

UK5-2-16.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

MAY 2, 2016

* * * *

* * * *

ANDREW HIPPI SLEY, CHAIR
KATHERINE MCCORMICK, VICE-CHAIR
KATE SEAGO, PARLIAMENTARIAN
SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR
LISA GRANT CRUMP, COURT REPORTER

* * * *

* * * *

HIPPI SLEY: Time to get started in the usual way.
BROTHERS: Let's just move to the President's Address.
CAPILOUTO: Thank you, Andrew, and welcome to all of you. I know it's been a productive spring for you and we're going down the home stretch. My wife and I look forward to the quiet and I know you look forward to a little rest too.
Before I talk with you today about our budget, I want to take time to acknowledge the team of people who worked with me, with you, and for you. I'm reminded again about how fortunate I am. I like to say that the administration (inaudible).
In the legislator we had, (inaudible) we had the expertise that I could call on to completely examine the implications of (inaudible). And people trust us because we're dispassionate and objective.

UK5-2-16.txt

But we're able to provide (inaudible). I have asked these people to come here today, some of them couldn't be here, to stand up and I'll ask me to join me in acknowledging the team of people that work with me. (APPLAUSE).

So I had the opportunity to tell your story, our story over the last few months, and that final state budget, it presents challenges. But everyday, I'm reminded that (inaudible) I work with venues to have opportunity for future success.

So a few weeks ago I accepted Congressman Rogers invitation to attend the National Drug Summit, it was the fifth drug summit, but the first that I had attended. And Congressman Rogers (inaudible) policy makers and elected officials. Congressmen, senators, even the President of the United States showed up.

And because of that we had the opportunity, Dr. Cassis and I and many others, to meet with in an individual basis or small groups, with the Director of NIH and the National Institute of Drug Abuse, and CDC, the FDA, the Surgeon General. And people listened to what we had to say and I can tell you, it's going to matter for the University of Kentucky.

Just a few weeks ago we were selected, we (inaudible) opportunity, but the Department of Energy contacted us to hold a summit on our campus, we had two weeks notice, to explore the global energy economy and alternatives to energy and the impact they have on a state like Kentucky. And we had the Secretary of the Department of Energy spend the day with us. And I can tell you that is going to bear fruit as well.

Because of all of this, our students perform, they discover, they talk, and they learn. And we broke new ground.

As I said many times to our legislators, we're serving more communities, treating more people, educating more students, raising more dollars than we have at any time in our 150 year history.

So I can go on at length, but let me share (inaudible) and I presented to them. We had an opportunity to speak in public and private. Since '08, 15 percent growth in total student enrollment; 6 percentage point increase in our retention rate; 9 percent growth in the degrees awarded, and that's going to continue to climb because we have

larger classes. And this is based on student demand since everybody seems to be interested in health and stem education.

I shared with them, we've had a 38 percent increase in (inaudible) engineering; 15 percent increase in those for Medicine, and that we were expanding our Medical School class in a partnership with Bowling Green Hospital and Western Kentucky University and doing so without making a request for a single dime from the State.

And now an 11 percent increase in degrees in the Health Sciences; 10 percent in Nursing; 18 percent in Business; and when you consider all the stem fields, it's 22 percent.

And I was able to hold up, as I did with you at the beginning of January, a program from one of our theatre productions, where I read aloud the majors of all those students. And if you remember those, they were fascinating. (Inaudible). And I dazzled them with those because the Creative Arts are important and those degrees remain robust as well.

And I shared with them that our doors are open widest for those from the lowest groups, 25 percent of all of our students come from families with median income of a little over \$19,000. And I was able to share as well that for those students, 95 percent of all the tuition and mandatory fees they pay are covered by scholarships and grants that they don't have to pay back.

And I shared with them how important our discoveries are. We know that we have scientists, who labor in obscurity, trying to study the reproductive cycle of a mosquito. And little did we ever know, that when we are now confronted by a virus that can be as dangerous as the Zika virus, that we have our people on the front line.

And I shared with them that because of our work over the last ten years, colorectal screenings in Kentucky have dramatically increased and where we used to lead the country in deaths from colorectal cancer, that has dropped precipitously. And I tell them we treat 16 more thousand people annually at our hospitals than we did ten years ago.

And long before I got here, we set out to be sure that Kentuckians would not have to leave their own backyard for the very best in care to see a subspecialty referral service. And in December of this year, we completed our 43rd heart transplant,

UK5-2-16.txt

ranking us 15th in the country. And all those other cities are major metropolitan areas. To do that in a town of 300,000 people is truly amazing.

So those stories are great, but let's look ahead. We have a great problem. More people want to come to the University of Kentucky. So our first year class, record number of applications and (inaudible). And this weekend, the dessert of it all, 5,200 students will get degrees from the University of Kentucky thanks to your work.

And I want to thank you. I can't imagine all the hours of hard work that went into getting those students to this milestone. And I ask you one last favor, if you can, show up at one of those commencements. I'll be at all three. But it means a lot to families and students.

So let's talk a little bit, more detail, about this budget. So in January, the Governor presents his budget. At first, it amounted to a 4 1/2 immediate cut in this fiscal year, \$12.6 million; a 9 percent cut for the subsequent two years in the next biennium, that's \$25.2 million. So in total, you're looking at \$63 million.

And we told people it's not just that 13 1/2 percent, but if you go back a few years, it's about 28 cents of every dollar that's been reduced. And importantly, so a new marker was put out there that in fiscal year '17-'18, 33 percent of our new lower base, our \$84 million, would be set aside (inaudible) performance pool yet to be defined.

And throughout February and March we told our story. The House and Senate drafted their proposals for our two year budget. So the House version came out first, no midyear reduction, no reduction in the next fiscal year, no performance funding language, but it created a process to determine what it would look like. And the House also included something called a Work Ready Scholarship program. And let me share a little about it.

It provides free tuition for our associate, our certificate degree, and community and technical college in Kentucky. And that has implications for four year universities because you're offering a low cost alternative to begin college close to home. So then the Senate came forward with this version, 9 percent reduction like the Governor had, (inaudible), it reduced the performance funding pool from 33 percent to 25 or

UK5-2-16.txt

\$63 million, 64. And it had a prescribed formula in there.

So during that whole period, we're asked for information and comment on these. And I had two opportunities both with the House and the Senate to testify and tell our story.

So April 1st, while we're still in conference committee and they're trying to decide how they merge these (inaudible) budgets, the Governor announces a 4 1/2 percent midyear reduction. And that is executed because they just don't send you the check. So that midyear reduction has been scaled back (inaudible).

The final budget was passed on April 15 (inaudible), 4 1/2 percent cut next fiscal year, 5 percent -- so \$13.4 million, not 60 or \$80 million put into a performance fund and we're going to all participate in the process to (inaudible).

And the Work Ready Legislation worked its way through the process, but I think at this stage I can tell you, its implementation is being deferred. But I think it's coming.

So the bottom (inaudible), 2 percent midyear reduction, and you know that's going to be (inaudible) and we'll wait the outcome. And the 4 1/2 percent reduction effective July 1st, 2016, (inaudible) million a year, and it continues into the following year as well.

So we have a new base of \$267 million, down from our 280. And then another 13 million will be set aside in a performance fund to be further determined. I cannot tell you what it looked like, but various versions of performance funding made its way to the Council on Post-Secondary Education, CPE. And they're not too different than what you've seen in the other 35 states that have implemented these, typically states look for a simple set of measures that are high priority and can be easily tracked.

So in this slide, these are the metrics in our 2015-2020 strategic plan approved by our Board of Trustees. And the ones in red are the priorities for the state and most states. But look at those. It's retention and graduation rates, student success, (inaudible), under-represented minorities and low income students. And then later on in diversity and inclusivity, the graduation rates for under-represented minorities, really the total of degrees you award. And in Research, something

UK5-2-16.txt

that can be measured, your research development expenditures. And those are it.

Now, let me make clear. The ones that were important to the state, all of them are important to us and will remain important to us as we go forward. But we're having -- we want to participate in defining these. I don't find them too inconsistent to what we say are priorities for us, but please keep in mind, we continue on our path regarding our other goals.

So another look at the budgetary and faculty state appropriations over time. It's a more than \$81 million decrease since '07 - '08. And the (inaudible) coming up with a little on the top now available for performance funding. We have really inverted ourselves when it comes to the portion of our funds that come from the state and those that we garner through tuition and fees. Fiscal year '16, we've reduced our state funding now to 37 percent of our total general fund. And these are so important because those are our first dollars that go into teaching. And it was 57 percent in '08.

So here's a startling number to me. If you control for inflation, it gives higher education equivalent from the (inaudible). The students that we admit this year, the funding received in today's dollars back then, would have been \$19,000 per student. Now, we've grown. So today, we receive \$8,600 a student. I will contend we've had to be more efficient to do all this.

And I show this slide to all the legislators as well to remind them that we do not exist in a vacuum. We look at what the states around us are doing. This is for the fiscal year '14 - '16, there are four states who did reduce their budgets, but the vast majority are increasing their state support. And I told them while we were doubling the cuts, other states were doubling down in investing in education. While this can be disconcerting, there are other states now, Arkansas, Oklahoma, West Virginia, considering cuts with their legislator (inaudible).

But I said when I arrived here we must earn our way forward and we are and we continue to be the University for Kentucky. So when we started our budget development processes a few month ago, I charged my team to respect these principles. Student access and affordability (inaudible) faculty and staff, that map that I just showed you,

UK5-2-16.txt

that's our competition, strategically planned to prevent across-the-board cuts and maintain an enhanced academic quality. And lastly, not to lose sight of our diversity and inclusion goals.

So I'm going to share with you in a moment, I'm going to let Eric Monday elaborate on these in a moment, but these are our principles. First, student access and affordability. I shared what we do for low income students. (Inaudible). And for the last several years, we've done this by increasing financial aid. And we have for the last few years, worked hard to make sure that when you are teaching, that our students are being taught by the best and that they are competitively rewarded. And we must keep our commitment.

And third, strategically prevent these across-the-board cuts, we have to plan in a smart way and make all hard decisions, but to the extent possible, we always try to protect the academic enterprise. Across-the-board cuts do not lead to success. It can be an easy (inaudible) but it's not the best one.

And fourth, in diversity and inclusion, just a recap of some of the things we've done. For the past year, we're going to maintain (inaudible) increase the faculty diversity and inclusion, increase the fund from 370 to \$750,000.

Over the past five years, we've increased our Parker Awards for (inaudible) up to \$16 million. It goes up 600,000 this year. We are enhancing our counseling services. We have set up (inaudible) response team. And we have ads out for eight new counseling positions with a focus on how you (inaudible). Our positions of Senior Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and assisted needs in the Graduate School, on diversity and inclusion so that our faculty are recruited, retained, and promoted. And we do the same thing for our graduate students.

We have enhanced the Center for Graduate Professional Diversity Initiatives located on the Health side of campus. The Health enterprise is offering new, more attractive and greater space, and the Medical Center is providing \$200,000 in additional funds for (inaudible). And we've enhanced, increased the budget (inaudible). And the Provost introduced, the Provost (inaudible) \$1.5 million. It's those students, believe it or not, you know,

UK5-2-16.txt

\$200, \$300 makes a difference about whether you can register or not and whether they can (inaudible). And these are reserved for students high financial unmet needs (inaudible). A good number of those students are under-represented minorities and (inaudible). We continue our ambitious plans for unconscious bias training process on campus and we quickly are changing our K week and UK 101 experience for entering students to help them succeed, succeed in a more diverse (inaudible).

So again, I want to thank this budget team that has been so helpful around this process. And I'm going to turn it over to Vice President, Dr. Eric Monday, who is going to give you an update on some of the things we've done and the things we still have to (inaudible).

MONDAY:

Thank you, President Capilouto. As we look to the budget for fiscal year '17 and fiscal year '18, let's begin by looking at where we are in fiscal year '16.

So this is (inaudible), the UK truck, if you will, represents the University's consolidated budget, so what is represented here, the \$3.4 billion. And note, the engine in the front of the truck, that \$280 million, that represents our state appropriation. It's the engine that propels all of our efforts. Everything on the back of the truck is only possible with the 280 million that's on the front.

And we cannot miss these sources. So you can't use a Research dollar to teach a student, you can't use a Healthcare dollar to offset undergraduate tuition. Have we utilized these Healthcare dollars, for example, where it's appropriate? Of course. We've used those in non-(inaudible) investments in the Healthcare activities, facilities and startup packages for researchers. So are they connected and complementary, yes, but you have to respect these boundaries.

Let's talk about a few of the things on the back of the truck. So if we look at the auxiliaries there at the very top, the \$170 million. Over a 100 million of that 170 is in one auxiliary, the Athletics Department.

In Athletics this fiscal year, will transfer to the University in gifts for the Academic Science Building and in scholarships, another (inaudible) million. That's a transfer coming from Athletics to the University. And that is in addition to paying for all of the

UK5-2-16.txt

services that are rendered to them, all the tuition and fees for student athletes, all the non-resident tuition and fees, that's another 16 million.

We also look at that and look at the largest package, if you will, on the back of the truck, 1.38 billion in our Healthcare enterprise. Over 115 million is being transferred out of our Healthcare enterprise to our College of Medicine for College of Medicine activities in fiscal year '16.

So we're already transferring in these complementary sources, tremendous amounts of resources to the institution. So it's the engine is the first dollar in as the President said, it's what pays for that (inaudible) and it's why that 280 million is so critical to our enterprise.

If we look at a fund source and we look at fiscal year, let's look at it from '08 to '16, we'll start at the right and move to the left. And so we look at what's the change that has occurred in that approximately 8 year period: The hospital growth at 101 percent. Sales and services, 90 percent. Tuition and fees, 84 percent. Gifts, grants and contracts, 49 percent. Auxiliaries, 43 percent. So you see the enterprise that is growing, whereas you see that state appropriation down, now over 17 percent. And that's for fiscal year '16, not '17 and '18 that the President has already shared with you where it's going down even further.

Our operating budget, and you see that if you look to your left, that's state appropriations and tuition and fees. So we're growing as our size and mix of students, as well as some (inaudible), whereas the state appropriation continues to decline.

