

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

FEBRUARY 8, 2016

* * * *

* * * *

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

* * * *

* * * *

HI PPI SLEY: I want to call the meeting to order, please. Please make sure you have a clicker. Order, please. Order. For our first slide, as usual, are you here. Ten second countdown. All right. You are here, that's great.
All right. No corrections were received so the minutes of December 14, 2015 are approved unless there's an objection now.
Please be warned that the March Senate meeting won't be the first Monday of the month, it will be on the third Monday.
A couple of web transmittals. Please just keep track of all web transmittals. Sheila Brothers always sends them out, so look and see what's there.
Happy new year, everybody. It is the year of the Monkey and to celebrate that you have been invited by

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt
the Confucius Institute to the Boone Center from 5 to 7. And I think that's free.

A forum on public art, is Ben Withers here? Okay. This is something that's going to happen on the 29th of February. It is co-sponsored with Senate. We're going to have, in this very room, a public forum on art. We'll have special panelists, including Melynda Price, to discuss the intentionality of defacement of public art and public art in educational context. So it should be interesting. And I'll send more warnings as it gets closer.

Soyna Feist-Price is a co-chair of a special faculty subcommittee on unconscious or implicit bias. This is an initiative by the President to improve our diversity and inclusion on the campus, and part of that will be directed to faculty, specifically through this faculty subcommittee.

We're going to send out a notification to anybody who wants to be part of being trained and training in unconscious bias. So this will be an email I will send out. I'm also co-chair of the committee and I'll send that email in due course. Is Sonya here? She's not here.

Okay. We have a new Senate Council member, Amani Doyle, are you here Amanee, replacing Sarah.

I did mention this Honors College faculty advisory committee last time and this is the composition. I believe they've done their work, but (inaudible) is in office, if you need to be in touch with anybody. And you'll notice David Royster and Bruce Webb were the two that Senate Council appointed, so these are also people that you can contact.

We replaced someone on the UK Core Culture Citizenship. Buck Ryan is now a new person on that.

There are a number of calendar changes and deviations that you can see there.

Katherine is in Cambodia, so she cannot give her report right now.

Kate is going to tell us something.

SEAGO: Okay. I'm just covering parliamentarian. Parliamentary procedure, which is when and if during a meeting the chair elects to step down temporarily because they wish to speak for or against a particular item.

Since the chair normally should be neutral, when a chair decides that

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt

they can't remain neutral then a chair person pro tem comes forward. Usually that's the vice chair.

In this case, our vice chair/secretary has decided to be out of the country, in which case the chair can temporarily appoint another member of the body to step in during that time period.

I just wanted to let you know about that. Any questions? Okay.

HIPPISLEY: I just saw Ben walking into the room and I would want to allow Ben to talk a little about the public art forum.

WITHERS: Should I come down there or should I do it from here?

HIPPISLEY: You can do it from there.

WITHERS: On February 29th, we're sponsoring a town hall forum. This follows up with a town hall forum we had on Constitution Day, that looked at confederate imagery in public places.

That was well-attended and well-received and that's the point that we decided to go forward with this.

This is also related to a new AR that was passed last year to create a committee for public art. The idea is to try to create a more intentional and strategic view of public art so that we can make sure that we are representing the campus well and making sure that we're using public art in an educational way.

This all predates the current discussions about the Memorial Hall Mural and even the national discussions about this, so it was well-timed in that way. And it also shows that this campus has been proactive in trying to have these discussions.

So we invite you all to come. It's going to be the 29th. It's going to be right here. It starts at 6:30. There will be a message that will come out that will provide more details.

We're got the advertisement ready, it will come out here just about any day. Anything else you need, Andrew?

HIPPISLEY: Who are the panelists?

WITHERS: I'll see if I can remember them all. Rick Schein from geography, we've got Melinda Price, College of Law, Arturo Sandoval, from the College of Fine Arts. We've asked Jim Clark, who is now on the Advisory Board for the Ashland Estate, for the longest time, he was the CEO of LexArts. And the person who is moderating will be Stewart Horodner from the Art Museum.

HIPPISLEY: So do we have a Trustee Report?

WILSON: Bob and John?
We don't have a formal report.
We always want to entertain questions.

GROSSMAN: I guess the one thing that of course it's on everyone's mind is some thing that the President and our EPVFA are about to address. So we'll defer to them to answer questions about that. Does someone want to get that, please?

UNIDENTIFIED: I can't.

GROSSMAN: I tell my students that if ring tones go off in class I'll start dancing. If you really want me to do that, go on. I have yet to have a ring tone go off.

UNIDENTIFIED: I'm tempted, Bob, I really am.

GROSSMAN: Any questions? Okay.

WILSON: Bob and I try to answer emails and phone calls promptly, so if you do have questions, please ask.

HIPPISLEY: Okay. So I'd like to invite our President of UK, Eli Capilouto.

CAPILOUTO: Thank you, Andrew, and thank all of you for being here.

The next few weeks mark in my tenure some of the most serious tasks and responsibility I'll ever have, and that involves engaging our legislature and executive branching government over the proposed budget cuts to the University of Kentucky and all colleges and universities throughout the Commonwealth.

Today I just want to give you a preview of some of the things I'll be saying. I want to build on a conversation that was started through the email that I shared with you the day after the budget was introduced by the Governor.

I want to be able to answer any questions or concerns that you have, at least to the point that I have knowledge about those now. And I want to share with you what I think our future looks like.

I will be telling your story. It is a powerful story. It is one of impact, purpose, and promise. Thanks to all the incredible things you do, this Kentucky story, I believe, is going to be well-received.

We will not concede anything, anything, from the healing arts to the liberal arts in this discussion.

Now here's what I'm telling people about this cut, which I'll describe in a little more detail in a moment, this is chilling. It chills almost everything we do because it is our first dollar. It chills our momentum that we had gained when we are evolving better ways to teach and ways

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt

to treat and cure and ways to discover and ways to serve. And we cannot afford to interrupt that story.

So to describe the process to you now, the budget's been introduced. I will be having individual discussions with legislators over the next few weeks. I will testify in front of the committee, in the House, this Thursday about the budget.

As in every year, the Senate and House probably won't agree on a budget. It will go to a conference committee and those will go on for two or three days and hopefully, a budget will be (inaudible).

I want you to know that I will be there every step of the way and we have a wonderful team, including Steve Byars, who is our liaison in Frankfort.

And what we have there is something that is immeasurable. And that is trust. Everything we have said we were going to do, we do. And they believe in you. I want them -- and they tell me they believe in you -- but I want them to tell you they believe in you in this budget.

So I had our leadership team looking at what could be some of the scenarios of what I'm going to call potential reductions. I'm not going to concede on those yet. And you know, we'll follow a couple of principles.

Number 1, we're not doing things simple like across-the-board reductions if that's going to be the case. And number 2, we're going to use as guidelines some of the things we've learned in the strategic plan that was just passed by the Board of Trustees.

This is what I love telling people about the University of Kentucky. We're educating more students than we ever have before. We're treating more patients with serious illnesses than we ever have before. And we're attracting more research and rendering more service than we ever have before.

In the last six years, enrollment's up 13 percent, the number of degrees conferred during that period up 15 percent.

We have slowed the rate of tuition growth. I had my office do a little analysis because I saw an article in the New York Times, a few weeks ago, that said when you control for inflation, on average across the United States, tuition had gone up 33 percent above inflation.

So I said, "I want to know what students at the University of Kentucky,

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt
during this time period, on average,
have paid out-of-pocket above the rate
of inflation." It's only 6 percent.

We've slowed the growth of
tuition. And when the state could not
pick up the tab to cover the scholarship
requests for students with need, we
stepped in and did so. We stepped in
and did it. We fulfilled that
responsibility. And it shows in those
numbers.

Our awards and research grants,
up 20 percent in the last year and a
half. And our hospital, what a story
there, since 2003, the number of
admissions has nearly doubled. I think
we've gone from 19,000 to 37 - 38,000.
An incredible story.

And I will dare anybody,
anybody in this state to tell me who has
done more with less than the University
of Kentucky. We have been innovative,
we have been creative, and we've painted
a bright future.

So here's the budget as it
stands proposed. In this fiscal year,
starting with our current state
appropriation, \$200 and roughly 80
million, there's a 4 and a half percent
cut proposed, which means by the end of
the year, one way or another, we have to
return nearly \$13 million.

For next year, there would be a
9 percent cut from that \$279 million
base. So that's \$25.2 million. Our
base appropriation goes down to \$254.

Now the next year is when it
gets very interesting because you really
cut our state budget by a third. \$84.7
million. Every college and university
in the state, publicly funded, would
have their budget decreased by a third,
and this money would all go into a
performance funding pool. So our base
would be \$169.7 million.

So I don't have anything really
against performance funding, we talked
about doing some of those things here.
And we worked with our fellow university
presidents to come up with a performance
funding formula to earn new money. Not
a big pot like this that's taking money
away.

So what did we have in that
performance pool? Here's some of the
simple metrics. We had number of
degrees, and if you do a better job in
graduating those from under-represented
minorities, our low income families,
that counts more.

We track progression of
students for student success, retention
and progression throughout their entire

time here.

We had a metric in there for research. So we tried to keep it simple. We put some money in play that we would like to earn, but that was rejected.

My difficulty is this proposal to reduce something by 33 percent. By the way, the Governor mentioned the following year he'd like to take 66 percent and the year after that, 100 percent.

So that just introduces too much uncertainty. It introduces instability. You know you don't recruit students for a year at a time, you don't recruit faculty a year at a time. You need some time to plan.

And given the things I've told you we've done and how successful we've been, I like to think we're not that broken that you need to put 100 percent of our funding in a performance pool, and I hope people will listen to what we have to say about this.

So why this \$750 million? When you take the (inaudible) and you combine the tuition, it's \$750 million. I like to say it's the seed bed. From that everything else happens. That's why it's so important.

So my office has put together this little engine here. The nice little picture sums it up. It's \$280 million that the state gives us to build a little engine with a flatbed on the back and look what we load onto it. Yep, we do charge tuition, \$470 million, but the rest of this revenue is typically generated.

Sales, services and other income, 288, auxiliary, \$100 million of that is athletics. No state money goes into athletics whatsoever. There are only ten universities in the country, ten, where athletic departments return money to the university, and we're one of them. Gifts, grants, and contracts, (inaudible) and then our hospital system at \$1.38 billion.

So where does that 280 million mean? There aren't too many people that don't have some of those dollars in their paycheck. So it hires our talent.

