

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

OCTOBER 12, 2015

* * * *

* * * *

ANDREW HIPPI SLEY, CHAIR
KATHERINE MCCORMICK, VICE-CHAIR
KATE SEAGO, PARLIAMENTARIAN
SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

* * * *

* * * *

HIPPI SLEY: I'd like to call the meeting to order, please. Please make sure you sign in. It's not good enough to just grab a clicker anymore, you have to sign in, too, sorry about that. So please click. I'll give you five seconds to click. Five, four, three, two, one. All right. Great.
So normally I say I didn't receive any corrections. This time I can say I did. We received some corrections, they are there. And then in the last one, we received a correction of the correction. We've done those already, so that's what the arrows are pointing to. Negotiating was put us in by us by mistake, it's affecting no reality, instead of investigated. So unless I hear any objections now, the minutes of September 14 are approved by unanimous consent.
Okay. I'd like the Senate's permission to rearrange the agenda so that

UKSenateMeeting10-12-15.txt

when the President comes, he is the next item on the agenda. He's number five anyway, so that may happen. So unless I hear any objections to the rearrangement, this is approved. The rearrangement was approved by unanimous consent.

Okay. We know Thursday is a football game, first time ever. There's mixed messages. We had the Football Organization Committee in Senate Council, and they were very emphatic, classes should be on as usual, exams should be on as usual.

So there should, in theory, be no academic interference. There is a website, which in UKNow, it was on today, showing you exactly what the parking accommodations are.

Friday, we posted a web transmittal, please review courses and programs. So send any objections to Senate Council Office.

There has been a number of these advisory workshops. I think maybe some of you here may be nominees. Some very recently. Please note that Phil Kraemer is our chair of the Senate Academic Advisory Committee, which is the direct point of Senate into to these advising initiatives. The main point about the advising initiatives is to make advising better. Phil is here today. I don't know if he wants to add anything to this. Phil?

KRAEMER: I think you did fine.

HI PPI SLEY: I'd like to invite Susan Carvalho to quickly give a arm-twisting plea for nominations for the Honorary Degree Committee. Are you here, Susan? She's not here. Is there a member of Graduate School here today? Graduate Council?

Okay. Well, you know that we have solicitations periodically. It really helps if you send the message to your colleges and to your deans to find names to be on the list of nominations for honorary degrees. We will can be more explicit about this and send more emails, too.

We were delighted to get so many nominations for these college reviews. Thank you very much. A lot of people emailed to say that they were (inaudible) faculty and their colleges. And the upshot is we have Senate Council approve nominations for all the list of colleges for their reviews.

On the way, I also approved nominations for a sexual misconduct hearing panel and the University Honors Program Committee. As soon as the nominations are known, we'll make sure you know who's on those committees.

Oh, Susan is here now. Susan, will you tell us something about honorary degrees?

CARVALHO: Sorry for being behind.

I wanted to just take a minute to say that each semester we accept honorary

degree nominations. We can give five, up to five honorary degrees per year.

And so in each cycle, spring and fall we received maybe eight nominations. Some of those are re-nominations.

And while often, one, two, or three of them are slam dunks in terms of qualifications and the kind of individual that we would want to stand up as a model of success, intellectual achievement, social entrepreneurship for our students, there's often a big gap between them and the next tier. And the top tier often can't promise to attend commencement.

So one question is: Should we only worry about filling the slots? And if that's where we were, we're okay. Or should we have a large pool of deserving candidates so that A) we can feel good about the people being put forward by our community of scholars; and B) if that first, second choice can't come, we have some bench depth.

And since this is primarily the province of our faculty to confer degrees, generally, honorary degrees and a subset of that, I think as a community we need to take it seriously. At the same time, it's an onerous process. There can be extended letters, even though those don't (inaudible) get approved.

So I would look forward to your input about how we can smooth the way. And also how we can get more people to think seriously when that email, out of the thousands, comes across your desk, thinking about who you might want to put forward as the kinds of role models for our students.

That was all I had to say, was there is input from you, suggestions for us on how to engage a broader community in this process.

UNIDENTIFIED: There's a question.

WEBB: Would it be possible to have --

BROTHERS: Name, please.

WEBB: Bruce Webb, Ag.

Would it be possible to have like a lean evaluation to reduce the burden of preparing the nomination so that you would have a tiered review process?

CARVALHO: Where we would get maybe a one to two page nomination from a nominee --

WEBB: Exactly.

CARVALHO: -- and then have a first cut, and then request a full packet from others?

WEBB: Yes.

CARVALHO: We can do that. That's a great suggestion. Everyone can make one. It's hard because you can make anyone sound awesome in one to two pages. But you're right, it might work and we should try it.

We might get more evidence in the first rush if we (inaudible). Thank you.

HIPPISLEY: On behalf of Senate Council, Senate

Chair approved a change to the University calendar for this academic year.

In a moment there's a poll going out, at the close of Tuesday, 5:00, screening for this committee, the UK Core Committee. A number of people (inaudible) for obvious reasons. So that (inaudible) very best faculty on the committee.

So I've had nominations. I'd love a lot more nominations. So please, I encourage you to think about that.

Alice Christ went on sabbatical, Bruce Webb, who just asked a question here, is a member of Senate Council, as the second highest voter. And he will fulfill -- he will fill Alice's remaining term.

Elections amongst ourselves will take place soon enough. In November, early December, we'll email you. You need to please think very carefully about people, including yourself, to replace the people coming off Senate Council, bearing in mind, that one of those people could be the next chair. So please be on the lookout for emails. The three people who will be rolling off will be me, David, and Bruce.

We did a lot of form creation in the summer. And Senate Council approved the use of a number of different forms. For me, the most important on there is the University Scholars Program form. There's never been one like that before. But many deans are asking their faculty to contemplate the USP program. So be on the watch for emails about where these forms are going to live.

We also approved a change in the retroactive withdrawal appeals form. And Tommy is going to talk more about retroactive withdrawals in a few moments.

I'll ask Katherine, if she's here, to give any reports? Katherine, are you here? No.

I'll ask Kate if she has a report.

SEAGO: No report.

HIPPI SLEY: No report. And our Trustees, John Wilson and Bob Grossman, do you have reports?

WILSON: Can you hear me in the back? Bob and I wanted to give a very brief report today because we have a busy agenda.

I wanted to quickly bring you up to date from what I had talked about at the last meeting. At the last meeting, Bob and I had -- I was here and mentioned that we wanted to defer some things to this meeting because the President would be here.

Subsequent to that meeting, Bob and I had an opportunity to meet with the President and express our concerns about some of the actions taken subsequent to the Board meeting, related to Dr. Kearney's case.

Specifically, that some of the restrictions placed on him were not consistent with the Board's ruling and were

difficult to understand from an academic point of view.

Specifically, banning a faculty member from public lectures was something that we considered an extreme step. And that consistent with the Board's ruling, anything that Bob and I could attend would be something that would be appropriate to Dr. Kearney.

We had an opportunity to express our concerns to the President and subsequent to that, we don't know what the President is doing about that. That's where we are at the moment.

GROSSMAN: Do you have anything to amplify? No, I have nothing to amplify on that. He did say he would consider what we said very seriously. But we haven't heard whether his considerations have been complete.

I would like to say we attended, last week or the week before, a meeting organized by the Council on Postsecondary Education of all the Trustees of all the universities in Kentucky, public, four year, two year, even I think there were some of the independent colleges and universities in Kentucky.

And one of our own faculty won the Acorn Award from the CPE for outstanding teaching at a four year University. That was Christia Spears Brown from the Department of Psychology. So if you see her or know her, make sure you congratulate her.

And one other thing, Andrew mentioned the upcoming football game. And this is the -- this is not the first time that we had a Thursday night football game, but it's the first time in about 80 years. Lexington is a little different than 80 years ago.

But anyway, obviously, this is going to cause some disruption. What is not clear is whether it's going to be a little bit of disruption and minor inconveniences, or there's going to be a huge headache and a huge disruption.

I hope to send out a poll, after the football game, to all the faculty, hopefully all the staff as well, to get your feedback on how badly your life was disrupted or whether it wasn't disrupted much at all. So please look for that.

I hate those. I usually delete them as soon as they appear in my inbox. But the more feedback we can get, the more we can carry it back to the administration and say, hey you did a good job at ameliorating the problems, or this was such a disaster, please don't make us do this again.

HIPPISLEY: Questions for the Trustees? Lee?
BLONDER: John, you mentioned that you discussed with the President concerns about

banning Dr. Kearney from open meetings given that (inaudible) reinstated (inaudible). Did the President have any response to why that was being enacted?

- WILSON: I'll let the President speak for himself about those things. He was -- he listened to our concerns and that's where we are at the moment.
- DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S.
So can you just follow-up on that and say -- well, are you waiting for a response from him now? I mean, what if nothing happens?
- WILSON: We sent him a note earlier this week, asking for clarification, and as yet have received no response. Thank you.
- HIPPI SLEY: I think our first actual item here, this is a recommendation, it comes from Senate Council: The Elected Faculty Senators amend the August 2009 degree list adopted on April 13th, 2009 meeting by adding a Master's of Music Performance and rescinding a Master's of Arts in Music Performance to Student KA-06.
This is a petition that came from the Graduate School. I'm sure Susan would be delighted to answer any questions if we have any.
The motion is on the floor, it doesn't need a second, it came from committee. Connie and then Liz.
- WOOD: I'd like to propose an amendment. Instead of the word rescinding, replace that with deleting. This is a degree list, not a degree confirmation.
- HIPPI SLEY: Unless someone objects, on behalf of Senate Council, I'll accept that as a friendly amendment.
- UNIDENTIFIED: So amended.
- HIPPI SLEY: Is this to speak to Connie's --
- GROSSMAN: Yes.
- HIPPI SLEY: Okay.
- GROSSMAN: I don't object to that. But please make sure that when this gets to the Board of Trustees, the Board of Trustees understands that it is rescinded and not merely deleted.
- HIPPI SLEY: Liz?
- DEBSKI: I just kind of have the obvious question. So this was in August 2009 and the paperwork said that the Graduate School caught the mistake at the time the degree was conferred.
What happened in the intervening years?
- HIPPI SLEY: Great question, Liz. So Cleo Price, I'd like to defer to --
- PRICE: Sorry. I didn't hear the question.
- GROSSMAN: Why has it been so long?
- PRICE: Communicating with the student, trying to find out why it was so long, she said she noticed the incorrection shortly after graduating, sometime in

November/December, and went to a particular area and called someone, but she didn't get response. No one responded.

