

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

NOVEMBER 9, 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. All right. So let's first decide if we're here or not, so please click. I'll give you a countdown. Five, four, three, two, one. And even though people are still getting their clickers, we're definitely at quorum levels.

So I didn't receive any objections to the 12th of October minutes, so unless there are some right now, those minutes stand approved as distributed by unanimous consent.

Don't forget that Senate holds elections for Senate Council, that is in December. Things will come probably towards the end of this month about that.

It's very important when you decide who you want to be on the Senate Council, that that person is acting on your behalf and that committee does a lot of

work. There's a lot of meeting work in the Senate at the University.

And also, please don't forget that members for Senate Council are the only eligible people to actually serve as Chair of Senate Council. We encourage you to think very carefully about that.

Unless I've got this wrong, you will also be asked for your ideas about who should be the next Senate Council Chair. It will be made very clear to you who is eligible for that. (Inaudible).

All right. The AAUP at the University of Kentucky is in a rebuild situation right now. If you are interested, I would encourage you to contact Rob, and there's his gmail. I am going to ask Lee Blonder if she would like to add anything to this.

BLONDER: Yes. We have a chapter but it's not active at the moment. There are probably about 19 faculty who currently belong to the AAUP right now. But some of us are getting together and we're going to try to reactivate it. We have several thousand dollars, apparently, in an account that we can use to help this along.

And Rob Lodder is actually the only officer right now. So we would get the bylaws going and we want to elect officers. He's the president.

But in the future, there will be maybe, possibly, an email announcement or some way we'll communicate and have some kind of event, but any time if you want to get onto the national AAUP website and consider joining, that would really be great.

HIPPISLEY: Yes, go ahead.

MCGILLIS: Yes. Can we ask Lee to --

BROTHERS: Name, please.

MCGILLIS: Joe McGillis, Medicine.

Can we ask Lee to send out a notification we can distribute to our faculty?

HIPPISLEY: The notification would probably be on the slide, more or less?

BLONDER: Yeah, it would come from you.

HIPPISLEY: Right. Sure. We take great pride and pleasure in approving for recommendation through the President to the Board of Trustees, degree lists. But nobody goes. So it would be great if this Body could lead by example and not just approve degree lists, but watch what you did in action, actually watch these little degree list numbers walking and grabbing their degrees.

So please, please, please, if you can, either come to the 10 a.m. ceremony or the 3 p.m. ceremony on the last Friday of the semester. It's charitable and it's a great thing to do.

If you now feel that you do want

UKSenateMeeting1109-15.txt

to do this, there's the email. John Herbst is in charge. It would be great if Senators went to these things. It really would be great. Bob?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.
It means a lot to the students and their parents for faculty to be there.

UNIDENTIFIED: What's the date?

HIPPISLEY: The date is --

GROSSMAN: The last Friday of finals week.

HIPPISLEY: Are there any students here who are graduating then, who are walking? No. A few actions that we did: We approved a few calendar changes; the details are there.

Senate Council also approved nominations for a host of committees, approving the University Appeals Board, and we'll hear more from the University Appeals Board Chair later today.

In consultation with Ben Withers, Undergraduate Education, Senate Council appointed two new members to the UK Core Committee. Thank you for all of those who sent their nominations.

Sharon Lock is now the new Chair of the Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure. There was an interesting thing, it doesn't -- it's not very usual, but we did actually have a formal objection to a course on the web transmittals, someone is reading the transmittals. But the Senators who objected and the proposer got together, reconciled their differences and all is at peace.

I'd like to ask Katherine is she's got anything?

MCCORMICK: I would just say you for signing in. We are required to make sure that we keep a list of who is here and who isn't. And remember, that if you are not able to come, make sure you let Sheila know, I know that is excused absence.

And the other requirement is that if you're absent more than three times, I am required to send a note to your Dean. So come. All right, thank you.

HIPPISLEY: Any parliamentary report from our parliamentary Kate?

SEAGO: No report.

HIPPISLEY: No report. I'd like to invite Bob to give us a Trustees report.

GROSSMAN: First of all, John Wilson apologizes, he is ill. So it's just me today.

I think all of you know that I conducted a survey last month about the effects of the Thursday football game on the academic enterprise of the University.

If you go to that site, you can download several documents. The Excel file contains all the raw data, the answers. So you can feel free to slice and dice that

UKSenateMeeting1109-15.txt
data as much you like, if that's your thing.

There is the summary of the percentages of people who respond to each question and what they responded. And then there are 260 pages of comments from the narrative sections.

So this went out to 19,500 or so faculty and staff. And there were over 5,000 responses, so it's about a 25 percent response rate.

Among faculty, the response rate was about 44 percent, which is really amazing. Thank you to everyone who responded.

I was surprised by the results. They were much less negative than I expected. So just a few things to note: 79 percent of people who normally work on campus came to work that day. And of those, 73 percent had no difficulties with their normal work duties. Then another 13 percent said they had a few difficulties but nothing they couldn't handle.

So that does mean 14 percent said they had more severe difficulties. But that was much smaller than expected. And then 89 percent of people said they arrived to work on time that day, which is again better than I expected.

Among the faculty who responded, 36 percent had a class scheduled on that day. And then of those, about a third cancelled classes due to the football game. And then of the ones who had cancelled, 61 percent gave extra work outside of class. And more than half of the people who cancelled class later regretted that they did so.

And then among those who had class, half had the same attendance that they usually did, reported having the same attendance. A quarter reported a little worse attendance. And a quarter reported a lot worse attendance.

And in the Excel file, I divide up the attendance rates by both the level of class and more importantly, the time the classes started. And as you would expect, the classes that saw the worst attendance were the ones that started at 2 p.m. or later. The ones that started earlier didn't.

So I think the results of the survey showed there were definitely some problems, especially with classes later in the day, some people who did have really severe problems in terms of childcare and getting to work on time. But overall, it wasn't nearly as bad as a lot of us were expecting.

And I would say if this happens again, and my guess is that it's likely to happen again in three or four years, go

UKSenateMeeting1109-15.txt
ahead and hold class, okay, and just hold your students' feet to the fire. Tell them they have to come to class. Maybe if you have two o'clock or later, you might consider giving them some outside -- out of class work instead. But there's no reason to cancel class.

So any questions for me?
VAI LLANCOURT: Lisa Vaillancourt, College of Ag.
Did you ask where people were located that --
GROSSMAN: Yeah, I did. And you can slice the data according to that, because the people down on the south end of campus probably had more trouble than people in the --
VAI LLANCOURT: Did --
GROSSMAN: I didn't look at it. But again, if you want to sort out the data by where people spend most of the -- the way I put it "was where do you spend most of your time on campus." And so if you want to slice the data that way, feel free.
Yes?
BRI ON: Are we looking at --
BROTHERS: Name, please.
BRI ON: Gail Bri on, College of Engineering.
Are we looking at making Thursday football a regular event?
GROSSMAN: Regular in terms of every year, no. Regular in terms of every three or four years, possibly.
If I recall correctly, Mitch Barnhart, at a Senate Council meeting, said we are not under any obligation to do this again. That doesn't mean it won't happen again, because no one asked us, do you want to do this again, which was a decision made by Athletics and whoever.
The SEC likes us to do these things because they get to televise the game. So that's why it was done, because the SEC kept asking us to do it.
Like I said, I think it will probably happen again in the future. Especially, it wasn't a total and complete disaster last month. So I do expect it to happen again. But when it will happen is anyone's guess.
Yes?
BAILEY: Ernie Bailey, College of Ag, Food and Environment.
I mean, to some extent it degraded the educational activities. Is there any other study, is anybody investigating how much of an impact that it had, beyond your survey?
And I guess the other question would be: Is there a limit to determine if it degraded it 20 percent or 30 percent? Is that something that (inaudible) concerned about?

GROSSMAN: I don't know of anyone else who is looking at that. That's why I did the survey, because I wanted to see. I don't know how you define degrading the educational environment.

I asked people "were you able to get your jobs done in terms of the research, teaching, and service missions of the University", you know, that's our mission. And then specifically asking about holding class, because that was, you know, that's the thing that most students do most of the time.