We break down the enterprise and look at the revenue by source in '16, same thing you just saw on that truck, the 41 percent is in Health, you see tuition and fees at 14. Our state appropriation now is down to about 8 cents. So 8 cents of every dollar. That first dollar in and then we do that (inaudible) on that \$280 million.

So how do we build a budget? The first thing that we do when we build the institutional budget is we want to understand the needs. So this is a sheet that we use and we start with the first two. And you see some question marks. The question marks don't necessarily mean we don't know, we don't know the exact number yet. There's teams of people in your college and

UK5-2-16.txt

across this campus that have been working on this for months and we'll fill these in in the coming days.

But what do we know? As the President referenced, we lost over \$12 million in state funds. We also know that our institutional aid package continues to increase to get the type and the mix of the students that we want. And that's based on a program (inaudible) evaluation and implementation over the last few years. We're about in year three. Next year that new student aid program has 12.8 million in '17. We also know that in '18, we're going to start to see that aid number come down to a more manageable number at 7.9 million. We want, consistent with the President's principles, to see an increase in faculty and staff pay, so 1 percent equals 4.6 million.

We have fixed cost increases, we have Academic Science Building coming online this year, in operations of maintenance we have phase 2, the Gatton College Building opening this year as well, as well as we want to increase our modernization pool.

We have strategic investments this year, and Provost Tracy is going to join me here in a second and talk about this in particular. But this year, we made a strategic investment in the financial allocation model with the sum \$5 million. We want to continue that next year and do that strategic investment again next year for recurring dollars. And then that sums up to really what's the challenge, what's that direct student impact. How much more or how much less do we have to invest in the enterprise? So Provost Tracy is going to join me here and kind of walk us through a little more about strategic investments.

TRACY: Thank you, Dr. Monday. So what we've been trying to do over the last few years is continue to build on that tremendous momentum. And hopefully, you've seen the tremendous momentum over the last five years under Dr. Capilouto's leadership, where we've not only grown in the class size but we've grown in quality and we've grown in research efforts. So everything we've done has had a tremendous momentum and we want to continue that.

To do that, we need to make sure that we make very strategic investments. And as Dr. Monday said, last year, this current fiscal year, we invested 5 million new recurring dollars

in the colleges. That was awarded to the colleges based on percentage of your state base, because we know the state base had not changed for several years. So about 25 percent of that \$5 million went to the colleges based on your percentage of the state base. The remainder of that other 75 percent was based on undergraduate colleges, the total number of students retained over the previous year. So that really meant that for each additional student you retained in your college over the previous year, you got \$5,600. Again, think about that, how that multiplies up very quickly at \$5,600 per student of additional allocation to the colleges.

So what I'd like to walk you through on the next slide, then, is how that money was distributed out to the various colleges. And you see the colleges listed on the left there and then the financial model distribution.

So you can see again, it was based on growth in your colleges, both in terms of the growth in total number of students, but also how you retained those students. So it ranged from about 548,000 down to about 22,000 on recurring dollars in your colleges. As Dr. Monday said, we hope to next year be able to do the same kind of thing, to invest. But we don't know what that number looks like right now, but continue to invest in the colleges. So you can see the 5 million there, spread across the 16 colleges plus the graduate (inaudible).

But I also wanted to talk a little bit about a program under the leadership of our Vice President for Research, Lisa Cassis. In the past, we had had money for - usually, the colleges call it their startup funds, related to how you get money to help your faculty in terms of startup. And Dr. Cassis, with the input from the deans, developed a financial allocation for F & A or facilities and administrative dollars.

And so, you can see there almost \$2.7 million was allocated out to the colleges now based on the F & A dollars that you had generated. So it's a very fair and equitable system in that it rewards productivity and adds additional dollars into the colleges where the decision making can be made best, at the local level. So instead of it being made at the central level, as the one allocations go to individual colleges for a startup package, now those allocations are at

UK5-2-16.txt

your local level, to be carried out the way you see strategically best.

And I'd also like to mention here that now we are allocating out, through Dr. Cassis's leadership, almost 44 percent of every F & A dollar that comes into this University, is going back to the colleges. That is benchmark. And that's, in fact, well within the best institutions of return, which is usually somewhere in the 40 to 50 percent range of F & A dollars go back to colleges. We are allocating that much of the F & A dollars back into the colleges, again for you to grow and continue to make those strategic investments.

So you can see here again a few little side notes. That Medicine previously had a separate agreement, now it's all under that same agreement, where everybody gets a (inaudible) distribution. The Graduate School includes Martin and Patterson, and again those additional funds of how they were allocated out.

So that again, investing back in the enterprise to continue to grow our education and our Research activities here at the University. So I'll turn it back to Eric for just a couple moments. He's going to go through another couple slides with you as well.

MONDAY:

Thanks, Tim. So we talked about step 1, far left. How do we determine those total additional spots needed. (Inaudible) student impact, how do we solve that problem, how do we overcome that challenge.

And so we looked at really four areas between steps 2 and steps 3. So let's talk about step 2 for a moment. First thing, how do we grow new revenues. Tim's going to walk through some academic examples in just a second of how we're looking to do that for next fiscal year.

Second, increased efficiency. So when we talk about efficiencies, what are we talking about? How we pay our bills. So can we pay our bills with the use of our procurement card more at the institutional level and therefore generate a higher level of rebate. Can we take our operating cash, when our students pay tuition and fees, we get those in, how do we invest those funds. Can we invest those funds in a way in which we can generate a higher level of return to the institution.

It's those types of things;

how we procure goods and services, how we pay our bills, how we collect monies that are owed us that we maximize. And when you look at those and you do a number of those things, we'll see next year a seven digit number in increased efficiencies for the institution.

Third, strategic re-allocations. I've heard some people talk about vertical cuts, strategic re-allocations. We've heard the President's principle about not across-the-board. So how are we strategic, and Tim will talk about that in a moment as well, in an example of reallocation.

So once we go through Step 1, then we go through Step 2, kind of take a pause, understand do we still have a remaining need. And if we still have a remaining need, and because of the size and complexity of the challenge especially this year, we likely will have a remaining need, then we look at Step 3 and what is the revenue from tuition and fees that is possible.

And we'll talk a little bit in a moment about CPE, Council on Post-Secondary Education and the ways in which they've looked at tuition and mandatory fees for the upcoming fiscal year. But first, Tim is going to talk a little bit more about Step 2.

TRACY:

Thank you, Eric. So I really want to talk about two pieces of that. Remember that you seldom cut your way to success. You really succeed by growing revenues. Yes, you need to manage your expenses extremely well. You need to be as efficient and effective as possible, but you really become successful through growing revenues.

And so I'd like to give you a couple of examples of new revenues that are really making a difference here at the University of Kentucky, and one of them is Masters Program. Because Masters Programs, both online and traditional Masters programs are very, very popular, but they've also been very, very successful for us. So we have -- we also allocate those funds to the colleges in, I think, a very fair way.

So for online Masters programs, we're returning 60 percent of that tuition revenue directly to the colleges. Sixty percent of the tuition revenue for online Masters programs is being returned directly to the colleges. For traditional, what I would call onsite, traditional Masters programs, we're returning 40 percent. Remember

there's additional overhead for programs that take place here at the University. We have space. We have security. We have all those other issues. But we're still returning 40 percent. Again, that's well within best practices in terms of dollars returned. So it's a benefit to the colleges, but it's also a way that we, as a university, continue to manage our budgets and manage these budget reductions.

The second piece I'd like to talk about are strategic re-allocations. How do we make those hard, difficult decisions that align our resources around our priorities. And let me give you a quick example in our shop of academic excellence. We know that fundamentally there are four reasons why students struggle. They struggle because of academic issues. They struggle because they have financial issues. They struggle because they are struggling with a sense of belonging; I'm alone and away from home and I don't know anybody. And they also fourthly struggle because of emotional and other wellness issues.

How do we align our resources around addressing those four key reasons that students may struggle, and if they struggle, potentially leave the university. So you've probably seen some communication from me recently regarding academic excellence and how we're realigning our efforts there.

We're making some very difficult decisions, but making decisions that are important to align what we do in those offices of Undergraduate Education, Student Affairs, the Center for Enhancement of Learning and Teaching, International Center, and Enrollment and Management. How do we align those so that everything we do is focused on those four key areas from which students struggle? Again, in these times, we need to make sure that we invest in the things that have an impact and those things that are key to what we're trying to do.

In addition to that, we also have to look at tuition though revenue. And part of that is, again, those sharing arrangements with the colleges, but how do we grow and continue to increase those revenues in a thoughtful way and a way that also looks at access and affordability. We want to make sure that we provide the greatest access and the most affordability to our students. We have to be conscious of that.

And I want to start on the

UK5-2-16.txt

right hand side first, if I may, on this slide, because it really speaks to that. You see there is the fall semester. This is semester tuition. It's not total year, but semester tuition. Our resident rates, the annual percent change and what I think is most important is the four-year average percent change. Notice that the four-year average in 2008 was over 10 percent, over 10 percent average increases in tuition. But now look at the last few years. That has continued to go down and, in fact, last year, the four-year rolling average was 4.25 percent.

So we have taken very conscious steps to moderate those tuition increases to make it as affordable as possible to attend the University of Kentucky. And in just a few moments, Eric is going to share with you some benchmarks to other institutions and what they charge for resident tuition.

Now, I'd like to walk you through the left hand side of this slide because this is equally as important. And this is really an investment in our students. You can see that in that left hand graph, we have -- the red line is total student enrollment. In '09, it was about 27,000 students and it currently it sits at 30,800 or so, give or take a student or two.

But what I also want you to pay attention to are the bars which is our financial aid. Notice that it was pretty flat for the first three or four years, 51 to 57 million dollars in institutional aid to students. But now, you notice that between FY '12 and FY '17, we have doubled the institutional aid to students. This year over \$104 million going to student scholarships. That, with moderation in tuition increases, is a step toward helping those students make sure that college is affordable for them. Now, you can see then the projected growth in the scholarship budget as well.

But that's an investment in our students and it's an investment in our success. So we're doing everything we can to try to make sure that college at the University of Kentucky remains accessible and affordable.

MONDAY:

Thank you, Tim. A few other slides that we wanted to share with you while talking a little bit more about tuition and fees. So our Council on Post-Secondary Education has the constitution or statutory authority to

regulate tuition and fees.

So these are the fee parameters for the upcoming fiscal year, fiscal year '17. No. 1, they set those rates by sector. We're in the research sector with one other institution, the University of Louisville. And we'll share those data in just one second. No. 2, is they revised their policy on non-resident students. It used to be just twice, charged twice the rate for resident students.

Now, they've revised that to look at a better net tuition and fee revenue generated per non-resident must exceed 100 percent of the direct instructional student services cost per student. For reference, the University of Kentucky is (inaudible) 44 percent. So we're well positioned within this metric.

And lastly, it gives us some ability to be market competitive when we're talking about the graduate tuition and mandatory fees.

So what are our numbers? You may have read in the paper, we're the first row on this sheet, University of Kentucky. We're at \$10,936, that is our base and what we charged in '15/'16, the ceiling. So the ceiling that we can go up to at the University of Kentucky, under these guidelines, is \$11,483 or that is 5 percent.

We also have listed -- so U of L is No. 2 there, they're the second one in the research sector, and then you see Western Kentucky University, all the way to Kentucky State University. Those institutions represent the comprehensive sector, and then the community and technical colleges is the last row and you see their pricing principle.

As it relates to the comprehensive sector, they had the ability to adjust based on a fixed dollar amount of \$432 rather than a percentage. And you see why the percentage varies by institution. The goal of CPE was to become more market-driven for those comprehensive institutions, and to spread that out on a fixed dollar amount rather than on a percentage, and you see the various percentages.

So Tim referenced this, where do we sit? How do we compete, compare with institutions that surround us? So from the top there, you see Illinois above \$15,000. These are the flagship universities in those states, so we all know those names. Virginia, 14,4, Tennessee, that is, of course, the

UK5-2-16.txt

University of Tennessee at Knoxville, 12,4, Missouri is at 11, a little bit more than 11. We're right there at 10,9. Indiana is a little bit below us at 10,4, and then you see Ohio also in the 10s, and then a little bit of an outlier, somewhere on the top of Illinois, on the bottom of West Virginia, it's \$7,600.

So we talk a lot about operating. We also wanted to share a little bit about the capital budget. So in the Commonwealth of Kentucky there's an operating capital component. So we're talking about the capital, looking at fiscal year '17 and fiscal year '18, the next two years. This represents -- this slide represents what was approved in that budget. There are many different processes between the House and the Senate version of what occurred. This is what was approved.

So we received legislation, legislative authority or authorization for two projects for agency bonds. And what we mean by agency bonds, the ability to use our own resources, our own debt. So this is not including any State debt. These are just the University's resources to go out and sell bonds to support these two projects. No. 1, was our Facilities Renewal and Modernization Pool. We had asked for \$250 million, 125 million in bonds and \$125 million of our own cash. We were able to receive \$60 million of bonds. No. 2, was \$150 million of agency bonds to continue the capital transformation and to finish out Pavilion A and other surrounding facilities in UK Healthcare.

As it relates to the \$60 million facilities renewal pool, the President and Provost and others will continue to discuss those and how we utilize those resources consistent with our strategic planning, and more to come on those funds in the coming months.

We did receive legislation, legislative authority for multiple cash funded projects, so that cash funded projects would allow us, if we had a significant utility outage or significant challenge within our facilities, the ability to do those projects currently.

And the last point is suggesting there is a change coming. But currently any project over \$600,000 has to be approved. So that number is moving to a million dollars through HB 80, revising the statutes listed, which will move that threshold and it would

UK5-2-16.txt

really help us moving that threshold to a million dollars.

Lastly, here's our timeline. So just last week, CPE approved those parameters for tuition and fees. Of course, today is May 2nd and we're here with you today. Tomorrow, the President will present this information to our Board of Trustees. The units will work in the month of May, with the Provost and others, to look at their revenue and expense projections. The Staff Senate meeting is upcoming on May 12th. We expect that CPE will take action on proposed tuition and mandatory fees on June 2nd. And then our Board on June 24th, will consider the operating budget, our capital budget, as well as our tuition and fees. I'm going to turn it back over to the President, who wants to make the closing comments. Mr. President.

