLONDER: How was the proposal vetted?

HERBST: I'm sorry?

BLONDER: How was the proposal vetted?

HERBST: With a core group who did the commencement committee. We do not meet during the summer. But we had to make the decision to move it to Rupp or not to move it to Rupp in order to secure the dates. We

were very afraid that if we waited too long, Rupp simply would not be available to us.

What will happen is the decision on changing times will go to the Commencement Committee, which is advisory to the President's Office, in terms of any changes that take place with commencement.

So this decision is not final in terms of changing the times. But we would like to have that as an option.

HIPPISLEY: Yes?

MCGILLIS: Yeah, Joe McGillis, College of Medicine.

I'm wondering, and this may not be doable, but as an alternative, could we end exam week for 1 or 2 on Friday. And another benefit of considering that is it will also allow students to get out early who may have a later exam. And then if you held commencement at 3, there's no longer this overlap of this conflict.

HERBST: I'm not sure I'm understanding your proposal.

MCGILLIS: So the conflict is between finals that are scheduled between say 2:00, starting at 1:00 or 2:00, and finishing before 5:00. So I'm suggesting as an alternative, would it be possible to end finals at say 2:00? That finals have to end, fall semester have to be completed by 2:00.

And to address the young lady's concern about people wanting to get out earlier and not be on the road as late, being able to catch flights, that may allow them to escape campus a little earlier. I don't know that it's really an issue that addresses this, but it's an alternative.

HIPPISLEY: It resolves a conflict.

MCGILLIS: It eliminates the conflict, that's correct.

HIPPISLEY: So if we vote against this (inaudible) not necessarily going to happen as long as --

MCGILLIS: Right. And I don't know what would be involved with the change in finals week time. That's a whole other...

HERBST: That would come through you all also, and in coordination with the Registrar's Office. So changing the end of finals week is not within our purview.

HIPPISLEY: Gail, you had your hand up.

BRION: I'm just -- he kind of got my point.

HIPPISLEY: So hearing no further comments or

discussion -- yes, sir?

CROSS: Al Cross, Communication.

You said 847 undergraduate participated last semester. The Registrar said it would be a potential conflict with 1.8 percent. That's 15 people, you know. It's worth a try. If it's a problem, then come back and address it.

You've got a full house in the Coliseum, standing room only. I think the more we can do to involve the general public in activities at the University, the better off we are. (Inaudible).

HIPPISLEY: Liz?

DEBSKI: Going back to Lee's point, we actually don't know it's a step in that direction. I think at least the students might have been polled or something of wanting, you know, because we had one student talk for it and one student talk against it here. So it seems that it's your intention certainly is to make more people participate, but you don't know that's going to happen because we're not the people participating.

HERBST: The poll that we take is from the people that participated in previous commencements, in terms of suggestions to make it better. Does that answer your question?

DEBSKI: I thought you said you didn't do a poll. I'm sorry.

MALONE: We do each year. There are comments of all the graduates each year. It's done on an annual basis.

DEBSKI: And it specifically asks whether you want to move the time of this and you got a response rate from everyone or is this --

MALONE: It's electronic. And it varies in the number of people that respond, obviously.

HIPPISLEY: Gail?

BRION: I don't -- I'm still going to speak against this because I don't think it's necessary because in the rule already it says in the case of undue hardship for an individual student, a final examination may be rescheduled by the instructor.

If we're dealing with 18 students, it would seem to me that if the student went to the instructor and said I'd like to attend the graduation, that that part of this rule already covers what you're trying to solve.

HIPPISLEY: Okay. Before I (inaudible) is that a possible interpretation of hardship (inaudible)?

WOOD: It leaves it up to the discretion of the instructor. But -- yeah, for the instructor to make that --

HIPPISLEY: For the instructor --

WOOD: - they can interpret it that way.

HIPPISLEY: Is there a student that --

LEHMAN: Yes. I'm Christina Lehman in the College of Business and Economics.

I frankly would be in favor of this just because I come from a big family. So trying to get all seven of them in one location is difficult enough, and both of my parents work. And I think about our situation of getting everyone there because my sister's going to be graduating this December.

So to think about that, logistically it would be better for us to do like a Friday at 3:00 because traffic to get here at a minimum would be bad. But then, like if it's around 6:00, then think about the Lexington traffic where it picks up somewhere between 3:30 and 4:00 and you're sitting there, like going nowhere, for probably 30 minutes.