I asked her who did she talk to, obviously she forgot with the period of time elapsing. But she said after a period of time, she thought it was best that she tried to correct it because she is looking for jobs. And so she wanted to have the correct information on her transcript and she could pursue other employment.

DEBSKI: Well, then is the information that accompanied this incorrect? Because it says the Graduate School, Graduate School caught the error at the time the degree was conferred. And here you're kind of putting it on the student.

PRICE: You know, we -- I will take the blame. I will take blame because what happened is initially the student was not enrolled. So there are issues right there when the student is not currently enrolled, we have to manually go into the system to put all the degree information.

And so it was myself or between my Student Affairs person that we put the wrong degree, put MA instead of the (inaudible). So we will take the blame on that.

DEBSKI: Well, it's not the original mistake, it's just again, why did it take so long to correct it? It doesn't seem good for the University to have a person out there with the wrong degree either.

PRICE: Well, we don't go back. We don't have the resources to go back and double check each degree that's been awarded. So it was brought to our attention, and that's what the student did.

DEBSKI: Again, I hate to keep harping on this, but the documentation that was presented to the Senate for this pdf file says the Graduate School at the time the degree was conferred. So either that documentation is wrong or (inaudible).

PRICE: Well, clearly, by the student's email, it seems like she knew it was wrong, she knew it was incorrect, but didn't take the appropriate action to rectify it at that moment.

CARVALHO: It appears the documentation is wrong.

HIPPISLEY: Greg?

WASILKOWSKI: Greg Wasilkowski, Engineering. I have a friendly amendment, just to remove the word Senate.

HIPPISLEY: Oh, reduplication, as it were.

GROSSMAN: The first instance of the word Senate.

HIPPISLEY: On behalf of Senate Council, we will accept that as a friendly amendment unless anyone in Senate Council objects.

WOOD: We can't hear.

BLONDER: What was it? We can't hear.

HI PPI SLEY: Greg has noticed that the Elected Faculty Senators, amend the August -- we don't need the word Senate. Any other questions? Lee?

BLONDER: If we're going to be deleting this degree, the degree to be conferred needs to be recommended to the Board, who then confers the degree. So where's the statement in here that we're recommending this to the Board?

HI PPI SLEY: Davy?

JONES: Doesn't this language -- there's a can language that goes here and it talks about recommending through the President to the Board of Trustees.

HI PPI SLEY: There is such language when we're doing recommending for new degrees. This is the boilerplate language that we've used for the last two or three years when we're amending a degree list. We certainly did that all year.

WOOD: We could do that, Lee. I think the Board understands what we're doing here. Connie?

WOOD: I move the boilerplate to include the recommend -- and the recommendation is through -- what was it, Davy?

JONES: Through the President to the Board of Trustees.

WOOD: Right. Through the President to the Board of Trustees to award a Master of Music Performance.

HI PPI SLEY: Sheila, do you mind just incorporating that so we can see it?

BROTHERS: No, I'm sorry. I can't. Sometimes the touch pad is disabled on the laptop.

GROSSMAN: Would the Senators just accept that the Faculty Trustees will explain to the Board what's going on if there is any confusion on the part of the Board?

HI PPI SLEY: I think I tried that and I don't think it worked. We might -- bear with us one minute.

WOOD: The motion is on the floor.

HI PPI SLEY: So this is a motion to make an amendment which will be this language coming up here, through the Elected Faculty Senators to the Board of Trustees.

UNIDENTIFIED: Through the President to the Board of Trustees.

HI PPI SLEY: Board of Trustees. Again, I would like on behalf of Senate Council, unless Bob has a problem with this, to accept this as a friendly amendment so we don't have to vote on this.

WOOD: Okay. Without any objections, this is accepted as a friendly amendment. Are there any other questions? The motion is going to be this.

BLONDER: I thought we had accepted that we would change rescinded to deleted. Is that not what we --

HI PPI SLEY: Oh, we can do that now. And we got rid of Senate.

UKSenateMeeting10-12-15.txt

WOOD: And recommend. After KA-06, and recommend through the President to the Board of Trustees that the MM be awarded effective August 2009.

HIPPI SLEY: All right. So this is a friendly accepted amendment and this is the motion now. Any other questions?
Okay. We will vote on that amended version. I'll give you five seconds. Five, four, three, two, one.

BROTHERS: I'm sorry. I can't slice it at the moment. The touch pad is disabled.

HIPPI SLEY: We'll do the slicing later. But we will actually subtract any votes that come illegitimately. In other words, votes that were made by people who are not elected faculty. Motion carries.
Okay. We have our first committee report. I'd like to invite Wally, Chair of Academic Priorities.

FERRIER: I'd like to ask the faculty in the room to indicate by a show of hands the extent to which you're familiar with the rules and policies about the way that classes are scheduled during a semester. So the standardized meeting times for classes, how many of you are familiar with that?
Okay. How many of you are familiar with the reality that a large portion of classes are not in compliance with the policy that you think exists?
Don't complain here, I kind of bated you a little bit. There is no formal standardized meeting times. And it's funny, but, you know, it does impact a very large number of students, and I'll give you some information.
According to the Registrar's Office, about 30 percent of classes scheduled, in any given semester, are out of compliance. That is they're scheduled, you know, Tuesday morning from 8:15 to 11:09. So some of them are that kind of silly.
So 731 courses in terms of combinations of dates and time slots in the fall of 2014, about 200 were scheduled at difficult or non-standard times. And it affects thousands of students each semester, really.
So the Registrar's Office gave me a huge list, huge spread sheet that had these 731 time slots. And I randomly chose three non-compliant time slots. So that would be the Monday, 1:00 to 2:50 time slot, the Monday, Wednesday at 11 to 12:15 time slot, and the Monday 1:00 to the 2:15. That affects roughly about 21 sections of this course or that one. But it affects nearly 500 students.
So 500 students, so what does that mean? What are those implications of scheduling the class in a non-conforming time slot?

UKSenateMeeting10-12-15.txt

When you consider the fact, for instance, classes from a student center point of view, need to kind of align so that they can take what they need to graduate on time.

So for instance, if a student wants to take a Monday, Wednesday, Friday, we'll look at 10 a.m. class, 10 a.m. to 10:50, but also has to take, to complete the degree, a Wednesday 9:30, 11:15 slot, they're kind of precluded from taking those.

So, you know, the students come first insofar as the friction that it creates for them to complete their degree requirements on a timely basis.

Then comes the classroom utilization in efficiency point of view. I'm sure many of you have traveled through classrooms all the time, you know, during what seems to be peak hours and you see a room totally empty. That happens far more often than we think.

So the Registrar wanted to get out in front of this and requested to Senate Council to kind of look into the possibility of maybe not forming a Senate Rule or a formal policy, but at a minimum, an understanding and awareness that this problem exists. And perhaps a, maybe we could all come to a census to agree that there should be some guidelines to that extent.

So the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee took a close look at this. And with lots of help from the Registrar's Office, and David Timoney, in particular, who is sitting back there. So David, if I've gotten any of that story incorrect, feel free to chime in.

So our committee offered 20 or 21 standardized meeting times. And they are what you think they are, Monday, Wednesday from 8 to 8:50, Tuesday, Thursday 9:30 11:15, 9:30 10:45, on and on and on; right?

So out of the 731 time slots that had been scheduled, just a semester and a half ago, we have 20 standardized proposed. Okay?

Now what about exemptions? Any exemptions whether they be a pedagogical reason or for other kinds of reasons would need to be approved by the department's dean. Courses like labs, studios, recitations, clinics are naturally exempt.

Courses of the distance learning type, particularly asynchronous distance learning classes, are exempt; however, synchronous distance learning classes would be subjected to the guidelines.

So I don't know where we go from here, really, Andrew. Is this a --

HIPPISLEY: Well, we have a -- let's put the motion on the floor, Wally.

FERRIER: We couldn't believe that even just making this fact aware, that everyone would

kind of jump in and say, well, I'm out of compliance, maybe I'll get in compliance.

HI PPI SLEY: So (inaudible) what Wally said is a recommendation that the Senate endorse the meeting patterns proposed and state that all faculty must abide by the policy.

GROSSMAN: What does abide mean?

HI PPI SLEY: So this is the motion on the floor, it comes from committee, it doesn't need a second. It's on the floor. The first question is Liz and then Greg.

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S.

I'm kind of -- it seems that there's a contradiction between what Wally said, he mentioned guidelines a number of times, and then I see this and it says "must abide by the policy."

And so it seems you're making a policy and the committee made guidelines. Is that a correct perception or am I --

HI PPI SLEY: I will say what I think but I'd like Senate Council to chip in and (inaudible). Senate Council voted to rethink the guidelines as an actual policy.

One extreme thing would have been -- we went back on was to actually incorporate into the Senate Rules. So we didn't put it, we decided not to put it in the Senate Rules, but to treat the recommendations in the report, which is standardized meeting times are (inaudible), and there are these exemptions as to policy and communication by Senate because there's a statement by Senate that faculty must abide by that policy. So that was a Senate Council recommendation. Bob?

GROSSMAN: I agree with your characterization.

I would just like to add that in addition to the exemption that Wally mentioned, there is also a process by which a faculty member and a chair and a dean can request that in a particular case that a non-standardized meeting time be -- it can be accepted.

HI PPI SLEY: Which is in the pdf on the website.

GROSSMAN: Yeah, that's in the policy.

HI PPI SLEY: Greg?

WASILKOWSKI: Greg Wasilkowski, Engineering.

You just mentioned also about assigning rooms. I notice there's a big problem because, for instance, when I teach a class with 60 or 70 student and this is in a classroom building that always have very small room, whereas across the hall, there are huge rooms and only 10, 15 students, and I was told that they have priority because they're Arts and Sciences. I don't think it's right. If your colleague can look at this and make another recommendation, they should assign rooms based on enrollment.

FERRIER: I think assigning rooms and time slots are related but disconnected issues. Perhaps we could look into that, I don't know. But it becomes a space allocation

problem well beyond our scope of understanding, I think.

David, do you guys have some really fancy hocus focus algorithm to optimize all of that?