CAPILOUTO: Thank you, Eric and Tim. So you see our budget has challenges and it has some opportunity costs. We will continue to climb the ranks of great universities. Unfortunately, we may not climb as fast. Some of the monies we've been able to earn and some of the efficiencies we've been able to gain are used to fill a hole instead of entirely dedicated to moving us forward. But we can earn our way forward because we've got a high class (inaudible).

We've got more people who are being treated here than we can handle. We turned away some 2,000 people at our hospital last year. And we have more students, and it's a growing number of students that are coming here than we can admit.

So despite the cuts, I know we are in a better place than any university in Kentucky and I can assure you we're in a better place than most State agencies throughout Kentucky that spend on State support.

We are still positioned to weather the storm and to thrive. We can prosper. It is not a time to whine and make excuses. We don't need to because we're going to prevail and we're not going to lose our way in terms of what we want to do. But we're going to have to find new ways to do it. And it's not just because of this budget, it's the world that is so rapidly changing around us.

You know if you've read articles in the last few weeks about the decline of manufacturing in the United States, you realize the peak in 1979 in the number of manufacturing jobs. But

UK5-2-16.txt

you look at the impact of globalization, technology, and automation on our economy in terms of the impact on jobs and you recognize that this is a disruption that will continue in an unabated way.

And so, yes, our students, I think, are going to be well prepared for this. We've changed our curricula so it continues to evolve. We've focused on everything from communication skills to quantitative literacy (inaudible). And there are three codes I see emerging in the future that our students are going to have to master, at some level, is genetic code and computer code, but the most important code, is the one of character and conduct. And that to me can best be found in the arts and the humanities which must remain strong at the University of Kentucky.

So I had all these people share data with you. My real job at the University of Kentucky is to tell stories, and you give me lots of stories to tell. And stories are very powerful because they connect us to one another on this campus and they connect the Commonwealth to us. And so I could tell you a million, you know.

Friday night, I took a walk on this campus at 10:30 to midnight. I bumped into eighty students, mostly minority, who are part of a group called Underground Perspective. And their mission is to build community through diversity and I am lifted by what they do.

Now, I'm going to share a story, an individual one. Don Witt, every year gets requests for diversity scholarships, and everybody is required to write a (inaudible). So here's just one from a perspective student. Diversity is understanding that each individual is unique and recognizing those differences. I believe from being in my little corner of Appalachian mountains, I was made, made me diverse from other individuals that may attend the University of Kentucky.

I then had a life changing experience in 2013 when I was diagnosed with cancer. I was a sophomore in high school, cheerleading, playing tennis. Then, all of a sudden, my life changed drastically. I became engulfed in a whirlwind consisting of chemotherapy, radiation, blood transfusions, scans, and doctors appointments.

But my very own struggles have given me a unique outlook on daily life. I realized that this life-altering

UK5-2-16.txt

prospective would enable me to contribute to Dance Blue, allowing me to spread compassion of fears and strengthen a sense of community at the University of Kentucky.

While a patient at UK Children's Hospital, I was introduced to the wonderful organization called Dance Blue, and I learned very quickly that Dance Blue is a vital part of the children's clinic.

Once being exposed to the philanthropic sides of that scale at the University of Kentucky, I knew I wanted to go to the University of Kentucky and be a part of Dance Blue. And I was so inspired by this charity that I encouraged my local high school to host a mini-Dance Blue marathon that raised \$11,000 in a small community of underprivileged citizens. And I look to bring this same zeal to Dance Blue in Lexington.

I believe that the unique prospective that I possess can help volunteers of Dance Blue better understand the experience that these children live with day to day because I, too, live it.

So while a patient at Children's Hospital, I witnessed compassion firsthand unlike any other. Each nurse that I came in contact, treated me not like a patient but a friend. My junior football homecoming I could not attend due to hospitalization.

This person won an award and was supposed to be recognized. She couldn't be there, but the students -- the nurses sprang into action making me a makeshift crown and sceptor. And I want to apply the same amount of compassion and friendship to my fellow colleagues at the University of Kentucky. Hope to be involved in many organizations and I want to treat each member with the same level of respect and kindness that I received upon my diagnosis.

Growing up in the foothills of Appalachia, I always felt a strong sense of community. Each member of my county feels a sense of dependency and loyalty in each (inaudible). I can never extend enough gratitude to my county for the amount of support I received. I plan to demonstrate this sense of community to the University of Kentucky students. After all, everyone should all be exposed to a little bit of our famous hospitality.

My unique experiences undoubtedly shaped me into the lady I am

today. I became independent, strong and determined. Among all these things, my unique contributions to Dance Blue, the discovery of true compassion, the sense of Appalachian community, I believe that I'm a strong asset to the diversity of the University of Kentucky.

So this is why we are here and this why we are the University of Kentucky. Thank you and I'm happy to answer any questions.

HIPPISLEY: Does anyone have a question for the President?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.

So this performance pool, maybe you don't know anymore about the criteria than you've already shared with us, but that \$13 million that's being taken from our budget, is that something, a maximum that we can earn back or can we earn back more than that if we exceed our goals? How exactly is that going to work?

CAPILOUTO: I think the way it's determined now it's probably the maximum you can earn back.

GROSSMAN: Oh, great. Thank you.

HIPPISLEY: Is there any other questions?

Thank you very much. (APPLAUSE)

HIPPISLEY: Let's vote on if we're here. Five, four, three, two, one. 60 people here, 3 have abstained. No objections were received. Unless there are any objections now, minutes of April 11, 2016 stand approved by unanimous consent.

This is something we do every year, we mention the people who receive the Provost teaching awards: Andres Ayoob from Medicine; Elizabeth Combs from Cafe; Christopher Doty from Medicine; Susan Thiel from Fine Arts; Jean Wiese from Medicine. And then four TA's got their awards: Patrick Herald from A and S; Alyson Hock from A and S; Jo Mackby from A and S, and Francesco Masala from A and S. Well done everyone. (APPLAUSE)

HIPPISLEY: I'd like to congratulate on everyone's behalf Lee Blonder, who is now your new Trustee, well, June 1st, new Trustee. Lee, are you here? Can you stand up? And sadly we say thank you and good bye to John Wilson, who is our outgoing Trustee. John, can you stand up and be applauded?

All right. We start with old business and there are two items. Two things that didn't get done last time. One is the TCE report, which is a set of seven recommendations, and the other one is the Ad Hoc Calendar Committee Report, which was a set of about three or four

recommendations.

So I want to talk briefly about how we are going to conduct our business for the TCE. We basically have a motion on the floor from last time which we postponed. I want to emphasize a few things. No. 1, we're not deciding whether we should have TCEs. We're not deciding what the questions should be. That was all done in March. All right?

What we're deciding today is those things that we endorsed in March, how are we going to implement them going forward. That's what Senate charged a committee to do and that's what the committee has done. Okay.

One of the overriding principles of the committee was to follow specific charge of Senate, which was maximize the return of the responses. That's what people were so worried about with the general universal set of questions that are done online, how are you going to be sure that students (inaudible) the results.

Now, we have a lot of business to do. There are an awful lot of actions where people's programs depend upon whether they get through today or not. So I want to suggest, unless there's a objection, my suggestion goes away, that we limit this discussion and vote and debate for 30 minutes.

I invited people, a couple of weeks ago, to send specific language which would amend one of the recommendations or more in Dr. Golding and the committee's report. I received maybe five or six people's language. That language becomes a motion as soon as a person stands up and says I move to amend and this is the way I want to amend it.

Okay? We're going to go, we've created this document for you and I hope everyone got -- had time to get one in the back -- wait, no. Oh, they haven't -- (inaudible). You'll see it on the screen anyway. This is just to help you reference while we're going on.

The first page is just basically going through all the recommendations and when somebody sends an amendment, it's registered. Then when you open the document, you read what the (inaudible). It's just rows of things crossed out and things added. That's basically the track changes, track change version of the document.

We'll go through each recommendation in turn. The color coding is the people who sent a recommendation, okay? And I'm going to

take those in the order of the recommendation, but when two or three people sent (inaudible) in the order in which they're received. Some people sent a recommendation amendment for one recommendation and then they agreed by e-mail that they -- that they were (inaudible) motion. Obviously, it's not.

So this is the motion on the floor, so let's, right now, and I'm sure there is, there is an amendment on the floor to change that Senate recommendation and we'll put the amendments on the floor. Anybody move to amend the document? And I would like to point to Kaveh first, because his is the first amendment I received. And his is for recommendation No. 1. Tagavi, do you want to amend the document by looking at recommendation No. 1?

TAGAVI: Yes.
HIPPI SLEY: Okay. Do we have a second for Tagavi?

WASILKOWSKI: Second.
HIPPI SLEY: Kaveh is 1, second is --
WASILKOWSKI: Wasilkowski, Engineering.
HIPPI SLEY: Okay. So Sheila is going to put on the screen what Kaveh's amendment looks like and you will find it on line, starting line 60.

Todd Porter had an amendment to this as well, but he's agreed to -- Todd, if I'm wrong about this -- he's agreed that Tagavi's amendment will cover his as well. So both (inaudible). Is that right, Todd? Do you agree to that?

PORTER: That will work, yes.
HIPPI SLEY: If you'll go to 60, you'll see what it is. This is all about the availability. We see Kaveh's first one is to score out as approved by UK faculty senate rules and Todd's and Kaveh's combined together to go from 64 to 72. Kaveh, just in a couple of words, would you want to say why you're doing what you're doing? 64 to 72.

TAGAVI: I just want to make sure when we talk about instructor and dean and chair, it will be the chair and the instructor and the dean of that college of that course, so make those few changes.

HIPPI SLEY: Todd, do you have anything to add?

PORTER: No. All I was trying to do is make sure that coordinators could actually see the results for other instructors in their course.

HIPPI SLEY: Okay. So, we've added instructors and we circumvented it so

it's the relevant parties that see the comments. That's basically the gist of the amendment. Any questions or discussions? Kaveh?

TAGAVI: I have just one concern. I saw that AR 2:1 just 40 minutes before I came here with President. ARs are not approved by us. We don't have control of ARs.

WOOD: Point of order. We're not approving this. We're endorsing it.

HIPPISLEY: We're going to endorse it. So

there's an administrative side to this, a very heavy administrative side to this. The last time we met decided to remove approve and we're basically endorsing. Unless there are any questions, this seems clear for me, but it may not be for everybody, unless there are any questions, we will vote on this first amendment.

WOOD: Which one are we voting on?
The whole thing?

HIPPISLEY: The whole, the whole thing,
yes.

BROTHERS: The amendments are in there
line by line, so there's --

HIPPISLEY: The amendment, Connie, would
be what you see from 59 to 76. It's the
amendment Todd and Kaveh, together, are
moving this. This as an amendment of
availability to TCE results.

WOOD: So your original motion was to
also include thoughts.

HIPPISLEY: Yes. Gail Bri on, Engineering.

BRION: Gail Bri on, Engineering.
Shouldn't D still be C?

HIPPISLEY: Yeah, we'll --

BRION: If we're going to put it in,
I just want to make sure it's not
missing a C.

HIPPISLEY: Okay. Unless there are any
other discussions points, we will vote
on this first amendment. Everyone see
what it is? All right. Five, four,
three, two, one. We're ready. Okay.
Motion passes. The document will be
amended in that way. We'll now move on.

So the second recommendation
that Jonathan's committee had was the
TCE grade release policy. I received
two amendments, pieces of language to
amendment from (inaudible) collected
two. I received Kaveh's first and then
I received Connie's, so I'll take -- and
they do not dovetail, so I will take
Kaveh's first and he will have to move
it. Somebody will have to second it.
But if you look at -- in fact, we made
an error, 83 to 86 is what you would
have already, so that should not be
shaded. Kaveh's additional language is

from 88 to 90. So Kaveh, do you have a motion?

TAGAVI: Can I ask you a question, first?

HIPPISLEY: Well, there's nothing on the floor yet.

TAGAVI: Move.

HIPPISLEY: Is there a second?

UNIDENTIFIED: Second.

HIPPISLEY: Are there any questions?

BROWN: Roger Brown, College of Ag. How -- this amendment here seems like it would be in contradiction to the one at the very end under Item 7. Are you planning to vote on this one and then vote again to change it a second time?

HIPPISLEY: Yeah, I will do it in order just to make it easier.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, so we had also made an amendment that was friendly to this one. Should I propose it now or do you want to wait and do it in order?

HIPPISLEY: If it's going to be friendly to this one, Tagavi may accept it as friendly.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, so we would accept all -- the College of Law would accept all of Kaveh's language and like it except that we wanted to start with each college's TCE, so at 2a, instead of saying TCE window, because some of the colleges, including Medicine, Pharmacy and Law have slightly different calendars from the University's. So to clarify, two weeks, two calendar weeks ending midnight on the last day of classes, it should say, each college's TCE window, which would clarify that there is a two weeks period. The clock starts for classes according to the calendar of each college.

HIPPISLEY: Kaveh, do you accept that?

TAGAVI: Absolutely.

HIPPISLEY: Any other questions on this?

Bob.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S. So at the last meeting, there was also a discussion about whether the TCE window should extend through finals because the final exam -- some people thought the final exam was the worse part of the course to evaluate. And other people disagreed, but they were worried that students who (inaudible) for the finals would change -- would not give reasonable responses. So does either of these amendments include the possibility of the TCE window open, staying open until after finals?

HIPPISLEY: This is a motion against finals being --

GROSSMAN: So if we vote against this motion, then we will be saying that the evaluation period should stay open through finals. Is that correct?

HIPPISLEY: I think this is a final issue. This is all about finals.

DEBSKI: So as I read the document -- Liz Debski, A and S, and I think Kaveh's point was there's no evaluation period currently in the document, so Kaveh is adding this. So Bob's question, if you vote against this, there's nothing in the document at the present time to say when the evaluation period will be.

HIPPISLEY: Jonathan, is that your understanding? Nothing is implied about finals if we vote against it.

DEBSKI: Nothing is implied about when the evaluation period is, never mind about finals.

TAGAVI: Can I add something?

HIPPISLEY: Yes.