I just had lunch with a donor, he's got a company of 5500 people, offices throughout the region, who said the most important, the most valuable asset he had in his company, he couldn't put on his balance sheet.

That goes for us too, it's our talent. Talent and infrastructure make everything else happen. It helps us to

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt
recruit students, recruit and retain
faculty. It helps us to serve 120
counties throughout Kentucky and our
extension offices.

So this is what I'll be telling
our elected representatives. This,
everything that can happen here, will be
chilled if we have to realize cuts of
this severity.

This is something else I'll
show you. This is, over the last couple
years, the changes in higher education
funding across our region. So you look
at Florida, they're increasing 11.4
percent. 8.5 percent. 6.3. 4.8. We
went down a percent and a half. That's
before we put in all these cuts. So
while other states are doubling down,
we're double cutting.

Last year, I went to the
Southern Legislative Regional Conference
in Savannah, Georgia. Why did I go, a
lot of our legislators were there and
they wanted me to come to be part of
welcoming all those legislators to next
year's convention, which is going to be
here in Lexington.

I assume they're going
to have a great party here, because
they're going to come to thank us for
picking off all their talent, do funding
like this. You can't do that; it's too
precious. We're going to be able to
tell them why, we are not going to
provide over the biggest brain drain in
Kentucky's modern history.

So I know we make lots of
investments in Kentucky. We try to
bring new entities here, create jobs.
But I dare say there's too many places
in Kentucky that the state makes a \$280
million investment that generates a \$3.4
billion enterprise, \$1.3 billion of
payroll.

I told legislators last week in
the (inaudible), we have about \$1.9
billion of construction. Only 10
percent of that has come from the state
of Kentucky. We know from our first
housing phase, \$400 million, we created
9,300 jobs and generated \$21 million in
this state in local taxes.

We had something like 230 -
\$280 million of expenditures in
Kentucky. That's only on \$400 million.
Can you imagine what it was at \$1.9
billion?

I contend we drove the economy.
We made the economy in this region and
throughout the Commonwealth, and you
don't want to chill it.

Another thing it chills, I tell
people, is philanthropy because I'm out

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt

there every day asking people, you know, invest in the University of Kentucky.

If your elected officials don't believe in you and don't invest in you, it's hard for the donors to think this is something I want to invest in. So this is why this is so important.

So I want to share something else, too. We're interested in educating a well-rounded student. So I've told people that I meet, and I will be carrying this with me, all through my time in Lexington. But, you know, I can write some nice prose about why the Liberal Arts are important. But I tell people, this is what our students wanted me to tell you about.

So this is "Shaping Space", the dance concert (inaudible). So I was so happy to open it because it has a little by note on all of performers. You ought to take a look at this sometime. I'm not going to skip any of them, but I'm going to read their majors. First one, doctoral candidate and first year medical student. Second, double major in biology and Spanish. Third, arts administration. Fourth, senior biology major, (inaudible). Accounting major, minoring in dance. Freshman neuroscience major. Freshman political science, pre-law. I can go on. That's what they all sound like.

Why, because this generation knows that to be successful you got to expand beyond your discipline. You got to grow into a consciousness that understands other people. You have to have civic responsibility. You got to know how to work with a team where people are different than you and come from different backgrounds and different perspectives.

That's why you have to have a well-rounded education and that's what the University for Kentucky (inaudible). Thank you very much. (APPLAUSE)

Sure. I'm happy to answer questions. Yes.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Board of Trustees.

So we often get a letter from the administration telling us, "don't call your legislators, we have a central office that's in charge of communicating with the legislature."

CAPILOUTO: So here, don't stop dreaming. Don't stop doing good things. Do what you do every day to make every student a success, to serve every constituent we have.

We're going to get through this. We're going to understand exactly

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt

the message to shape and we will turn to you on how you can help us write and deliver that message. Sorry, I got going on that performing art and I lost myself. Yes.

TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering.
So you told us what you will not do. I think one of them wouldn't cut across every single budget. There is a lot of anxiety among my college understandably (inaudible) at least for this year, you would not do or it is the lower priorities such as staff layoffs, denying tenure to people who are going up for promotion right now, not to give any raises, not to give any --

CAPILOUTO: I can only say this: That is not the first place we go. Okay? We don't rush to that. We don't start there. All right?

This gentleman I had lunch with today, he had a wonderful perspective about it, I said, oh, you still grow your business? He said, I grow my business so that my evolving talent will stay.

So let's don't start thinking about how we're going to retrench and how we're going to turn back and all of that. Let's think creatively. Look how much we've grown over the last few years.

You know what our applications are for our University this year compared to same time last year? There are what, 2500 students. 2500. There are 500 more students that want to be engineers than they did last year.

People want to come here. We have you. We have facilities. I toured that new academic science building. That's going to knock people's socks off. It conveys to people that we care about their education and we're going to use those classrooms in innovative ways to teach better so people can learn in ways they never imagined. So let's think that way first. Yes?

BLONDER: Lee Blonder, Medicine.

Some of us are on a listserv for the faculty, it's presidents around the state, from state universities, and there's talk about the students and the parents having a protest in Frankfort, or demonstration, over this budget. Have you heard about that? Are you aware of that?

CAPILOUTO: No, not fully. I haven't heard that, Lee. If you'd share that with us, I'd appreciate it. I haven't seen it. Yes?

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S.
So the word on the street is

that the higher educators of this state didn't have much notification with regard to these cuts. And I'm wondering to what extent the governor is going to consult in making such things as the performance metrics and stuff like that with the higher educators?

CAPILOUTO: Conversations are well in play and, you know, I'm saying to you that some of the most important conversations you don't read about in the newspaper. They're trusting relationships that we've had for four or five years that we've built and we talk to people and people want to work things out and listen and hear what you have to say and all.

So I think people recognize how serious this could be. Nobody is saying we don't talk to you. It's just the opposite, people want to engage and hear what we have to say. I'm encouraged. Yes?

VASCONEZ: President Capilouto, I appreciate your words, and I just wondered if the cuts were proportionate throughout higher education at institutions in Kentucky.

I mean, you talked about all the things that the University of Kentucky has done, and the ones that it had, it's raised its level in all these different areas. I mean, and then this performance fund, I mean, are we going to be pitted against all the other institutions in higher education to show performance? What is your take on that?

CAPILOUTO: First of all, the cuts were pretty much across the board. You heard the Governor in his presentation, talked about triing up some universities. So I'm sure that (inaudible).

The presidents and all got together to say, no, this took a long time to get everybody to agree to, as you can imagine.

There were different components in the budget. There was the performance pool and Louisville and University of Kentucky's research universities had performance metrics. You're really competing against yourself there, in a way, for new money.

And then the comprehensive universities had a performance pool. And then there was Bucks for Brains in the budget as well. There was a couple of special line items for Kentucky State University, and one for community colleges to deal with issues particular to them.

And then there was a pool of money for equity funding and it was

largely a pool of money for the comprehensive university and it was just a simple calculation on state dollars per student. And when you do that simple calculation, Northern Kentucky University and Western got an increase. So that's the budget. Oh, so it is across the board.

My real challenge with performance funding is it's just such a mystery, you know, people want to get together and work on it and so forth. We worked on it and we came up with something that I think was to the point, simple but compelling of how the funds that you want to pursue and that was rejected.

So you know, the question is what is the right answer? And I just think that it introduces too much uncertainty in many of the things we do and (inaudible).

CROSS: Al Cross, Communication and Information.

CAPILOUTO: Are you hear as a faculty member or as a journalist?

CROSS: I'm always a journalist.

CAPILOUTO: Always a journalist.

CROSS: Every American has the first amendment right to be a journalist. They're really two different proposals here. You have the cuts for current year, next biennium. Then you have the whole idea of the different ways to put together higher education funding.

On which of those points are you most encouraged by talking to legislators?

CAPILOUTO: I couldn't tell you yet. And it's simply because I feel my days this week. You know, you got to realize, you know, the governor had just a few weeks to put together his budget. That's a challenging thing when you're bringing in a whole new team and so forth.

And then, the House, I know last week started their hearing in understanding every bit of the budget. Now, everybody, I think, is more fully acquainted with this budget. And we can understand the questions they're asking, so now we're going to start having our conversation. I wouldn't want to answer based on the limited conversations I had. We'll have many, many more. Yes?

BRI ON: Gail Bri on, College of Engineering.

In some states they have written into the state constitution that when the amount of funding from the state drops below a certain percentage of the budget, I'm thinking University of Colorado, Boulder, and it's 6

percent, then the state no longer has the authority to determine what degrees are given or any input on tuition. And the university essentially becomes an (inaudible).

Has there been any discussion within the House and the Senate as to if this type of legislation might be appropriate for Kentucky? At what point is this funding irrelevant?

CAPILOUTO: I haven't heard that discussion. \$280 million is not irrelevant. You know, I joked with Mike Richey the other day, our Vice President for Philanthropy. I said, "Mike, I've got the answer, and I'm not joking when I say this, I need 2,000 people to give at least a million dollars." That's \$2 billion, that's \$100 million a year payout, if you're at 5 percent.

BRI ON: I just wondered.
CAPILOUTO: I'll be knocking on your door.
BRI ON: I just wondered at what point in time does the funding from the state no longer provide them a say in what (inaudible).

CAPILOUTO: It's just essential to us right now. It is essential and there is no substitute. Yes?

LEE: Chad Lee, College of Ag, Food, and Environment.

In these discussions, I've heard nothing mentioned in terms of performance and such on the Land Grant Mission component, which makes us different than most other universities in the state. Has that been discussed at all?

CAPILOUTO: Yeah. There is not a metric, you know, that we have 208 -- we have an allocation of \$280 million. And \$80 million of that goes almost immediately out the door to mandated programs.

Now, within those programs there's all kind of ways that success is measured. But no, there wasn't. And that would be a very hard one to come up with.

LEE: A quick follow-up then. One, I appreciate your stance and what you're saying, but do we have a contingency plan if they start going down this road of metrics and performance based? Do we have some people, key people, that are in communication on that side of the equation? Or I know --

CAPILOUTO: I am confident that the team at the University of Kentucky knows as much about performance funding as anybody in this state. That's the way I feel about our team. Yes?

LEHMAN: I'm Christina Lehman, I'm an undergrad in the College of Business.

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt

My question was more so for I know a lot of students are nervous about this. I think about my younger siblings who would go to college at another point.

What do you recommend for students to do? Because I know in student government we have maybe discussed contacting our local representatives from where we're from, talking to them, reaching out in other ways.