TIMONEY: The room scheduling software that we use, the data (inaudible) and for any fall semester, we would roughly have 6500 academic sections. And the vast majority of those would require room assignment. So we use the software to optimize the room assignments and this is done so based on the meeting patterns, but as well as the capacities that are built for each of these academic sections.

FERRIER: Okay. Because, you know, some of my colleagues would express some dissatisfaction with the room allocation assignment process. So hopefully, you can, you know, change a parameter here or there in that software to accommodate those sorts of things.

HIPPISLEY: The gentleman sitting at the side looking down, yes?

WHITAKER: I just wanted to --

BROTHERS: Name, please?

WHITAKER: Mark Whitaker, A and S.

I know that our department occasionally schedules seminar classes midmorning. But under the current guidelines, those would be discouraged. Is that what I understand?

FERRIER: Good question, I think. That's one of the things that Senate Council had discussed when I presented this proposal to them a few weeks back.

It's likely that central classroom scheduling as well as the larger colleges like my own, for instance, that have our own scheduling person, could, for instance, marry up your seminar, that, for example, might run from 9:00 to 11:30 on a Monday, with mine that runs that same time span, such that the rooms are fully occupied, won't disrupt any undergraduate, for instance, who normally run on a Monday, Wednesday, Friday schedule for those particular time slots.

So I think there's ways to, you know, in terms of building up the whole quilt or patchwork of courses in any given day, time slot, and room, kind of match those two so it's not disruptive. So in effect, what you would have are two courses, that combined, are reasonably compliant with the policy.

CALVERT: Ken Calvert, Engineering.

I just want to say thank you for scheduling the Monday, Wednesday 3 to 4:15 and 4:30 to 5:45 slots without the Friday. It's a big win, I think.

FERRIER: Thank you.

CALVERT: I hadn't looked at the documentation and I just was going to ask

UKSenateMeeting10-12-15.txt

FERRIER: about that, but I see you've done so.
Our committee thought it would be a good idea to have a series of time slots available on a Monday Wednesday that resemble the time slots typically offered on Tuesday and Thursday.

But Katherine just reminded me that one of the exemptions are classes that meet once weekly at or after 3 p.m. So if you've got a late afternoon class, you're off the hook.

CALVERT: I think what I was going to say is

I was on a committee that was looking at streamlining things for students and helping eliminate some roadblocks. And one of the -- standardizing the times is not going to solve the problem of empty rooms that you walk around because the demand for the times is super (inaudible). And everybody wants the morning and nobody wants to teach Monday Wednesday and Friday at 4:00. So this was one of the things that we suggested.

HIPPI SLEY: Liz?

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S.

Yeah, I don't think I was clear in making my point before. So we're voting on that recommendation, we're not voting on what Wally said.

And basically, this recommendation says we're endorsing the meeting patterns, not that whole section kind of thing, and "that all faculty must abide." That's what the recommendation says.

HIPPI SLEY: So whatever you see on the website is Wally's report. We voted in Senate Council to make a recommendation to Senate to take the report as it is, including the exemptions, and including the extra exemption that Roger Brown added, which is any class that's meeting out of sync right now, that's part of the exemption.

We're taking the whole package and what you see on the Senate website, Wally's report, and we're recommending that it's voted as policy, not as guidelines.

We could have voted it into the Senate Rules; we did not do that. We could have voted it in as guidelines; we didn't think there was enough teeth in there. We're voting it as policy. So that's what the recommendation is.

DEBSKI: Well, can you amend that a little so it doesn't just say "endorse the meeting patterns proposed?"

Can you amend that at least to say the guidelines that were proposed by this committee or something like that so it (inaudible). Because basically, the meeting patterns to me suggests just the times. It does not -- it does not include the guidelines and the other verbiage that went with that.

FERRIER: I understand your point.
HIPPI SLEY: So what about "endorse the meeting patterns report?" Because that's what the name of the report is.
DEBSKI: That's fine.
HIPPI SLEY: So again, unless Senate Council objects, I'd like on behalf of Senate Council to accept that as a friendly amendment that we add "report" after patterns. Connie and then Margaret.
WOOD: I'm concerned about the last part of that sentence, even though I totally support the uniform meeting pattern proposal. I am concerned about the last part of that recommendation.
If University Senate has no disciplinary function and I am very concerned that we are getting very close to administrative policy here. I'm very concerned about that.
I would be much happier if it said to endorse the meeting patterns report and recommend that the University Registrar adopt this as policy. That's an entirely different statement than talking about the behavior of faculty.
HIPPI SLEY: Okay. So let me answer that, Connie, because I think I can answer this one.
The evolution of where we are now begins with the Registrar coming to Senate Council Office and saying "faculty twist our arms, we have no authority to stop the faculty from meeting whenever they'd like," we would like --
WOOD: But we're giving them the authority. I'm just saying that what the Senate is doing is endorsing this as a policy for the Registrar to follow. The Senate is not declaring how faculty members shall behave.
HIPPI SLEY: Right. And the problem with it is I don't think the Registrar is an enforcement body either in regard to this.
WOOD: Well, they can say that's the policy. We have a Provost.
HIPPI SLEY: So Connie, would you like to make a motion to amend?
WOOD: I'll make it if there's a second.
HIPPI SLEY: Can you tell us what the amendment would be?
WOOD: Propose and recommend that the University Registrar adopt this as policy.
JONES: Connie, the "this" means the report?
WOOD: Right.
HIPPI SLEY: So we have a motion on the floor we don't have a motion on the floor. We have someone who has suggested an amendment, it would need a second.
WASILKOWSKI: Second.
HIPPI SLEY: Greg, second. The motion is put on

the floor right now. Is there any discussion here or questions about adding this idea that Registrar itself adopts this as policy? Bob?

GROSSMAN: Two points. First of all, reiterate what Andrew said: The Registrar asked us to make this a policy of the Senate so that when a professor calls the Registrar's Office and says, I want to meet at 8:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. on Monday, Wednesday, Friday, because I have to drop my kid off at daycare and I can't get here on time, that the Registrar say, sorry, the faculty, the University Senate has voted that this should be a policy.

And then the second point is the University Senate rules are full of rules that govern the behavior of faculty. And although it is true that we do not have an endorsement arm of the University Senate, that doesn't stop us from making all sorts of rules about faculty, what they must and shall not do. So I don't really understand the objection.

HI PPI SLEY: Thank you, Bob. Anyone else want to speak for or against the amendment?

David, before Liz, David, do you have any comments on this amendment as it would be --

TIMONEY: I think Wally's committee did an excellent job of summarizing our concerns and thoughts with the standardized meeting patterns. And we're extremely happy with the end product.

HI PPI SLEY: Liz, I think I saw your hand up?

DEBSKI: Yeah. Liz Debski.

I just wanted to speak to Bob's last point. So we're voting on a recommendation and not a change to Senate rules?

HI PPI SLEY: At the moment, we're voting to an amendment which would have the Registrar as the policy keepers.

DEBSKI: Right. Exactly. So I am absolutely in favor of Connie's amendment. Again, I don't think, first of all, that we can adopt powers, whether or not the Registrar thinks we have them, that we don't have. And we are not making a change to the Senate rules in any case. So I think that Connie's language is appropriate.

HI PPI SLEY: Katherine?

MCCORMICK: Could we change or add and recommend that University Registrar adopt this report as policy and these recommendations?

HI PPI SLEY: Yes. But is that accepted as a friendly amendment to your amendment? She said yes.

Any other discussion? And what we're going to do in a minute is vote just on this amendment, we're not voting on the recommendation, on this amendment.

Okay. Five, four, three, two, one.

So the amendment passes. So now our recommendation, that's the old recommendation, and it will have that new language in it.

Any further discussion of the recommendation to adopt Wally's report as policy and Registrar has the (inaudible) adopt as a policy. Yes?

HERTOG: Jim Hertog, CI.

Do we have any information whatsoever about the effectiveness of different patterns of meeting in terms of pedagogy?

FERRIER: I don't. Can you repeat the question?

HERTOG: It's just that we're making this standardized, but we don't know that we're standardizing anything better than anything else.

And I was wondering, you know, if you're going to be looking into patterns, my department does a lot of off pattern stuff, not because they have to drop off their kids, but because, in fact, they think that these other patterns allow for opportunities for the students in terms of outside the University and et cetera.

And I'm just wondering if there's any information that we have at all regarding what a good pattern would be?

FERRIER: I don't think at the University level we have that. It would be purely within the sphere of given academic discipline and faculty in that discipline and the dean.

And I should admit that when it comes time for me register with my senior undergraduate class, I'm going to be first in line at my dean's door seeking an exemption on pedagogical bases.

So the meeting patterns is the standard if there are legitimate pedagogical needs to deviate from that. I think that's up to you and the dean.

HIPPISLEY: Fox, then Margaret.

THORPE: Fox, Thorpe, College of Engineering. As far as like any evidence, I would definitely be in favor of this. I feel like it will help scheduling a lot. Ly

Sometimes you get the one class where there's only one section and it's not in the times that match up at all with the others. It can take up three slots and so it takes up the entire morning, if that makes any sense.

You know, like 10 to 10:50, 11 to 11:50, if there's a class that meets in between those, it takes up the 10 to 10:50 slot and 11:50 slot. And I'm just saying, as a student, this definitely seems like something that I would be very in favor of.

HIPPISLEY: Are there any other students here who would like to speak for or

against the motion so we can hear the student voice?

LEHMAN: Christina Lehman, College of Business and Economics.

I personally agree with getting this passed because like he said, that one class can run into two classes' time period and I work. Like outside of school, I have to work to pay for my rent and everything, and then for a business student, it's very beneficial to have an internship. And so trying to get an internship that will match the kind of hours that you need is very difficult when you have a class that runs at odd times and you have to reorganize your schedule.

So I think it would be very beneficial for students that are working, like myself, because that helps open up your schedule a little bit.

THORPE: And can I also add, it can lead to -- if that one class that takes up those several slots, you can have a Tuesday Thursday that you only have one class and then a Monday, Wednesday, Friday where you have eight or nine, not eight or nine, but you know, many, many hours falling in those that you can't fit in the other two slots.

HIPPI SLEY: Ted, Margaret.

FIEDLER: Ted Fiedler, Arts and Sciences.