TAGAVI: Last time, on the third floor, it was implied that. Let's say, final is given, grades are released and a student the week after that, four days after that student who did not get their grade because they did not complete, they're going to be given a chance to complete it then presumably after they know their grade. So I was very concerned about that possibility. If you don't put in dates, then anything is possible.

HIPPISLEY: But this specific date will also stop the possibility of (inaudible) students (inaudible).

TAGAVI: Right.

HIPPISLEY: So that was a big point, a big point from last time. That was a big point. Lee?

BLONDER: Lee Blonder, Medicine. Are we going to then be voting on another amendment to change the window if we vote this down? Isn't there a second amendment proposed by --

HIPPISLEY: Roger, I think. Roger has an amendment. Roger's amendment starts on, you have the handout, on 52. Roger, is your vote, amendment --

BROWN: Item 7.

HIPPISLEY: 215?

BROWN: Yes.

HIPPISLEY: So this is a very detailed proposal by Roger that set out exactly the times. Now, Roger, Kaveh's amendment contradicts this?

BROWN: Yes.

HIPPISLEY: Yes, Lee.

BLONDER: Yes, I just wanted to make it clear that this is a kind of an alternative to Kaveh's amendment to this

proposal .
HIPPI SLEY: We have two (inaudible) versions (inaudible). At the moment on the floor, it's Kaveh's amendment. Okay, Todd?
PORTER: Point of order. I guess I'm not clear. The way the second amendment in purple, the right below it, I guess, that's Connie's amendment?
WOOD: Yes, that's my amendment.
HIPPI SLEY: And that's a separate one completely.
PORTER: But if we vote on that one -- if we vote on this first one favorably, then how can we -- if we vote on that second one favorably, what's -- what's the outcome.
HIPPI SLEY: The second one is hugely encompassing. Basically, there is no, right, Connie, there's no grade release policy at all.
PORTER: But they're contradictory. The first one says you don't get your grades if you don't do your TCA until a certain time. The second one says you get your grade regardless. Can we vote both of those yes? What would the outcome be?
HIPPI SLEY: You can vote on -- the current one is to modify what was in the set of recommendations, which is to have a release policy and here is how we're going to define it. The second one which will do the opposite, that's not have a (inaudible) policy at all. So that's the order in which we're going to do it. John.
WILSON: John Wilson, Medicine. We're combining issues here. The first issue is the issue related to when you can complete a course evaluation. The second issue, which is in conflict with what is in purple there, is that there's a penalty involved. So there's two issues here. One is when can you ever complete, regardless of whether there's a penalty or not, the course evaluation. The second is, is there a penalty for not completing the course evaluation? Piecemeal makes it very difficult for anybody to know how to vote on it.
HIPPI SLEY: Katherine.
MCCORMICK: So can we vote on the first section without the A, because frankly, I agree with the first part, but I don't agree with the second.
HIPPI SLEY: So the first part, do you mean line 83?
MCCORMICK: 83 through 86.
HIPPI SLEY: 83 and 86 was there already.
PORTER: That shouldn't be in purple. The first amendment is better

than the original. And now I like the second amendment better than the first amendment.

HI PPI SLEY: Right. (Inaudible) sequence.
Yes.

MCCORMICK: And just for clarification.
The 88 excludes voting during finals.
Correct?

HI PPI SLEY: 88 excludes voting during
finals. If we defeat 88, then Roger's
motion spells out exactly how to do the
TCE in terms of (inaudible), right?
Okay. So the motion is 88 to 90, adding
that language in. It will exclude
finals. Have you had a chance to think
about this? Five, four, three, two,
one. Defeated. Now we have no
(inaudible).

Now this is, this is another
one, another amendment. It's
completely different. It's not
modifying. This is an amendment about
(inaudible). This is language, and
Connie, I will turn to her, she would
like to make a motion to amend.

WOOD: So moved.

BROWN: Second. Roger Brown.

HI PPI SLEY: Roger Brown, second. So this
is 97 and 98. And what it does, it
does away with the whole release policy.
So now, if you look at it, you look at
101 downwards, all of that in the report
is now gone and the sentence is, all
students will have access to final
course grades as soon as it becomes
available. So Connie, unless I'm wrong
here, it's the status quo.

WOOD: Yes.

HI PPI SLEY: It's a status quo because
that's what the case is right now.

WOOD: Well, it's more than the
status quo. It keeps this from being a
forced questionnaire which has both
statistical and legal problems.

BRIAN: May I also speak on it?

HI PPI SLEY: Yes, Gail.

BRIAN: I'd like to expand Connie's
thought as well. I believe serving on
the Rules Committee, when I read the
rules that the intent of the original
rules was that students have speedy
access to their grades. And I think
that this entire policy that we're
looking at is changing the original
intent of the rules by putting in a
punitive process. So I would like to
speak for this amendment.

HI PPI SLEY: I'd like to turn to the
committee because this is the thing that
the committee spent most of its time on,
how to actually incentivize. And one of
the findings (inaudible) with delaying
grades (inaudible). So I'm going to

turn to -- Jonathan is here, but I know Lisa is here and others, and if they'd like to join in to in what they have to say about it.

GOLDING: Well, the thing I would say, with all due respect, that's not how the committee interpreted the rules and we viewed it, as stated here, we viewed this policy very much akin to holds, except we thought holds were much more punitive than this would because with the holds, you don't get to register. You don't get your transcript. This is truly delaying. You're going to get your grade, but we're trying to think, and after we've looked at other schools and what kind of incentives would get students to do it, this is what we settled on. We thought it was a reasonable alternative, so I'm not sure what more to say about that. We thought it was reasonable and having been seen other schools and their success with it, we thought that it would work here.

HIPPISLEY: Because this is such a (inaudible) issue, I'd like to hear from more people who would like to speak for or against it. Greg, go ahead.

WASILKOWSKI: Greg Wasilkowski, Engineering. I like this idea, however, it will become irrelevant to TCE. So (inaudible) this statement. It talks only about final grade which has nothing to do with TCE under 97 and 98.

HIPPISLEY: Well, I'm not following at this point.

WASILKOWSKI: Okay. As suggested, which I like, but not in this place, this statement is irrelevant to TCE. It talks about only final grade.

UNIDENTIFIED: Maybe it's striking everything out underneath it to, correct?

HIPPISLEY: This is -- basically, it strikes -- yeah, if you go down, Greg, this is what the proposal really is. It's basically saying the TCE and the access to final grade is now disconnected. Yeah, there's no connection between the TCE and getting your grade.

WASILKOWSKI: All right. I suggest not to have this stay here. Just remove it, (inaudible) it's not a place in the document.

WOOD: I will accept that as a friendly amendment.

HIPPISLEY: So the friendly amendment, which Connie Wood, A and S, accepts is just not having the statement and instead just having the cross-outs.

WOOD: I was just trying to clarify.

HIPPISLEY: Anyone else like to speak for

or against the amendment, which is just basically to cross everything out about TCE related to grades. Liz and then John?

DEBSKI : Liz Debski, A and S. If you're going to do that, you have to also strike above, go above into your purple because it also refers to that in the purple, in the section 83 to 86. Do you see, students who do not complete TCEs for a given course will receive their grade after. So that also has to be struck, if you're going to remove that statement below.

HI PPI SLEY: So you're essentially removing the TCE grade release policy. So the whole recommendation two goes. Do you accept that Connie, as a friendly amendment? The whole TCE --

WOOD: Yes, we'll be glad to editorialize this based on the order in which they -- these amendments are passed.

HI PPI SLEY: So this would override the other ones. The whole of two goes. Anyone else want to speak? Anyone want to speak for it? We've had a lot of people against it. Anyone want to speak for it? John.

WILSON: Yes. My -- I will speak for the amendment. My concern is that the language to me implies that it is possible that an instructor would no longer have the authority to release their final grades to their student. In other words -- in other words, if I want to publish my final grade, will I be in violation of this policy which has -- in which I have no idea whether they've filled out a course evaluation. You could -- you could --

GOLDING: Again, Jonathan Golding, A and S.

I mean, you could give a student their grade, but as far as their official grade, they're not going to see it. That's your purview as a faculty member, what you want to do. They're just not going to see it for eight days. So, you know, whether, you know, you may sit there and say, well, that's not enough. Well, that's, of course, your decision to release your grades. I'm not sure I haven't --

WILSON: Well, if I release the grade and I'm the one who is sending the grades to the registrar, then I am in essence then in opposition to the policy of making them do a course evaluation prior to that. Will I, at some future point, be at risk for, you know, sanctions for violating this policy? And essentially, it takes, it -- many of

us do this as a -- in a regular way. So it trivializes the penalty, which I oppose the penalty anyway. But I just want to make sure that we're not approving something or recommending something that's eventually going to be another bureaucratic hurdle where I have to pledge I will not be releasing the grades.

HIPPISLEY: I don't believe -- I mean, the committee discussed this and nobody believes, the committee, that you'd be penalized for giving a student a grade. Nothing is stopping that. The only thing it's doing, it's preventing the particular access to the grade. Students accessing the grade through UK, myuk. That's all it's doing. You can use Canvas. They can look at Canvas and get their grades. You can show them an email. You can invite them into your office. There's nothing in here that stops that, it's the student access to the grade through UK, myuk. Connie.

WOOD: Please correct if I'm incorrect, but it's my understanding that it's more than the student just seeing the grade on -- through the SAP. It's actually being able to get transcript in order to apply to graduate school, jobs or anything else.

HIPPISLEY: Right. The transcript's delayed until that eight day period. Okay.

FIEDLER: Ted Fiedler, Arts and Sciences.

I think we're losing sight of the whole reason for the discussion of this. As long as we were handing out TCE forms in our classes, we also had students who chose not to fill these things out, but the compliance rate was fairly high. Part of the tenure promotion process at this institution is that we have some kind of comprehensive feedback about teaching. We're not going to get it if we don't impose some kind of restrictions on people filling these things out or not filling them out.

So I think we're losing sight of that and I would speak against this amendment because I think we do need to provide some kind of mechanism that will at least require students to look at the thing and go through it and say, I don't want to answer this question. I don't want to answer this question, okay?

UNIDENTIFIED: Amen.

HIPPISLEY: Okay. Yes, sir. Certainly.

VASCONEZ: Vasconez from Medicine. I've been listening to all this discussion and I'm not going to talk

about the statistical validity of the TCE. But I think that when the professor and students, they start the course, they make a tacit agreement that the professor will impart knowledge and the students will respond as to whether that knowledge is good, bad, or indifferent, and whether it was valuable.

So I think that that very -- it's a solemn pledge that there should be feedback back and forth. And so, I also think that in some way the responses should be both valuable, and I would keep the TCE maintained in some form of almost mandatory, but I know we don't like the word mandatory, but possibly making it an incentive.

HI PPI SLEY: So at this point, you're speaking against the amendment?

VASCONEZ: Against, yes.

HI PPI SLEY: All right. Hearing nothing else -- oh, Connie.

WOOD: With all due respect to my colleague, there is a statistical issue here. Because by forcing a student to go online, you are in no way ensuring that that student will be giving a fair evaluation of the course. And, in fact, it actually encourages what is known as the mischievous responder and it also does not help what is known as the bias due to voluntary response, which is the students who feel less strongly about the course have less probability of actually answering the questionnaire.

So even though I support the requirement for or the need for having fair and comprehensive student evaluation of the quality of instruction, I would state that statistically, we're much better off trying to follow the recommendations of the committee that do try and provide a culture whereby the students actually see this as a very important activity, as you are saying, as a contract between student and faculty member.

HI PPI SLEY: Okay. Yes.

LEHMAN: Christina Lehman, Business and Economics.

So I'm a student and I took it upon myself to ask like a full room, this full room of student government, and a couple of my business professors let me ask my classes what they thought. Students were overwhelmingly against it, but they were more open to the idea when they could have time like -- like Harvard has it where it is extended after finals because they felt that would give them more time to look at it after the stress of exams was over.

They were definitely more okay with it when they realized they could still see their grade on Canvas if they wanted to. It was just their transcript that they couldn't see.

HIPPISLEY: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate you doing the canvassing. Wally.

FERRIER: Walter Ferrier, B and E. I'd just like to ask my colleagues in the room who have experienced submitting or reviewing IRB requests, where we're asking students, well, we're -- we're demanding students do these things and, you know, the penalties when they try -- I just don't know if it passed IRB muster. I really don't.

HIPPISLEY: Okay. I don't know (inaudible) 30 minutes, but I'd like, unless it's a really crying out question, I'd like to move to vote on this. Okay. Let's vote on this. This is the amendment, which is just basically -- Connie, correct me if I'm wrong, the amendment is to strike out that recommendation on delayed release policy. Okay. Have you had time to think about this? Remember, yes is for Connie's amendment. Have to remember that. Okay. Five, four, three, two, one. Okay. The motion carries. So this means that there is no -- 39, 33, 1 abstention. There is no grade release policy.

All right. We will now go to the form, itself and it's the recommendation number three. Is there an amendment? Is there an amendment motion, Kaveh?

TAGAVI: So amended, yes.

HIPPISLEY: So moved?

TAGAVI: So moved.

HIPPISLEY: Is there a second?

WASILKOWSKI: Second. Wasilkowski, Engineering.

HIPPISLEY: There will be fifteen common questions for all course evaluations with the five point scale approved by the University Senate for the TCE. That's your amendment.

TAGAVI: Can I quickly say why?

HIPPISLEY: Sure.

TAGAVI: It is factually true, but before letting one the four or five or six that we were to work up, so I just to be safe, (inaudible) editorial change. Just to put in there because that's exactly what the recommendation is. It was just (inaudible) one of the five.

HIPPISLEY: Okay. So it's editorial.

TAGAVI: In my opinion, yes.

HIPPISLEY: Does anyone think it's not

editorial? Can we have a show of hands? All those in favor of this editorial change? All those against. One, all right. Abstain? Motion carries. It's an editorial change. So we have the green which is, I can't remember. Todd Porter. Todd, do you have a motion?

PORTER: So moved. Although, I would note that since we removed the penalty for not doing a TCE, I don't know that we need to worry about this as much. But I'd still have it in there anyway.

HI PPI SLEY: So could you -- so basically he wants -- so tell us what you want.