And I think about trying to get in for 6:00, it would be (inaudible).

I think Friday is better than Saturday just because it is the holiday season and people have a lot of things going on. People have other locations that they all have to travel to.

I think ideally we want to find a situation that works the best for everyone. I think it is realistic to think that some people are going to have problems with this.

And so I think we need to think about what is best for everyone. And I think this is more student-oriented just because it is the student finally graduating. (Inaudible) more of the students. And I think just having something that can accommodate these students while they want to graduate, seeing that it is such a small number, I don't think it's outrageous to vote for it.

HIPPISLEY: Thank you. Kaveh?

TAGAVI: As a matter of fact, the existing rule does say the University-sanctioned trips and events are excused absence. Obviously, it's a University-sanctioned event.

HIPPISLEY: For exam conflicts?

TAGAVI: Examine?

HIPPISLEY: For exam conflicts?

TAGAVI: Yes. It is a excused absence. And if you have an excused absence, then you are invited to reschedule your exam.

HIPPISLEY: Wally?

FERRIER: Wally Ferrier, B and E. Perhaps John alluded to this earlier, I don't think so, but in case anyone is holding out for a Saturday option, there's a nationally televised basketball game against Ohio State. And Saturday, (inaudible) the time of the game has not yet been announced. But I guess you have to flip from the graduation to basketball.

HIPPISLEY: Unless someone's got a voting issue to bring up, do we move to vote? Oh.

CALVERT: Ken Calvert, Engineering. I just want to point out that two weeks prior to the scheduled examination could be one week, essentially ten days, before the start of finals week.

So we know to schedule an examination, that a conflict is going on Friday, right? So you're talking about the Friday before dead week. I mean, to be precise, you might as well say two weeks prior to the Friday of finals week. If the only time it can be rescheduled to is the Monday of finals week then you have just about a week's notice.

HIPPISLEY: And are you proposing an amendment to this or are you --

CALVERT: A friendly amendment.

HIPPISLEY: I think that is a serious change.

CALVERT: Okay. Well, I withdraw. I'd like to call the question.

HIPPISLEY: The question has been called.

UNIDENTIFIED: Here, here.

UNIDENTIFIED: I thought it would be kind of interesting --

UNIDENTIFIED: He called the question.

UNIDENTIFIED: We're now voting.

HIPPISLEY: He called the question, do we need --

SEAGO: We need a second.

HIPPISLEY: We need a second.

UNIDENTIFIED: Second, David Hulse.

BROTHERS: Who was the second?

HIPPISLEY: Can you just say your name?

HULSE: David Hulse, B and E.

HIPPISLEY: Okay. So the motion is on the floor. I don't think calling the question needs a discussion. So all those in favor of calling the question --

BROTHERS: You need to give me a chance to

make the slide.

UNIDENTIFIED: We can do it by hand.

HIPPISLEY: For this one, we'll do show of hands. All those in favor of calling the question? All those against? That passes.

So we will now move to vote. We didn't need that. Five seconds to deliberate. Five, four, three, two, one.

TAGAVI: Does this need to be only elected faculty because it's an academic function?

BROTHERS: No.

HIPPISLEY: Elected faculty is the degree list, as far as I know. (Inaudible).

SEAGO: Well, I don't remember one for that. I will double check.

TAGAVI: Any matter which is of --

PORTER: Perhaps Sheila can tell us the answer to the question.

BROTHERS: I'm unaware of anything in the Senate Rules that restricts voting except for degree lists. For degree lists and honorary degrees, it's for elected faculty senators only. But to the best of my knowledge, there's no other restriction on who may vote for what item.

HIPPISLEY: Thank you, sir. Thank you. I'm delighted to introduce Michael Healy.

HEALY: Hi, I'm Michael Healy, I'm the Academic Ombud.

The annual report from our office has been distributed in pdf form to all senators. Laura Ansel, the Assistant Ombud, has pulled together the information that's reported to the Senate in that report.

I'll summarize briefly what the report's about. We first provide senators with the total number of matters considered by the office, which we divide basically on the basis of how much time is committed to a matter with questions or referrals, less than one hour, and cases greater than an hour. And then for cases, the report provides information about non-academic offense cases, including the subject matter of them and the source, in terms of the college that they (inaudible).