As a faculty member who has been chair off and on for 17 years, I think it's important to keep in mind that the underlying impetus for this report was not the pedagogical needs of individual departments, but the needs of the student body as a whole.

And, you know, it's one thing to have Wally teach a senior seminar where there's a select body of students. It's another thing for people to teach courses that really ought to be appealing to a wide audience because it's convenient for them to do so or because they think their pedagogy needs to do that.

It's needed for that purpose. I'm strongly in favor of having people think of the whole instead of always their little niche. So I'm strongly in favor of the Senate adopting this proposal.

HIPPI SLEY: Margaret?

SCHROEDER: Margaret Mohr-Schroeder, College of Education.

I have two questions. The first is I see that the request for exemptions are granted on a semester-by-semester basis. Is there something for programs within colleges that -- like our teacher education programs, once they getting admitted into the practicum and I see student teachings on here, but our practicum semester is off hours. That's the only classes that they're taking is within that. So every single semester our faculty are going to have to go get an exemption from

the dean or is that just going to be something that, you know, we put into a system that the Registrar knows about?

FERRIER: I would guess the latter. And you used the word practicum, I would say that (inaudible) synonymous with a studio or clinic, you know, the language differences notwithstanding, I think the intent and spirit of having had a few deviant time slots for specific programs purposes, probably would not have to reapply for exemption every year. So that -- I think there's got enough wiggle room in the policy guidelines and the language thereof to address those specific types of things.

SCHROEDER: Okay. And my second question is: Is this also -- I'm assuming this is fall and spring. It doesn't say it on here unless I missed it. Is this also summer, too, that we're doing this?

FERRIER: You surprised me here.

SCHROEDER: Sorry. We teach a lot of summer classes, especially for our teachers. So we're very interested in this standardized meeting time.

FERRIER: I'm getting a waveoff here from folks up front that it doesn't apply to summer. Although, you got to live up to the spirit of the standardized mind set.

PEFFER: Sean Pepper, B and E. You said in your thing that 11 to 12:15 Wednesday is a non-approved time. So does that mean that's knocking out the Monday Wednesday classes. You said that standing up there. (Inaudible)? Are you knocking out the Monday Wednesday classes, the ones going on Monday Wednesday Friday are on Monday Wednesday? He says it's knocking them out, the before 3 p.m.

Did you do any type of a -- by the way, that hits physics classes, too, so you're knocking Friday now. But did you do any kind of impact study to see what that would do to the College of B and E, because we run a ton of classes Monday Wednesday.

UNIDENTIFIED: What time slots?

PEFFER: From 8 a.m., 8 to 9:15, the same as Monday Wednesday Friday. Did you do any type of impact study and maybe talk to the deans a bit, the colleges or whatever, find out what impact this is going to have?

FERRIER: No. I did not do that kind of analysis.

PEFFER: That might be an analysis to do before we say to the Registrar, go ahead and do it. And then you find out that half the classes in your college or a college are affected. I'm thinking that's information I'd like to know before I vote yes on this. I do know that (inaudible).

FERRIER: But Sean, I think some of those time slots you mentioned could justifiably fall under the exemption category, you know,

UKSenateMeeting10-12-15.txt

based on pedagogical reasons.

PEFFER: Name me a pedagogical reason that says we can't go Monday Wednesday Friday instead of Monday Wednesday.

FERRIER: That is your job.

PFEFFER: No, no, no, no, no. You said there might be a pedagogical reason if --

FERRIER: I don't teach accounting. I wouldn't venture to have a guess of what the pedagogical reason would be.

PEFFER: Yeah. All I'm saying is, I'd like to know the impact this is going to have beforehand because I do happen to know that we do have a full plate, Monday and Wednesday, of those.

So anyway, that's my --before I do it, I'd like to know what I'm impacting. And I'd like to communicate that to the dean or communicate that to the college so the college to see what the impact is. That's all.

HIPPI SLEY: Ted and then Bob.

FIEDLER: Ted Fiedler, Arts and Sciences. The question is impact on whom, the convenience of the faculty or the convenience of the students overall?

HIPPI SLEY: Bob?

GROSSMAN: Someone mentioned summer, a summer session a moment ago. I taught summer classes a couple years ago and it was 8 to 9 a.m. Monday through Friday. If it had been 8 to 8:50 a.m. we would not have had the total number of hours required to make it equivalent to a regular semester.

But I would also like to mention that the first time I taught a summer course, 8 to 9 a.m., it was an Organic Chemistry course. But then a Biology course was offered 9 to 10 a.m. And so there was no time for students from my class to get to the other class. So they had to either piss me off or piss off their biology instructor. So each of us fought to be more hardline.

But the -- so this kind of thing also doesn't need to be done for summer sessions. Not these particular (inaudible).

HIPPI SLEY: There's a question over there.

WHITAKER: Mark Whitaker, A and S. I suppose I'm thinking about, a concern I might have, would be what this does to Friday. In our department, we tend to reserve Friday for graduate students activities, primarily having committee meetings and also in upper level undergraduate committee meetings and so forth and so on.

By eliminating Monday Wednesday schedules that means that there's going to be less Friday to do that kind of stuff, and I'm a little worried about whether we'd actually having enough time to do the stuff we're supposed to do with graduate committees.

UKSenateMeeting10-12-15.txt

So I must admit, that is a little bit of a time concern. I think that's a concern that actually goes beyond the faculty convenience to the student (inaudible). Just and area of concern for me.

HIPPISLEY: Thanks a lot. Hearing no more questions or comments or discussion, we need to vote on this recommendation. And thank you very much for your report.

We don't need that because we recommended it. Five seconds. Five, four, three, two, one. Wally, that was a thoughtful person. You heard it first in Senate, the motion passes. That is now going to be a policy. Thank you very much.

Before Wally goes, he's got another report, unless the President is here yet. He is not. All right. We'll move on to Confucius.

FERRIER: Same guy, different hat.

I believe in early 2014, the AAUP issued a statement that charges Confucius Institutes at a variety of institutions, throughout the United States and Canada, of compromise academic freedom at their host institutions. And they point to three different factors for this.

That Confucius Institute, and I'm just going to say CIs from now on so I don't trip over the words, CIs serve as conduits for the political aims (inaudible) of the oppressive Chinese government, that the contract between CIs, their parent organization called HANBAN, with many of the host universities have nondisclosure agreements that compromise and severely limit transparency. And that at many institutions, the China studies faculty aren't even aware of the details of the contract and the day-to-day operations and strategic aims of Confucius Institutes.

So perhaps, ask my colleague, Susan Carvalho, if I get any of this part of the narrative incorrect, please chime in and steer us in the right direction.

But it's my take that the UKCI wanted to get out in front of this, about a year ago, and requested the Senate Council to form a review committee to take a look at what our UKCI does. Are we falling within the sphere of suspicion as articulated by the AAUP, are we clinging, so what's up?

So Andrew had asked me to chair a committee. The committee consists also of Ernie Bailey out of Veterinary Science, Anna Bryski, College of Fine Arts, Liang Luo, Modern and Classical Languages, Katherine McCormick, Education, and Ernie Yanarella, from Political Science.

So we took a look at a mountain of documentation, both very positive and very critical of CIs in general, provided by the CI personnel.

UKSenateMeeting10-12-15.txt

And we found that the issues fell within four big buckets of issues. One is transparency and faculty oversight. The other is political interference by the CI parent organization from China. The impact of coursework and structural staffing, and budgetary autonomy.

So there's a, I don't know, 9, 11 page report with what we believe is a very comprehensive set of reasonable and actionable recommendations. I'm just going to highlight a few of them for you.

On the issue, for instance, of transparency and oversight, we found that the AAUP charges are somewhat overblown, and really don't generalize to most of the universities in the nation. They're very limited to a very few specific circumstances, predominantly of private universities.

The contract the University of Kentucky has with HANBAN, it is quite simple in terms of its language and intent. It's freely available to anyone, and there's nothing hidden, you know, in the cracks and crevices, that would resemble anything like non-disclosure agreements of any kind.

Our UKCI is governed by a Board which consists of Coach Calipari and, you know, the President of the CPE, they're, you know, excuse me for using the term, but kind of figure head people.

The Steering Committee is composed currently of seven members from the three contributing departments, faculty from the three contributing departments, Education, Language, and Art, the director, you know, the associate dean.

So we think there's sufficient oversight. Our committee would therefore, notwithstanding, kind of recommend that the Steering Committee be expandable to include a few more faculty members and expand it to nine.

In terms of political interference, UKCI has dozens of non-curricular activities on campus over the past couple of years. Some of which have (inaudible) into material related to, for instance, Tiananmen Square or the growing hegemony of China and the South China Sea.

You know, these are politically sensitive issues from the Chinese point of view, but then the interesting thing is that these topics were proposed by UK faculty and approved by the CI parent organization, HANBAN. So we found very little evidence, no evidence on -- that HANBAN has engaged in any political interference with us.

In terms of course work and structural staffing, UKCI, one of their major missions is to provide K through 12 language training in a number of counties throughout central Kentucky. For instance, for this

UKSenateMeeting10-12-15.txt
current academic year, they placed 35 teachers in maybe two dozen different schools around the area that serve about 20,000 students.

However, for the first time, UKCI is providing four credit courses for just two classes, Chinese 302 and Art Studio 390. Although these are funded by HANBAN and the CI, the faculty were hired by China Studies faculty here on our campus, our own faculty, and the syllabus and course content, you know, has received sufficient oversight there.

Our committee recommends perhaps a double layer or two-stage vetting process for candidates for teaching course-vetted course work. First, you know, the UKCI Steering Committee, vet them, and then, you know, it's up to the individual faculty members in Art, Education, and Language to fully vet these candidates for teaching course material.

Finally in the area of budgetary autonomy, we took a close look at the 2013-2014 budgets and found no evidence of political influence. Most of the budget line items are suggested by UKCI representatives that are predominantly faculty. And there were a few instances where HANBAN would say, no, we're not going to do that this year.

I think one of the bigger ones, in terms of dollar value, was that they (inaudible) going to fund a Martial Arts program or something along those lines.

So overall, the Review Committee fully supports our Confucius Institute. We think they're doing what they're supposed to be doing.

We found that many of AAUP's criticism are unfounded as they apply to UK, yet we did provide a set of actionable concrete recommendations that we think will enhance transparency, and enhance and strengthen the UKCI here on campus.