PORTER: This is just where there's one button at the top of the form that says, I opt out of doing this. As it is currently written, there is an opt out with each question so the students have to go and opt out on each question if they don't want to do this. This would allow them to punch one button and say, I don't want to do it, and it gives them a box, fill-in box, they can say why, which is just for our benefit. They don't have to fill it out. If there was a penalty for not doing the TCE, this would allow them to not do it. That is the way we do it in the College of Pharmacy. There's no penalty now so it's less necessary, but I think they still ought to have the right to opt out with one button, rather than not doing it.

HI PPI SLEY: Opt out with one button rather than every single question to opt out. That's basically the amendment. Is there a second?

BRI ON: I second. Gail Bri on, Engineering.

HI PPI SLEY: Anyone want to speak for or against? Anyone apart from Kaveh and Connie just for the moment? We've heard a lot from them.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S. I -- given that they don't have to complete it at all, there's no penalty for completing it, I would actually like it not to -- like not to make it easier for them to not complete it by having the single opt out question at the beginning. Otherwise, we're going to even get smaller responses as usual. And it does occur to me there are other ways to get students to fill these things out.

I've received four phone calls from various university officials for my son to sign up for orientation and I finally got him to do it by telling him I'm tired of getting phone calls. And so I believe we could possibly nag

students into filling these things out. And if we can do that, again an opt out all at the top would make it again too easy for them to opt out.

HIPPISLEY: So Bob is speaking against that, makes it too easy. Connie, Lee, then Kaveh.

WOOD: I agree with Bob. Since it's not a course questionnaire, you do not need the opt out button at the beginning. But in order to keep each question from being forced, it is statistical practice to leave the opt out on each question, but it's not that big a deal. But by best practice and standards, it should be there for each question.

HIPPISLEY: Okay. So you are against the amendment. Kaveh?

TAGAVI: Yeah, I am against -- I am in favor of making it one button only, and this is my fear, that's the seal mark of the fifteen questions, the last one is rate the professor. So the student has to say, opt out, opt out, opt out, until you say, you know what, I'm going to give you a zero on the fifteen one just to show their frustration that you had to force them to go through this.

WOOD: But they're not forced anymore.

TAGAVI: If they have to do every single one of them. I -- I just don't like this.

HIPPISLEY: Lee.

BLONDER: Lee Blonder, Medicine. I agree with Connie. Since we're not forcing them to do the questionnaire, we're going to try to force them to opt out, they'll get confused. Students will get in to do the questionnaire and they'll see this opt out button. And it doesn't -- I don't think it makes sense given what we just voted on.

HIPPISLEY: Mi rek?

TRUSZCZYNSKI: Mi rek Truszczynski, College of Engineering. I want to reinforce what Lee just said. Opt out is deceiving. Right now, there should be no place for opt out, but for some other (inaudible) people who feel this is (inaudible), no data or they cannot make the assessment.

HIPPISLEY: Well, if someone actually (inaudible) that, well, I choose not to answer. That's the language (inaudible). Todd?

PORTER: Todd Porter, Pharmacy. I'm actually opposed to my own motion now because of what Connie said. Because my motion takes out the individual opt out and I would think that's important to be

on each question, so I, at this point --

HIPPI SLEY: You're withdrawing it?

PORTER: I would withdraw it, but it's been seconded.

BRI ON: Oh, yeah. I will happily withdraw my second.

HIPPI SLEY: The other procedural issue would be (inaudible) language set by Kaveh again. Line 149-50. So this is the idea that evaluation must be announced a week in advance and no evaluation outside of this time period will be allowed. Kaveh, can you explain the --

TAGAVI : Yeah. This is not actually - It's -- it's a comment. It's not an amendment. I just want you to realize that it doesn't say if you (inaudible) in class time. Does that mean then you could not have out of class? It's just so vague. I don't have an amendment on that.

HIPPI SLEY: So Jonathan, do you accept this just as qualification rather a motion?

GOLDING: All right.

HIPPI SLEY: He's accepted -- clarification.

GROSSMAN: No, it's not a clarification. It's a new policy. But if he doesn't want to propose it, he doesn't want to propose it.

HIPPI SLEY: Okay. Kaveh? All right?

UNIDENTIFIED: Is he withdrawing this?

HIPPI SLEY: He didn't even make a motion. Okay. Next we have (inaudible).

TAGAVI : I'm sorry. I misunderstood. I will. I was looking at the second one. I will, I will amend, I will move the first one. If you have it in class then that would be limited to in class.

HIPPI SLEY: Is there a second? There's no second. There's no motion. Okay. We move on to 155. Kaveh, is this just the editorial one?

TAGAVI : That's the editorial one. Do what you want to do with it.

HIPPI SLEY: We'll move on.

DEBSKI : Wait, wait, wait. You're saying such -- that one is editorial? It's not editorial.

GROSSMAN: 155 is editorial. Line 155.

DEBSKI : What happened to 149 and 150?

GROSSMAN: It was dropped.

TAGAVI : There was no second. Would you like to second?

HIPPI SLEY: Move on to 182. Okay. Again, Senator Tagavi.

UNIDENTIFIED: Did you skip 172?

HIPPI SLEY: Oh, yes. Very small. So we have some language. Andrew, do you have a motion?

UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah, I have a motion to change the optional, supplemental questions from 10 to 20.

HI PPI SLEY: Do we have a second?
BIRD-POLLAN: Jenni fer Bi rd-Poll an, Colle ge
of Law.
I second.
HI PPI SLEY: Thank you. We're going to turn
to Jonathan again, this is one of those
numbers, 10, that we came up with after.
GOLDI NG: We came up with 10 because the
argument was with the old -- with the
current form, that it was too long, so
now we have fifteen questions. If we go
to 20 questions, now you're at 35,
questions, even longer than the current
form, and you try to think what's a
reasonable number, 20 seemed way too
large to the committee, 10 seemed a
reasonable amount, because, of course,
you can come up with any number. We're
just trying to go with the goals of the
original committee was to try and have a
shorter instrument.
UNI DENTI FI ED: So, we, at the Colle ge of
Law, the response -- so we give a 23
question survey and the response rate is
over 90 percent. It's really important
to us to have -- such a large number of
questions has not been a deterrent so
far. I would like to retain the
flexibility to have 20 questions.
GOLDI NG: Well, you can use your own
internal form. This is the Universi ty
form. You can still keep your form
because the Medical School, my
understanding is they're planning on
going with all the forms that they use.
UNI DENTI FI ED: We would prefer to not have two
evaluations forms.
GOLDI NG: This is just -- but again,
you're going to just make it longer for
everybody else (inaudi ble).
HI PPI SLEY: Yes, this will allow every
college who wants to to add 20
questions, in addition to the 15. So
you have the 35 questions.
UNI DENTI FI ED: But isn't this designed
speci fical ly to address colleges own?
HI PPI SLEY: Sure. Can I -- (inaudi ble)
there's a way of doing that, Jonathan.
Can you talk to that about adding
supplemental questions?
GOLDI NG: Well, questions can be added,
but I think that's for later on and I'm
not sure -- again, I am just sitting
here thinking what I know the Medi cal
side was saying that they would do
because they have many evaluations and
they were not going to get rid of those,
given the shorter form.
They were just going to use the
shorter form, but continue to use all
the -- there was a large number of
evaluation forms that they have. But it
sounds like you don't want to do that.

I don't really have a solution there. Again, if it was me, I just think 20 is getting too long, given what the original goal was, to have a shorter instrument.

HIPPISLEY: Is your dean here today?

UNIDENTIFIED: No.

HIPPISLEY: Mark?

KORNBLUH: Yeah, Mark Kornbluh, Arts and Sciences.

With the 20 in there, we're still allowed to have less than 10 in our colleges. So it doesn't mandate 20 additional questions, it just gives the college flexibility. And those of us who deal with undergraduates would follow the recommendation of the original committee and make sure that it was shorter.

MCDANIEL: Can I clarify something? I'm the person that runs the TCE's. Brett McDaniel. It's not going to make it that much harder for me to deal with with 20 questions.

HIPPISLEY: Bob?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.

I support this amendment because a college that is worried about how long something is can leave it shorter. A college that would like more feedback, can make it longer. We have a lot of different colleges on this campus, I'm in favor of flexibility.

MCCORMICK: He said his is 23 questions, right? The Law?

BIRD-POLLAN: Our current version is 23.

MCCORMICK: You want to keep all 23?

BIRD-POLLAN: Well, some of them are covered in the sample, generally.

UNIDENTIFIED: I move the question.

HULSE: Second.

HIPPISLEY: All those in favor of calling the question? All those against calling the question? It's called. We will vote on this amendment, which is moving from 10 to 20. Everybody is clear on that. Five, four, three, two, one. Amendment carries. It's now up to 20 questions. 63 to 9, no abstentions.

All right. Now, Kaveh, unless 181-182 is just editorial --

TAGAVI: This is editorial and already (inaudible).

HIPPISLEY: We're going to go straight to 215 and I'd like to be hand over to Roger because it's fairly extensive what this is about. Let me --

WOOD: You didn't pick up part of my amendment, which was to remove 5E.

HIPPISLEY: What line is that on?

WOOD: That's 192 to 195.

HIPPISLEY: Okay. That falls out from --

WOOD: I know, but it -- you can't

leave it in there. We can't leave it in there if -- if it's not a forced questionnaire.

HI PPI SLEY: Okay. So we'll vote on that one. I don't think there's much to say about that one, right?

PORTER: What happened to 181 and 182 lines up there?

HI PPI SLEY: Editorials, we'll get through them. Okay, so this is -- this just basically falls out from the previous vote. Okay?

BLONDER: Andrew, can you restate what we're voting on?

HI PPI SLEY: We're voting to remove, remove lines 192 to 95, which is basically fine graining what it means to relate TCE and grade release, which is a clean up. Right, Connie? It's a clean up.

WOOD: Yes.

HI PPI SLEY: Okay. Five, four, three, two, one. And is it going to be cleaned up? Yes, it is. All right. We now move on to Roger's amendment, it's fairly detailed, it's 215 to 235. And if you can give us the gist in a couple of seconds, Roger?

BROWN: This just takes the relic TCE window which was the week before dead week and dead week and recognizes it's all online now and so it changes the window now to include dead week, final's week and one week after the final exams are all over.

And if you'll read there -- this, see where it comes from student's suggestions at the last meeting, saying that they wanted to have an opportunity to evaluate the whole course. It creates a three week window and gives students the freedom to do it when they're not busy doing all their exams and projects.

HI PPI SLEY: To be very clear, we had a discussion. Liz Ms. Debski raised it. She was worried about finals being included in evaluation. A student countered by saying I'm worried about finals not being in an evaluation, what if it's unfair, you should be able to say that it's unfair. So this was the debating point. And this is -- this is Roger's amendment that takes care of that. He basically deliberately includes finals as part of the course. That's where we are. Anyone want to speak against or for the amendment?

UNI DENTI FI ED: Need a second.

HI PPI SLEY: Who wants to be a second?

WOODRUM: Second. Kim Woodrum, Arts and Sciences.

HI PPI SLEY: I think Lee's hand was up first.

BLONDER: Lee Blonder, Medicine.
I'm in favor of this amendment.
I think it's really important to give students the opportunity to evaluate the entire course. And this also extends the window so they have more time to do so because they're very busy right before finals week and it closes right now. So I support it.

HIPPISLEY: Thank you. Liz?
DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S.
I'm still very much against this amendment. And I think it just, I mean, there's a real association between TCE scores and grades given in courses. And I think that this is just going to encourage further grade inflation so that course instructors can get decent evaluations. And I think that really detrimentally impacts the educational experience of these students.

HIPPISLEY: Carrie and then Greg.
OSER: Carrie Oser, A and S. I wanted to ask the committee what they found at the existing university. Is there any sort of policy? Do they have a time frame? And does it differ because we're changing this midstream for some untenured professors and it could change their evaluations?

HIPPISLEY: Jonathan?
GOLDING: I'll be honest. I don't remember looking specifically at their time frames because I think in committee, we didn't think we were changing this at all. So we didn't get into the specifics, we just saw that they had -- whether they had the grade release policy or not.

HIPPISLEY: Greg?
WASILKOWSKI: Wasilkowski, Engineering.
I think that if we look at exam week into this window, then I would suggest that we change from teaching, teacher course evaluation to students get even.

HIPPISLEY: Christina, do you have a comment? Are you still here? Yes.

LEHMAN: Mine would just be so in regards to what other universities were doing, it was varied. But some, like when I looked at Harvard, it was during finals week and after. And then some were like right up at that week. But like I said, I think a lot more students would participate in it if there were more time extended, especially non-traditional students. They were the ones who spoke to that more than anybody. But a lot of people were in agreement that if we had more time to take it after all the craziness was over, that they would be more likely to respond.

HI PPI SLEY: Kaveh?
TAGAVI: I agree with my colleague, Liz Debski. For years in this University, we did not give opportunity to professors to influence their evaluation with their grade either way or vice versa for students who -- are going to influence their decisions. And if it is so important that students be exposed to the final exam and their grades in order to give a good evaluation, then why do we allow them to even (inaudible) a week before the end of the exam. So it just defeats the stated purpose.

HI PPI SLEY: So you're going to vote against the amendment?
TAGAVI: I am, yes. I'm against that amendment.

HI PPI SLEY: Connie?
WOOD: Having analyzed the teaching course evaluations for years, there's a very strong for -- I'm supporting Liz Debski and also Greg and even Kaveh. Sorry, Kaveh. There's a very strong correlation between, because we asked this is our departmental questionnaire, what is your anticipated grade. There is a very strong correlation between overall course evaluation and anticipated grades in the course. I'm afraid that by extending this through the point of time when grades are available to students, it will just exacerbate this correlation.

HI PPI SLEY: So, yes, Kim.
WOODRUM: Kim Woodrum, Arts and Sciences. Could we -- and I don't know if this will be friendly or not, but say that it can't go beyond the last day that we have to submit grades. That way if we want to hold onto our grades until that Monday, then beyond that date they couldn't do a TCE. If we weren't concerned about it, we'd go ahead and release their grades and all is right with the world, but if you were concerned that they were going to evaluate us based upon the grades they saw at myuk, we should close the window when grades are due that following Monday. The Monday after finals week.