Would you recommend these things as well?

CAPILOUTO: Stay tuned. I know if you just sort of spray and pray with different messages, it gets lost for busy people. So let us understand a little more of what the openings look like and then we will get back to you. But I'm so glad that you want to be engaged, thank you. Yes?

SCHROEDER: Margaret Mohr-Schroeder, College of Education.

In the paper this past week, they mentioned something about the presidents getting together to discuss specifically that 4 and a half percent executive cut and perhaps spreading it out over a longer period of time rather than just throughout this fiscal year.

Do you have any more information on that or do you know when that -- you guys might be able to come to some kind of determination on that with the governor?

CAPILOUTO: I think that swallowing that is a little more difficult depending on the institution. It is a lot for us to swallow and we certainly want to wait to the last day that we have to pay, if we're going to have to pay.

SCHROEDER: Do you feel like we are going to have to pay the 4 and a half percent?

CAPILOUTO: Well, the 4 and a half percent, you know, I'm a new Kentuckian, people still debate these things, but I'm pretty sure the governor has the authority to do that. I don't think he has to get the legislature to approve it.

Now what he said to some people who said how difficult it would be, is I'm willing to work with you to spread it out. That's what you read about.

SCHROEDER: Is UK one of those people that he's willing to work with? Sorry, I'm just asking. I'm just curious.

CAPILOUTO: Good question. Yeah, I'm encouraged by flexibility on a lot of things. No promises, but, you know, we're going - what is in our fight song, till the battle is won. Yes?

SACHS: I'm Leon Sachs in the College

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt
of Arts and Sciences.

I have a question. I don't know if there's an answer to it. But when the budget was announced, or when the governor's intentions were announced, and there was a gasp, a collective gasp, there was also a collective sigh of relief with respect to K through 12.

And I was wondering if the people on your team, are more knowledgeable about these things than I am, can establish some kind of articulation when you have a chilling effect on 13 through 16 and beyond, higher ed, and not have a negative impact on K through 12? Is there a way to articulate that?

CAPILOUTO: I think that's a good point and I think they're intertwined, and we'll certainly look for those opportunities. It is education. We're not competing for the opportunity to make our students knowledgeable and wise, and we need them prepared when they get here.

And I'm glad you raised that question for another reason. And I say this with great respect. Our financial challenges in Kentucky are real. When we make a promise to someone about their pension, that's a serious commitment.

And when the governor tried to make a big step to do that and he knows he's got a lot more to do, I respect that. And when he cares about prison guards that are guarding people who kill people, and they work five 12 hour shifts for \$26,000 a year, I can understand it.

When he's worried about retaining social workers that go into the hardest homes to tackle, you know, all kinds of problems, you have to respect that. So, you know, I'm not -- I go into all of this mindful that in many ways, we're all in this together.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Board of Trustees.

So that actually brings up the question of revenue. Everyone who had looked at this issue over the last 20 years agrees that our -- that we desperately need tax reform. Is this something the University is going to lobby for?

CAPILOUTO: We have certain sort of capital we expend and that really has to start first with elected officials. They got to hear it from the people that put them in office and they have to compose (inaudible). There are all kinds of options out there.

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt

You know, when the last tax reform commission met, we testified in front of that group, and offered opinions and ideas on our economy and commented and so forth. We're certainly there for that. Any other questions? Yes, sir.

WHITAKER: Mark Whitaker, Arts and Sciences.

Could funding uncertainty affect accreditation, for example, SACS accreditation, other professional accreditation? Has that been taken into account?

CAPILOUTO: Certainly, it could in time. I don't think you're going to be able to run to an accrediting agency and say, hey, tell us if we're going to be unaccredited and the state is going to say, oh, that's the reason.

They -- we've got a great story to tell about Kentuckians and what we do for Kentucky. And I have a great respect for our accreditation. It helps us be a quality institution. But we've got to tell our story. Yes?

SANDMEYER: Bob Sandmeyer, Arts and Sciences.

You mentioned at the beginning, talking about scenarios with potential reductions, and you used the strategic plan as a guidepost. And in the strategic plan, it mentions that in regards to the changing finances and sustainability of funding sources, while some areas are unpredictable, tuition, private gift giving and other sources have taken on more importance. So this is a revenue question.

What is your thinking about tuition, given the cuts that we have? I mean, I understand the importance of a slow growth tuition, but when we look abroad to the broader area, there's a -- well, I'm just wondering what your views on tuition are right now.

CAPILOUTO: Well, I'll tell you what we've done in the last four years. We have really tempered our tuition increases. And you look at our price and the value you get for it, go around the country, and I think we represent incredible value.

If you think about the price and you take the mix of our students, we open our doors widest for Kentuckians, 35 percent of all the people admitted last year are Pell grant recipients, those are the Kentuckians.

We have a higher mix of non-residents who pay, on average, double. That helps us do some of the things we're able to do.

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt

And I'm very proud to tell people, 53 percent of our graduates have no debt. And of those who have debt, it averages \$26,000.

I noticed somebody in elected position said, was worried that they had a child or relative or somebody that had, you know, graduated from college, not ours, I told them if they had come here, he wouldn't have this problem, you know, the child had \$40,000 in debt.

Out of 6,000 graduates, we have less than 200 people that had debt over \$35,000. And when you look at that, a lot of them are in fields where they're going to start off in high paying jobs.

So I think we have been quite differential to access and affordability. Does this put pressure on tuition increase? Sure. Thank you.

HIPPISLEY: Thank you very much and if you want us to help you tell our story, how should we do that? Should we email?

CAPILOUTO: We will get it to you.
(APPLAUSE).

HIPPISLEY: All right. Thank you very much. We're going to start with quite a few committee reports. I'll invite Margaret to the floor. She's the chair of our Academic Programs Committee and she has a few reports.

SCHROEDER: Okay. The first is the recommendation that the University Senate approve the suspension of admission into the existing BS in Spanish in the Department of Hispanic Studies within the College of Arts and Sciences.

I'm sorry, give me a minute. I thought I had this pulled up. All right, there it is.

So the recommendation for this suspension came out of the most recent external review, from 2013, to strengthen the BA in Spanish.

The External Review Committee specifically wanted to reduce the number of outside hours, while increasing the number of Spanish requirements. And the department did this. The changes occurred and the BA program was strengthened in 2013.

Meanwhile, the department submitted paperwork for the BS in Spanish suspension. It took a while to get through the system, and since implementing the new BA program, there actually has been no student who declared the BS major as a primary major, and there are three students currently finishing up the BS in Spanish as a second degree.

All three have been notified

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt

that they must complete the degree in five years from the date of suspension and all three are on track to complete it. All other program requirements are there.

Are there any questions?

HIPPISLEY: The motion is on the floor.

FIEDLER: I have no opposition to this, but it's my understanding that every degree program has to allow for the BS program. How is it that Spanish gets around this rule?

SCHROEDER: I will defer to Dean Kornbluh in the room or Ruth.

BEATTIE: Ruth Beattie, Arts and Sciences.

A number of years ago, the Educational Policy Committee and the faculty of Arts and Sciences voted that a program did not have to have both a BS and a BA degree.

HIPPISLEY: Any other questions? Hearing none, we will vote. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries.

SCHROEDER: All right. The next one is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the deletion of the Dramatics and Speech Education Certification Program in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction within the College of Education.

Okay. This one was found in Senate Council office for cleaning up, and correct me if I'm wrong, Sheila, it's the longest standing one. Yes, 2005.

It was submitted for deletion back in 2005, admissions to the program were actually suspended in the early 2000s because the English Education program and its resulting certificate absorbed the teacher certificate, per changes in certification at the Education Professional Standards Board, who issues teacher certificates in Kentucky.

Both current deans of College of Education and College of Fine Arts continue to support this deletion and the program has actually been deleted from SACSCOC a while ago. So this is a clean up on our end.

Questions?

HIPPISLEY: Hearing none, let's vote.

Five, four, three, two, one. No opposed.

SCHROEDER: Thank you. Okay. The last one is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new graduate certificate in College, Career and Civic Life Teaching and Learning Certificate in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction within the

College of Education.

I'm happy to report this is a current certificate proposal. The College and Career in Civic Framework for Social Studies State Standards was published in September 2013, a national leader in education, the state of Kentucky is paving the way for the C3 framework to take hold across the Commonwealth.

And in order to align classroom experiences with this new wave of reform, in-service teachers will need opportunities to improve their instructional practice in collaboration, communication, technology, critical thinking, problem solving in K-12 classrooms.

The C3 certificate will also be a pathway to more robust P-12 clinical placements, with more highly experienced teachers connected to pre-service teachers in our College of Education Programs.

Moreover, the certificate will be critical to clinical professional development for practicing teachers, who need to demonstrate competencies in 21st century innovative practices for next generation social studies classrooms.

The C3 certificate will require 9 credit hours of coursework or the equivalent of three graduate classes. There are no additional resources needed in the college for this certificate. The targeted audience for the certificate is practicing social studies teachers in the state of Kentucky.

There are currently 15 students in a pilot program for this certificate and the faculty of record hope to recruit 15 new students every two years for the program.

Questions? Yes.

KENNEDY: Michael Kennedy, Emeritus.

I'm having trouble reading that. Graduate Certificate in --

SCHROEDER: College career in --

KENNEDY: No, I'm just talking about the grammar. Is that -- certificate is in there twice.

GROSSMAN: The motion. Fourth line of the motion, the first word is redundant.

SCHROEDER: College Career in Civic Life, Teaching and Learning, in the Department -- okay.

SEAGO: Friendly amendment.

SCHROEDER: Friendly amendment.

HIPPI SLEY: Does anyone propose -- is the proposer of the certificate in the room?

SCHROEDER: Joan Mazur is here for the certificate.

HIPPI SLEY: Does that seem right, Joan, if

we strike out the second certificate?

MAZUR:

Yes.

HIPPI SLEY:

Other questions? We'll vote on the amendment, just as amended.

Countdown, five, four, three, two, one.

Motion carries. Thank you.

I would like to invite Ernie Bailey with a few recommendations.

BAILEY:

Our committee has two proposals. The first thing, a name change from the Department of Health and Behavior to the Department of Health, Behavior and Society, in the College of Public Health.

Mark Swanson, is Mark Swanson here? Yeah. He's the contact person for this proposal.

The Department of Health Behavior is one of six departments in the College of Public Health with eight faculty members. And they conduct research and they teach in a program leading to a bachelor's, master's and doctor of public health in the college. And the courses are listed as CPH for the College of Public Health.