HIPPSLEY: So there's a recommendation from Wally's committee that the Senate accept the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee based on the very detailed (inaudible) that Wally gave you. All those recommendations are in the report which is on the website. I think Wally would be able to take questions now.

Okay. Mark?

WHITAKER: I noticed in the report that occasionally visiting faculty in China were given a manual of dos and don'ts and kind of a monitor in class to see if they abided by those dos and don'ts.

But I didn't see a specific comment by the committee on what they thought about it except that they counter-balanced it with other claims that, you know, by and large, there was very little interference.

I wonder if you can expand on the discussion in the committee of that

particular kind of influence?
FERRIER: Well, we discovered, I'm glad you brought this up, discovered that through anecdotal, you know, information that a faculty member had experienced this, you know, given a classroom manual and a monitor, those things that you suggested. And upon discovering that, reached out to a few other faculty members who didn't experience that. So I think what our recommendation suggests is that we move beyond simply an anecdotal account of this and maybe do something a little more systematic whereby we debrief or interview or ask returning faculty members from Chinese assignments that are funded by the CIs to maybe provide a more comprehensive systematic account. And then perhaps it will be helpful to keep some sort of database to that effect.
Should we find next year, the summer after that, that that sort of treatment, as it were, is growing in numbers, then I think we should take a closer look at that. But right now we don't have any systematic information. Or do we, Susan? Am I mis-speaking?
CARVALHO: No, no, you're right. I just wanted to clarify that this is for UK faculty who were traveling to China --
FERRIER: Right.
CARVALHO: -- to teach Chinese students under the HANBAN umbrella. This is not about the Chinese faculty who come to UK.
FERRIER: Right, right.
WHITAKER: Yes, that's quite clear in the report. This was a professor talking about his experience visiting China.
HIPPI SLEY: Any further questions? Bob?
GROSSMAN: I would just like to propose a friendly amendment that instead of accept the report of the Ad Hoc Committee -- we're accepting the report, we're not -- the report contains recommendations. The recommendations aren't for the Senate, they're for the CI.
FERRIER: Right. We had another question back there.
DEBSKI: Accepting the report doesn't say that you agree with the recommendation. I mean, usually you accept the report.
HIPPI SLEY: Again, this is what I think happened on the Senate Council meeting, that we accept the report, we agreed to the recommendations. By accepting the report, that entails --
DEBSKI: Accepting means you got the report, that's it.
HIPPI SLEY: Bob, you were at Senate Council meeting when we voted on this, was it your impression that accepting the report was accepting the recommendations of the report at the same time?
GROSSMAN: Well, again, it's not up to the

Senate to accept the recommendations, it's up to the UKCI to accept the recommendations.

HIPPI SLEY: Davy?

JONES: Accept the report and endorse the recommendations.

HIPPI SLEY: That will work, I think. So on behalf of Senate Council we accept this as a friendly amendment or does anybody have another story? Okay. This is the motion now that we're discussing. Any other questions? Okay. Hearing none -- oh, sorry, Al.

CROSS: Just as a point of information, Al Cross, Communication and Information.

The Confucius Institute funded a program we sponsored, back in January, with Chinese journalists and party members who came to hear about Journalism. And this would be one of the subject matters, I think, that the controlling parties might be the most interested in, but we got absolutely no interference.

And I'll be making a trip to China in a month and a half and look forward to continuing that relationship.

I do think every single recommendation here is well-founded though. We have to be careful.

HIPPI SLEY: Okay. Is there any further discussion? We vote. I'm using the five second countdown. Five, four, three, two, one. Okay. The motion carries. Thank you very much, Wally.

FERRIER: Thank you for helping and I'm glad I could serve as a warm up for the President.

HIPPI SLEY: Who I now welcome to the podium.

CAPILOUTO: It is great to be with you today. In a moment I'm going to share data, quantitative data. But really the most important data to me is what I call the qualitative data and it's centered around your stories.

Just a few weeks ago, I attended the CPE Conference for Trustees from across the Commonwealth. Our own Dr. Christia Brown received the Acorn Award for Outstanding Teacher, and I love what she had to say: "When my students are not learning, I am not teaching effectively."

She takes full responsibility in engaging her students to improve how she can better teach. What principles.

And just last week, I was in Clay County, as UK Healthcare was opening another partnership. And a young woman approaches me to tell me how the University of Kentucky had changed the lives of the fifth graders at Oneida and Manchester Elementary School.

It seems that through some grant, we equipped all of these elementary students with fi tbits and journals so that they could discover and learn about circadian rhythms and diet and what it means to well-being. And she told me one of those fifth graders

UKSenateMeeting10-12-15.txt
was asked to take her fitbit off and she said no, because I'm a researcher at the University of Kentucky.

And yesterday on a flight to Atlanta, I happened to sit with an entomologist in the College of Agriculture, who shared with me a novel approach to control mosquito reproduction, even had a video, using international companies as partners. And to think here at the University of Kentucky. Vector borne diseases could find their end because of the work we're doing.

That's every day I am dazzled and grateful for everything you do.

A few weeks ago, for the first time, we had a Board of Trustees meeting, off our campus, in Hazard, Kentucky. And all who -- all of those who attended, I'm sure, were delighted to learn about our partnerships with Appalachian Regional Healthcare, with our Centers for Excellence and Rural Health and all the people that we train (inaudible) in the Fifth District.

And then we heard about a race to the top grant, where we're working with schools to advance the most innovative and engaged learning.

And in the Fifth District, the numbers of students who decided to come to the University of Kentucky continued their rise. And they are the best prepared. In fact, their ACT average is a full point higher than those of our entire freshman class.

So what are about priorities for our time, I think you all know. Our students come first. And it starts with access and affordability. We worked to curb the rate at which we've increased tuition and fees.

We have tried to balance our financial aid to address more of those individuals who have financial needs. Remember this: 85 percent of all the students that enter the University of Kentucky have some form of grant or scholarship that they don't have to pay back, 50 percent who graduate have no debt whatsoever, and the average debt is around \$23,000 (inaudible).

And what about the quality that you have driven: The expansion of our Living Learning communities, new curriculum, innovative teaching, and the use of technology.

I attended the Gaines Center Luncheon and we had a student, majoring in Architecture and minoring in English, talking about surrealism and the design of our most creative spaces now and in the future. You can't find that at too many college campuses in America.

Our campus, thanks to philanthropy

UKSenateMeeting10-12-15.txt

and innovation, and some help from the state of Kentucky, we have \$1.8 billion dollars of construction completed or underway. And I look so forward to the new facilities that will come alive like our new Arts Living Learning Community in the Limestone development.

We work to make this a safer campus. At our lowest point, in terms of funding five years ago, when we were undergoing severe cuts, I turned to the Board of Trustees and asked them to invest \$5 million into technology to further protect our campus. And we have over 2,000 cameras.

And I think that the event that you witnessed at ECU this week would have been a little harder at the University of Kentucky because you can't enter and exit buildings without being captured.

And again, we're not snooping, but if something bad like that happens, we're able to respond.

And it's not just for technology, we have 15 new police officers. We have additional counselors. And because of our commitment, we boldly make up something like sexual assault and survey every student on this campus. And I learned this week that we've received a grant from CDC, because of that work, to develop ways to better prevent this.

Lastly, but most important, our people, our most important asset. We will work to continue competitive salary plans. And like this year, we start with those with the lowest pay.

So what about this class that entered? To me it is a tribute to you. They came here because of you. In an increasingly competitive market, where many universities, many in the Commonwealth, have decreasing applications and enrollments, we have record applications, both residents and non-residents.

For the second year, a robust enrollment of over 5,000 students. And we want a "quality class." What does that mean? It means about in terms of accessibility, diversity, and many ways that you (inaudible).

So first, our geography, that diversity. No qualified Kentuckian was turned away. We have Kentuckians from all Kentuckians from all 120 counties. Students from all 50 states and dozens of countries.

Class, social economic study, more and more a determinant of student success. We keep our doors open wide. 30 percent of all the Kentuckians admitted this year are Pell Grant recipients. Nearly 20 percent are the first in their family to ever go to college.

This summer, we had a gear up

UKSenateMeeting10-12-15.txt

program, three weeks we host students who are (inaudible) first generation students. We tried to give them that leg up to come to our University or any university in the Commonwealth and succeed.

What about race and nationality?

11 percent of our incoming class, 10 percent of the entire enrollment at the University of Kentucky are African American students, and our population in general, in terms of (inaudible) percent, (inaudible) 44 percent in the last five years.

Hispanic enrollment, up 155 percent to nearly 980 students.

And look on the right here, on the academic credentials of this group. Highest ACT and GPA average. We now have over 400 National Merit, Hispanic and Achievement Scholars that make the University of Kentucky their first choice. And this: 704 freshman, a record, with a 31 or greater ACT.

Now, this slide more than any slide I'm going to show you today endears you to me because we know we have to do a better job in ensuring the success of our students.

Here is a progress that I hope we maintain as trend. We welcome back the largest cohort of returning students, 4,253, 82.7 percent highest level. That represents 463 people, that together, I hope we meet in a graduation ceremony three years from now. That is our responsibility.

If you watch what's happening in higher education, there is a group that is for the change to application system. They want to develop a new kind of cap. There are 83 universities. They're among the best in the country. And I really wanted to be part of that group, but there's a cover charge. You have to have a graduation rate of 70 percent or more.

We can do better and we will do better. That is where we belong and we will get there. And I think that so many people, the faculty, staff, deans, Student Affairs, everybody had a hand in this success.

So what about our overall enrollment? It's up again over (inaudible). And our graduate and professional enrollment holds steady. Doctoral enrollment seems to be up, master study. And the students who come to our professional schools are highly prepared, get better every year.

So 23 percent of our student population is made up of graduate professional students. That puts us at the midpoint of those aspirational benchmarks that we looked at five years ago, the committee that Hollie Swanson chaired.

And if you look in the Southeastern Conference, outside of Vanderbilt, we're in the top tier, easily. We're even of ahead of I believe Missouri and Texas A & M, who are

members of AAU. So I applaud our faculty who are doing an excellent job at our graduate programs.