HI PPI SLEY: We're going to turn to Roger Brown, whose amendment it is.
BROWN: I would welcome the additional amendment if this one fails.
HI PPI SLEY: Okay. That's the diplomatic way.
TAGAVI: Would you repeat what he said, please?
HI PPI SLEY: He said no.
WOOD: The Senate Rules require that faculty members submit grades within 72 hours of the exam. So I would be very hesitant to support your --

WOODRUM: We would have to change that policy or we, too, would (inaudible).

HIPPISLEY: Mirek, and then to Liz.

TRUSZCZYNSKI: I would like to speak for this amendment. I think that it gives students more time to complete evaluations and I think that after 15 or 16 weeks of listening, attending lectures, interacting with professors, the student probably will not change, in my opinion, that much his or her opinion just because of the final.

HIPPISLEY: Liz, John, and Andrew.

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S. I still continue to very much oppose this amendment. I would remind everyone that the first charge of the committee was to reduce the amount of time taken for these TCEs. So, now, you know, now the students don't have to fill out this long evaluation and they are going to have a short evaluation form, so that this issue of how long it takes may not be such an issue.

Also, we have removed the penalty, all right, for not submitting it. I think those are two changes that -- that will make this kind of very, very big change, in terms of potential impact, on assistant professor's careers really, really unnecessary.

HIPPISLEY: John and then Andrew.

WILSON: We want more students to fill this out. I want to speak for this amendment. If I receive the survey a week before a grant deadline, I'm far less likely to complete it. I think we should recognize the student input and we should say let's open this up for whenever they can fill it out. We shouldn't be afraid of their input.

HIPPISLEY: Thank you. Andrew.

WOOD: I'm against the amendment and I'm especially against it if it involves allowing students to see their grades. I would be shocked, for example, if the Harvard delayed response after the final evaluation period, allows them to fill it out after they get their grades. I think they just get their grades much later. I'm also against it even if they can't see their grades, but they get to see their finals because it seems to me that the goal of the TCE is to have them evaluate the course. And it's not clear to me that seeing the exam and getting shocked at how little you remember -- all the negative feeling you have now when you, when you take an exam. It just didn't seem like the exam is educational or relevant to the overall analysis of the course.

HIPPISLEY: Time is getting on. I would

like to encourage someone to call the question at some point. Kim Woodrum.

WOODRUM: So moved.
HIPPI SLEY: Who called the question?
WHITAKER: I called the question.
HIPPI SLEY: Your name?
WHITAKER: Mark Whitaker, Arts and Sciences.
HIPPI SLEY: Mark Whitaker, Arts and Science called the question. Is there a second?
BRION: I second. Gail Brion, Engineering.
HIPPI SLEY: All of those in favor of calling the question? All those against it, against calling the question. Motion carries. The question is called. We will now vote. Remember what we're doing. We're voting for Roger Brown's amendment to allow three weeks which would encompass the final exam.
TAGAVI: And the grade.
HIPPI SLEY: All right. Five, four, three, two, one. Remember, this is for his amendment. Try to remember that. All right. Amendment is defeated. So that whole language is gone.
Now, we return to the original motion as amended. And in theory, this should involve discussion and questions, perhaps, I hope it doesn't. Okay. Now, here we are at this slide. The University Senate endorsed the plan to implement the TCE questions that were approved at the Senate's March 2015 meeting as outline in the committee's final report as just amended. And it comes from committee, it doesn't need a second. It's on the floor for questions and answers.
LAUERSDORF: Mark Lauersdorf, Arts and Sciences.
Does the result of the perceived votes now mean that there is no recommendation in this document concerning a time frame?
UNIDENTIFIED: That's correct.
HIPPI SLEY: All right. We will vote on this.
LAUERSDORF: Does there need to be one?
HIPPI SLEY: Okay. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries, 43 for, 25 against, 0 abstentions. I would like to thank Jonathan Golding very much and his committee too. (APPLAUSE) Really difficult stuff, and thank you for being such good Senate citizens today today. All right. Kevin Real.
REAL: Well, when I first got asked to chair this Ad Hoc Committee, I thought it was to align the spring break at UK with the spring break of Fayette County Public Schools. Then I found out that it was

all about the minutiae of academic scheduling. And if you took the time to read this report, this is picking up from the 2012 report that somehow never got anywhere. I don't even think it was even voted on.

So, we, our committee, two of my members are right here. They've declined to do the President's team approach. David Timoney and Margaret Bausch from the College of Education, and the Registrar's Office. We went back and reviewed the 2012 committee and we were also on the Senate Academic Priorities and Planning Committee, which we thought had some sort of linkage to the class standardization that Wally chaired. And so recently we engaged a number of elements of the calendar proposal and that would be boiled down to four issues. College and departmental autonomy. Single, summers of single or multiple terms. Implementation of the proposal from 2012. And the classroom availability. And recently, our recommendation after studying this issue is we want to allow departments and colleagues more flexibility in terms of offering more part of term courses. However, and we also believe that there should be a single summer term. However, this is caveated with the fact that we think that if you read our recommendations that this should only be implemented in the summer. It would be much too complex to implement in the fall and spring because of the lack of classroom space at this time.

So our -- we could not distill this down into one sentence or even -- we had a set of issues that we recommended and I don't know if they're available to show, but they're Items A, B -- A through F. So our recommendations start at the bottom of the page. Yeah. So there is the overall favor of recommending flexibility for colleges and departments.

Just a little history. Nursing and the College of Education have to go to the Senate Council on a regular basis to ask for this kind of flexibility and Margaret has very compelling stories about, which we put in there, about the need for teachers, especially from across the state of Kentucky, to come in for short-term courses in the summer in order to earn their Masters Degree.

So we want colleges and departments to use -- have the flexibility to have a single term, I mean the flexibility to offer courses that they need. Summer, as a single term. That is an experiment. Just limit this

to implementation.

And then, go down further please, if you could. And then we would suggest that programs use departments, the classrooms they control and that the structure of summer is important. And we offered some examples of what that would look like for summer of 2018. And this would allow us to have some sort of coherent structure. And there was a number of other issues that were raised and I think we dealt with in terms of financial aid and housing and the like.

HIPPI SLEY: Okay. Just a quick addition, that one of the Senate Council felt about the summer session change, be important that the deans supported this. And the Provost, at the deans' meeting, asked them about the summer session (inaudible). And it comes straight from committee. Doesn't need a second. Any questions for Kevin?

KORNBLUH: Yes. Mark Kornbluh, Dean of Arts and Sciences.

So the last, latest date you have on there is the 2nd of August. Is that on purpose? Do you preclude the last couple of weeks before school starts or was it that (inaudible).

REAL: Do you want to answer that Davy?

TIMONEY: Yeah, sure, David Timony, Registrar's Office.

So the three weeks or so that lead up to the start of the fall semester usually are saved for orientations, as well as time for renovations to some of the classrooms. And we really felt like that would pose an issue if we extended it any further (inaudible).

KORNBLUH: We run summer programs now leading up to or right before school, on purpose, to prepare students, to get them in an academic mode. And a lot of our discussion has been on whether those programs could be for credit. So I'd like to at least have that as an option to discuss in the future, dates that are in those three weeks for credit.

REAL: Yeah, I mean, I think that's very reasonable.

KORNBLUH: It sort of fits with the philosophy of this, that you let colleges have a little bit more flexibility.

REAL: Definitely.

HIPPI SLEY: Kaveh.

TAGAVI: One clarification, you are giving more flexibility to the department, which I agree with you. But correct me if I'm wrong, every term has to be within one of these terms. Is it correct?

REAL: No, no. Because the College of Education has a nice example here where

they require -- they require the kind of flexibility that would not fit within this framework we showed. It was -- this was more or less a structure to operate within and if you couldn't operate within that, you would provide a rationale to your dean, is how we, that's how we -- that is, the colleges would decide that question.

HI PPI SLEY: Liz.
DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S. I'm wondering if you actually asked for feedback from the department chairs on this, people that actually have to schedule these things.

REAL: Yeah. We got some from the affected colleges. We didn't go out to the ones that didn't seem to have any issues. Margaret, you want to talk about it from the College of Education standpoint?

BAUSCH: Well, we had -- had discussed this with the chair of the College of Education, and I believe in Arts & Sciences we had some folks, and then also in Nursing, they were on the committee. And I'm trying to think of who else. We had gotten no opposition from the department chairs or the deans (inaudible).

REAL: Well, we didn't do it systematically. We did it with a kind of -- I mean, a goal in mind to see -- like for example, Nursing has had this issue, right. So is there anyone from the College of Nursing? And this has been an issue in the College of Nursing, as well.

SCOTT: Leslie Scott, College of Nursing.
Yes, it's an issue. When we redid the curriculum, we suggested that it would actually be easier for us. For some of our one credit hour courses at the graduate level, would be easier to offer at four to six weeks intervals instead of covering a whole fifteen weeks.

HI PPI SLEY: Okay. Is there any other questions? We will move to vote. Give the countdown. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries 59 for, 2 against and 1 abstaining. Thank you, Kevin, and Ad Hoc Calendar Committee. (APPLAUSE).
Sorry for going to the beginning here, but this quick bit of chair's report here, Michael Healy, he's the current Ombudsman, he's served two terms. So there has to be a search committee of these three appointees of the search committee.
Katherine McCormick, Secretary of Senate, do you have a report? No.
Parliamentarian, Kelly

Vickery today, do you have a report? No.

Okay, candidates for degrees. Should be fairly uncontroversial. You remember that the Senate a while ago passed a (inaudible) degree called Memoriam posthumous degrees. We have a few candidates for that and I would like to ask a spokesperson from the College Communication, Information, and Science. Is that person here? Yes. Talk a little bit about Jonathan.

ECKMAN: Hello, my name is Alyssa Eckman. I'm the chair of the Department of Integrated Strategic Communication. It became a stand alone department in the School of Journalism on July 1st.

Jonathan was one of my students and I had him in both our sophomore skills class and also I had the great opportunity to travel abroad with him on our study abroad winter session class in London and Dublin just in the two months before he was killed.

Those of you who may remember his story from just about a year ago, April, Jonathan was walking home and was shot and killed on East Maxwell Street. And he was a junior in our major, Integrated Strategic Comm.

He was also known for his photography work at the Kentucky Kernel. He was a junior at the time of his death, second semester junior with a 3.5 GPA. To me, he was one of our finest students. If you ask anyone who knew him, he was kind of the epitome of what we want at UK.

He was a Wildcat through and through from Perryville, Ohio, but said that there was no other school that he would pick other than UK. His family told me this at the memorial service just a couple of weeks ago that we held at the one-year memory of his passing.

And we'd really appreciate you considering this degree for him. I'll keep my comments short because I know we're running late. So if you have any questions, please let me...

HIPPI SLEY: Any questions? Thank you so much. Second one, this is Martin Stritx from the College of Arts and Sciences, Biology. Is there anyone from Arts and Sciences who would like to talk a minute about Martin? Kaveh.

TAGAVI: Are you going to vote on both of them?

HIPPI SLEY: We're going to -- we're going to add these to the May 2016 degree, one of (inaudible).

TAGAVI: I think you have to vote on them one at a time. I'm sorry.

BROTHERS: That's for honorary degrees.

HIPPI SLEY: When we get to that point, then we can decide if we want to do it that way.

DEBSKI: Martin Stritx is a PhD?

HIPPI SLEY: He was PhD, on his way to PhD. I haven't got to the defense yet.

DEBSKI: So we're giving out PhDs, BAs, BSs (inaudible). And they're all together?

HIPPI SLEY: Yes. This is a PhD. Yes. Because the motion is going to be to add these people to the May 2016 posthumous degree list. We're voting on a list. What we did a year ago. College of Engineering, now it's Stephen Spence.

ANDERSON: Okay. So my name is Kim Anderson. I'm an Associate Dean in the College of Engineering and I'm here to ask for a posthumous degree for Garrett Spence.

Garrett was a junior, Mechanical Engineering student. He was very, very hardworking. He actually worked at a grocery store in Falmouth and we talked to them at his passing and they said he was a very, very caring dedicated person.

His degree in Mechanical Engineering kind of came from his love and fascination with naval ships, specifically the Titanic. He actually did some in-depth studies on the British passenger liner. He spent quite a bit of time with his family on their houseboat.

He actually lost a brother to cancer, when the brother was only 23 months. So he set up a fund for him and spent quite a bit of time raising money for that fund. His lifelong dream was to be a mechanical engineer. He was a junior and he had worked through a very, very challenging curriculum and finished strong before he died of cancer on April 8, 2015. So I request a degree in his honor, thank you.

HIPPI SLEY: This is our last one.

EGLINSKI: Hi, everyone. Thanks for your ears here this afternoon. I was Tyler Foster's academic advisor in the College of Business. He was quite an exceptional student. He had just finished an internship with a company in Louisville this past semester and was planning to return to the college to finish his last 18 hours of his accounting degree.

He had a 4.0 in accounting the entire time he was here. So he was a really exceptional student. Obviously, it's a major that is often quite challenging.

He was also a member of the Armed Services, had deployed to Africa just a couple of years ago. And so, he was an incredibly generous, very giving

UK5-2-16.txt

person. Always impressed me because he really heard what I had to say as an academic advisor, and wanted to know, you know, what he could do to kind of improve his experience here.

He was just exceptional. So I hope you'll consider him, as a member of the group here, for an in memoriam degree. Thank you.

HI PPI SLEY: So this is the motion from Senate Council that the faculty senators approve the May 2016 in memoriam posthumous degree list for those four people for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be confirmed by the Board.

Is there any comments or observations? Vote on this motion. This will go straight to the Board for tomorrow's meeting if it passes. Five, four, three, two, one. The motion carries, it will go straight to the Board. 59 for, 0 against, 0 abstained. Thank you very much.

Okay. We now have a motion from Senate Council, the elected faculty senators to approve the May 2016 degree list for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees tomorrow as the recommended degrees to be confirmed by the Board. If there are no comments or questions, we will vote on this. Five, four, three, two, one. 58 for, 0 opposed, and 1 abstained. The motion carries.

And the last thing we do is we the -- there are two August degree lists. One of them is the early one and we do that now for the Board. So this is the motion for the early August 2016 degree list. Any comments, questions? No. Five, four, three, two, one. 56 for, 0 opposed, and 1 abstained. This will go to the Board tomorrow as well. The degree list is done.