The reason they would like to make the name change is that their field has evolved, and I think in the proposal, in the letter, I've got a better description of it. Basically, the health behavior doesn't describe the activities that they're doing as well as the current name.

The proposal has been reviewed by the faculty who approved it. It's been looked at by the (inaudible) in the college. And I think there was several other deans that had looked at it beforehand and basically approved it. And the committee voted, our committee voted unanimously for recommended approval of this proposal.

HIPPI SLEY:

Any questions for Ernie or Mark Swanson? Vote on the proposal. Five, four, three, two, one. The motion carries, (inaudible) to 2 against.

So I am now going to hand over my clicker to Phil Kraemer, who is the vice chair of Senate Council incoming, and he is now going chair the meeting, pro tem.

KRAEMER:

What button do I push? You're in good hands.

BAILEY:

The proposer for the next proposal is Andrew, and this is why he has stepped out, because I suspect he's prepared to answer questions.

There is a program, this proposal to create a new Department of Linguistics. There is currently a linguistics program, which is an interdisciplinary degree program,

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt

offering a BA/BS and master's degree, as well as a minor.

The faculty members come from a variety of different departments but there is a core of nine faculty, eight from the Department of English, and one from the Department of Modern and Classical Languages, all who teach exclusively linguistic courses under the course acronym LIN.

This proposal has been supported by the Arts and Sciences deans executive committee, which is the faculty council of Arts and Sciences. The chair of the Department of English supported the proposal and had a committee meeting, and 33 of the faculty in English voted in favor with 1 opposed. The chair of Modern and Classical Languages said that they also supported 25 for and 1 opposed, 4 abstaining. And there were letters of support from a number of benchmark universities that have similar programs that said this was an appropriate (inaudible).

So our committee looked it and recommended approval again on this proposal. There is one thing I will say is that I think there were -- one of the questions that came up, there was an issue if you looked at the letter, in terms of resources available for the program, there were modest discrepancies between what the dean has said and what the committee has said, but they were really small and not something that we considered to be relevant to the discussion. That's something they should be able to hash out themselves.

KRAEMER: So the motion is on the floor, any questions? Discussion? Let's vote. Five, four, three, two, one. 85-2, it carries.

HIPPISLEY: That was an emotional moment for me, I confess. All right. Moving on. Scott Yost, Chair of Academic Standards Committee.

YOST: Good afternoon, all. I appreciate your time here to discuss the committee proposals. I know that we have so many of them, and I know we've got actually some more in the future. I'm here to talk about the excused absences proposal. I think if I were to take a poll (inaudible). Let me take a vote with this 20 percent rule, just a curiosity question.

How many people believe that the 20 percent applies to unexcused and excused absences? Okay, very good. So this is good. So the senators we expect them to basically know the issue.

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt

This particular proposal coming to us, based on the annual report filed by our Ombud, Dr. Healy, who I believe is here in the back, in trying to seek clarification because there's been a number of faculty and/or students who have wanted to use this particular 20 percent rule, shall we say, in a way that necessarily shouldn't apply.

So the goal of this particular proposal, from that report, was to put clarification in the Senate Rule to specifically articulate when the 20 percent rule applies and also what is -- what are the rules, if any guidance, shall we say, for the unexcused absences portion. The 20 percent does specifically apply only to excused absences.

So with that, a couple things. One is we want to just clarify that the first and -- I'm going to go to the unexcused first policy or part of this, for clarification, that the unexcused absences are entirely left up to the instructor of record as to what -- how a class or how you would treat unexcused absences.

If you do not put any policy in your syllabus or you do not have grades associated with attendance issues, then you are not allowed to penalize a student, whatsoever, for any unexcused absences. You might as well not even take attendance in your classroom.

The other half dealt with the 20 percent rule was to -- what happens if a student for excused absence purposes exceeds a certain threshold, in this case, currently, our predecessors before us put in the "one-fifth of 20 percent rule" and it was specifically under the assumption that being engaged, participate in the class, being there for a class is certainly an important part of learning.

And then it's also tied in with accreditation. We have accreditation bodies that say if students miss more than a certain percentage, you are not allowed to let them satisfactorily complete the class.

So with that, this particular proposal again, I think you read it all, is just to take and clarify that the 20 percent, the one-fifth rule, applies only to excused absences. And a student, if that 20 percent rule kicks in, the student is asked or could be asked to petition for a "W" for the course, in other words, and this is like after the withdrawal.

So over the entire semester, a

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt

student could petition for the withdrawal from the course. And if the student does not want to petition for to withdraw from the course, then the faculty of record does have the authority to give them an "I" for the course, to help accommodate if, in fact, you do need to have some key for accreditation or for your own particular goal that, you know, being part of my class is important.

So that's kind of the background, the history, everything in a nutshell. Questions?

HIPPISLEY:

Kaveh?

TAGAVI:

Maybe I'm misreading this, so please help me.

As I recall the rule used to be that the student could ask for a "W" and the professor could force a "W". It seems we are changing the rule instead of forcing the "W", going to an "I", but "I" might not be appropriate.

You can only give "I" to somebody who has a very good chance of getting a passing grade. By a rule, we cannot give "I" just because somebody is missing.

And on top of that, "I" actually entitles the student to make up all those things that they otherwise are not entitled to make up because an unexcused absence.

This creates a can of worms by saying you could give them an "I". When you give them the "I", then you are obligated to let them make up all of it. So that's number 1. I have one other one, but you can go ahead and answer that one.

YOST:

I can respond to that, just briefly. And of course, the Ombud, you can also correct me if I'm wrong.

But number 1, this only, the 20 percent only applies for excused absences. It has no bearing whatsoever with unexcused absences.

So whatever your policy is for unexcused absences, if you said, for instance, if you told your students if miss one day, they get an "E" in the class, one unexcused absence, you can have that policy.

TAGAVI:

I didn't say excused -- I didn't say unexcused, I said excused. If the student has excused absence, more than 20 percent, "I" might not be appropriate.

YOST:

The other thing is --

TAGAVI:

You should be able to let the professor force the student to get a "W", which used to be like that (inaudible).

YOST: Actually, that language really has not changed. It's been the existing language and pretty much stated the same way it was before.

TAGAVI: I thought I read it today, it says either the student could ask for a "W" or the professor could force a "W". It looks like that has been changed.

HIPPISLEY: If you look, Kaveh, you see the crossed out second bit, in the second, fourth line, is a crossed out bit, that's what it used to be.

TAGAVI: Okay. Even if this is not a change, I'm just telling you that it's not appropriate to force the professor to give an "I". "I" has a very specific definition. Only those people who have done enough so that their chance of success is likely are entitled to an "I". You cannot give "I" to someone who didn't do anything.

YOST: The other aspect if you look earlier in the Senate Rules here, it states that we cannot penalize a student for an excused absence. So your argument comes across as a little bit of like, okay, if they have an excused absence, we cannot penalize them for that excused absence, then they do have all the opportunity in the world to make up that work.

Even if you don't think they're entitled to it, they have the luxury of making up that work if it's an excused absence. And so that way they can (inaudible) to complete the work when it comes to the incomplete aspect of this.

PEFFER: Sean Peffer, Business.

If you read, I think, right under the line where the page switches, it says, and the Instructor of Record may require the student to petition for a "W". That wording is what he was talking about. It's right there.

Now, when we go down to the new one, this is why it had to do with his. When you go down to the new one, it says, or the Instructor of Record may award an "I". It does not -- that is not consistent with the wording above that says, Instructor of Record can make the student petition for a "W". So those are not consistent. Don't stop at the for the course, there's an "if". If the student declines to petition for a "W".

YOST: Yeah.

PEFFER: If the student declines to petition for a "W" --

YOST: Right.

PEFFER: -- then the Instructor of Record can make them petition for a "W". That's the old wording.

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt

YOST: They can award an "I". They can award an "I" if the student does not petition for a "W".

TAGAVI: You cannot award an "I" for someone who doesn't come to class.

YOST: But if it's an excused absence, you cannot penalize them for that.

PEFFER: Please, go back up and look at the screen, back to where the page splits. Now, please read right after by looking at the screen that part there that says, "and the Instructor of Record may require the student to petition for a "W"." That is there in the old wording. I'm not missing that.

BRI ON: But then down at the bottom, that wording is not consistent. Yeah. We no longer have the right to require the student to petition.

GROSSMAN: I can respond to that.

PEFFER: Go ahead and respond.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S. You are right, the language about requiring a student to petition for a "W" has been removed; however, the instructor does not have the power to require a student to petition for a "W". And that's why it was removed.

We can't force a student to do anything. So if you -- you may advise the student, you may advise strongly, you may even threaten, I wouldn't recommend it, but you can't force the student to petition for a "W". So why have the rule there if it's completely unenforceable?

HIPPI SLEY: You're right, that that doesn't make a change. (Inaudible). Greg, do you have a question?

WASILKOWSKI: I have two points, the first may be shorter. If we adopt this new language, we could just say, could petition for "W". (Inaudible).

YOST: There's already --

WASILKOWSKI: I would suggest to make it very clear.

YOST: It's there. In other words, if you as permitted under withdrawal of Senate Rule 5.1.8.3, that has the rules for how to petition for a "W". So that's the reference.

WASILKOWSKI: The second point is concerning this discussion. As far as I remember, instructor when giving "I" grade is supposed to write some (inaudible) with the student how this grade will be changed to (inaudible) in one year. How can we force instructor to do this for the student (inaudible) plan of removing "I". It's not consistent. It's something that needs something there.

YOST: Certainly. And I'll tell you

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt

in the discussions that went on, there was a thought of we allow instructors to take and just give a grade or not give a "W" and do something different. But it was the consensus of the Senate Council and the committee that we want to take and because you cannot penalize the student, that's the underwriting principle here, you cannot penalize the student for an excused absence.