So we talked about our time and what we're doing today. I want to talk to you a little bit about what you can expect in the future. There are disruptions that await us. This morning I listened to an entire report on cable TV. Why? Because if you are a member of the Southeastern Conference, you care about cable TV, we signed up for the SEC network. This is the way you build an academic Science Building.

The 18 to 34 year-old group, they are cord cutters and never (inaudible). I can tell you that the Southeastern Conference is doing strong. Because people who are trusting the traditional ways to access information are (inaudible). So people are focusing on value.

I've always thought that soon higher education would catch up with what has been a trend in health care for a long time. On the left here is data.medicare.gov, you can go on that and compare hospitals, physicians, all kinds of (inaudible).

Through the Affordable Care Act and other means, we now collect massive amounts of information on physicians, hospital, patients. And we measure here at UK and other places, case adjusted predicted mortality (inaudible), re-admission rates, extended stay, hospital acquired infections. You name it. And over the last few years, the payers, the federal government and insurers who represent those who provide employer based insurances are making (inaudible).

So value defined by quality and price is replacing volume as the determinant for reimbursement.

So what about our education? Look on the right. I think about four Saturdays ago, President Obama released the new college score card. And you can see some of them mentioned there.

Average, this is University of Kentucky, average annual cost, graduation rate, salary after ending, students who are making progress and paid back their loans, and so forth. Some of these measures are crude and some of them are important.

To measure someone's income and comparing to a university that may train more teachers to one that trains engineers is not a fair comparison.

But guess what, when they institute some of these (inaudible). So I think we're going to see more and more of this kind of thing. And I wouldn't be surprised, with the chatter in Congress, on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act or by executive order, you can start linking funding to

performance.

So what about at the state level? So this map shows that 32 states, in some for or another, have performance based funding. This morning I talked to the chancellor at the University of Tennessee. They've had performance based funding for several years. And these things they're talking about locally, you're sort of adjusted for how well-prepared your students are. You compete against yourself.

And he said to me that they've received all kinds of awards. They've been on an incredible trend in improving graduation rates and all. It's kind of hard to move up when you get closer and closer to the top.

Something else is ongoing there. Every high school graduate in Tennessee now has access, for free, to two years at a community or technical college. And with the exception of the University of Tennessee in Knoxville, four year enrollment at other four year universities are decreasing rapidly.

A change out there, people talking about what we can do at the state level.

So what are we talking about in Kentucky? The Council on Postsecondary Education has been working the past year, in dialogue with legislators and administration, to talk about possibilities for performance based funding.

So the one that's on the right, on the left are for community colleges, and the ones on the right are for all the four year universities, the research and (inaudible) universities. And they wanted one set of measures that reached across the entire Commonwealth because there's a quest to increase the number of individuals with college degree.

So what are the dimensions they're looking at? The number of baccalaureate degrees, the retention rates of the first and second year, the (inaudible) second and third, third and fourth. Your graduation rate, here's at four years. But those little triangles and circles indicate this: Part of the levels are going to be weighted by how well you do in under represented minorities and lower income students. (Inaudible.)

For the sector specific research universities and they look at your total extramural funding. You get to pick something institution specific, for us given that one third of our enterprise deals with health care, we would pick something there.

So I am not sure whether we're going (inaudible) in the near future. We know we have challenges in Kentucky related to pension and Medicaid and a means to better support the K through 12. So I'm not sure, but we must work together on this.

UKSenateMeeting10-12-15.txt

There's one thing I am sure about. What is the biggest driver of our financial resources and support, and that's the choices students and their families make about where to go to college.

So I want to share something that intrigued me. This is the Gallup-Purdue survey. They put out an index; this is the second time they've done it. They survey over 29,000 US college graduates who have received undergraduate degrees (inaudible).

So they basically asked three questions: Do specific undergraduate experiences matter more to alumni's overall impression of their alma mater, and which most consistently relate to positive outcomes such as high well-being and workplace engagement after graduation. The second question: Does any of this differ by the school you went to, public, private, research? And the third question: To what extent did financial burdens such as student loan debt influence alumni's perception of their university and quality of their lives after graduation.

I'll answer the last one first. You get beyond \$25,000 in debt, your appreciation for your university plummets.

The second question that I'll answer is does it matter in terms of the different school you go to. So with the exception of the private or profit, which is this group right here, every other university, 50 percent equivocally agreed, you know, that my University was a great experience. It doesn't vary by research or public or private. Interesting finding.

But the most interesting finding to me are what are those value-added experiences, when you control for income after graduation and debt that make a difference in a college experience.

So here are the top (inaudible) that they found in this survey. Nearly doubles the likelihood of valuing your institution, your education. It's not professors at our university cared about me as a person. "I had a mentor who encouraged me to pursue my goals and my dreams. I had at least one professor who made me excited about learning." Those are the value added propositions that I think you can't find at many other places.

And people continue to write about this, I know there's an article in the Atlanta Monthly this week, the title is: Is college working? But I think these are important factors to pay attention to.

We know we face challenges in this, (inaudible). Working with the Provost, I learned that we have disparities in things like student faculty ratios, making it harder for some units to provide these experiences

than others. And we need to work on that.

But we also need to watch the evolution of technology out there, talking about the (inaudible). You know a few years ago everybody got concerned about MOOCs, massive open online courses. This was going to revolutionize education.

One of our student freshman asked me a few weeks ago, he had heard a lecture here at the University of Kentucky, and he said the guest lecturer said, well, you know what, the largest transportation company in the world doesn't a vehicle, that's UBER. And the largest hospitality company in the world, these are these B & Bs, doesn't really own a hotel. And the speaker contended, you can imagine a college degree without a university. I don't believe that.

But I do believe we're going to have to do a better job in doing these things. So I watch with fascination, this movement of MOOCs that really haven't been successful. But the next generation of that type of learning is fascinating to me.

So Harvard, they said, you know, we got it wrong. We're scaling up, we need to scale down. They don't have MOOCs, they're developing the SPOC, which are small private online courses. They're not that small; they have a few hundred students. But they take what's best about centuries old education at a university, and combine it with technology, to meet students in these personal ways. And I know we're doing much of that on this campus, too, and I appreciate it.

So those are some of these things we face. I want to mention one other thing before I make my final comments. The Council on Postsecondary Education requires a lengthy process that would present your capital budget priority.

When I arrived at Kentucky, stubbornly I said -- they kept asking what is your one building and what is your second building. And I said, well, we can't do that. Would you give us a pool of money and as we go out and work on these projects and we could possibly raise funds, we could do more than one building. But there were no receptors for that discussion. Everybody wanted to know the one building.

We still sort of think that way, but we've come this year with our priority list and asked for a full pool of funds, \$125 million state-supported debt. And we would matched that with \$125 million to modernize and preserve this campus.

And we're looking first at the core. And you all know these buildings. They have the highest levels of barriers for access for those with disabilities. They do not lend themselves to the modern teaching

UKSenateMeeting10-12-15.txt
that we're talking about. They don't excite you when you walk into them every day.

To me, to see the transformation of those faculty, who at one time were in that Reynolds Warehouse and to see that (inaudible), is what we'd like to do with our core of campus.

We have more work to do on this to learn what the priorities would be. But there is, I hope, greater receptivity amongst the legislators in this kind of approach. I think they have higher levels of trust in the way we've been able to take on capital projects. So hopefully, we will be able to move forward.

Lastly, I want to speak to you from my heart and my core. Much has been written and said about recent events and their implications for academic freedom. And more broadly, the relationship between the University faculty and the University administration. And I want to point out with great respect and appreciation that Trustees' Brothers, Grossman, and Wilson, and Chair Hippisley serve the faculty very well as advocates. And they serve the administration well as partners. So we don't always agree and (inaudible) should be our (inaudible). I appreciate their challenges and I hope they help me better serve.

I believe the relationship between the faculty and administration of our University must be defined by the twin aspirations. That's mutual respect and mutual accountability.

Mutual respect requires that we all will adhere to the principles that define academic freedom. In 2012, one of the most delightful visits I think somebody made to our campus, was when the Law School hosted Dean Robert Post of Yale, he's dean of their Law School.

And he's written widely about academic freedom and its essentiality to working universities. And he argues "the basic idea of academic freedom is simple and unanswered. Knowledge cannot be advanced unless existing claims to knowledge can with freedom be allies and criticized." And I agree. I agree strongly.

The advance of our understanding of the world around us compels us to pursue answers to every question, to resolve every issue we can, and to never allow our assumptions to go unreviewed.

Indeed, our collective efforts must always be aimed at understanding our past with honesty and clarity, our current situation with intelligence and mutual respect, in shaping our future with knowledge and resolve. And we must be able to do so always, always with the autonomy of purpose and without the fear of punishment.

UKSenateMeeting10-12-15.txt

This is our sacred and essential duty to each other, to our students, to our patients, to our visitors, to our community, to our world. And if members of the community of the University of Kentucky are unwilling or unable to respect these principles then we ought to close our doors because we're not worthy of the mantle of pursuers of knowledge.

But this does not mean every utterance and action on our campus can seek protective shelter under the cloak of academic freedom.

As Dean Post also observes, "a public university may not punish an astronomy professor who writes to the editors claiming the moon is made of green cheese. But it certainly can't deny tenure in the astronomy department on the grounds of incompetence."

Dean Post is right. A law professor may criticize the rationale for Brown versus the Board of Education. But a law professor can't use racist or sexist stereotypes in his interaction with the students in discussing this matter.

And a physician may use his or her finely honed knowledge and (inaudible) skills to preserve the lives and well-being of patients but may not use abusive language and behavior that can affect the quality of care, even in the most trying of circumstances.

And a senior member can push other faculty and staff to work harder and perform better but may not insult, demean, intimidate other members of the community.

So academic freedom presupposes a marriage of free inquiry and professional competence. Even in our celebration of the necessity of academic freedom, we will be bound together as a community, a community of scholars, students, staff, patients, alumni, friends and visitors. And we owe it to one another to do our work with energy and intellect, but with a deeply held fidelity to mutual respect and (inaudible).

We must not and we will not, as long as I am here, tolerate anything less. When a member of our community fails to embrace the standards of community and professional competence, I am guided by several principles that I will share with you.

First, I will do what is necessary to protect our students, our patients, our staff, our faculty and our visitors. I will comply with the laws of the Commonwealth and the United States and the ethical principles of this University.