So, you know, I gave you the numbers already. The majority of people did not see severe impact. A substantial minority did see a strong impact. I think that's about all we're going to know.

I think some people probably cancelled classes who didn't really need to cancel classes. Other people may have had such a bad experience with it they will cancel classes later.

But again, if we look at the regret numbers, a lot more people who cancelled class regretted it than those who did not cancel class.

Yes, Ted?

UNIDENTIFIED: What --

GROSSMAN: Name, please.

FIEDLER: Fiedler, Arts and Sciences.

I assume you said something about the SEC was interested in this. What is the financial advantage of this organization from a Thursday evening football broadcast?

I mean, to me, you know, I wasn't impacted by it, I wasn't teaching on Thursday. I happened to be on campus, had no problem because I park on Limestone in that garage.

GROSSMAN: Right.

FIEDLER: But I don't understand why the hell we have to allow this kind of stuff.

GROSSMAN: Well, we don't have to from what I understand.

FIEDLER: Who -- who benefits from this? What's the advantage?

GROSSMAN: My guess -- I don't know --

FIEDLER: UK football program certainly didn't. They've lost every game since.

GROSSMAN: Tom, can you address this?

HARRIS: Sure. From a financial standpoint --

BROTHERS: Name, please.

HARRIS: Tom Harris, Vice President of University Relations.

From a financial standpoint, it's pretty break even. The SEC gives some money to the University to accommodate this. A planning group that worked for over a year, trying to negate any negative impact in parking, transportation, shuttles, that's where the money was spent.

UKSenateMeeting1109-15.txt

The real value is an exposure for the Athletics program, the campus and the community. There were a lot of spots about UK, about the community, obviously the Breeders Cup, leading up that, that two weeks later.

So the exposure is really good. There are a lot of people -- a lot of programs have really build their football programs on Thursday Night Football.

The SEC had been asking Athletics to do it for over ten years. And we've always resisted because of the challenges of on-campus parking issues that we have.

I think Bob's right, they may ask again in three or four years. But the financial impact was really small. We didn't gain anything, if that's the question.

GROSSMAN: So there are intangibles associated with having it on Thursday. Whether those intangibles are worth the inconveniences is something that the administration is going to decide. Hopefully, they'll ask us.

HIPPISLEY: We have one more question on this subject. Any other questions for Bob about any other matters?

GROSSMAN: Liz?

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S.

If we're done with the football, I was wondering if you could mention what issues are in front of the Board and what important matters are going to be decided in the upcoming months?

GROSSMAN: What issues are in front of the Board of Trustees right now. So one thing that is coming down the pike, and I guess the President mentioned this last month, although it might have been lost in some of the other stuff that was going on last month, was -- is this notion of performance funding from the state, where they're going to set certain goals for all the different universities.

And UK goals are going to be different from the goals of other universities because we are different from other universities in the state.

So they're going to set goals for us and then if we meet those goals we will get additional funding. And if we don't meet those goals, we won't get that funding.

There may be funding to help us achieve those goals. We may like write a -- it may even be something like a grant proposal where we say "if you give us this much money, we will see this much increase in retention or graduation rates." I think all that still has to play out.

Of course, we have a new governor, or we will have a new governor in a few weeks and so --

DEBSKI : Yeah. Who exactly is setting these goals?

GROSSMAN: The CPE has been setting -- working -- at the direction of several influential legislators, the CPE in collaboration with university presidents, has been setting these goals. And UK has been intimately involved in setting goals for itself, that it thinks are reasonable, achievable, desirable, et cetera.

So the CPE will then present those to the legislature and then we'll see what the legislature does.

DEBSKI : Are those goals going to be shared with the faculty?

GROSSMAN: Yeah.

DEBSKI : Before they're decided upon?

GROSSMAN: Before they're decided upon?

DEBSKI : Yeah. Before they're decided upon. I'm just wondering, you know, I imagine retention is probably one of them, but I imagine there are probably a lot of others that (inaudible).

GROSSMAN: Yeah. So there is a document -- Tom, you probably know about this as well. I've seen a document, I don't know how final it is.

HARRIS: Yeah. No, it's very draft form at this point. The CPE working group is still weighing in on that. And then the General Assembly will have input on what those goals are.

GROSSMAN: Right. So at what point will it be appropriate to share it with the faculty? I think what Liz is saying is the faculty would like to look at it and have an opportunity to offer feedback.

HARRIS: Absolutely. I don't know exactly what the time frame is of that working group and what they're going to propose. My guess is they were waiting to see who won the Governor's Race and what input they will have on the process.

GROSSMAN: Right. Yes?

BLONDER: Lee Blonder, Medicine.

So the Board had a two and a half, three day retreat, October 22nd, I think it started?

GROSSMAN: Yes.

BLONDER: So in addition to what you responded to Liz about, were there other things that came up that are important? And also, I'd like to know specifically what the Board was told or discussed about the Honors College given the huge donation we received, the timeline.

GROSSMAN: Right. Well, the Board retreat was largely, if not completely, dedicated to the Strategic Plan, pretty much explaining what the Strategic Plan was and what the goals, what the metrics were. (Inaudible) would have been very proud the number of times the word "metric" was used.

The -- so there wasn't really any -- there wasn't any decision-making about that. It was largely just the commissars of the various committees doing -- giving presentations. The other part of your question?

BLONDER: The Honors College.

GROSSMAN: Oh, the Honors College, yes. The Honors College, it's been made very clear to the Lewis's that the Honors College must be approved by the Senate.

And administration's already working on putting together a proposal to bring to the Senate. They've already consulted with Senate Council a few times, at least once, and gathering feedback on what they've done so far.

Obviously, they want to see this go through. We have final say about whether this happens.

It didn't really come up at the Board other than how wonderful it is that this gift is being given. And the hope is that this will all go through the Senate without trouble.

HIPPISLEY: We do only have time for one more question. We have a lot of things -- I think Davy has had his hand up.

GROSSMAN: Davy?

JONES: Davy Jones, College of Medicine, Toxicology.

I also noticed on the Board website for the October Board meeting, the President has only just now submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval to have Bill Thro be the General Counsel.

GROSSMAN: We voted on that and approved it.

JONES: Yeah. They made it retroactive to three years. Was there any discussion as to whether there's been any legal liability created by having somebody acting as General Counsel for three years who didn't have Board approval for each one?

GROSSMAN: There was not such a discussion.

HIPPISLEY: Thank you, Bob, so much.

GROSSMAN: Uh-huh.

HIPPISLEY: Okay. Easy, but a little bit awkward, we courageously and resoundingly voted to modify a degree list and we did it wrong. Sorry.

We were taking away a degree from the student and she never actually had that degree.

So what we should have done is that. So we're going to use a parliamentary procedure right now to get to that place.

What I want to invite is somebody who voted for what we did by mistake, to move that we make an amendment such that the Master's of Arts in Music Performance is changed to a Master's of Arts in Music Theory. These are the degrees that are taken away, not served.

GROSSMAN: So moved, Bob Grossman, Trustee.
HIPPI SLEY: Second?
BROTHERS: I'm sorry. Bob would not have voted.
GROSSMAN: Oh, I'm not an elected faculty.
BROTHERS: He's not elected faculty.
HIPPI SLEY: Oh. Sorry. Someone --
PORTER: So moved, Todd Porter, Pharmacy.
HIPPI SLEY: And a second from the elected faculty who voted for it?
BROWN: Roger Brown.
HIPPI SLEY: So that's the easy bit. And so this is basically the recommendation on the floor right now as an amendment. To amend the motion relating to the degree awarded by correcting the degree deleted. The degree deleted from Master's of Arts in Music Performance to Master of Arts in Music Theory.
So this is the motion on the floor. It's got a first and a second. Any discussion? Hearing none, I'll give you a countdown. Five, four, three, two, one. And the motion carries. Do we need to do the --
BROTHERS: No.
HIPPI SLEY: So what we're going to do right now is we're going to make sure it's only the elected faculty who voted for the amendment so you might see that number change. Motion still carries. This will go on the Board's agenda for December.
I don't seem to be able to get to the next --
BROTHERS: Now try.
HIPPI SLEY: Okay, thank you. All right. The first of many committee reports, mostly actionable, in fact, all actionable. So I'd like to invite Scott Yost, who is the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee, Scott?
YOST: Just a couple items of business real quick, and I hope you had a chance to review the proposals. I think they're fairly straightforward.
We have three proposals, well, three that are going to come before you all, but the first one -- I'm hoping they're all straightforward.
This first one was to approve the change in the Master's requirement for Public Health, where they want to basically drop the requirement for the students to take a professional and a national exam. It's not about passing, it's the taking it.
They were -- they put it into place a few years ago. They went through this requirement. The exam is fairly expensive. There is issues about whether the value of taking that exam, given the expense, is, you know, a wise use of resources, you know, the students or if the college pays for it.