TAGAVI: "I" is a penalty.
YOST: Pardon me?
TAGAVI: It's a matter of semantics.
YOST: "I" is not a penalty.
Actually, a "W" is a penalty.
TAGAVI: So is "I".
YOST: Right, but --
TAGAVI: This is semantics whether we could force the "W" or not, we could give them "W", we could give them "E" --
HIPPI SLEY: Michael Healy, your Ombud, if you could tell us about "I" as a punishment and the plan for an "I". And then we'll come back to you, Kaveh.
HEALY: I think this is a difficulty with this rule, as we've discussed. And I agree with the point that was made down there. There doesn't -- there's no mechanism in the current rule for an instructor to insist that a student take a "W" in a course if they've exceeded this 20 percent rule.
So one thing that Scott's committee looked at was to resolve that by -- and an initial proposal said that with the consent of the dean, a student would be given a "W" in the course, if that's what the instructor requested in these circumstances.
There was objection to that in that it sort of went against the students' rights in terms of not receiving a penalty for an excused absence.
But at the end of the day you have to do something in these circumstances. And I think what Scott's trying to do here is come up with the most acceptable statement that doesn't include this language, which is essentially misleading, which seems to be saying that the faculty member can demand a "W" from a course because there's no mechanism for accomplishing that.
So and a virtue of this proposal is that it actually is not misleading in that regard. But, you know, whether an "I" or a "W" is a penalty, you know, one can debate, but these seem like the only feasible remedies in this circumstance.
YOST: Let me go back to Kaveh, just

real quick, and then we'll come back.
Go ahead, Kaveh.

KAVEH: You could only get "I" if --
it's a grade, "I" is a grade, you have
to earn the "I".

You're saying you could show up
basically none or just one day and you
are entitled to all the provisions of
"I" is just wrong. It's against faculty
freedom. And whether it's "I" or "W",
we could give "E". If somebody doesn't
show up more than 20 percent and they
don't want even an "I", we could give an
"E".

And my last question to you is
this: We have been doing like that for
years and years and years. Who decided?
Was it the Rules Committee who decided
this is not acceptable? Was it the
Appeals Board who decided this is not
legal? Who decided this is not legal?

YOST: It's not to the fact that it's
legal. On the Ombud's report, because
the number of shall we say "gray areas"
that were coming before him and then
went on to the Appeals Board, the Senate
Council, based on that report, asked the
Admissions and Academic Standards
Committee, my committee, to look at this
to see if we could clarify the language.

So we worked with the Ombud to
come up with clarifying language to try
to keep the 20 percent in place so when
you did have to take and have a student
not repeat the course because of excused
absences, we could still have a
mechanism to do that.

TAGAVI: I'd like to move that we put
back the language that said, "Or the
professor require that the student apply
for a "W"."

SEAGO: So is there a second to the
motion to amend?

HIPPI SLEY: Is there a motion to amend?

TAGAVI: Yes.

HIPPI SLEY: What is your -- what are you
amending? Say it very clearly.

TAGAVI: I'd like to put back the
language that said requires a student
to petition for a "W" or the professor
demand that petition. Whatever was the
language before, I'd like to resurrect.

BROTHERS: Are you talking about this
language?

YOST: That's the original language.

TAGAVI: I'm not very good at finding
stuff on the --

YOST: That is the original language,
that's highlighted.

TAGAVI: Okay. That's my motion, yes.

YOST: To just keep the original
language?

TAGAVI: Add that part. The rest is

fine.
HIPPI SLEY: Is there a second? No second.
No motion. Greg, Mirek, and then Mark.
WASILKOWSKI: Greg Wasilkowski, Engineering.
I think that this new amendment
doesn't solve the problem because it
says "may", so there's a possibility
that neither "W" or "I".
However, I would like to add a
third possibility: "or the student is
allowed to retake the course without --
YOST: Without what?
WASILKOWSKI: Retake the course without
paying for it.
HIPPI SLEY: That is what is entailed by an
"I", you don't have to pay a fee.
WASILKOWSKI: No, but you don't have to
retake the course. Sometimes it's
enough to do a couple of things.
YOST: An "I" is a contract with the
student and professor and you could tell
them they have to retake the course,
given the circumstance to that "I". You
have that authority to do that. The
student may not like it but you have the
authority to (inaudible).
TRUSZCZYNSKI: Mirek Truszczynski, College of
Engineering.
Since we are trying remove this
language which includes "may require", I
would suggest that we simply strike the
sentence "or the Instructor of Record
may award an "I"." This may or doesn't
have to. The fact that we say "may"
doesn't help at all. I would simply
stop at the student shall have the right
to petition for a "W" as a permissive
withdrawal period.
YOST: And so the question I would
have on that is what if the student
doesn't?
TRUSZCZYNSKI: That's fine. It's a grade.
YOST: You have to be careful here
because you cannot penalize the student
for excused absences.
TRUSZCZYNSKI: Well, an instructor may make a
mistake in giving the grade. That's
perfectly fine. The student will
appeal, it seems to me, in such a case.
We make mistakes.
YOST: I understand that. But we're
also not trying to create a problem.
And so if a student may appeal, it goes
back to the Ombud, which goes back to
the University Appeals Board.
TRUSZCZYNSKI: I don't know really what
this tells me, that I "may" do
something.
YOST: The alternative is the word
"may" is because there are some
instructors who may want to go ahead and
say, look, the student has 22 percent
absences, okay. I'll just go ahead and

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt

Let them fulfil the course going through here. This is an option issue.

The trouble is if you have an institute, have a program, for instance, Law, if they have a requirement from accreditation that says you cannot let your students miss more than a certain percentage, you have to have a mechanism in place where you can take and make sure they do not receive credit for a course. And that's part of trying to accommodate those cases as well.

HIPPI SLEY: We're taking questions in order. I think Mark Whitaker was next.

WHITAKER: I think my --

BROTHERS: Name please.

WHITAKER: This is Mark Whitaker, Arts and Sciences.

I was going to react to the point that "I" was a grade. I thought an "I" stood in place of a grade until the final dispensation had occurred. And so it's not a grade, it's a place marker.

Overall, I'd like to actually speak against the current amendment and in favor of the original wording. I think it handles the overarching problem, which is the one you stated, that students are not to be penalized for excused absences.

I don't see any suggestions of alternative wording that actually do that as well as the wording that was originally proposed. So I'd like to stick with the original new wording and against the proposed new wording.

HIPPI SLEY: In the back? A and S senator?

SANDMEYER: Bob Sandmeyer, A and S.

In looking at the two, I want to talk about the second conditional, I teach Latin, I'm sorry, because the second conditional, let me see, I just lost it, I'm sorry, where it says -- I'm looking at the revised language in number 1, the last line, if the student declines to petition for a "W" is unnecessary.

I mean, if the student has an excused absences, then you have a disjunction. If they decide not to petition, then it follows necessarily that they may get an "I". So I would move that that second conditional be removed.

BRION: I second this. Gail Brion, Engineering.

HIPPI SLEY: So we have a motion to strike out because it's redundant?

BRION: Yes.

HIPPI SLEY: The second (inaudible).

YOST: So the only -- let me just say, I tend to agree with what you're saying,

the only trouble is this, is what happens if the student wants to petition for a "W" but the instructor says, no, I'm going to give you an "I". And that takes that away from the student's ability to actually receive the "W" if you now have the authority to give an "I" unilaterally, in this circumstance of the 20 percent rule. That's my only concern that I have of removing the (inaudible) at the end.

HIPPI SLEY: Are you going to carry on with the motion?

SANDMEYER: I'll carry on with the motion.

HIPPI SLEY: Anyone about this particular motion? I know you had something about this. We have a second, but there's more questions about this particular amendment. Connie?

WOOD: Connie Wood, A and S.

I concur with my fellow senator who proposed this amendment. Not only is that the conditional clause redundant, the phrase in front of it, "or the Instructor of Record may award an "I" is also unnecessary because that is always a option for the instructor.

The important part of this clause here is that the student does have -- it preserves the right of the student to petition for a "W". If the student does not, then the faculty member has all options available.

UNIDENTIFIED: Exactly.

HIPPI SLEY: Are you asking for a friendly amendment to bring it all the way back?

WOOD: Yes. Yes, I am.

HIPPI SLEY: Do you accept that as a friendly amendment?

SANDMEYER: Yeah, I would accept that.

HIPPI SLEY: It's bringing it right back to -- Sheila is going to show us where it goes back to.

WOOD: Shall have the right to petition for a "W".

HIPPI SLEY: Do you accept that as a friendly amendment?

SANDMEYER: Yes.

HIPPI SLEY: So our motion is to back back up.

YOST: Let me also say in due respect to the two amendments, if you don't allow the faculty the opportunity to act upon this then we cannot act upon this as a faculty. And if it stops right there and the student does not and they continue to go forward in a class, number 1, as a faculty, you cannot penalize them for excused absences, and if you don't have any other mechanism, they can have excused absences for the whole term. They can miss the whole term and they still -- you would have to

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt

Let them go back and finish all the work because you cannot penalize them. That's just the bottom line.

Ben, do you want to say something?

WITHERS: If I could, if you read the portion in the Senate Rule at the top about an incomplete. First, it doesn't make it clear that it is a grade. It's not a temporary grade, so it expires after 12 months. Temporary grades are described elsewhere.

But it says specifically: Except in exceptional circumstances the student must petition for an "I". And the way I read this here, it provides the instructor with the opportunity in this particular instance to supply that "I" without the student petitioning. That's just my reading of the section.

HIPPI SLEY: So you're speaking against the motion? I'm going to get to Healy, I know your hand up. I just want to invite the Ombud one more time.

HEALY: Yeah, I think that I personally prefer the way it was offered as the amendment because I think in a sense it is redundant, but it also is helpful in explaining the options that are available here. And I agree with that last comment about the "I" as written in the current rules is one that is typically available for students, but this is one that specifically offers it as an option for faculty and it doesn't require that. It says that they may.

And the other thing to recognize here is that Senate Rule 5.8.1.8.3 actually specifies the 20 percent rule as the basis for permissive withdrawal when that petition is through the dean, which I think almost all deans are going to give that permissive withdrawal under those circumstances. So it I think it's written and fits together pretty nicely as a whole, even though at some level it may be redundant.

HIPPI SLEY: The left in the hat, I'm sorry.

RICE: Jenny Rice.

HIPPI SLEY: Oh, Jenny, I didn't recognize you.

RICE: I know, it's the hat. Just to be -- for my own clarification because I think I've been really confused about the 20 percent rule the past few years.

So with this, if the students say this is 30 percent of courses were excused absences and we cannot penalize them, which I would understand it to be "E", so then it would have to be either a "W" or an "I"? I mean, if that student, say has not shown up 50 percent

of the classes, I can -- and those classes are excused, an "E" is not an option?

YOST: That is correct.
RICE: Okay. So then --
YOST: Based on the 20 percent rule in effect. Once the 20 percent is in effect, these are the only two options that we have. Even existing --
RICE: So either a "W" or an "I"?
YOST: Correct.
HIPPI SLEY: Yes.
BIRD-POLLAN: Jennifer Bird-Pollan, College of Law.