The second category of information is academic offense cases which provide details about the 120 cases in which a student was determined to have committed an academic offense by a University department.

The third category of information is grade appeals, which a student filed an appeal letter with the Academic Ombud Office.

We had 14 grade appeal cases in total last year.

And then the last category of information which ends up summarizing other information in the report and is also reported by the University Appeals Board, is the summary of the academic offenses and grade appeals that were submitted to the University Appeals Board and provides information about the disposition of those cases.

I'm happy to answer any questions that anyone would have about our report.

HIPPISLEY: Questions from anyone? Hearing none, thank you very much.

HEALY: Thank you.

HIPPISLEY: We have a brief presentation by Jason Hope, who wants to talk about the new travel risk management. Jason?

HOPE: I'm Jason Hope from the International Center. I wanted to talk to you guys a little bit about -- it's just going to be an informational sort of thing -- about the new international insurance benefit that the University has bought for faculty and staff that travel abroad for work, and some of the background with that right now.

In the fall of 2013, there was an international travel task force that was convened by the Provost at the time. It looked at how institution-wide international travel was being supported.

At that time, education abroad was obviously the piece that was best supported in terms of insurance for students, as well as in terms of tracking and policy, and things like that.

It came to everyone's -- it became very obvious that the faculty and staff were the ones who had the least support, and the issue came to how UK would respond to them if something bad happened while they were overseas for work.

About 1600 trips were booked overseas last year for UK travelers. This is only faculty and staff. It's not 1600 individuals, but 1600 trips, because some people may have traveled more than once. But just to give you an idea of sort of what the mobility looks like, that faculty and staff do go overseas.

So to support these people, before August 1st of this year, which was when the new policy went into effect, your insurance

that you had through Anthem was basically what you took with you when you went overseas for work.

Some people aren't aware that that doesn't always work when you go overseas. If you have just an insurance card, in certain countries, they won't even know what to do with it.

So a lot of times what was going to end up happening was people were going to end up having to pay for things out-of-pocket, up front, or their college was going to have to front the money and they were going to look at reimbursements on the back end. Anthem isn't always friendly when it comes to the documentation that they need, so sometimes the college is just out the money.

The executive assistant's package was something that allowed you to be evacuated from a country if there were a natural or political disaster. But it was not insurance, it was something that UK was going to have to pay for after it was used.

In the recent earthquake in Nepal, was sort of a talking point across universities throughout the country because some of the flights out of Nepal were up to \$50,000 a piece. And so the policy that we have now is going to help mitigate that risk as well.

Institutional support in an emergency: At the institutional level, UK has never kept track of where its faculty and staff are overseas at any given time.

In 2011, when the earthquake in Japan happened, that became fairly abundantly clear. I wasn't here at that time, but I've heard that there was really a lot of scrambling going on trying to figure out who was where, contacting budget officers in the middle of the night, trying to figure out where people were and how we could reach out to them.

And if you wanted anything above and beyond what Anthem provided before August 1st, you were on your own. You had to purchase your own policy. I did that for myself when I went overseas for work for UK several times. And UK actually did not allow it to be reimbursed.

Anyway, after August 1st, so currently, there's a new blanket travel medical insurance and evacuation policy in effect through a rider called AXA Assistance.

So if you go overseas for work now, you're covered through this policy, which my office is coordinating.

My position was created in

February, of this year, to act as sort of a clearinghouse for any sort of international problems that people have. Everything from questions about eligibility for visas or where do you go to get inoculations for certain countries, all the way to if you get hurt overseas and you need Workers' Compensation, how does that all work.

And finally, institutional support in an emergency was another thing that my office was created for. The fact of the idea that (inaudible) at any given time, hopefully now, we're going to know where people are.

And the way that this is all going to work is through a new travel registry that the International Center has set up. What the travel registry will do is it will allow faculty and staff who go overseas for work to basically just tell where they're going, how long they're going to be there, and if they're taking anyone with them.

Once we know that, once you've registered, this registration takes about five or ten minutes. It actually just went live today, so hopefully next week, I'll be sending out some information to budget officers and others about this.