So they just decided that they thought it would be best to since it's not -- maybe 15 years from now it may become more nationally recognized, but right now, it's not according to what we've been informed of.

So they just made a motion to drop that requirement of the students to take that national exam.

HIPPISLEY: So this is the motion on the floor that Senate approve the change to the Master's of Public Health by no longer requiring the CPH exam. It comes straight from committee so it doesn't need a second.

It's straightaway on the floor. Does anyone want to speak for or against or have a comment? Gail?

BRI ON: Gail Bri on, College of Engineering.

I think it's worth mentioning that the College of Public Health goes through an accreditation process itself, all their master's degrees are accredited. But this was just something for the students, so it doesn't really change the academic rigor of the program.

YOST: That is a good comment, I'll agree with it. I don't know -- we haven't had that conversation, but yes, it makes sense.

HIPPISLEY: And by the way, Katie Cardarelli is in the room, she's just over here. She's a proposer and she's willing to take any questions as well.

Lee?

BLONDER: Lee Bl onder, Medicine.

It looked to me from reading through this that the College Faculty Council approved this, but did the entire college faculty approve?

CARDARELLI: Katie Cardarelli, Public Health.

In the College of Public Health, per our bylaws, there's an Academic Affairs Committee that's comprised of faculty as well as student representatives, and they approved this proposal. And then it went on to our Faculty Council, which is our elected body of faculty representatives, they, too, approved this proposal.

HIPPISLEY: Questions? Yes.

WOOD: I'd like to respond. Connie Wood, College of Arts and Sciences, also Chair of the Senate Rules and Elections Committee.

This -- a question about this arose on Friday morning. According to your bylaws, your Faculty Council can only recommend actions to the College Faculty as a whole. I believe that's 6.5.2B. And I could be wrong, I haven't looked at it since Friday morning.

But I understand that you are in the process of changing those, but at this point in time, due process says that it has to be approved by the college faculty.

- CARDARELLI: So I would invite any of our Senators to respond as well, but you're correct.
- Our Faculty Council is right now revising the bylaws to I guess refine the specificity as to what a Faculty Council approval implies. I believe, historically, in our college, it has implied approval by the faculty.
- HIPPISLEY: Any questions? Okay. Hearing none, ready to vote. Didn't need that. I've give you five seconds. Five, four, three, two, one. The motion carries.
- Scott Yost will stay here for number 2.
- YOST: The second -- actually, the second and third motion I'm going to bring before you are very similar. And that is two programs have asked that they drop the World Language or Foreign Language requirement for the PhD program.
- And so it's -- any kind of an internal thing that they require, they'll have an efficiency level of certain foreign language, the first one is in English.
- Then the faculty have basically said given the changes in the way, you know, PhD in English and the profession there is going, unless you happen to be in a very narrow area of English, the medieval kind of time period where you would want to have a broader perspective on say Math and a Foreign Language, for the vast majority of their recent graduate student, PhD students, it really was more of a burden. It was more of a burden than actually of any benefit whatsoever.
- So they just anticipating and seeing the trend at the minimum requirements, certainly is not a necessary thing for the vast majority of the PhD students. Those that need or would like to have that broader perspective, the minimum requirement is way too narrow of a requirement (inaudible) they actually take much more to get the perspective.
- So they're proposing to drop, from my understanding, that terminology, drop the PhD requirement for their program, this Global Language requirement.
- HIPPISLEY: The motion has been approved to change the PhD in English by dropping the World Language requirement. The motion is on the floor. Questions? Leon?
- SACHS: Yeah. I'm Leon Sachs in Arts and Sciences.
- I'm going to speak to this, I'm not actually supporting it or opposing it. I just want to make a comment.
- I teach in the French program, so it might occur to people here that of course he would be opposed to this because this will affect my program, teaching in Foreign

Languages.

But, in fact, I'm told that by people who know better that we got very few students of these students anyways. So there's no real material interest in my being ambivalent about this.

It's got more to do with a concern about what broad humanistic inquiry and advanced scholarship mean. I was an English major. I sat as an impressive 20-year-old in English classes with professors who read the foreign languages and James Joyce and Ulysses, who could translate Beckett from Beckett's own French to English at the same time. And that had a profound effect on me and others, to see what someone with broad humanistic learning could do.

I'm worried that increased specialization and narrow focus in the job market will undermine a certain commitment to preserving cultural memory and training even with broad, general capacities, abilities.

I just hope that when my daughter is in college and in English class, she will be learning from a teacher who does have those broad skills. That's all I have to say.

HIPPISLEY: Thank you. Ted?

FIEDLER: Ted Fiedler, Arts and Sciences.

I'm going to also out myself as a World Language professor. I'm in German. I think part of the problem with this proposal is that it trivializes the meaning of the current requirement which is reading of one foreign language.

And I have to assert that the course I teach in German for reading knowledge does make people more than cursorily proficient in reading.

And the implication is that we're not requiring that if our students -- or the implication in a sense is that the courses that are being taught for students to achieve this are not up to it. So I take some umbrage there.

I'm also concerned about the narrowing of the sort of humanistic scholars, you know, we're in a moment when World Literature as a concept is -- has sort of experienced a kind of renaissance.

And I find it a little odd that at this moment, we're being told that it's progressive to eliminate a foreign language requirement. It doesn't make sense to me and I'm going to vote against this proposal.

HIPPISLEY: I'd like to invite Andy Doolen, (inaudible), he's also DGS of English who -- the proposal.

DOOLEN: So this was -- the decision to approve this was unanimous in the English Department.

FIEDLER: It was not unanimous. According

DOOLEN:

to this, it was 15-5.

So (inaudible) support broad humanistic inquiry, there's no debate about that. We currently have one student who is working in an area where their research requires in depth knowledge of a foreign language. We had one student (inaudible) but now we have (inaudible). We have two students in Early Modern.

Many of us in the department speak another language, read another language. The current requirement is so superficial and inadequate that it isn't really a good measure for language acquisition.

I do work in Spanish and English, so in the past I've often thought that a measure of this sort would go against my scholarly ideals. But as DGS, when I've gotten to know the full range of research interests on the faculty and the students, I see this as a real obstacle for our students that are currently up against all sorts of challenges to finishing their degree within five to six years. They're only guaranteed five years of funding.

The language requirement necessitates all sorts of covert maneuvers to get the proper training. They don't receive money from the University. There's no frequent course that they're offered in our languages departments to support their study.

And so oftentimes, they have to sort of embark on a self-study course in the summer at night and it gets in the way of their research program. So I think only superficially can this be seen as sort of an assault on humanistic inquiry.

Research has changed dramatically in the 21st century in literary and cultural studies and people, frankly, don't do the same sorts of dissertations as they did in the 1970s, 1980s.

We no longer have a faculty that have the same broad expertise in two or three or four languages. So English faculty don't even have the sort of language skills, you know, that they might have had in 1975.

So there are many other practical reasons why we want to do away with this requirement. But I think the important thing is that we are not advocating the abolition of the study of language.

We're giving this decision to the Advisory Committees and the directors. And so if a director at a committee decides that a student could benefit from further language training, then they'll receive that training and it will help them with their schol arshi ps.

So this is just a decision that we decided would be more beneficial than translating a paragraph of Spanish in a

very, you know, I think inadequate way, and it would be something that would give them, you know, help them pass this benchmark.