So I actually don't read this sentence as giving those as the only two options in the universe because it's just you "may" have the student petition for a "W" and if that doesn't happen, you "may" award an "I".

So I'm just wondering what the committee contemplates as the other possibilities. Because it seems to me, if those are the only two possibilities, then either the student petitions for a "W" or necessarily the instructor awards an "I". If there's another option, which it seems to me there would be, which is, for example, if there was 21 percent, you could just give the student an A if they earned it, on the remaining -- on the work, if they did the work and they missed 21 percent of the classes, you could give them an A if they earned it, right?

YOST: Correct. And earlier in the Senate Rule section here, it talks about, you know, one thing it tells the instructors is you can't just take a subset of the grade and award it. In other words, as long as you want to award them a full like everybody else is getting awarded, you can still award them a grade. That's the unwritten thing going on here.

But the issue would be is if for some reason, and I'll use accreditation, if the student is not allowed to go forward, okay, we have to take and not give them a grade. They cannot get credit for the class, and unfortunately, you're penalizing them, yes, it shows up accreditation issue. So we have (inaudible) and we're trying to allow that under those unique circumstances where there is that conflict that is set up. It's beyond our control.

BIRD-POLLAN: So in many instances, the third option will be a grade.

YOST: It could be, yes. It could be.
HIPPI SLEY: Does anyone else want to speak for or against the motion, which on the

floor is to do that last strike through from "or" all the way down to "W" (inaudible).

- YOST: Roger?
BROWN: Roger Brown, College of Ag.
If the student already has the right to petition for a "W" according to this other Senate Rule then that seems redundant as well, therefore the whole thing seems redundant.
- YOST: Well, it's also a clarification because this deals with excused and unexcused absences. And in the past, that has been muddying the water. The excused and unexcused, faculty and students have tried to use those to the center to put this rule in place so they can actually get out of a course or get a student out of a course.
So half of this is clarifying excused versus unexcused and the rules by which then apply to that, under this particular occasion the extreme circumstances apply to that.
Do we have a student (inaudible)?
- THORPE: Fox Thorpe, Engineering.
I think I heard that the point was to keep confused students from going to the Ombud when they don't need to. And I think that the more explicit that that is like the less confusing it is. So I would say I'm in favor of leaving what's there because to me that seems the most clear. And the fewer assumptions that you have to make that students know about the rules, the better.
The more we're taking out, you're like assuming the student kind of understands the rest of the rules and I think the most explicit is the most clear.
- HIPPISLEY: So Fox is against the motion. I want to hear from any other student to this point, for or against. Any other student want to talk? No. Bob?
- GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Board of Trustees.
At the Senate Council meeting where this was discussed, I actually proposed striking this entire paragraph just for the reason that is redundant to other parts of the Senate Rules; however, the Senate Council voted that proposal down.
- HIPPISLEY: Do you remember the results of the vote?
GROSSMAN: Huh?
HIPPISLEY: Do you remember the results of the vote?
GROSSMAN: Seven to two or something against. No, sorry, the two trustees

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt
weren't allowed to vote. So it was very quite strongly against.

So yes, everything here is redundant, but redundancy is not necessarily a bad thing. Because as Mr. Thorpe here stated, sometimes redundancy clarifies things because you don't have to search through the entire Senate Rules to find the passage that you're looking for.

So I think if we're going to include any of this, we should include it all. So I'm against the proposed amendment.

HIPPI SLEY: Anybody else specifically for or against the particular amendment? We're running out of time, I should say.

BRI ON: Gail Bri on, College of Engineering.

If we're going to be redundant, then let's go ahead and say, "the Instructor of Record may award an "I" for the course or any other grade as they see fit based on allowing the student to make up the work." Because this makes it seem like the only grade option they have is an "I" and that's not so.

YOST: If you back up again, which is not on here, but there is a paragraph that says you can still -- you can -- it basically tells you not to, you cannot award a subset of class work and a grade on that. You have to complete the whole -- that was already spelled out.

BRI ON: There is, if you go further down, it talks about students assigning some sort of contract in this. The student agrees in writing, if you go down. Unless the student agrees in writing. That would seem to say that it's --

YOST: Because that gives a student the ability to then, not the professor to dictate that. Okay. But it's still an option to give a grade, but it's not the professor saying you missed 30 percent of my class, I'm going to give you 30 percent - I'm going to knock off 30 percent, so I'm only going to give you the C in the class. Because this gives the student the ability to say, you know what, I don't want that. Unless they want to accept the C.

BRI ON: But you can't force a professor to give an incomplete. It is a grade.

YOST: I know. We're not forcing the professor to give an incomplete. This is not to force the professor --

WOOD: Call the question.

HIPPI SLEY: Okay. There is a senator that is calling the question. Katie, do you just vote or do we --

SEAGO: Is there a second to the call
the question?
UNIDENTIFIED: Second.
UNIDENTIFIED: Second.
SEAGO: So we vote on the amendment to
the motion.
HIPPI SLEY: We have to vote on calling the
question, no, we don't.
SEAGO: No.
HIPPI SLEY: All right. The question is
called and we will now vote on this
amendment.
UNIDENTIFIED: You have to vote on calling the
question.
HIPPI SLEY: All right. All those in favor
of calling the question? All those
against? The question is called. So
this was deleting that "or". All right.
Five, four, three, two, one. Okay.
It's been defeated. What's been
defeated is that amendment.
Now we go back to our original
proposal. Does anyone want to speak for
or against the original proposal? No?
Anyone want to speak for or against?
PEFFER: I would like to ask the Ombud a
question. Can I or not? Because I
can't vote on this until I know if
something (inaudible). The way it's set
up now, I could have a student miss five
unexcused and then I've got a scale of
-- I'm sorry, five excused and then I've
got a scale of unexcused.
Can I make that scale of
unexcused contingent upon how many
excused they did so that if I say in my
syllabus, you miss five -- I don't want
them to be able miss five unexcused on
top of the five that -- five excused on
top of the other five. So can I take
the total of both can't go over
something? Does that make sense?
HEALY: I think I addressed that to
some degree in the memo that asked for
this clarification or asked (inaudible)
Senate Council to actually consider this
as an issue.
YOST: Yes.
HEALY: My reading, and ultimately this
would be the Appeals Board that would
decide this if it became an issue, but
my reading is the fundamental rule is
can't penalize for your students
absences.
So if you have five excused
absences and let's say two unexcused and
you penalize more severely for that
seven total, then -- or just two
unexcused, then that would be a
violation of the rules as I understand
it. Does that sort of answer your
question?
PEFFER: Yeah. If I have somebody miss

four unexcused absences or four excused absences total, that can't be any different than the student that just missed four unexcused absences and that can't fly? Okay.

HIPPISLEY: Anyone want to speak for or against the motion? Kaveh?

TAGAVI: Under that paragraph, the one that starts with the instructor shall provide the student, if you read that a little bit more, it basically says if you miss one of the elements of the test or of the grading, you cannot force the student to accept their grade to be divided into everything else. Please help me.

We used to have this rule that said if your final is cumulative and if a student misses a test, let's say you have test one, test two, and the final, you could force the student to accept double the grade for the portion of the final which covers the same as the test that they need. Does anybody remember that? I might be here too long. And you are dropping them.

YOST: The (inaudible) is if it's for an excused absence you cannot if the student wants to take a make up test, you have to give it to them. You can't just force them to take the final and double the final.

UNIDENTIFIED: That, what's he talking about is on common exam. There's a special rule for common exams and you can use a portion of the final for an exam that's a common exam but not for any other.

TAGAVI: Not for any other.

UNIDENTIFIED: And never has to (inaudible).

HIPPISLEY: Unless anyone has any really burning question or statement, let's vote. This is the motion. Count down, five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries. Thank you.

YOST: Okay. Hopefully this gets easier as we go along.

The next proposal deals with a plagiarism issue and if you'll look at the changing nature of education and how things -- how we do different modes of education, learning, things like this, it was brought to the attention of the Senate Council that maybe based on the original wording of the Senate Rule that there's kind of an inherent bias against certain types of things you want the students to do and the rules are kind of like penalizing them for that particular things.

For instance, group work, okay, in other words, if you allow group work and we encourage work, under the existing rule is a little bit

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt

(inaudible) of whether that actually would be a violation of plagiarism rules if they didn't acknowledge the group work. This is a result of group work. Or if you went to the writing center and got help with your document, the writing center may give you suggestions and gave you a rewrite and things like this, and if you did not acknowledge that type of help, that under the old rules, it seemed to kind of penalize that.

So the motion here that was charged, the Senate Council charged my committee to look at this to see if we can clarify and try to be a little bit more inclusive to things that the instructor, in fact, wants the student to participate in versus the traditional things we don't want them to participate in.

So that is -- do you have the wording up there? And fundamentally, it allows, it gives more I guess importance to the instructor of record, or designee, to clearly articulate what would be acceptable or what would not be acceptable under the plagiarism rule.

So that's the essence of what the proposal is, to try to broaden it a little bit and also put it to the faculty to articulate to the students what would be accepted and what would not be accepted. It's that in a nutshell.

HIPPI SLEY: You've seen this all over the weekend, no doubt you were studying this. There it is. Any question for the committee? Let's vote on this one. This is the plagiarism one. No amendments. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion passes.

YOST: This next motion is basically, quite honestly folks, a little bit of clean up. It came, Dentistry redid some of their academic policies and it came to students probation, graduation, advancing, and they did things locally several years ago and then they realized that the Senate Rules need to be changed to make sure that the local policy is in parallel with the Senate Rule policy. And it just took a little while for that clean up to get to us all and get through the committees and finally show up to the Senate.

The bottom line is in all the different changes, it was literally just taking the local policies that Dentistry put in place and make sure it's consistent now with the Senate Rules or maybe more appropriately the Senate Rules are consistent with what Dentistry is actually doing.

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt

And so the committee looked at it and didn't see anything that was what we consider, you know, a real change in direction or different standards or whatever, it's just helping to clarify how they want to run their program based on the rules and regulation policy.

So we looked at it and it comes before you. There's a few minor edits that we did within their policy, in our committee, but it basically it comes to you with unanimous support from the committee and unanimous support from Senate Council.

HI PPI SLEY: Does anyone have questions for Scott? Okay. Let's vote. Five, four, three, two, one. The motion carries. Thank you, Scott, very much.