You'll be able to register. It will spit out an automated email that tells you everything you need to know about this insurance policy, including numbers to call, UK's policy number, so on and so forth.

And the registry is the way that we're going to proactively liaise with people in the event of an emergency overseas where we feel like we need to get into contact with you or someone in the department needs to get in touch with you, and they, you know, need the International Center's assistance.

This is the website for this new registry. It's going to work with not only faculty and staff, but students who go overseas and they're not earning academic credit. So graduate students, for example, who are going to conferences or undergrads who are going to conferences and not earning credit, are covered under this policy. They just also need to register through a separate link on this website.

So this is really the main section

that's going to have anything to do with faculty and staff. If you all want to look at the website later on, it's there.

My name again is Jason Hope. I didn't put my email address up, but it's jasonhope@uky.edu., in case anyone has questions that they'd like to reach out about.

HIPPISLEY: We have a bit of time for questions. Yes?

BRION: How will the registry that you're putting together be secure? Like when I traveled to Columbia, we were told to not leave a record because we could be kidnaped.

HOPE: Okay, that's a good question. This is interfaced with SAP. So when you log in, you have to log in using you're my uk user name and password.

Once you've created a registration, there are only four people on campus, currently, who have access to the registry. It's me, Dean Carvalho, and the Director and Assistant Director of Education Abroad.

BRION: And hacking?

HOPE: This was all set up by UK IT, who has given us assurances that it is secure in terms of all that, to what UK requires for any sort of institutional database.

HIPPISLEY: Anyone else have questions? Yes, sir?

MURTHY: Ganpathy Murthy, A and S. So the very act of registering in this website would give us enrollment in that policy; is that correct?

HOPE: That's right. It's a blanket policy. So actually, there's not a lot that you have to do to tell the insurance company that you're going somewhere.

There is a portal that the insurance company has available that you can look up providers, you can look up destinations and specific information. And that requires a separate registration directly with the insurance company. But all that information is contained in the email you'll get after you do this.

KORNBLUH: Mark Kornbluh, A and S.

This is a huge step forward to covering our faculty and staff internationally. And you do not have to be University reimbursed, right, to do this?

HOPE: That's right.

KORNBLUH: So if a faculty member is doing their own research or their own work, it's

still covered by the University.

HOPE: And if you're taking anyone with you, they are also covered. Spouses, children, friends, whoever may be going with you on the trip, are also coverable. Yes?

PORTER: And if you don't register are you not covered?

HOPE: You will still have the coverage. The problem is, and this actually occurred over the weekend, when AXA gets a claim, because it's a blanket policy for the entire University, they're going to reach out to me and they're going to say, is this a valid claim.

The way that I'm going to know it's a valid claim most quickly is by looking in the registry. If a person hasn't registered, then it's going to have to trickle down to the department levels to figure out whether a person is actually overseas.

REAL: Do you have to --

BROTHERS: Name please?

REAL: Kevin Real, Communication and Information.

Do you have to register for each time you travel or do you just register one time?

HOPE: You register for each trip.

REAL: Okay. By the way, this is great.

I was in Peru last summer. This is just really good because I was dealing, you know, with some things like that. They were concerns, not the actual things.

HIPPISLEY: Questions? Mark?

KORNBLUH: Mark Kornbluh, A and S, again.

I came here seven years ago from Michigan State and we had this more than a decade before that at Michigan State. And there was lots of concerns about registering.

But I know many incidents where I had faculty abroad that it was really important to be able to contact them. So this is through SAP, which has the highest level security, and it will really help faculty and staff.

HIPPISLEY: If you'd like, I can make these slides available for you for your colleges.

HOPE: I appreciate it.

HIPPISLEY: Thanks so much. Thank you. So I introduced this item called "other business" about a year ago. There are no actions that arise from other business, but it's a time for someone to raise a concern that they may have that may actually become an action item

in a future meeting. And we do have a little bit of time remains.

So if there's anybody of this body who would like to mention something that's on their mind, that they think they want this body to address at some point, now is the time to do it.

That's fine as well.

So I would now like to entertain a motion to adjourn.

MCGILLIS: Joe McGillis, College or Medicine.

HIPPISLEY: Second?

CALVERT: Ken Calvert, College of Engineering.

HIPPISLEY: Okay.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY)
COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

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, 2019.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 23rd day of September, 2015.

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