HI PPI SLEY: There's a question right next to you.

RI CE: I'm Jenny Rice, Arts and Sciences.

So I was -- I have a PhD in English as well, I'm not in the English Department. And my own experience, I had to take two of these. I took German and Spanish. I couldn't read you the paragraph I read when I kind of limped through my reading course.

I would also say that rather than seeing this as a narrowing of, you know, a humanistic focus, I think it's important to realize that humanity today in the 21st century is broader than ever and in English studies especially.

The things that you're expected to become expert in as a PhD student in English, is so much broader than it was when this was the standard and this was the norm.

Everything from, say, visual humanities, which if you look on the job market, (inaudible) for all areas. You're expected to know when you have Cultural Studies, Digital Humanities, you have interests in areas that simply don't match up with sort of the, you know, (inaudible), traditional forms of language studies that the student (inaudible).

So I think it's important to recognize the fact that it is -- we do need to prepare students for the job market that they will face and this doesn't necessarily give them the best (inaudible).

HI PPI SLEY: Thank you. Harris and then Dean Kornbluh.

SYMEONIDIS: Haralambos Symeonidis, Arts and Sciences.

I share the concerns of my colleagues who spoke in the beginning. I think this leads to a narrowing of humanities (inaudible).

I teach in the Spanish Department; however, I saw as a burden things I actually learned at school and later at the university, like Latin or foreign language requirements. (Inaudible) of what (inaudible) and right now (inaudible) things related to things that people, other people cannot do.

I think that as humanists we must be able to (inaudible) in English to read maybe articles that are within other languages (inaudible) that people might have another view (inaudible).

HI PPI SLEY: Dean Kornbluh?

KORNBLUH: Mark Kornbluh, Arts and Sciences.

The college did not ask the English Department to do this, but we have asked every department to think responsibly

UKSenateMeeting1109-15.txt

about their graduate students and to work on their programs to enable them to finish their degree in a timely manner, in a way as requested, that English degrees being a five to six year period, where the most of the country they're in eight to ten or longer there.

And what we've asked our departments to do is precisely what Professor Doolen said, which is that you customize the program and work to meet the need of the individual, that the Advisory Committee work with the students about what's needed rather than have across-the-board requirements that hold people up and make it so hard for them to finish in a timely manner.

HIPPISLEY: Any other comments? Anyone else want to speak for or against?

MCCORMICK: I want to make a comment. It has nothing to do about the merit of case. But when this came to Senate Council, there were some documentation missing and I want to share my appreciation to Anna Bosch, Joe Clymer, Andy Doolen and Stephen Testa for providing the documentation, as well as to Scott, for making sure that it was part of the Senate record.

HIPPISLEY: Unless there are any last questions or comments, I'd like to move to vote on this. The motion is there, it's on the board. No amendments. I'll give you a five second warning. Five, four, three, two, one. Okay. Motion carries.

YOST: Okay. The last order of business from the committee is similar to English, the Mining Program, the PhD program in Mining had a similar World Language program requirement for their students. Certainly, they do get a lot of students, international students which end up being exempt from this particular requirement because of their -- they speak (inaudible).

And so, given the size of their program, they did not -- from a fundamental standpoint as far as it didn't necessarily impact foreign language programs because they don't have a lot of PhD students.

The fact that they thought that this was more of a burdensome -- burden to their domestic students or to the foreign students, and again they don't get credit, graduate credit for taking a foreign language, the faculty there in the Mining program have asked to drop their foreign language requirement as well for the PhD program Mining.

HIPPISLEY: This is the motion that's now on the floor: The Senate approve the change to the PhD in Mining by dropping the World Language requirement. It comes straight from the committee so it's on the floor. Any questions, comments? Yes?

WHI TAKER: Mark Whitaker, Arts and Sciences.
I just wonder, do we have any information about whether this is a trend in the rest of the country in universities like ours that are research universities, that PhD programs are dropping language requirements?

YOST: I have no knowledge of that. I'm not sure and I'm not sure -- Mirek, do you have any knowledge, when it comes to Engineering, any thoughts?

TRUSZCZYNSKI: Mirek Truscynski, College of Engineering.
All I can say is that in Computer Science we dropped this requirement about 20 years ago or more. And I suspect many of the Engineering Departments don't have this requirement. It's quite common.

Another comment: I would also expect that high school and college should do a better job preparing students in foreign language. It's not necessary (inaudible) PhD program to accomplish this.
HIPPI SLEY: Any other comments? Hearing none, move to vote. Five second warning. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries. Thanks, Scott.

Now, I'd like to invite Ernie Bailey, Chair of Academic and Organization Structure Committee.
BAILEY: So we had a proposal from the College of Communication and Information to change the name of one of its constituent program, the School of Journalism and Telecommunications.

What they're proposing is to change the name of the school to Journalism and Media. And the reason for the change is largely that the telecommunication is becoming less relevant to their mission.

Recently, their change was their undergraduate programs titled Telecommunications to Media Arts and Studies. And so the name change for the school would bring the name in line with their current education programs.

The faculty in the school voted 14-0 in favor of this change. We didn't get votes from other programs, but we had letters from the administrators in charge of those units saying there had been discussions and that there was support for this change. We didn't discern any -- that this was controversial in any way.

So I'll take questions.
HIPPI SLEY: Okay. So the motion is the Senate approve the change in name from the School of Journalism and Telecommunication to the School of Journalism and Media.

Any questions at all? We'll vote. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries.

I would like now to invite

Margaret, who's done an awful lot of work recently. So this is the first of about five.

SCHROEDER: Okay. So the first today is the motion that the Senate approve for submission to the Board of Trustees the establishment of a new Master's degree Applied Statistics, in the Department of Statistics within the College of Arts and Sciences.

This is a 30-hour, plan B Master's degree program that's completely online and designed to train professional and practice-oriented statisticians who have both data, analytic, and computing skills.

This program will open up a number of opportunities for traditional and non-traditional students, working scientists, and professionals who seek new career opportunities. This is an initiative that came out of the EL-2 grant funding from the University.

Questions?

HIPPISLEY: Question?

WOOD:

Connie Wood, Statistics.

It's a Master of Applied Statistics, not a Master's.

HIPPISLEY:

Would you accept it as a friendly amendment on behalf of your committee?

SCHROEDER:

Yes.

WOOD:

Thank you.

HIPPISLEY:

We'll get rid of the apostrophe and the "S."

WOOD:

And the "in Applied Statistics."

BRIAN:

Instead of "of."

WOOD:

The degree is a Master of Applied Statistics.

SCHROEDER:

I think it's correct on the paperwork that you all have in your packet.

WOOD:

It is.

GROSSMAN:

It's not "in Applied Statistics."

BROTHERS:

That's the major.

WOOD:

With a major. But it's not part of the degree title, Sheila.

BROTHERS:

Correct. That's why I said Master of Applied Statistics.

TRUSZCZYNSKI:

The first occurrence is incorrect.

HIPPISLEY:

You did say a new program, Master of Applied Science? That's our format, usually will say a new program or say new degree program.

SCHROEDER:

At Senate Council, SAPC was asked to resubmit the recommendation to say Master of Applied Statistics in the Department of Statistics within the College of Arts and Sciences. So that's what I did.

HIPPISLEY:

Does that seem right, Connie?

WOOD:

What Margaret said is correct.

HIPPISLEY:

So if we ignore the "S" and the in.

WOOD:

Thank you.

HIPPISLEY:

Any other questions? Well, let's

UKSenateMeeting1109-15.txt
vote on this. I'll give you a countdown.
Five, four, three, two, one. Motion
carries.

SCHROEDER: Okay. This is a recommendation
that the Senate approve the establishment of
a new graduate certificate Eurhythmics in
the School of Music within the College of
Fine Arts.

This graduate certificate is a 12
credit hour program mostly offered in the
summertime to help appeal to its target
audience, school music teachers.

The program offers a unique blend
of learner centered instruction designed to
challenge and support students in learning
about teaching general music via Dalcroze, I
hope I pronounced that right, Eurhythmics.