One last thing we do, now and again, we'll have an administrative error that leads to a student left off the degree list or going to the wrong degree list. We have a student of SN-53. I believe we have a member of Agriculture to speak about this. Larry.

GRABAU: Yes, Larry Grabau, College of Agriculture, Food and Environment. A staff member in our unit accidentally signed in the form December '16. Did I say that correctly? December '16 graduation date for this person, for this student, when it was intended to be December '15. (Inaudible).

HI PPI SLEY: It wasn't the student's fault?

GRABAU: Not the student's fault. It was

administrative error.

HIPPISLEY: We'll we vote on this unless anyone has a comment. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries 55 for, 0 abstained, and 1 against.

We're now moving to our committee reports and I'd like to invite Ernie Bailey to give us the first of his reports.

BAILEY: So I have a number of proposals. There are letters from our committee that I hope you had a chance to look at, I'll go over and summarize them quickly. If there's questions, we can take it up further.

But the first one is a proposal that Rachael Shane in the College of Fine Arts proposed to create a department of arts administration. There is currently a program of arts administration, it was founded back in '88 and (inaudible) of our program has a lot of students.

We reviewed the proposal by email. We asked for input from the Dean of Fine Arts, from the College Faculty Council, from the chairs who were giving up faculty to the department, to the faculty that were involved in it.

We didn't discern anything that was controversial in it. It seemed to be a logical development of the program to go from being a program to being a department in this college. And so we recommended it to the Senate and there is a proposal to -- that the Senate endorse this program.

HIPPISLEY: And questions for Ernie or Rachael? Hearing none, we will vote. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries, 56 for, 0 against.

BAILEY: The second proposal I've got is from the --

HIPPISLEY: Hang on just a -- let me just (inaudible).

BAILEY: Okay. The second one is a proposal by Associate Dean, Kim Anderson, from the College of Engineering, that the major Biosystems Engineering be moved from the College of Agriculture, Food and Environment to the College of Engineering, which seemed a bit odd and strange. It seemed controversial, but it really isn't.

What's happened is that the -- in order to get -- I may not say this right -- accreditation requires that the degree be awarded by the College of Engineering. So for years, the College of Engineering has awarded degrees in this which is essentially Ag Engineering. However, the major has resided, continued to reside over in Agriculture. So the student services and the accreditation is

operated through Engineering. The major has resided in the College of Agriculture and this is a matter of correcting that. It's really quite a unique situation.

Sheila was telling me there aren't any others in the University -- or perhaps there are. We asked the Chair of Ag Biosystems, is Sue Nokes here?

NOKES: I'm here.

BAILEY: And we also talked to the people in Engineering, and this was just not a controversial issue. It's a correction of something that made it very difficult for students over a long period of time. We got letters of recommendation from the deans. We got letters from the faculty councils, and it seemed to be a non-issue.

HIPPI SLEY: Any questions?

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S. Does this change the courses that the students have to take (inaudible)?

NOKES: Our courses have always gone through the College of Engineering so it does not.

BAILEY: The other thing I would say is from in the College of -- what, is it Sue, Ag Biosystems?

NOKES: Biosystems in Agricultural Engineering Department.

BAILEY: Okay. But they have a very robust graduate program. They have a robust research program and a very robust extension program. And so that was one of the issues, what happens if they're -- they have lost -- this major isn't there. That really isn't an issue.

HIPPI SLEY: Any other questions? Hearing none, let's vote. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries, 57 for and 1 against.

BAILEY: Okay. The next one is a name change and for the -- in the College of Engineering, there is a Department of Biomedical Engineering and they've had a generous donor, who over the years, has given -- well, it's given a total of \$7 million in support and they would like to recognize that, perhaps, even encourage other donors or even this donor, perhaps, to continue this activity.

And so, they are proposing changing the name from Department of Biomedical Engineering to the F. Joseph Halcomb III, M.D. Department of Biomedical Engineering. This comes from Dean John Walz.

The committee, six of the seven department faculty voted. All those were in support of naming the department and eight of the eight members from the Engineering Faculty Advisory Committee voted in favor of it. Again, not very controversial on that side.

WOOD: Since the names of all units have -- educational units have to be approved by the Board of Trustees, I'm wondering if the motion should read endorse?

HIPPISLEY: Does it not say that?

WOOD: It says approve.

BAILEY: Oh, it should be endorse.

HIPPISLEY: Yes. Senate Council recommends endorsement. Do you accept that as a friendly amendment (inaudible)?

BAILEY: Well, yes, but I thought that we had talked about that at the Senate Council too. It is supposed to be endorse.

UNIDENTIFIED: It sort of snuck it's way in.

HIPPISLEY: Imagine that it says endorse. Any other questions?

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S. I'm wondering if there are any other departments at this University actually named for a person. It's such a long name. The third and (inaudible). Is all of that really necessary?

HULSE: Yes. My own department is named after somebody.

DEBSKI: (Inaudible).

HULSE: Von Almen School of Accountancy, which functions as a department.

HIPPISLEY: Any other questions? Hearing none, five, four, three, two, one. 43 for, 10 against, 4 abstentions. Motion carries.

BAILEY: The next two proposals are for creation of multi-disciplinary research institutes or centers. The first proposal is for the -- or by Scott Lephart, who is the Dean of the College of Health Sciences and he is proposing to create a sports medicine institute. He came to the University in 2014 from the University of Pittsburgh and had a similar program there. He wants to recreate that. Several faculty join him. The proposal is a joint initiative involving the College of Health Science, College of Medicine, UK Healthcare, UK Athletics, College of Ag. I think there's a number of other programs I think that have faculty that are participating in that. The proposal is accompanied by letters of support from deans and faculty councils from the Colleges of Agriculture, Food and Environment, Education, Engineering, Health Sciences, Medicine, Nursing, and Public Health. Faculty who were invited to join is, of course, members (inaudible) and again, it appears to be a very popular initiative and we recommend the approval of this.

for two motions. One is that we approve, because we have approval of academic programs, we approve it on its academic merits. Following that, there is a second motion that was put forward to recommend that it be established (inaudible). But right now, I guess, we're looking at it this one about its academic merits.

HIPPISLEY: Questions based on academic merits approval? Countdown begins. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion passes. It's established based on academic merits. 53 for, 0 against. A similar motion, but you'll notice it's an endorsement for resources and reporting only.

BAILEY: So this has to do with infrastructure. The resources we're -- the lion's share of the support for this comes from the College of Health Sciences. The interim director of the program will be Dean Lephart, but they are conducting a search for a director. There are faculty participating from other programs but its I guess, financial home will be in Health Sciences and so we propose that the reporting be to the Dean of Health Sciences.

HIPPISLEY: Any questions? Tagavi.

TAGAVI: I'd like to express my support of this proposal by my friend, Ernie Bailey, PhD.

HIPPISLEY: Any other questions or comments? All right. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion passes, 55 for, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

BAILEY: The next one is for a multi-disciplinary research institute or Center for Human Biomedical -- Institute for Biomedical Informatics. There is (inaudible) was attributed to the University of Kentucky and he was recruited in order to start a division of human -- to start a division of biomedical informatics in the College of Medicine, which he has done.

He recognizes and many people on campus recognize that there is a huge need for informatics resources. And so, the proposal here is to create a multi-disciplinary program. A program that will span the campus and share resources in a particular area. The colleges that are involved include -- I've lost my notes and so I don't have it. Dr. Zhang, can you speak to this?

ZHANG: Including Medicine, Engineering, Arts and Sciences, and Dentistry, and Pharmacy, and maybe I'm missing...

BAILEY: Ag.

ZHANG: Ag, yes.

BAILEY: So we have letters of support

from lots of faculty, from college faculty council. We didn't discern that there was much concern about the breadth of this.

There was some concern initially about whether this was a program that was identified as being principally within the medical campus, and that doesn't seem to be the case. There's a genuine interest in all the college programs on campus in this and it's exciting. I think that's the main things. Again, we looked at that and it seems to be a well-supported proposal.

HI PPI SLEY: Like the other one, this motion at the moment is to approve the unit based on academic merits. Questions? Hearing none, approval based on academic merits. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries, 53 for, 1 against.

BAILEY: And this is similar. The only difference here is the reporting of the director of the institute will be to the Provost rather than to the dean or to the vice president for research. In this case, the Provost provided the lion's share of resources and support of the program. So this seemed to be a appropriate reporting structure.

HI PPI SLEY: Any questions for Ernie? Five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries, 59 for, 2 against, 1 abstained.

I want to say how grateful Senate Council and Senate are to Ernie. He's done an awful lot this year, from changing the name of the department, to creating a brand new college. So thank you so much, Ernie. (APPLAUSE).

Next hero of the Senate, come up, please, Margaret Schroeder.

SCHROEDER: Okay. The first is a recommendation that the University Senate approve for submission to Board of Trustees, the establishment of a MS degree in Research Methods and Education within the Department of Educational Policy and Evaluation within the College of Education.

So the Masters of Science in Research Methods and Education will provide students training for careers in settings such as academic institutions, school districts, state and federal agencies, health care and certification, licensing and testing organizations.

Students enrolled in the program will develop a basic foundation in research methods in education. The inter-disciplinary program will cross fields of study within education, drawing perspectives in policy, psychology, pedagogy, and history, developing research knowledge and skills within the

(inaudible) practice framework. Enrolled students will learn to apply research methods, techniques and constructs to real world education settings, issues, and data sets. This is 36 credit hour program. It's completely and entirely online, asynchronous, this is part of the ELLI 2 grants. Any questions? Yes, sir.

FERRIER: Wally Ferrier. Who do you have with you?

SCHROEDER: This is Riley. He's a little boy. He made his appearance shortly after the last Senate meeting.

FERRIER: Congratulations.

SCHROEDER: Thank you very much. He's all in favor by the way. He's voted. Any other questions?

HIPPISLEY: Hearing none, five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries, 53 for, 0 against.

SCHROEDER: All right. The next is a recommendation that the University Senate approve for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new BLS degree, Bachelor of Liberal Studies, with a major in Liberal Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences.

A BLS degree will allow students to design individualized programs of study in the humanities, social sciences and natural and mathematical sciences. It also allows students to develop a breadth of knowledge reflective of a true liberal arts education, which is the hallmark of College of Arts and Sciences.

It will also help them to develop critical thinking and writing skills and synthesize problem solving strategies. It will be beneficial for a wide range of students, such as students who plan to work in business, technological, cultural, community and human service settings, and also for students whom a highly specialized structured major is not ideal, and students who have accumulated a substantial number of credit hours across a range of departments.

In order to complete the degree, students will complete a rigorous upper division courses within the College of Arts and Sciences and will complete a Capstone writing intensive course in which they synthesize and evaluate their previous course work. They also will be required to take at least one course that includes a lab or field experiences.

It is a degree that will be highly competitive and that is being offered at benchmark institutions and at other institutions across the state, such as Western Kentucky University.

Questions?

HIPPISLEY: We have two deans from A and S here as well.

SCHROEDER: Yes, ma'am.

MCCORMICK: This is our only BLS?

SCHROEDER: Yes. There is not another BLS.

HIPPISLEY: Questions? Vote. Countdown, five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries, 48 for, 4 against, 0 abstentions.

SCHROEDER: All right. Another degree. They're kind of popular this month. The University Senate -- this is a recommendation that the University Senate approve for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new BS degree, Digital Media and Design in the - - or in the School of Art and Visual Studies within the College of Fine Arts. The Digital Media and Design Bachelor of Science degree is intended to educate its students in studio-based digital media practices of the pre-professional level. This degree is available to students who plan to undertake careers that require creative use of digital imagery with artistic and/or commercial applications involving digital designing, illustration, photography, video, sound and digital-based fabrication. It's for students seeking training in software applications, lens-based technology and digital design within a studio environment that emphasizes creativity. It is a degree that was crafted with students in mind, the students asked for this degree, and for a creative class of students who want digital skills to be successful in today's job market.

Questions?

HIPPISLEY: Hearing none, let's vote. Five, four, three, two, one. 52 for. That's the end of the story there.

SCHROEDER: They're celebrating in the back. Congratulations.

UNIDENTIFIED: Good job.

SCHROEDER: Yes, very good job. All right. The final proposal that we have is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new undergraduate certificate in Universal Design, in the Division of Undergraduate Education. The certificate in Universal Design is designed to give students a foundation in the principles of Universal Design and its application and cross disciplines. The certificate will create a focus for students scholarly work in developing environments that maximize the engagement of all community members, including people with disabilities.

The certificate creates environments and resources that are usable by people across the life span. The principles of Universal Design are applicable across environments and to programs and learning across a wide span. A requirement of undergraduate certificates is inter-disciplinary. This one hits it with a home run. Cross disciplinary collaboration is evident through involvement of 19 faculty across 12 colleges. So there's your new standard. The certificate will provide the academic recognition for participating in 12 hours course work. Questions?

HIPPI SLEY: Hearing none, five, four, three, two, one. 51 for, 2 against. Don't go away, Margaret. Now Ernie is great. Margaret, you're also very great. I think she's done about 20 of these over the course of the year.

SCHROEDER: Twenty-four.

HIPPI SLEY: And she has all the other things as well on her plate. So thank you so much, Margaret, for being such a great Senator. Don't go away. (APPLAUSE).

HIPPI SLEY: Okay. I'd like to invite Jane Jensen and Scott Yost.

YOST: I don't see Jane, so I think I'm own on this one. Okay, fair enough. A couple of things. You know that back in 2014, the fall students first coming to the University of Kentucky, they were subject to the new GCCR policy which replaced the GWR policy. You know, the graduation communication composition requirement over the graduation writing requirement.

And if you remember a couple of principles there, that the communication was then, that whole policy was about putting communication back in the control of the program. So we looked at the policy that was passed back then, it dealt with communication that was basically relevant to the program. Hopefully, imbedded into the program. Okay? Information literacy related things, assessment, sorry -- draft feedback process, and all of that was put into place with the one exception, shall we say, that basically there was the assessment phase of the GCCR, and those who may have been on the GCCR Committee when we were approving all those programs, that little line about assessment was basically, yeah, we'll assess. And so, rather than actually come up with a plan.