YOST: The last two I'm going to take together, okay, if that's okay because they basically deal with admissions change to two programs that are really kind of tied together. So students migrate back and forth, and fundamentally, what it was is that there was a change in one of their required courses that was serviced outside a program and that change and some of the corrections of that course put, you know, had an impact on these two programs.

And so what it is, fundamentally folks, they're just changing the course requirement that's listed in a pre-major in both Dietetics and Human Nutrition and moving from Chemistry 152 to Chemistry 148.

UNI DENTI FIED: Biology.

YOST: Biology, my bad. Sorry, I'll get it right. And so moving Biology 152 to Biology 148, only because 152 made it (inaudible) and 148, their students have to take 148 (inaudible) so they just dropped 152 as part of admission into the program, either Dietetics or Human Nutrition. And that's it in a nutshell.

HI PPI SLEY: Questions for Scott? A change in rule. We'll vote in five seconds. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries. Thank you.

YOST: Thank you all. Just two editorial comments. Number one is we do look for like this particular motion you just passed, unintended consequences, if you're in a service-oriented program or department and you make a change with some of the courses that may be used elsewhere, we are wanting to see that you have got them to sign off.

So there was, I think, a mis-communication between the Human Nutrition people and the Biology people that led to this kind of discrepancy,

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt

and just be mindful that if you make a change in a potential service-related course, you get the program to the (inaudible) take that course to sign off, and likewise, those other administrative standpoint, if you're making changes or if your administration is making changes in local policy and you see it happening, just make sure they also go through and change the Senate Rules as needed or at least get an opinion from the Rules Committee of whether things have to be changed or not because these couple things, to be honest with you, it shouldn't have happened, I mean, two, three year delay on stuff like this. So just be diligent with your administrators and open when making local changes. Thank you.

HIPPISLEY: Okay. We have one more actionable item. Connie Wood, chair of SREC.

WOOD: In the fall of 2015, the Senate Council sent Senate Rule 1.4.4.2, that should not be a "B", to Senate Rules and Elections Committee for review and possible revisions.

To refresh your memory, basically SR 1.4.2 charges the Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure. These are violation of procedures and processes that are duly established in University Regulations or violations of privilege and/or academic freedom that have affected -- violations have affected the outcome for faculty personnel decisions or faculty reappointment, terminal appointment, non-renewal of appointment, promotion and tenure.

Section 2 sub B of this also extends the privilege to post-doc residents, TAs, RAs and non-renewal of administrators, contract holding faculty appointments.

In addition, SACPT is charged to consider cases of dismissal from employment for cause for a tenured faculty member or faculty employee under KR164.230, in cases of dismissal of tenured faculty or non-tenured faculty prior to expiration of the term of appointment or financial emergency.

This consideration by SACPT is to conduct an investigation, mediation, and in the absence of an acceptable resolution, make a recommendation to the president regarding whether dismissal procedures should continue.

I bring this to your attention to see that this is one of the very most important committees within the Senate structure. When SRAC reviewed this, we

identified two issues.

Although, implied and traditionally practiced, it is not clearly stated that the faculty right to appeal to SACPT is inalienable.

Secondly, the procedures used in the hearing process when not clearly specified. The proposed changes that we are proposing rectifies this deficiency and clearly specifies the procedures to be used in a hearing process, including the right to appear and present witnesses, present evidence, et cetera.

These procedures are already codified in the Senate Rules in section 1.4.4.3, the University Hearing Panel on Privilege and Tenure, which hears more formally advanced cases of dismissal of tenured faculty, dismissal of non-tenured faculty before the end of appointment, and allegations of violation of academic freedom for non-tenured faculty members as an administrator or terminate a post-doc resident, TA, RA, or clinical fellow.

The actual change is the insertion that says that the faculty right to appeal under each of these subsections, which I have just gone through, cannot be impeded. And the investigatory hearing process exercised in SACPT will follow that which has already been established in SR 1.4.4.3.B.

The intent of the proposed changed is one that clearly specifies that a faculty member's post-doc right to appeal to SACPT cannot be impeded by administrative action. And two, ensure that the processes duly guaranteed under 1.4.4.3 for non-tenured faculty are also guaranteed to tenured faculty in 1.4.4.2.

HIPPISLEY: Thank you, Connie. Just keep that on there for the moment in case people have questions to the chair of SREC. Questions? Okay. Hearing none, let's vote on this. No amendments. Count down, five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries. 70 for, 1 opposed. Thank you.

Chief Monroe, I am sorry to keep you waiting this long. Thank you for coming to visit our body. He's going to give us a presentation and take questions on campus safety.

CHIEF MONROE: We're bringing this up, I'll go ahead and talk a little bit about some of the stuff.

Let me give you an update on the police department as well as some security and issues that we've undertaken over the last three years.

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt

I met with Trustee Grossman and Trustee Brothers and Executive Vice President for Finance and Admin, and I just want to kind of give you some update on things.

BROTHERS: I tell you what, I've removed my clicker so if you just tell us, we'll get it for you.

CHIEF MONROE: So I want to give you a little bit about the police department. The police department is a fully authorized police department under Kentucky statutes. We have the full powers of arrest just like any other police agency in the state. We're actually now considered the 11th largest police department in the state of Kentucky, which most people don't realize, and we are of course the largest University police in Kentucky.

Our officers go through the same training that all the other police officers in the state go through at the Police Academy over at ECU, as well as I put a higher demand on our additional training. Normal, the state law only requires us to have 40 hours of in-service training per year. But I push even more. I push our officers to get at least 60 to 80 hours of in-service training a year. Most get between 80 and 100 hours of training. So I put a big emphasis on education and training.

We are the primary police authority throughout the Commonwealth of Kentucky at the University of Kentucky and only patrol on these properties throughout all 120 counties. Most people don't realize that either.

We are responsible for the security for the three hospitals, Chandler, Samaritan, and Eastern State Hospital, as well as the medical clinics around the city that the University is responsible for.

I want to spend a little bit more time on these last three bullets. The first one talks about the security cameras and our access control management platform.

The Board of Trustees authorized us to go ahead and procure a security software system that enabled us to access control. And that's why most of you had to finally get some ID cards.

We had to create a standard ID card for the University because we only had that little paper employee. Now you have an ID card that has a lot of technology in it. You can put your meal plan on it, you can swipe to get into offices or into buildings after hours instead of having to have a key or

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt
somebody to come unlock it for you.

The good thing about it is in the event there was ever an active shooter or some type of emergency on campus, those buildings that have access control, we can remotely lock with two clicks of a mouse at our dispatch headquarters. So that helps increase the security of us on campus.

The campus ID card operation, we were tasked with taking over the ID operations for the University and (inaudible). So now we have health care IDs as well as the campus-wide ID operation all under one umbrella.

The last part is our crisis management preparedness. The University had an emergency management office that was initiated probably about 10 years ago and was grossly understaffed and trained.

Dr. Capilouto came in, asked me for a report of the status of it. At that time, it was not under me. Since then it was brought under me and I've almost tripled the employees in there as well as some of the services that we offer in that unit.

They do all the crisis management, the planning for the snow emergencies, the weather emergency, the active shooter emergency. They're responsible for the UK Alert System that wakes you up in the middle of the night.

But it's a great unit that we have now and we're able to do a lot of positive things with it. Go ahead.

We have 60, well, actually a little bit more now, 61, we just hired a couple more so we're at about 64 now, sworn police officers, well over 95 security officers that run our hospitals for us, a dozen dispatchers. We're over 185 total employees now for our police department.

All our patrol officers are also equipped with body cameras. With the body cameras, one of the things that we were able to do is hold ourselves accountable with any actions that occurred by our officers as well as protect them from erroneous or alleged allegations against them.

Since we implemented the body camera program, we've actually cleared our officers of several frivolous complaints, when we showed the individuals the body cam footage of their complaint was unsubstantiated. It wasn't like they were caught. So it's really done well for us on that.

In the CAT survey, one of the things the CAT survey has shown us is

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt

how our students felt toward safety on campus. Some of the things that we took away from it was 98 percent of the students feel safe during the day, 77 percent at night. So it shows we have some room for improvement on our evening hours. But that's also pretty standard. It's actually higher than most other places.

Now, the perception that UK feels safe or cares about their safety was pretty good, it was at 94 percent almost. And then the fact that they actually receive and read their crime bulletin, at 86 percent.

And then probably a more issue for another day is the fact that sexual violence was deemed not a problem on our campus. And that's based on the fact of grossly under-reported because of several factors. One, a lot of the individuals don't want to come forward with a complaint because of some of the process of it. So we're working with the Violence Against Women's Research Center to see how we can streamline that as well as provide some resources to make them feel more comfortable in coming forward and reporting these. Go ahead.

So we talked a little bit briefly on this about the Board authorization back in 2012. The project took us about 36 months in the first phase of it and there was four components to the overall security project.

The first part was to implement a video management software and install cameras across campus. The second part was to incorporate access control in the buildings, consolidate the ID badge operations, and then implement the early warning notification system.

Some of the benefits we've seen from this so far has been a quick resolution to some recent crimes and I'll go over that, a couple models, case studies on that, as well as increased awareness for safety, and broader coverage for our emergency notifications, with multi-delivery modes. And then the project has added benefitting assistant facility management and building security as well as we're working with them on some other ideas, that they can piggyback on some of our stuff on.

The development of a campus security standard. We kind of timed this at the right time by developing a standard for all buildings, all new buildings under construction, that they

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt

have to have access control, they have to have emergency notification system as well as cameras.

So by doing that, a lot of these new construction projects were able to put this into the planning phase and implement them as they went forward.

We talked about the one card, the concept of you can pretty much do everything with the ID card now. And then the original project, it's (inaudible) tremendously by individual units doing a price contract to add stuff into their buildings. Go ahead.

98 percent of the project was completed in 23 months, nearly a year ahead of schedule. We're finishing up healthcare transition of cameras and access control.

And today we've issued over 70,000 ID cards. And that was a challenge because we had to re-card all the students on this campus. So that was probably more of a challenge that we were able to accomplish fairly easily. Here's what the ID card looks like.

I want to talk a little bit about this. On the left you see a older emergency phone that we had on campus, the brown little pedestal towers. For you all that have been around here as long as I have, you remember these things. Half the time they have never worked. They were a dial-in analog system.

We've gone to a more modern system. Because what we did, we looked at some studies around the country and found that these phones only have about a 3 percent usage rate. And with that, we wanted to figure out how we could capitalize on these towers because the minute you take one of these towers out a parent notices, a student notices. So it's the perception of safety by having them as well as, you know, the low usage rate.