This will answer the demand for
professional development opportunities for
artists and school music teachers in this
region, and will also help to attract the
international participants as well.

HIPPISLEY: The motion is on the floor.
Questions or comments? We'll vote. Okay.
Five, four, three, two, one. Motion
carries. Someone loves to oppose these
motions, look at that.

SCHROEDER: Okay. This is a recommendation
that the Senate approve for submission to
the Board of Trustees the establishment of a
new dual degree program, Master's in Public
Health and Master's in Health Administration
in the College of Public Health.

The Master of Health
Administration degree is currently a two-
year, 54-hour program and is offered through
the College of Public Health. The Master of
Public Health is also a two-year, 42-hour
curriculum in the College of Public Health.

Under the dual degree program,
nine credit hours would be recognized as
filling degree requirements in both
programs, which would allow the students to
complete both degrees with a total of 87
credit hours compared to 96 credit hours.

This would reduce the time to both
degrees to two and a half or three years,
rather than the four years. This is a
degree, a dual degree that is being added at
multiple universities as the need for the
combination of these unique skills has been
needed, increases with the Healthcare
payment reform.

HIPPISLEY: Comments, questions for or
against? Hearing none, we will vote. Okay.
Five, four, three, two, one. Motion
carries.

SCHROEDER: Okay, just two more. This is a
recommendation that the Senate approve the
establishment of a new graduate certificate
Military Behavioral Health in the College of
Social Work.

This is a 12 credit hour graduate

certificate program. There's a high need for providing effective mental health services to military personnel and returning veterans and military families. Requires specific knowledge of skills, practitioners who serve veteran families must be attuned to the way military culture affects individual and group behavior, knowledgeable of military systems of care, and cognizant of unique limits of confidentiality inherent when serving military members.

This specialized course of study will focus on that practice with military and veteran populations and help assist in preparing graduates to meet those needs. We have over 336,000 veterans in Kentucky.

HIPPISLEY: Thank you, very much. Are there any questions about that proposal? Hearing none, countdown, five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries.

SCHROEDER: All right, last one for this month. This is a recommendation that the Senate approve the suspension of admission into an existing graduate program, the graduate certificate in Health Administration in the College of Nursing.

No students have ever been admitted to this certificate program. All students who are currently enrolled in Nursing Studies have completed that certificate or a different certificate program that was created in the College of Nursing through their DNP program which is more popular.

This certificate has essentially become obsolete now.

HIPPISLEY: Any questions for this proposal? Hearing none, I'll give you a countdown. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries.

I'd like to invite Roger Brown to give his fall 2015 report of the Senate Committee on Distance Learning.

BROWN: So I have one action item and a couple of updates. This is a new committee, it was established in 2012. I just want to recognize the impact that the inaugural and former chair had, that's Sharon Lock. So a lot of the work that I will report on today is stuff that an earlier leadership committee undertook and is bringing to you now.

Let's see. The first action item is to bring our Senate Rules in compliance with FERPA. So FERPA allows students to have access to all of their academic records. And our Senate Rules previously has said -- I don't know if we have the other slide, too, Sheila. That's fine.

BROTHERS: Do you want me to pull up the --
BROWN: Our Senate Rules previously has said that faculty and instructors are required to return to discuss with/or make

UKSenateMeeting1109-15.txt
available to students their academic records. And the "or" creates a possibility that instructors may choose just one of those things and therefore would not comply with FERPA in making available those records to students.

So we made a quick edit, essentially allowing, removing the portion that says: "Return to and discuss with" and just say that "instructors will make available to students those records."

We also agreed to add a note at the bottom of this that informs students and instructors that they can contact the UK Office of Business Learning where this is really going to be the most important issue, otherwise on campus, you just go to the instructor's office and it's not really an issue, for advice about how to share students' records remotely and securely. The idea is that they would be able to provide the most state-of-the-art way to do that.

Just so that you know, if an instructor doesn't want to distribute their exams, the idea is that the Distance Learning Program Office at this time will tell the instructor of the student to set up a time where the student, let's say in Alaska, could do a proctored experience, much like they would take the exam initially, but instead in that proctor environment, they would be allowed to review their exam.

And again, this is only in the rare cases where the instructor doesn't want to distribute that exam for whatever reason, then there's a mechanism for that to happen.

HI PPI SLEY: Thank you, Roger. So Roger, his committee has proposed a rule change. The change would be essentially this. So we can move to vote on this. It comes straight from committee.

We can go back to the slide. The motion on the floor is to maybe change the 7.2.2., which is exactly what Roger presented.

So are there any discussions about this? Do you have questions for Roger? Oh, in the back.

REAL: Kevin Real, Communication and Information.

Can you provide clarification on the giving -- providing exam to students? Do you mean the results of the exams or the exams themselves?

BROWN: My understanding is that federal law, FERPA, which require that all student records be made available to the student, which would include a copy of the exam.

REAL: I've never provided a copy of my exams to students.

JONES: You have to make it available. In

class, you can pass it out, you go over it, require it to come back to you, you made it available.

REAL: Oh, okay.

HIPPI SLEY: If there are no other questions --

SANDMEYER: Bob Sandmeyer, College of Arts and Sciences.

This is about a similar in regard to quizzes because a lot of the quizzes, when I've done this, are in the system that I really don't know how to get -- how to make it available other than make it available right after the students takes the quiz. Is the adequate?

In other words, what is the means by which if you have an electronic quiz that just is automatically graded, you can make that available to the students?

BROWN: If it's automatic and it's in our learning management system, BlackBoard or Canvas, then that should be something that you would have access to now.

So if a student wanted to review that quiz, you can invite them to your office and print out the quiz and they can look at it or you can point them to the screen. And if you have questions about how to make that work you can contact technical support.

HIPPI SLEY: Other questions for Roger?

Hearing none, I'll give you a countdown. Five, four, three, two, one. And the change to the SR passes.

BROWN: I just wanted to make a couple of announcements about other activities that are going on in our committee that I think you would have an opportunity to weigh in via the Chair, if you chose to.

One exciting thing is that UK has just established a testing center. And this testing center, we have a testing center for the Disability Resource Center, this will be a similar type facility where especially folks who are teaching classes in Distance Learning and felt like the online exam process could be compromised, we have a room that would be available where students could register much like a seat on an airline, let's say, or you could have the students all come at once and they would be able to have a proctored exam there.

So the design is for Distance Learning students especially, but would also be available for other students and faculty in the case of a makeup exam, then there would be a proctor that's there. So that's being looked at.

We've got a room identified in the Classroom Building, and there's going to be some faculty that weigh in on exactly how that's going to work. It looks like it's going to be set up, operational in the

summer. So 2016.

And our committee is also looking at some questions about intellectual property and the confusion about who owns and controls Distance Learning materials. So I'll have a report in the future about that.

And then, if you wondered a little

bit about the vision for Distance Learning that has a set of tools, our committee is wrestling with some of those questions now with faculty and administration input.

And you might think, for example, that millions of dollars going to support in development of online courses and programs, at the same time, we're devoting millions of dollars to develop residential donor (inaudible), and our committee is asking the question: "To what degree might those kind of things be in conflict and can there be something in the order of a vision statement that will help guide future investments if there is a conflict."

HI PPI SLEY: Thank you, Roger. This is the -- you might have some questions, but this is the first report from this committee since (inaudible) so we were delighted to receive it. So now is the time to ask questions. Yes, Kim?

WOODRUM: Kim Woodrum, College of Arts and Sciences.

Do you have a feel for what the capacity of the testing center is going to be?

BROWN: This is going to be a transitional room assignment. It's in the Classroom Building. Patsy Caruthers in IT is leading that and she says that it's a larger room than what they -- among the larger rooms that they requested, but it's still relatively small. I just got the information this weekend so I don't know -- it will be Classroom 338 in the Classroom Building.

SANDMEYER: Bob Sandmeyer, Arts and Sciences. Is this available to a consortium of university and schools in the area or is this a UK -- solely a UK facility?

I ask because I taught an online class and we had severe problems for distance learning students, who were not in the state, finding places to take a proctored exam.