I will respect our established processes and will expect all participants in these processes and observers who are relevant to the process to follow the agreed upon ways to discharge these

UKSenateMeeting10-12-15.txt
responsibilities. And I will work to make sure that nobody interferes with their decision so that what they determine is done so dispassionately and in a professional way.

I will work with seriousness of purpose, professionalism, (inaudible) with respect for the institution, our processes and policies, all parties involved, excluding those that may have violated a University regulation or rule, or engaged in unacceptable behavior. And I will do so with great respect for those who have the courage to come forward with reports of wrongdoing.

So when discipline is required, I will consult with the relevant persons. I will gather feedback from those who have daily interaction with our faculty, staff, students, patients, and visitors, and those who are experts in the legal, regulatory and accreditation requirements.

And I will also (inaudible) when appropriate past behaviors, individuals compliance with agreed previous progressive disciplinary action and the willingness to accept responsibility.

We will hold accountable those who break our rules and those who treat others with disrespect. But as we do, the faculty and other members of our community are right to hold the administrators accountable for what we do. And I assure you we will make mistakes.

It comes with trying to manage a 3.4 billion enterprise located on the 700 acres stretched across the Commonwealth, populated by 30,000 students, 2700 faculty, and (inaudible). But making mistakes also comes from being human and we all can be prone to error.

So when we make mistakes, it is right to call attention to it, and it is essential that we fix it, and we will.

We also constantly work to strengthen our communications with the entire community in an appropriate and timely way. There have been and will be times when our communications are not as clear or as timely as they need to be. It is right to hold me and other members of the administration accountable.

I am disappointed with how some recent decisions have been handled. But they are my responsibility and I will not shirk them.

Criticism is appropriate when grounded in facts, all the facts. But what I do find disappointing and unproductive is the seemingly constant effort on the part of some members of our community to rush to judgement at every perceived error.

And rather than reach out and attempt to understand all the facts and circumstances, the sad instinct is to

UKSenateMeeting10-12-15.txt

immediately rush to public criticism. And that criticism, in the absence of all the facts, to me is little more than an ill-informed rant that often takes on personal and mean-spirited tone towards the administration and particular administrators.

And so while some of you may take particular pride in doing so, I believe it reflects poorly on the faculty colleague about whom they claim to speak.

We have taken unprecedented measures in recent months as a member of our community chose by word and deed to abandon that shared community for mutual respect and (inaudible). These are sad days.

We took action as our rules and principles required. This in many ways, is new ground (inaudible). And our management of the results of the actions of our Board of Trustees has been imperfect. And for that, I apologize.

We will continue to review how best to enforce the decisions of the Board and we will do so with the guided principle of protecting all members of the community. And we will work with all relative parties to communicate better and more effectively.

So I look forward to continuing to work with all of you and the entire faculty, to strengthen our University and serve best our students and patients and the citizens of the Commonwealth. And we must aim to do so with mutual respect and mutual accountability and always in the spirit of community.

This is believe and hold sacred, and I believe in you. Thank you very much. I'm happy to take any questions.

HIPPISLEY: The President is happy to take questions. I would like to ask for priority to be given to members of the Body, members of the Senate. And once members of the Body have exhausted questions, then I will hand over to guests. So if any member of the Senate would like to ask any questions about any part of the President's talk...

BLONDER: President, Lee Blonder, College of Medicine.

President Capilouto, I want to go over a few things that have occurred that you've alluded to. So on the August 24th, the Board Healthcare Committee voted unanimously to reaffirm Dr. Kearney's current status as a tenured faculty member, and to -- and his access of campus will be no greater or less than those of a tenured faculty member who lacks clinical privileges.

One week later, Legal Counsel, Mr. Thro, wrote a letter to Mr. Pafunda, Dr. Kearney's attorney, stating, among other things, that Dr. Kearney would be banned from public (inaudible).

I would like to know the rationale for this decision and what this means for

tenured faculty members attending public meetings in general.

CAPILOUTO: The decision, if you read carefully the memo, is talking about clinical teaching and those settings whereas behavior raised concerns.

I'm not going to elaborate on all of those, I've read the complete record, but that is a rare step to take. But I do so according to the principle that I outlined earlier.

I have no interest in pursuing other faculty in a groundless way. I want us to have complete access to our campus.

HIPPI SLEY: Any other questions?

WOOD: Connie Wood, Arts and Sciences.

President Capiouto, last spring this body, at your request, passed a faculty disciplinary document.

One of the things that you just stressed was to respect the process by which decisions in these types of situations are actually made. I want to focus on the due process, as did that document.

What is the status of that document and how would -- how have -- is your administration moving to actually respect, strengthen, and protect the academic privileges of this faculty?

CAPILOUTO: Sure. First of all, the process that was followed, in this particular case, were those of the by-laws of the hospital and physician group, and they were followed to a "T". And that was a step-wise process, and as I said in my (inaudible) I went out of my way not to interfere with any of that (inaudible). That was the process that was followed (inaudible).

Now in terms of our disciplinary policy, this wasn't a fun exercise, but we all learned from and I think we can all look at it with fresh eyes. I certainly am. I look forward to working you and others to do so.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.

If it's okay, I'd like to change the subject. A few years ago we heard a lot of talk about how bad our funding model is in terms of the central administration. And it's a historical funding model. And if we don't change to a different funding model, we're going to be left behind in the (inaudible).

And so we're two Provosts later and we still apparently have historical funding model and a lot of people have asked me "What is the status of changing our funding model."

CAPILOUTO: Bob, it's a good question, and it's a disappointment for me and others. But you know what, we listened the wrong way and we couldn't get it exactly right.

So in listening, I think we're

UKSenateMeeting10-12-15.txt

about to make a step forward. The Provost has met, and the Vice President for Finance and others have met, with the deans to get feedback on a way forward. And I think that would be an excellent topic for an upcoming Senate meeting to get your feedback.

But I think what's important about it is the thing that I think we kept bumping up against was we tried to change everything, it was really too disruptive.

So if we try to make it simple, try to do it in terms of fairness, and as I've asked the Provost to work on, let's do it about quality. Quality. Not just, you know, a race to enroll more students. Our race is to graduate more students. So those are some of the principles I think you'll see in the next manifestation.

GROSSMAN: Can I just -- are we talking about weeks, months?

CAPILOUTO: Tim, do you want to answer that question?

TRACY: That's a good question. So we had a great discussion with the deans two weeks ago. We've gotten feedback from them. Tomorrow morning we'll have another discussion with them, of the suggestions they made.

Then the idea is to begin rolling that out in bigger groups. So I think we're talking weeks, not months. And I think it's something that, as the President said, it minimizes, hopefully, competition, maximizes quality, and incentivizes people to do greater and greater things.

So we're not talking about months and months, we're talking about weeks. And we're working very hard through the process and trying to get feedback along the way and work our way through.

So it is getting very close. And I think that the feedback is coalescing, but it is a -- it's a different model. I'd say it's more incentive-based than anything else. It's (inaudible) by us doing the right things like retaining students, graduating students.

WEBB: I'd like to ask a question for a follow-up on your conversation with Steve Dobson about the mosquitos.

CAPILOUTO: Yeah, that was so good. It was just amazing.

WEBB: So my concern is that we've gone from in 2011 over 100 disclosures to this year we'll have approximately, 60, you know,

invention disclosures, which is a pretty remarkable decline. And that office has been really without effective leadership as long as I've been here.

So what are the plans for, you know, dealing with technology transfer, private property, is it something the University values? That was my question.

CAPILOUTO: Yeah, it is something the University values and I would hope that Vice President Lisa Cassis could come and present. We've taken a close look at what we do and ways we have to improve. And she would welcome the discussion and dialogue. But you raised a very good...

HIPPI SLEY: Any questions?

CAPILOUTO: Liz Debski.

I'd like to follow-up on your answer about the faculty discipline process. You said that we all learned something from going through that. I'm wondering if you could share with us what you learned?

CAPILOUTO: I think, and let me say that a little cautious here because the University is facing legal action in this, and a faculty is facing legal action. And I don't want to do anything that interferes with those processes and all.

But I think for us, the content or maybe tenor and tone of some of our communication, I think in some cases we had to respond quickly, addressing a problem we had never addressed before. And that was the loss of clinical privileges when those clinical privileges are so associated with teaching and care and so much a part of the faculty.

It in some ways reminded me in my past when I had to deal with cases of people who are found doing some wrong things associated with research, scientific misconduct, but still maintain faculty (inaudible). So I think we could have done it better and (inaudible).

HIPPI SLEY: Any questions? Thank you very much.

CAPILOUTO: Thank you.

HIPPI SLEY: We have just a few more pieces of business. I think Mary Rayens is here.

RAYENS: Hi. This hopefully will be quicker

than some things, but I was at the Senate Council meeting, I guess a couple weeks ago, and then just came here to give our end of the year report.

I finished this last month as the Chair of the Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure. And so the report, you have a copy of it your materials for this meeting.

But basically, we had one case during the year. That was a faculty member, a pre-tenure faculty member, who was given a terminal contract after her four year review. And we were asked by that faculty member to review her case because there was some irregularities in how that terminal appointment was given to her.

We did that. We met with both the faculty member and then on a separate occasion, her chair, and determined that

UKSenateMeeting10-12-15.txt

there were some procedural guidelines in the governing regulations that were not followed.

So our recommendation as a committee, was as a remedy for the lack of (inaudible) governing regs compliance, was that she have her terminal contract year be reinstated as a regular contract year.

The feedback we got from that was that first we were asked, a couple months after we turned in that decision, we were asked by the President to give, weigh in on the aspect of whether she deserves to have that terminal contract, which is beyond the purview of our committee.

So we responded and said, you know, the purview of our committee is to provide advice relating to procedural noncompliance and other matters pertaining to how rules and guidelines are followed when decisions concerning privilege and tenure are made.

We found out afterwards that this particular committee member, rather than being given the full year reinstated, she was given -- originally she was given a six-month extension of what the terminal year was.

We pointed out that her contract year was not on the regular academic cycle of July to June, but rather, from August to -- I guess from August -- she should have been, if she had been given six-month extension, it would have extended through February of next year.

She said, oh, no, what we really meant was we want her contract to be terminal as of December of this calendar year. And that was sort of the bottom line.

So our recommendation was that she be given both months as the, you know, so that if they wanted to follow the procedure for giving a terminal contract, they would have time to do that. They gave a four-month extension to what her original termination date was.