So one of the things we did was we looked at these. Of course, we wanted them in a UK blue when we ordered them. So we got them in blue. We put a blue light on top of them. So at night you can see these things from a good distance. When it's activated, the light flashes. It's a strobe light inside there.

Also on there, you can see there's a pedestal camera in that dome that gives us camera use from there. We started putting these along our CATS path on campus and then expanded it out from that.

The other added benefit we did

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt

with it is inside the top, you can't see it, when you walk by, you'll see on the side, there's like a metal grate at the top of it. Those are speaker boxes. They broadcast out just like these tornado sirens do them on the city.

We can actually use Carl Nathe voice on a pre-recorded text or text the voice speech where it will actually put out emergency notifications through there.

So if somebody's outside, doesn't have their cell phone, this is primarily where UK alert comes through for most everybody, you'll actually hear it come through these speaker boxes. So we were able to do that as well with it.

Now, this is a map of the main campus here. Every one of those blue dots or turquoise dots represents an emergency phone. The orange or amber color there is the radio of that speaker on top of those towers. So you can see, we predominantly have most of campus covered now with these boxes.

The little hole right in the middle there, that's the healthcare facilities. There's not a whole lot we can do on the outside of that.

The added benefit of this is, we've also started integrating some other software that we're going to be rolling out in the coming year. And that's to put it through the VIP network allowing alerts to come through your desktop or your laptops. If you're logged into the UKY network and load this software, download this software to your computer, it will actually give you the alert on your desktop as well. All the IP phones now receive this alert.

Now, we wanted to see how this was actually working with some of our recent crimes so we took a crime data and overlaid it with our towers. So you can see there's a couple, four concentration spots of where most of our violent crime has occurred in relation to our speakerphones. So that gave us a good way to kind of judge where our crimes were occurring and how our cameras were working as well as our emergency phone deployment.

Here is some of the buildings that we have actually installed with phase one, which is the initial Board authorization, and then phase two are some of our installations are the orange. So purple is what we put in under the original 7 and a half million. The orange is what was paid for by those individual units. So you can see, we're really starting to get across campus

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt
with access control.

Here is some of the next upgrades that are being planned as well. Go ahead. Currently, we have over 1400 cameras on campus. Over 5,600 doors with access control, and a little less than 30 emergency phone towers.

Here is some locations of where our exterior cameras are on campus. These are just exterior; these aren't the ones in the inside buildings as well. These are only exterior. And you can see, these are little strips of basically (inaudible) up the video that kind of give us an idea of different crime that was solved by using these on a video footage. Go ahead.

Basically, we had an arson that took place out at Commonwealth Stadium, somebody set a car on fire. And we were able to go back, starting at the scene of the crime and backtrack that car through campus until we actually found footage of the car, then even found better footage of the faces on another camera as they came through campus. We released that out to the media and within 48 hours had those individuals identified and apprehended and charged. Okay. Go ahead, next one.

This is from an armed robbery that occurred over on Scott Street. It was actually off campus but it was right there at the border of campus on Scott Street, at the parking lot. We were able to use some of our blue phone footage as well as some other camera footage.

And this is probably a good case study because it let us really test all our assets at one time. The call came in from a student who had just been robbed. We were able to immediately put out a UK alert system that went through all the speakerphones on campus, all the blue phones, all the desktops, your UK alert mobile phones, as well as it let us go ahead and pull camera footage from there, identify the description on these suspects, able to get that out to the Lexington police.

They actually saw the vehicle on the north end of Lexington, were able to meet up with them, do a traffic stop on these individuals, apprehend them and arrest them for the robbery fairly quickly as well. Go ahead, the next one.

This is probably one of the newest things that we've accomplished and actually started the Emergency Operations Center that has allowed us to centralize an emergency operations team

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt
and functions for the University in time of crisis, your weather or anything else that should occur. And by doing these we've actually (inaudible) from a lot of technology that enabled us to be ready to face any kind of major crisis that the University faces. Go ahead. One more.

Livesave ap, this is a mobile ap that we bought an enterprise license so the faculty, staff and students all can download this ap for free. And by doing so, it gives you availability to do a lot of things with. You can contact us, report tips to us, you can send us video clips of something or still images, as well as get a map of campus. Probably the number one thing that you can do on it that most people like is if you're out walking on campus, you can just call the virtual walk and we can actually follow you on campus with that phone when you activate that feature.

A lot of students use that because if they're walking from the library late at night, they don't want to wait on an escort or somebody to come do it, they can actually use us or a friend that they put in there to watch them walk. Go ahead. Go ahead. Keep going.

Now, this is the number of downloads we have as of December 15th. It included 70 tips to the police as well as 32 emergency contacts, and over a 1,000 of these were safe walks as well. Go ahead.

Briefly, I'll give you a highlight on this. Back in July, we had a professor who was hearing impaired, was able to use the ap to send us a message of coming down Nicholasville Road that he was experiencing a road rage incident and was able to get with us. We were able to see his location, get officers to him immediately and make it a safe situation for him. Go ahead.

The UK alert system, I talked briefly about this. It goes to the phones, to the emails, social media, you know, the twitters, the facebook, the blue emergency phones as well as the new fire alarm panels, also broadcasted inside. Go ahead. Go ahead.

One of the questions that always comes up about UK alert is how can we issue an UK alert for something that occurred off campus. If it's not an immediate threat to campus, we don't issue and aren't required to issue a UK alert. If it is on campus, an immediate threat, or somebody say robbed the Shell

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt

station across the street and they were last seen running on the campus, then we issue it for that. For something that happens, you know, two blocks off campus, we're not going to issue unless it seems like it's coming a threat to our campus. Go ahead. Go ahead.

Here's a couple of examples of the different things we would send the UK alert out for and you can see the different things. Go ahead.

So far we've got about 57,000 people that are enrolled in the UK alert system. It's an opt out system. You (inaudible) automatic go through your email. If you want to add your cell phone, you log in and under your UK account and you can change those features. A little over half have opted for the text notification. And then we have 90 percent on campus covered with the blue phone speakers. Go ahead.

Over the last three years, here's just a quick snapshot of what we've issued UK alerts for, the different categories. Okay.

Now, I wanted to spend a little bit of time, real quick, on this. The active shooter training, if you go to that website, which is our police emergency management, crisis management website, they actually have the availability to download some active shooting protocol information as well as you can schedule some active shooter training for your unit, your class, or however you want to do it. We have active shooter training response on what we expect from students as well as faculty and staff in case we come into a building that does have an active shooting situation. Go ahead.

And then make sure you all know about the Community of Concern Team, which is a multidisciplinary team made up of professionals, counseling, student affair, legal, and police department, some others. But that has an online reporting portal where you can report if you know an employee or a student that may be exhibiting some questionable or concerning behaviors, that we can examine them, evaluate them and find out if they're a threat to your class, to the University, or to themselves.

A couple things of what we're working towards over the next two years, we're working on a virtual patrolled campus where we'll actually be using a lot of these camera technologies to patrol campus virtually, which will give us the ability to cover more ground quicker as well as do a lot of virtual

walks.

We talked about we're already in the phase for the notification software on the desktops. We're going to continue to expand the video management access control platform. We're working on an upgrade radio system that will include all the radio user, not only public safety but for the University into one radio system. It will give us the ability to talk to our public safety partners here locally.

And then we're going to (inaudible) this coming year in bringing up our EOC teams, get them trained and some exercises as well.

We have worked with communications to identify a backup 911 site in case something should happen to our primary site. (Inaudible) in place. We're working on our staffing level to correlate with enrollment growth in the future as well as probably the one that you're more interested in is that last bullet.

We're working on a pilot project now for some classroom security. So I got feedback from Trustee Grossman and some others about how these doors don't lock and some of the doors open out.

So what we are working on is an electronic access version of a box that would fit on the door and you would have a fob mounted at the front of the room that will allow you to hit that button and it would automatically that door. So if you have an emergency, you hit that button, it locks the door, sends a notification immediately to the police department and we'll be able to respond.

So we're working on this pilot project that we hope to start installing over the spring break and then we'll push it out over the summer to you all in the fall semester. So we'll provide that information through the Provost Office and to this group to get you all some training on how the fobs would work and so in the event you ever had to use it, you would know what that would be.

Okay. Questions.

UNIDENTIFIED: I just have a question about visitors to campus for potential students and summer conferencing. Are they allowed to download the safety aps?

CHIEF MONROE: Yes. The thing about the safety ap is right now you can use it if you go to other places. If they have that ap like other universities I know have purchased it, Saint Claire, California had it for the Super Bowl. I know that community has it. So a lot of

different venues had it and you're able just to switch the location to that area and be able to use it. Somebody over here had a question. Ms. Wood?

WOOD: It was just about the redundant 911 number. If I dial 911 from here, doesn't it go to Metro?

OFFICER MONROE: If you dial from a cell phone, it goes to the Lexington Police. But if you dial from one of the campus phones, it goes to us.

WOOD: Thank you.

OFFICER MONROE: What happens is you dial from your cell phone, it goes to them, and then they transfer it to us. Yes.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Board of Trustees.

So one of the issues a lot of police departments are facing, of course, is rough relations with minority groups and I haven't seen anything in the papers around here recently for campus police. But what do you do to train your officers for diversity and awareness and things like that?

OFFICER MONROE: We have annual training that is part of the mandated stuff that I set up where go through a lot of stuff, and part of that includes diversity training, different other safety training that's unique to the University. But as far as your question on diversity, we bring Terry Allen in, he does an hour for us on integration into different things that people perceive the police and how we can respond differently.

The other thing that we do differently than a lot of police departments is we take an approach, because my background is not from administration, believe it or not, that's a whole other story how I got into this job, but I take a business approach to running the police department. So as a business approach what I'm talking about is we provide a service and so we look at customer service being a priority, one of our core values and our mission is customer service. So we treat everybody fairly regardless of rank, position at the University, or out in the community. So we treat everybody the same.

And the other thing we do is we always want to make sure that we leave them, in a bad situation, as positive as we can. Most of the time when you interact with the police it's a negative situation, so we always want to make it as positive as we can.

HIPPI SLEY: Thank you very much.

CHIEF MONROE: If you think of some other

UKSenateMeeting2-8-16.txt

questions you're concerned about don't ever hesitate to call me or shoot me an email, and I'll be happy to address it or, you know, take care of it for you.

HIPPI SLEY: I would like a motion to adjourn.

* * * * *

Thereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 5:23 p.m.

* * * * *

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 18th day of March, 2016.

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