So I'm just wondering if this is open only to UK students or it's really going to be a facility that is applicable to distance learners outside of our University?

BROWN: We haven't discussed that, but I'll make a note. My expectation is that would be available if there are additional space for other students outside of the University. And I agree that that's a

useful feature, space permitting.
EL-MALLAKH: Peggy, El-Mallakh, College of Nursing.

I just wanted to clarify, Roger, is this going to be open or available to both graduate and undergraduate students?
BROWN: Yes. The testing center should be available campus-wide. And again, there will be more information forthcoming as it gets set up. There's also faculty that are going to be providing input about exactly what the specific needs are in terms of scheduling and students coming in all at once, so we'll have more information about that, but graduates, undergraduate, professional students as well.

HIPPISLEY: Thanks very much, Roger. Thank you.

So I'd like to invite Marcie Deaton from General Counsel. She's not here. Anyone from General Counsel? No. All right. So I'd like to invite Joe Fink, who is here, to talk to us about the UAB and the 2014-15 report.

FINK: Good afternoon. This is the annual report of the University Appeals Board.

I'm going to talk about first what is the jurisdiction of the University Appeals Board, what kind of matters do we get involved with. Primarily, academic appeals, that would be a grade dispute, an allegation of cheating or plagiarism on a grade assignment, that sort of thing. That's on the academic side of things. And we also get involved with disciplinary conduct type matters.

Earlier this summer, there was a carve out from that related to disciplinary matters that have a sexual component. And that's handled by a separate committee. It's a ten person, I think it's called the Special University Appeals Board or something like that.

But regular disciplinary appeals, somebody being disruptive in class or defacing a building or something like that, that would still come to the University Appeals Board. So that's the jurisdiction of the University Appeals Board.

What's the appeals process? Let's talk first about academic appeals. Academic appeals comes from the Office of the Academic Ombud. A student who has a potential issue goes to see the Ombud, usually will encounter Laura, who is back in the corner, as the first face of the Academic Ombud Office. And then Laura does sort of a triage screening type conversation with the student.

If appeals are something there, will recommend the student return and talk to the Ombud, bringing with him or her, any

UKSenateMeeting1109-15.txt
relevant documents, syllabus, exam papers,
term papers, that sort of thing.

And then the Ombud will get involved in discussions with the student and the faculty member, back and forth, back and forth, trying to identify some mutually agreeable solution.

If the Ombud, after investigation, concludes that the matter lacks merit, he sends a letter to the student essentially saying "that I have determined that your matter lacks merit." But the final paragraph of the letter says, "you have the right to appeal that." That is my, the Ombud's, classification of your matter as lacking merit.

And so that can come to the University Appeals Board, we call that a no merit review, and we call it a review because the student does not appear. It's purely a paper process where the student makes a submission that supplements from the student's perspective, the letter from the Ombud.

And the only question to be considered at that juncture is should the student be given a hearing. And it's a very narrow question at that point for a no merit review.

If the Ombud has concluded the matter does have merit, then he writes a letter to the Appeals Board in which he summarizes what's the issue, what's the student's perspective, what's the faculty member's perspective, and so forth, and sends that on.

When I receive that, I then begin to try to set up an identified time slot when a quorum of the Appeals Board can gather to hear the appeal, and it goes from there.

On the day of the appeal, the student has been invited, the faculty member has been invited. We have no authority to compel anybody to participate, to attend to participate. They are invited. They can attend. Sometimes they choose not to attend. Sometimes the student chooses not to attend. Sometimes the faculty member chooses not to attend.

The process starts with the student stating what he or she is appealing. We had a student case this year where the student's appeal statement was two sentences. And the Appeals Board is sitting around looking at one another. They had received the packet in advance and they had received all the written document, but that was all the student had to say.

So these things vary all over the map with regard to how they flow.

The faculty member is in the room to hear everything the student says; the

student is in the room to hear everything the faculty member says, but there is no questioning across the table. All of the questions come from the members of the University Appeals Board.

Once the questions have been exhausted, the parties are excused, and a decision is made right then before the next case is called. A good rule of thumb is about 45 minutes for the testimony part, about 15 minutes for the deliberation part. And we'll typically do three cases when we succeed in getting a quorum of the Appeals Board together.

For a disciplinary appeal, that's a different flow. That comes through the Dean of Student's Office, and there's a three-person hearing panel, composed of faculty and staff, that reviews the matter.

They make a recommendation to the Dean of Students. If the student has a differing opinion, the student can appeal that decision implemented by the Dean of Students and that then comes to the Appeals Board. That's handled a little differently.

It's handled by a three-person group from the Appeals Board, me plus two others, and there are two narrow questions to be addressed in that instance: Is there new evidence, new information available that was not available at the time of the hearing with the three person panel, or was there procedural error committed through the procedural hearing below. That's it, just those two questions.

The Appeals Board sends a recommendation back to the Dean of Students and the Dean of Students pursues it from there.

The composition of the Appeals Board: The Appeals Board has 30 members, 18 faculty, 12 students. The faculty are appointed for a three year term, staggered, students are appointed for a one year term, some can be reappointed and some faculty can be reappointed, too.

What's a quorum, 30 people, a quorum is 8. You would think from those numbers, not a problem to get a quorum. It's a problem. It's a problem. It's a real challenge to get a quorum because you have to have the right mix of people and so forth.

This is where we have a document that's sort of evolved over the years. It's a question and answer format document that we send to all the parties who are going to come to an Appeals Hearing. We send to the faculty, student, so forth, and it goes through different questions that typically would be asked, about how the thing flows and so forth.

Hopefully, you see these numbers.

UKSenateMeeting1109-15.txt

These are some recent history of incidents of things we've handled. It starts in 2009-10. All the way to the right is 2014-15. Top entry, cheating and plagiarism and fair and just evaluation of academic performance, then a no merit review, that thing I talked about where the Ombud has determined the case lacks merit. College honor code violation, haven't had any of those for awhile. Retroactive withdrawal where the student is denied the opportunity for a retroactive withdrawal. Code of student conduct, you can see that last year we did 17 of those. Wow. That's all I have to say about that.

Then down at the bottom it tells you whether the student prevailed or the student did not prevail. Last year the student prevailed in 14 and did not prevail in 19.

During the time I've been doing this, it's roughly 50/50, right down the middle whether the student's going to prevail or not. And that's over the run of a number of years, a mix of all kinds of cases.

So students often ask me "what are my chances, am I in an uphill climb taking on this faculty member, challenging the faculty member's decision or whatever?" The answer is it's a 50/50 shot. Over the years, it's turned out to be 50/50.

And a lot of it turns on how well prepared on how the student is and how well prepared the faculty member is. Do they come to the hearing having reviewed all the relative documents, are they on top of what happened in the incident, that sort of thing.

So what are some continuing challenges? One continuing challenge is getting a quorum. Getting a quorum for cases is a continuing thing. I see a number of alumni of the Appeals Board in the audience, they know how tough that is. And it's the number one thing.

Questions? Any questions I could

-- yes?

CALVERT:

Ken Calvert, Engineering.

Can you just break down the numbers there according to academic versus disciplinary?

FINK:

Okay.

CALVERT:

So cheating is --

FINK:

Cheating is academic, fair and just evaluation of performance is academic. No merit could be anything, it's usually going to be academic because it's coming through the Ombud.

College Honor Code, that would be classified as an academic but there are only certain colleges that have an honor code. Retroactive withdrawal would also be

academic. And then the code of student conduct would the disciplinary conduct category.

JONES: Davy Jones, College of Medicine. I have several real quick here. Who orients the new members of the committee and what are the features of the most difficult case to decide?

FINK: Okay. New members are oriented by me when I get the list from the President's Office, and that's usually in July.

The term of appointment for the students who have a one year appointment is September 1st through the end of August.

I usually get that in time to start their orientation before they start classes. Hopefully, that can be done before they start classes and their schedules get less flexible. It's a one hour conversation I have with them, hopefully I can get a group together and not do it one-by-one-by-one.