So then the Undergraduate Council, the GCCR subcommittee is a -- is a subcommittee of Undergraduate Council. We were charged this year to come up with

UK5-2-16.txt

basically two things: One was this assessment. In other words, closing the loop on the policy and tightening up the assessment plan, the assessment policy, and that document, if you will.

And so, you have one policy in front of you today, is that assessment policy put together by the GCCR Committee, which will then move forward if approved by you all to then be the guidance document, shall we say, for programs who are doing their GCCR and how we are going to continue to monitor and assess that for continuous improvement. Much like it's a parallel structure to UK Core. In fact, the assessment will take place in the same structure that UK Core classes are being assessed through. And again, it is program specific.

A couple of things from the committee, it's gone to the Senate Council, back to the my other committee, the Academic Admission Standards Committee. They looked at it because there is some wording in the Senate Rules right now that deal with the assessment, and this is just an expansion (inaudible) clarification.

There were concerns about, shall we say, a lot of dictating or mandating from the University requirement onto programs. And I think, those concerns were alleviated because it really is much like that model of how the GCCR was implemented several years ago. All it's doing is asking a program to come up with a definitive plan, there is some guidelines what that plan should, you know, what should be in that plan and that reporting, if you will. And then, of course, once you have the plan, the plan will be looked at. The plan will be assessed and then given feedback both from the GCCR Committee, as well as the University Office of Assessment.

Once you have that plan in place, then you will follow through on that plan as part of (inaudible). It will come up every time you have your program assessment, which we do our outcomes now, I think it's a three year cycle. At least all of your outcomes must be assessed within three years and so this will just be part of that normal process.

So the plan will put in place. Then it will be assessed accordingly. And so that's what -- the first of the two proposals was looking at that assessment, you know, tighten that up and closing that loop as far as how to assess the GCCR, give the guidance and (inaudible) according to that. So that's

the one policy. Any questions on the assessment issues?

What I'm going to do is -- the other charge of the Committee was to come up with a substitution policy. In other words, we have transfer students that come in from outside the University. We have students that transfer within the University, and remember, the GCCR is meant to be within a program. And so we need to come up with a policy and some statements about what would be acceptable in this, you know, students move around, what would be acceptable.

Unlike the GWR, which was, quite honestly, folks, it was writing for the sake of writing. It just depended on the class you were writing. Okay? Because it's program specific, this policy on the substitution is basically giving the authority of the program to determine whether they want to accept another program's GCCR if the student was here at the University of Kentucky, just has migrated to a different program. So that's -- that's one aspect of the policy.

The other aspect of the policy is what we do for students that come in from outside the University. What guidelines do we have for them to bring in classes that seem to have the communication components, that seem to have -- relative to a program, seem to have the types of communication that was relevant to that particular program they're coming into and then that program could petition to allow something outside the University to transfer in. And maybe it could be they're like 75 percent there. And you just come up with, okay, we'll have them take maybe a course at UK, and together it would satisfy what we wanted to do in our program relative to the communication requirement.

And so, the substitution policy again puts that in place and codifies that, if you will. At least it's a policy then. So before I go into the logistical issue, any questions on that? On the substitution policy?

BOSCH: I'm not a senator, but I'd like to ask a question.

HIPPI SLEY: I recognize you.

BOSCH: Thank you. Does this mean that for your substitution policy, you would accept the department's substitution or would the student have to write a petition as a student currently would for a UK Core, to the UK Core Committee?

YOST: If you look at what was included with the information that you have received, there's also a how it

would be implemented idea. There's a form there.

We're not considering the form. We're not voting on the form. It's just information for you all to kind of put it in context. So on that form, there is a petitioner. So every single substitution would be a petition and it could be started by the student. It could be the director of studies, could be a faculty member, could be the chair. But it's going to be someone who is relative to the program, but it has to be attested to by an official in the program whether it be the DUS or the chair. That basically what they're asking for as a substitution is consistent with what we are doing in our program relative to GCCR.

I will say to you, I will say this, just because it's stated in the policy that, or the statement, that probably a student, if they took courses at the University of Kentucky that were not GCCR courses and they're asking them to be GCCR courses, those will probably not be approved. Okay? There's a reason a program has a GCCR set up.

If a program wants to come back and say look, we would like these new -- a new track to our GCCR, they can apply as a GCCR Track within their program. And that's an entirely separate issue.

So the substitution is, within UK, really it's meant to be an existing GCCR course that you -- another program accept, or outside the university, they don't have GCCR, but they have the support of their committee. Does that answer your question?

BOSCH: So in other words, the department has to approve the student's petition and the University wide GCCR committee has to approve the petition?

YOST: It's going to be approved by somebody. There's three different levels -- there's two different paths of approval. Certainly, the academic dean could approve something using, within the University, okay. If it's already a GCCR course and the department says they accept it, the academic dean can say, we're good with that. And they would then forward that approval on to the GCCR committee just for information purposes.

If it's outside the University, then it goes to the GCCR committee or a designee to review that to make sure it has all the components that's basically codified in the Senate Rules of what the GCCR means, if you will.

And then there's one last little thing we threw in there. And, of course, those of you who are the associate deans

or the deans in the college, you are particularly forewarned that there is something we gave in there. If you have a student through no fault of their own, the eleventh hour comes down, graduating semester and they did not satisfy GCCR for whatever reason, we're not to going into what those reasons could be, there is an eleventh hour kind of we don't want to penalize a student and delay their graduation. So we allow a petition from basically the program through the academic dean to say, what happened? Why did the student not take a GCCR? What went wrong? Was it an administrative issue? What (inaudible) happened.

If a student comes back and says I just didn't want to take it, hoping I can get away with it. I mean, they won't say that, but that will probably not be approved. But we wanted to allow that path for the truly, the exception to something going on, okay, that's beyond our control, if that makes sense. Any other questions on the substitution policy or any other clarifications needed?

KORNBLUH: I'd just like to clarify the (inaudible). So the program director or the dean cannot approve the substitution, this outside committee is going to approve it? That's the proposal here.

YOST: If it's -- yes. The proposal, if it's outside the University transferring in, goes beyond the associate dean. We'll get an endorsement or non-endorsement from the associate dean, but the GCCR committee will review outside transfers. In other words, courses outside of UK, because we need to look at those to see if they actually support the essence of what GCCR is.

KORNBLUH: So what if it's a UK course?

YOST: If it's a UK course, if it's not a GCCR course, it probably will not be approved. Now, if it's within UK, it needs to be a GCCR course. If a program wants to use a non-GCCR course, and use it as their GCCR, we're going to ask the programs is this a viable track to make it another GCCR track for your program.

KORNBLUH: There's been discussion, I guess I'm very troubled by this because I have many departments that require the same type of writing in several different courses, but they purposely chose one because they could staff it. But there are three or four others that are very similar to that that the department is satisfied with, with the GCCR.

If we advertised it as the course to take, then we cause all sorts of difficulties in how we're staffing

these courses. We should be able to say that there's a senior seminar in Biology and there are three different ones and they all require these type of writing. (Inaudible) One is our standard track. We should be able to just allow a substitution.

YOST: Coming from two years ago, the GCCR committee and the charge of the GCCR, if a program wants to use other track -- I'll use Biology as an example, they have multiple courses that -- multiple ways of satisfying GCCR. It all had to be approved. And so I would come back and I would encourage you to tell your departments if they want to use another GCCR, they need to get it approved for GCCR. That was part of this.

HIPPI SLEY: Connie, do you have a question?
WOOD: I'm concerned about process here. And if it's already a GCCR course, does the substitution approval fall with the dean of the college or does the college have to wait until they hear from the GCCR Committee in order to certify the degree to the Registrar?

YOST: If it's a GCCR course, an existing course, the program will petition through the associate dean that that would be a substitution. In other words, we would allow it for our program. The associate dean can approve those situations. That's not a problem from that standpoint.

If a course is already a UK GCCR course and your program just (inaudible) to use it for the student and accept it for the student, the associate dean can sign off on it. That is correct.

WOOD: Okay. So the dean's approval is all that is required if it is an existing GCCR course.

YOST: Correct. Once the program has asked for that.

WOOD: Does this policy then state that they have to so inform the committee or not?

YOST: Well, for informational purposes, we like to know what has been approved, yes. But the committee does not have to approve.

WOOD: Why, if the approval process lies with the dean?

YOST: From a longitudinal standpoint, if a program continues again and again and again and again to ask for a substitution of the same type of thing, we may go back to the program and ask why don't you take and ask for that to be a GCCR track for your program. If there are so many substitutions going on, why

WOOD: not make it a track to your program?
If you have 800 majors, it's going to look huge.

YOST: You have 800 majors? Well, not necessarily.

WOOD: Biology.

YOST: But they have three or four tracks already approved for GCCR and if they wanted to --

WOOD: No, I'm just talking about the process in general.

HIPPISLEY: Katherine, then Gail.

MCCORMICK: My question was (inaudible). So I'm not sure of the purpose of the substitution if it can't be -- if it doesn't go through the dean's office. So only -- tell me, tell us again about how, why a substitution would be used if you can -- you can only -- tell me again.

YOST: Okay. A substitution can be -- well, let me also give you some background information. This is information you need to take back to your colleges as well. If a course at the University of Kentucky was approved for GCCR and it happened to be a course that was on the transfer agreement with some school outside, all transfer agreements of GCCR courses were terminated as of this year. Okay? Because -- and if you want to know the rationale, I'll give you the rationale. If you don't, then fine. But the bottom line is they were all terminated.

So now the issue is students who come in with a communication that's kind of what you're doing in your program and you want to try to substitute, you want to get approval for that for a graduation requirement, it has to be approved for the substitution. It's just like substituting a course. It has to be approved. It starts within -- within the program. They collect the data. They look at the application. They sign off and attest to, the DUS and the chair attest to that this substitution is consistent with what we do in our program for the GCCR communication requirements. Then it goes from there and if it's within the University, the associate dean can review it and they can approve it. Okay? (Inaudible) within the University being already existing GCCR course, but not your GCCR course for your program. If it's outside the University, then it comes through the associate dean to the GCCR.

HIPPISLEY: Okay. Let's -- any other -- oh, sorry, Gail.

BRIAN: How do these substitutions relate to the criteria that you require for assessment?

YOST: That's -- the goal would be again, if you -- one or two things when it comes to substitution. In other words, if your assessment -- I'll give you an example. If your assessment plan is a sample of students, okay, there is no requirement that you must take and collect these substitutions as, you know, artifacts for assessment.

BRI ON: How about if you who have multiple classes for that GCCR? Are you going to have to assess each and every class?

YOST: You have to assess your GCCR. It's part of the assessment plan. Whatever your plan, whatever you come up with as your plan, you have to assess your plan.

BRI ON: So you have to assess your plan in the multiple courses and then you're going to have to assess your substitution courses, as well?

YOST: No. That -- that is not something that's mandated. This is going back to one of my comments here. If a program starts having lots of substitutions when it comes to the overall -- the thing that we're trying to do here when it comes to the GCCR requirement, they have lots of substitutions, but it's going to come back and say take and put another track in your program because you are missing all these assessments because we are now requiring you to assess substitutions.

HI PPI SLEY: Yes.

TAGAVI: Can you make your motion, so we can call the question? You're not supposed to discuss before having your motion. We have to have a motion.

HI PPI SLEY: We don't have a motion yet?

YOST: Well, there's a logistical thing that goes on with these. Two problems. We need to explain and then --

WOOD: We have to have a motion in order to have the discussion.

YOST: Okay. So this is my first motion.

HI PPI SLEY: Doesn't need a second. It's on the floor.

TAGAVI: May I ask you a question, please.

YOST: Let me just explain so you know what's going on here. We had two policies that the GCCR Committee was working on. It came to the Senate Council previously during the last two weeks. Because it had to then also be put into the Senate Rules, when it came to my committee to look at it real quick, we took a first stab at codifying those two policy statements.

So the Senate Rules, which is

theoretically what this body would be voting on, but the Senate Rules, the changes to those Senate Rules 5.4.3.1 is a -- an attempt to codify the two policy statements, okay?

So if you're looking and wondering how those three things fit together, the policy statements are what they are. Those are what have been working through the whole University for the last year. They've been approved all the way through, and the changes to 5.4.3.1 are the -- what came out of the committee's first attempt to codify those policies.

PORTER: Please let us vote.

YOST: The motion is to approve the policies.

TAGAVI: Question.

PORTER: Second.

HIPPISLEY: The question has been called.

All those in favor of calling the question? All those against? Okay, we will now vote. Five, four, three, two, one. We need to get to 45 to have a quorum, if you've got your clicker, you're not clicking. We need five more.

HIPPISLEY: So I'm going to talk to our parliamentarian. No one's asked for quorum.

WOOD: I call a quorum. I want to see the vote. We do not have a quorum.

YOST: Just so you know, okay. I need you to report back to your colleges now that all substitutions will not be approved because we don't have a policy. So the bottom line is, it's cut off. That's because we've -- we've already done away with all the transfer agreements. We've done away with those things, so there's actually no way of getting any type of substitution --

SCHROEDER: So this is going to hold up people's graduation?

YOST: It could. It could because we have no policy. That's just the bottom line. It's not your fault. It's just the reality of the situation. Ben can chime in.

WITHERS: Well, a point of order. I think the Senate Council Chair has the authority to provisionally approve certain things and he can take make that approval and let the Senate come back and vote in the fall.

HIPPISLEY: Okay. That's the procedure. You'll accept, Senate Council Chair?

UNIDENTIFIED: Does that require a motion?

WITHERS: No.

HIPPISLEY: Don't go yet because there's not -- we can't vote on any more actions. A quorum has been called. So we can't do that. Sorry nurses. We

UK5-2-16.txt

can't do that this time either, College of Medicine. We can't do (inaudible), Marcy, sorry about that. But we can do this, so don't go away. We're going to pass the gavel to Katherine McCormick, who is the new incoming Senate Council Chair. This is for Katherine, for being a great Senate Council Vice Chair. (APPLAUSE).

MCCORMICK: Senate Council has something for you to thank you for your leadership this year. You give flowers, we don't.

HIPPISLEY: Anyone move to adjourn? The meeting adjourned at 5:15 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 26th day of June, 2016.

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