Questions?

HI PPI SLEY: Questions for Mary?

WILSON: Was anything shared with the committee about why your recommendation was --

RAYENS: No.

HI PPI SLEY: Any other questions for Mary?

Mark?

WHI TAKER: Mark Whi taker, A and S.

Did this decision go through any of the credential level promotion and tenure committee?

RAYENS: No. We report directly to the President.

WHI TAKER: Oh, okay.

RAYENS: That's the structure of this committee. So our committee, we were approached by this faculty member, and our decision, as a committee, went directly to the President.

HI PPI SLEY: Bob?

GROSSMAN: Just to add to what you said. I'm not sure if this is what you were asking, but this was a case of a terminal reappointment of an untentured faculty member before they even come up for tenure.

WHI TAKER: Oh, I see.

GROSSMAN: So it never went through college review or Provost level review.

RAYENS: Thank you for that.

DEBSKI: Liz Debski.

Did your committee draft any recommendation to the President after you found that your recommendation was not followed?

RAYENS: No. It's one of those things where if you don't hear back how do you decide that there is not going to be a response, you know, when's that cutoff date to say, hey, what about us. So no.

HI PPI SLEY: Anymore questions? Thank you very much, Mary.

We have one last annual report if he's still here.

NI EMAN: I fell asleep, I'm still here. I'll take about 3 seconds.

I'm doing my due diligence. I need to do my annual report for the Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee. I've done this every year for a number of years. You have the report in your documents, also.

We're kind of interesting some of the progress with this thing over the years. And last year we had 86 hearings of which we accepted and agreed with 81 of them, and we turned down 5, you know, for various reasons that we didn't think supported the withdrawal.

The interesting thing for us is that the tenor of these meetings are changing. A couple of years ago, we had a lot of requests for retroactive withdrawal for military reasons and that's changed now.

Last year the preponderance were medical reasons, 47 of the 86 were for medical reasons of one type or another, personal issues.

The other thing we found is last year we had 10 or 7 requests for withdrawal from multiple years ago, like as much as 9 years ago. So we've got people coming back into the system again who left for various reasons, and they're asking for a waiver of that time period, which is normally two years. And they want to get back in.

And it's kind of interesting to see that. We're seeing gradually more and more of that maybe because the economy now is changing a little bit, that people are coming back in the system again, which we think is kind of interesting.

This year so far, in that we had 86 last year, we thought that was pretty much of

UKSenateMeeting10-12-15.txt

an average, we hit like 16 cases in September. If that's any indication, we're on about a 135 time frame. And generally, whatever you get in August or September, generally kind of tapers on through, tends to be the norm. So we think we're going to have a lot more requests for retroactive withdrawal.

The documentation is getting better, we've seen to that. We worked all summer changing the documents, fixing them up where the students can now do it online. They can actually type them out online and hand them in and things of that nature. So we're trying to make the system work better.

Other than that, we're cruising along real well. We've got a full committee. And the other thing, I don't know if you know it or not, but there's four voting faculty on the committee and then there was four ad hoc type advisory people like the disability resource center, the counseling and testing, they're always in on the meetings, too, which really is very helpful for us.

So we're going along quite fine.

Any questions?

MCCORMI CK: I have one quick question. In the past students came to the committee because they had one course that they failed to withdraw from and therefore had an E on that course. And it would happen repeatedly and repeatedly. Have we done anything to change that?

NI EMAN: This is really interesting. We've been working on that for like three years, trying to get the withdrawal (inaudible) on the computer and they can withdraw from all of their courses except one. That they have to do personally or through letter or something like that. We have not been able to get that specifically -- that it's easier, but we've not be able to get it changed so far.

MCCORMI CK: So if I'm in a hospital in another state, I have to come to UK personally or have someone write a letter on my behalf --

NI EMAN: That's correct.

MCCORMI CK: -- because I cannot be withdrawn from all my courses --

NI EMAN: That's correct.

MCCORMI CK: -- mainly because of some internalistic --

NI EMAN: Yes. But if they can send an email to the Registrar or write to the Registrar or something like that and say what the (inaudible). But they --

MCCORMI CK: And they can do it --

NI EMAN: They can't do it on the computer.

The computer won't let them do it. And like I said, we've been trying to change that.

HIPPI SLEY: Associate Provost, Ben Withers who has been addressing this (inaudible).

WITHERS: I'd be happy to address that. One

UKSenateMeeting10-12-15.txt

of the reasons that we are looking at this issue is because we want to make sure that all students, regardless of the reason for them withdrawing from UK, we want them to understand that there are resources available for them here.

Sometimes students are withdrawing for financial reasons, sometimes because they need counseling, there's other issues that are going on. And we want to make sure that there's some person at the University that has an opportunity to reach out to them.

We understand that in some cases it does cause a bit of a hardship, but as Tom said, students still can respond to the Registrar via email. So they can be at some distance, in other words, they don't have to show up personally and hand in a form, they can still use an electronic means.

This is certainly something that's important for retention because we want the student to understand that we're here for them not only now, but we would welcome them back in the future if they're able to come back. We just see that as part of our mission to make sure the students understand that as individuals, they are important to us. That's the reason for the current policy.

And as a matter of fact, the Academic Associate Deans that I meet with where retention committees that have looked at this says that we perhaps should be a little bit more robust in those interventions so that we're reaching out to the students even before we know they're withdrawing from that last class.

For that reason, for example, we're working with IT to find a way to make a learning system for when a student withdraws from a class that takes them from 15 or 12 to 9 credit hours, that takes them away from a full-time status, that someone at the University would be informed and that that person can reach out to them even at that time, before they get to the place where they're withdrawing from their final class. We want to be as proactive as possible in helping the students.

HI PPI SLEY: Any questions for Tom Nieman?
Thank you very much for all the work you do.
Okay. It's 10 past 5, but I think we still have maybe a few more minutes left, not like time last time when it was 6:00, and I had someone write to me in advance that they had something to say.
Leon?

SACHS: Yeah. I actually thought I wouldn't, but I'm Leon Sachs, College of Arts and Sciences.

I actually thought I wouldn't speak if we went beyond 5:00, but since you (inaudible) maybe it's something we can turn

to later.

Since I've been on the Senate one thing that I've heard from colleagues in my college is a concern about what someone has called managerialism, sometimes called academic administrative bloat. You've probably heard about these issues. They've been talked about now over a decade.

But one of the questions that came to me is: Is there a way to assess that, where does UK stand in comparison with other universities of its kind, do we have data that allows us to measure and see the activities of administration.

I think part of this is being generated from a feeling that an increase in certain demands, administrative demands, and some of this is for very good reason for things like assessment and accountability, that we all believe in but some people are feeling, that I've spoken to in my college, is actually sometimes, though, (inaudible) is actually impeding or interfering with our ability to I guess keep the Kentucky promise or provide what we're supposed to be providing for our students.

And they wanted to get a sense of where UK stands on this issue. Do we look good in terms of managerial, bad compared to peer institutions, how do we collect that data, what would that data look like, and I was asked to bring this to the Senate to see if this is the kind of thing the Senate would want to discuss and pursue, if it's in our purview. (Inaudible).

HI PPI SLEY: Does anyone have any responses for Leon at this point?

UNI DENTI FIED: Here, here.

SACHS: Maybe this already exists and I just don't know where the documents and data are.

HI PPI SLEY: Bob?

GROSSMAN: It's a great question and a lot of people have asked that question over the years.

It's an extremely hard thing to study. It would probably require hiring an outside consultant and I don't think that's in the Senate's budget.

I have in the past asked the President to look at this and he nodded and say yes, yes, that would be a good thing.

I'll ask him again.

SACHS: Maybe the question can be asked in a different format or form. I don't know.

GROSSMAN: There are very few universities like us. I mean, so it's very hard to compare universities to universities. I mean, we're a four year research University in Kentucky. How many of those are there. Two. And we're one of them.

So yes, you can make comparisons and certainly it's really worthwhile. But

I'll bring it up with the President again.

SACHS:

Is there a --

HIPPISLEY:

Leon, we will discuss this in Senate Council, get back if there is actually in the Senate some committee which looks at institutional plans, resource allocation. It may be something Senate (inaudible) things to charge that committee with.

It may be true that we can't compare the University of Kentucky with University of Tennessee, but we may be able to compare UK with UK (inaudible). And that might be interesting.

Liz?

DEBSKI:

Yeah. I believe it was when Hollie Swanson was chair. She actually shared data with us with regard to the University of Kentucky.

And basically, it was for like a five or six year period. I don't think it was for a very long period. And UK just grew at a tremendous rate whereas the University of Louisville did not, it was actually going in the opposite direction with regard to administrators.

But the point was made, at that time, that a lot what appeared to be administrative was with the hospital and that it was impossible to, at least with the data they gave us, to sort that out.

The hospital administrators from the regular campus administrators and it was thought that that made us appear to grow much more quickly than other universities.

And I've never seen any other data since then that separated it out or tried to separate it out.

HIPPISLEY:

So this is a document that I'm aware of, too, and maybe it's something that we could bring back.

DEBSKI:

That you could bring back, yeah.

HIPPISLEY:

Any other questions for Leon?

MCGILLIS:

Yeah. Joe McGillis, Medicine.

And I think, you know, one issue that begs is the number of administrators. What I think in my mind is more important (inaudible) is the quality or the value of some of these things we're asked to do that take a lot of time, a lot of paperwork. And a part of it may be that assessments or someone is not communicating it effectively to us, you know. Other cases, I've gotten a sense that this administrative function itself has become (inaudible).

The thing I can correct you said this has been a correct for a decade. Take mine, it's three decades.

SACHS:

I should just say that the people I've been discussing this with are not necessarily -- they're not necessarily sharpening their knives. They want information because this would be an interesting thing to collect, to decide how

UKSenateMeeting10-12-15.txt
we collect it. What is collectible, what is
collectible, what is not collectible. And
then see, you know, if we're doing as best as
can. It's not really a malicious intention.
HIPPI SLEY: I don't think there are any other
questions unless there are any other items
someone wants to bring up. I will suggest
this. Thank you. Please return your
clickers.

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

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY)
COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

I, LISA 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 27th day of
October, 2015.

LISA GRANT CRUMP
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE-AT-LARGE

K E N T U C K Y