And then I just review the whole process, beginning to end, and emphasize with them the number one expectation is to check their email every day. And they don't do it. And the faculty don't do it and the students don't do it. When I'm trying to schedule a hearing, that's the number one need.

JONES: What was your second question? What are the features of the most difficult kind of academic cases you decide?

FINK: Where you have a student who comes in unprepared. They have gone to the Ombud, they've worked with the Ombud in terms of presenting their case to the Ombud.

But they then come to the Appeals Board, and when the hearing starts my opening statement to the student is: The members of the Appeals Board Panel have received in advance the packet of documents that relate to your case, but we have found it's helpful to hear from you, in our own words, what are you appealing and why. Would you please tell the Appeals Board what are you appealing and why?

And at that point, they can read a statement, they can talk extemporaneously, whatever they want to do, it's totally up to them. And we try to let them go through that without interruption.

I might interject in clarifying a question, like the student might say, well, he told me. And I'll say, wait a minute, you mean the department chair or the dean? Who is he? But I try to let them -- we try to get the Board members to hold their questions because this is a high tension thing for the student to challenge a faculty member and so forth.

So hopefully they'll go through that statement and make a clear statement of

what they're appealing and why.

And then the other thing I do, at the very end, the very last thing, we've heard from the student, we've heard from the faculty member. I then go back to the student and say, okay, we all realize this is a fairly tense situation, and sometimes you'll be sitting there thinking, holy smokes, I forgot my point number 3. Is there anything else you want to add, any other point that you maybe neglected to mention before.

And then my final questions is what would you like to see happen as a result of this process, what is it you're seeking here? Because the student's the appellant. The student is the one who initiated the activity, so what is the student seeking in that appeal.

So just getting the students to adequately participate I would say is the continuing challenge. That was a long answer, sorry.

HIPPISLEY: Any other questions?

JONES: A 30 second one. Are there any other third party advocates there, legal counsel, a disability officer, you know?

FINK: The student can bring anybody he wants to, the faculty member can bring anybody he wants to. The faculty member sometimes bring the Director of Undergraduate Studies, sometimes the Department Chair, sometimes the Associate Dean for Student Affairs. It varies.

A student can bring roommate, spouse, parent, attorney. Attorneys, from my perspective, really don't add much and the reason is that they weren't there, they don't know what happened. All their information is secondhand and they tend to drag things out because their clock is running. So I view my role as keeping them moving.

JONES: Is there anybody in the room other than committee members when the decision is being made?

FINK: Sometimes legal counsel is there. If the student has brought an attorney, the University attorney, will be, General Counsel's Office will be representing. And then they will stay during the discussion. I can't recall them ever saying anything during that phase; they're just there as a resource.

HIPPISLEY: Connie?

WOOD: Joe, Connie Wood.

We've had situations where a student has been banned from campus because of inappropriate behavior.

FINK: Right.

WOOD: The student can appeal that to the UAB.

FINK: That's correct.

UKSenateMeeting1109-15.txt

WOOD: How do you handle that?
FINK: I meet them off campus.
WOOD: The whole committee?
FINK: No, no. For the pre-hearing discussion. I meet them off campus to give them sort of the overview of the process and so forth. And he's allowed to, let's assume it's a he, he's allowed to come on campus for the hearing if it is a hearing where he is going to appear.
Now if it's a disciplinary appeal, he's not going to appear. It's going to be a review of matters based on what the student has submitted in writing, where the student thinks there's either a procedural error or newly available information.

WOOD: And so you're saying the student could not appear in that case?
FINK: It's never happened.
WOOD: But it's a question, could they.
FINK: I suppose they could if they wanted to.

WOOD: That's all. I just wondered.
FINK: Yeah. One that stands out in my mind, is the meeting I had with the student who had disrupted a class, where he came to my office and he wasn't supposed to be on campus. And I walked him back down the street so he wasn't on campus and we stood there under an overhang and had our conversation.

HIPPISLEY: Any other questions for Joe?
MCCORMICK: A number of these have gone down, which is great news.
FINK: Oh, the numbers?
MCCORMICK: The numbers. So would you attribute that to faculty being more careful in their syllabi? I guess could you tell us things that we should do to improve? And I'm curious about the number of student conduct going up three-fold.

FINK: I think in the student conduct arena what you're seeing is an increased awareness of sexual assault matters. And that's -- those ones that are going to be carved out and handled by the other thing, so they won't be on this slide in the future.

In terms of faculty, do not deviate from your syllabus. Once the syllabus is distributed, adhere to it closely. Don't change your grading scale in the middle of the course. Or don't say, well, you know that assignment, I'm going to add this assignment.

I think one of the reasons the number has gone down is because the Ombuds have done a very good job of resolving these. They've handled many more cases than we do. There are many more matters that come through their door than ever we try, and that speaks to the effectiveness of the Ombud. That's a heck of a job. That's a

terrible job in my view.
MCCORMICK: Which would suggest why the no merit is up?
FINK: Yeah. Yes, correct.
MCCORMICK: Thanks.
HIPPI SLEY: Any other questions for Joe?
Thanks very much. Thank you for all you do. We now have Marcie Deaton.
DEATON: I apologize for not being here when my name came up. I thought you all would get me like 5:00. Oh, well.
This is the regulation that establishes the Joint University Committee for honorary degrees. It came up for its routine review to the Regulation Review Committee who try to review regs about every five years. As you can see from its date, this one went on for six, we're a little behind.
The Reg Committee reviewed it. I don't consider anything that's been done to it to be substantive, but I will walk you through exactly what we did.
Is a copy in the package?
HIPPI SLEY: We can have it on the screen, too.
DEATON: Okay. So first of all, we did a few things that we do to conform it to other university regulations because we've been over the years trying to do stylistic things, grammatical things, to make all of our Regs read more consistently.
Such as in this one, after the first time we the whole committee name is out, we use the word committee. After the first time we use Board of Trustees, we use Board. It just helps for readability.
We, over the years changed from having a purpose section to calling it the introduction. But it actually calculates the purpose, why do we have this Reg. So that's the first change, we just moved it from purpose and it became the new introduction.
What else did we do? Then the more, I don't even want to call them substantive, but the more, little bit more substantive changes are over on the middle pages. First one is that we had a discussion, it said in the Reg previously that the President would appoint an ex-officio member from the senior administration.
But I think it was maybe an error because ex-officio means by nature of position. The President has not said and, you know, it will always be the Eric Monday position. So I think some years, I don't know when, but by saying nonvoting ex-officio, I think someone really meant that the President chooses someone from senior administration to be nonvoting. And as we read it, that's what we thought it meant. We changed that to be clearer.

UKSenateMeeting1109-15.txt

We also felt that there was a section called the role of the Senate, but it included the role of the Senate and the role of the President kind of all mixed up.

So when I took it to Senate Council twice, we thought it would read better if we had a section on role of the Senate and a section on role of the President. And we edited the language slightly to make it clearer how it flows through the President and the (inaudible) transmits. So that's why I've added the one sentence to make it like the process (inaudible).

What else? That's all. We had three changes there and then the stylist. It's an important committee so if anyone has any other comments about it, how it's worked, didn't work, whatever?

HIPPISLEY: Questions for Marcie? So we will vote on endorsing this. So this is a motion that comes from the Senate Council, we recommend that the Senate Body endorse the changes as you saw to the AR 11:4.

Unless there are comments right now, we'll move on and do that. Okay. This may not work immediately. Five second countdown. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion to endorse passes. Thank you, Marcie.

DEATON: Again, I apologize.

HIPPISLEY: So we traditionally now have an item called "any other business." It's not a motion. Leon Sachs had something last time, you remember. So this is a situation where anyone can stand up and say they have an issue they would like Senate at some point to address. So I'd like to entertain that now. Does anyone have anything they'd like to talk about?

Lee?

BLONDER: Lee Blonder, College of Medicine. I'd just like to know more about the process of approving an Honors College, how you as the Senate Council Chair envision that procedure?

HIPPISLEY: Okay. So a lot of people are asking about the (inaudible) College. In theory, it's a possibility.

It's quite clear from the GRs that Senate is charged with endorsing any change in academic structure and the Honors College would be quite a valuable change. And it's not just a change in academic structure. There's change in SRs. There may well be a change in admissions and standards, and there may be well be a change in the Senate, there might be a new program, it would look like a new program.

There are all sorts of ways in which Senate subcommittees and the Senate Body itself so would have to be involved in reviewing a proposal, if it was ever made,

UKSenateMeeting1109-15.txt

and then voting on its endorsement.

I should also add that it would be very tricky if a proposal for a new Honors College went to the Board of Trustees and it didn't have University Senate endorsement. It would also need a Student Senate endorsement and Staff Senate endorsement because there would be a change in GRs.

So what's happening right now is Ben Withers is leading the actual concrete proposal. He and the Provost addressed Senate Council, gave the heads up on what we were doing.

Ben Withers is going to consult with the Chairs of Academic Programs, Standards and Admissions, Rules, and Organization and Structure. This is a consultation, am I on the right track, and (inaudible).

At some point after that consultation, he will formally, on behalf of the Provost, submit a proposal to Ernie Bailey's committee on Academic Organization and Structure. He will review it, and Ernie may involve all sorts of people in this room or outside this room in his review.

That would take place and then Ernie's committee would recommend or not recommend to Senate Council. And then Senate Council will go on the agenda either with or without a recommendation for the full Senate's endorsement.

So those are the steps that will be taken.

So the proposal itself, I don't believe is completely finished yet, but I do understand it's very close to being (inaudible) and can start its way to the Senate. Does that answer your question, Lee?

BLONDER: Yes. But the proposal itself from what you described is being written by the administration or is there a faculty of record in the Honors Program involved in this? What is the grass roots faculty involvement in creating this proposal?

HI PPI SLEY: I don't know the exact composition of the authorship of the proposal. I know that Ben Withers is the lead on it, I don't know who else. So that would be a good question once it hits Senate, the faculty involved with the creation of the proposal.

BRI ON: Yes, Gail?
Gail Bri on, College of Engineering.
So is this going to be a college where the faculty within it will be granted tenure within that college?

HI PPI SLEY: I think that that's one of those very important questions which should be asked in the process. And even if the answer is yes, it's what kind? Is it

Lecturers, is it special (inaudible).

So these are valid questions.

These are questions I suspect even at the consulting stage folks like Ernie will probably ask. Senate Council has already asked those very specific questions. So those questions should have answers. Gail?

BRI ON: Because faculty in a college have to vote on the number of lecturers that would be allowed to be within the college.

HIPPISLEY: Request a percentage, yes.
Bob?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Trustee.

To address Gail's question, the initial proposal that Senate Council saw, and understand that it was very preliminary, the plan was to house I think 12 to 14 lecturers in this college. And then to have associate faculty from other colleges constitute the body of the Honors College.

So the only faculty that would have appointments in this college would be lecturers. All the other faculty would be involved in the Honors College would be in the colleges that they are in now.

BRI ON: But you have to have faculty within the college vote on how many lecturers can be within the college. So if you don't have faculty in the college you can't vote on the lecturers. This is chicken and egg.

GROSSMAN: This is obviously -- it's obviously something that's going to need to be worked out in the course. I don't see that as an insurmountable object.

HIPPISLEY: I expect the answer you'll get there is the difference between this kind of college and your kind of college is it doesn't offer degrees. So the colleges that offer degrees, most of them have faculty embedded in there. This doesn't offer degrees so --

BRI ON: It has programs and curriculum which faculty (inaudible).

HIPPISLEY: Right, right.

MCCORMICK: Do you have a time line?

HIPPISLEY: I think they're going to get moving very quickly. I've already sent an email to the chairs of those committees saying can I set up a meeting with you and Ben Withers and whoever else, so when I get a reply to that, that's step one started.

How quickly it would move to Ernie's committee after that, I don't know. I suspect they want to get on with it quite quickly.

WOOD: Connie, did you have a question? Well, I was saying that what Gail was bringing up -- Connie Wood, A and S -- is actually in terms of the current governing regulations, is one of the stickiest problems because you have to have an educational unit in order for lecturers

UKSenateMeeting1109-15.txt

to be -- who are faculty, to have primary appointments within that unit.

So this, you've brought up a really relevant point and I agree with what you're saying, but if they want people who are in the college, the faculty in the college are lecturers, how can the faculty vote to give the course to a lecturer?

BRI ON: Well, you can't. You can't have --

WOOD: I mean, but there's even a deeper problem in that is it going to be an educational unit. And our current governing regulations, do not allow for different types of colleges, those with programs and without programs as opposed to those that do. So this is going to take a great deal of finesse with and change in the governing regulations.

HIPPISLEY: Lee?

BLONDER: Lee Blonder, College of Medicine. Andrew, would it be possible or have you obtained the -- there has to be a legal agreement or a contract with the donor as to how this money is to be allocated, what the priorities are from the donor's perspective, that the University made.

And I'm wondering, do we have that document? Can you or the Senate Council review that document? I think it would be important to know what the agreement is at this point between the University Administration and the donor.

HIPPISLEY: So that's a good point and I haven't seen such a contract. I can certainly ask for it, I can't see why it would be denied.

What I know is it's been made explicit many times that anything to do with faculty decision making on programs the donor does not have a stake in that. So they've been telling the donor that from day one. He cannot decide what the curriculum is going to be. (Inaudible).

Margaret?

SCHROEDER: I just wanted -- I know I emailed you about it earlier, but there is an Honors College Committee Task Force that was created four or five years ago and we did a lot of work for a semester and a half to produce a report for the Provost.

And I was just wondering if that was being taken under consideration, because we looked at national models, interviewed students in the program, interviewed faculty affiliates in the program.

And we thought we had some pretty solid recommendations and at the time we did not have any funding to do that.

Now it seems like we have funding, but from what I read, it was not at all in line with any of the committees recommendations.

UKSenateMeeting1109-15.txt

So I don't know if it wasn't known that this document exists or this work had been done, and if so, how can we resurrect that. You know, our email accounts have changed. I don't have a personal copy of that report anymore, but if there's some digging that can be done, because there was a lot of faculty and student input and a lot of work done on that.

HIPPI SLEY: I know the report you're talking about, I believe Ben Withers actually wrote that report.

SCHROEDER: No.

HIPPI SLEY: Was it Phil Kraemer?

SCHROEDER: Phil Harling.

HIPPI SLEY: Not you, Phil?

KRAEMER: No.

HIPPI SLEY: Okay. This is about five years ago.

SCHROEDER: It was Phil Harling.

WOOD: Phil Harling.

HIPPI SLEY: Phil Harling wrote the report?

SCHROEDER: He was the chair of our committee.

UNIDENTIFIED: Phil Harling?

SCHROEDER: Yes.

HIPPI SLEY: How many years ago was that, roughly?

SCHROEDER: I think it was four or five years ago.

BAILEY: Actually, 2010.

HIPPI SLEY: So I'll do some research and try and dig out that report of all those chairs and have that in advance of any meeting.

SCHROEDER: And the people proposing this; right?

HIPPI SLEY: Should. One would hope that they've seen the report, but I will make sure that (inaudible) and that that will happen.

SCHROEDER: Thank you.

WOOD: I just wanted to concur with what Lee requested, and that is I think it's very important that as the committees work through this, that we know exactly what is, you know, what the commitments are from the donor and from the University.

HIPPI SLEY: I will also say that I don't think the committees or this Body should be constrained by anything that's written in the contract.

WOOD: Well, if it's a contract, we're constrained.

HIPPI SLEY: Any other questions? Liz?

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S.

In the preliminary discussions has there also been discussion of administrative component for this Honors College?

HIPPI SLEY: Like who's going to be in charge of it?

DEBSKI: Like is there going to be a dean, lecturers?

GROSSMAN: The current plan is there will be a dean.

DEBSKI : And how about other administrative
 facul ty?

HIPPISLEY: It will come out slowly. Thanks,
 Lee, for bringing up your point. I've got
 some action to do. Any other kind of
 business people would like to bring up? If
 not, you can always propose a motion to
 adjourn.

WOOD: So moved.

SCHROEDER: Second.

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