

SENATE MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

NOVEMBER 10, 2014

* * * *

* * * *

ANDREW HIPPI SLEY, CHAIR

ALICE CHRIST, VICE-CHAIR

KATE SEAGO, PARLIAMENTARIAN

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

LISA GRANT CRUMP, COURT REPORTER

* * * *

* * * *

HIPPI SLEY: I'd like to call the meeting to order, please. Welcome to the third session of Senate of the year. Remember the new system is to sign in in the back. Just after you sign in, grab your clicker if you're a member of the body, and your name will be on there. If you have a clicker, make sure that that name is yours.

And we will start clicking more or less immediately. The first thing we want to do is just check everybody who is here. So at this point, please answer one, two, three. This will tell us if we made quorum, which is 45, and we do. I'm going to close the polls in about five seconds, five, four, three, two, one. Thank you.

There were no corrections received by 9:00 a.m. on Friday, so unless there are objections now to the minutes, the minutes from October 13, 2014 stand approved by unanimous consent.

A few announcements. I'm delighted to introduce Kate Seago, give everybody a

UKSenateMeeting-11-14.txt

wave. There she is at the front. She's our new parliamentarian from Library, and she will, I suspect, help us a lot today as we go on.

If you remember the very first meeting, I talked about this new item called other business. I wanted to just refresh your memory about how to use it. To make the agenda a little bit more body driven, there's an opportunity at the very end to come to the microphone and say you know what we really should be discussing, and then make a suggestion.

Senate Council meets every Monday and they recommend what goes on the Senate Agenda, so if you're convincing and the body thinks it's a good idea, no doubt we'll try to put things on the agenda that we wouldn't put on otherwise. But we don't want to entertain any motions.

Another thing that just came in just now, there is a committee called the Learning Management System Committee, LMS, they have decided, they have voted to abandon Blackboard starting on June 30th, when the contract expires. There will be two Town Halls to discuss the implications. One on November the 12th, from 3:00 to 4:30, here in this room, and one on November the 14th, from 11:00 to 12:30, in the Student Center.

Senate Council did some nomination approvals for Periodic Program Reviews of three colleges, Business and Economics, Medicine, Engineering, and Law, four colleges.

We also identified nominees for Summative Reviews of several deans, Mark Kornbluh, David Brennen, Dan O'Hair, and Mary John O'Hair.

For the year's time, Kentucky will do something very radical, it will have a football match on a Thursday. And for this there is a twenty member committee to discuss the implications of this. And one of those members is specifically a member of Senate. And we nominated Bruce O'Hara and he said yes to that. So he will be on that committee.

We've also been asked to come up with a Senate nominee for a new committee called the UK's Dining Oversight Committee. This will look specifically at sustainability issues of the new dining system, menus, and prices. They will report no later than June the 30th. Brad Lee was nominated, and he accepted, from Agriculture.

One of the things that Senate has to do every year is review the calendar. This is the charge of Senate Council, but Senate Council delegates this to an ad hoc committee. We've done that. I'll tell you the composition in a minute. But these are some of the things that ad hoc committee will do.

UKSenateMeeting-11-14.txt

They will look at the report from the last calendar's committee. They will look at various priorities and implications, of some things that came out of that report. They will also liaise for the Academic Priorities and Programs Committee who are specifically right now reviewing the standardized meeting patterns. So the two will intersect.

These are the people who will be on that committee, Sharon Lock; Kevin Real; Margaret Bausch; Christian Oberst, who is a member of this body and Senate Council, he's a student; and as a resource from International Center, Miko McFarland, and from Registrar, David Timoney.

You may have been reading in the Chronicle or the Times that not everybody is happy with Confucius Institute. Several universities in Canada and the states have pulled out of the partnership. Susan Carvalho, Associate Provost of International Affairs wanted Senate to think about this, our own Confucius Institute, with the following charge to review our agreement budget activities and to look at the (inaudible) statement (inaudible) and present findings to Senate Council, and we will present them at Senate of course, in a few months time.

Wally Ferrier, I'm delighted has agreed to chair this committee. He's also Chair of the Academic Priorities and Programs Committee; Katherine McCormick; Ernie Bailey; Ernie Yanarella; Anna Bryski; Liang Luo; and Ashley Zepeda, she's a student member of Senate and also she majors in International Studies. She might be here? Is Ashley here?

CHRIST:

Absent. Excused.

HIPPISLEY:

Senate Council also approved non-standard calendars for several courses, EDP 665, EDP 670, EDC 610, and EDC 730.

Senate Council approved the waiver of Senate Rules 5.4.2.8.1, this is regarding final exams for an exam to be taken in CHE 232-001.

Senate Council also officially recognized the transfer of the MS Physical Therapy and two degrees, BS and MS in Communication Sciences and Disorders from the Department of Clinical Sciences into the Department of Rehabilitation Sciences within the College of Health Sciences.

According to the rules, this was in effect anyway when the Department of Rehabilitation Sciences was created in 2000. The degree programs should have been administered then when the new department was established.

CHRIST:

I'll hand over to our secretary.

I don't have anything to report.
Thank you.

HIPPISLEY:

I would like to hand over to our

Parliamentarian.

SEAGO: I'm Kate Seago and I'm a member of Libraries. I'm sure most of you are aware what a parliamentarian is. But just in case, my primary responsibility is advising the presiding officer on matters of parliamentary procedure. So I'm concerned about the rules, not so much the context.

Our parliamentary procedures run from Robert's Rules of Order, newly revised, except where the Senate Rules and Regulations override it. So those are the rules that I'll be using on it.

And I told Andrew when I accepted this appointment that I'm a firm believer in term limits. There is not one for the parliamentarian. But I'm starting my campaign now and I would like to have a replacement in three years.

Anybody is eligible, any faculty member is eligible to serve as the parliamentarian. The position is appointed by the Senate Council, and like I said, there are no official term limits.

One of the ways that I may be interacting with this body as you deliberate is when you wish to raise a point of order, when you're asking about what are the rules in the situation on it.

So basically if during debate you want to ask what are your rules, you would raise a point of order and ask the question. And I would confer with Andrew and we would have a decision.

HIPPI SLEY: Before we give the Trustee report, just to remind you, too, that using the floor is a privilege of members of the Body in the first instance. Guests are completely welcome here, of course, but they will speak at the discretion of the presiding officer, which is me. Another way of saying it, is please, if you are a guest, let members of the body go first.

I'd like to now turn it over to Bob Grossman. He's our Trustee.

GROSSMAN: John apologizes for not being here. He had a family commitment.

So the Board of Trustees met in October at a retreat and then had a short Board meeting the following day. The primary focus of the retreat was to discuss the research enterprise and what directions it might go.

As is often the case in these sort of things, I think the President had in mind what he wanted the Board of Trustees to do or agree to and he largely got it.

Some of the context of what was discussed is really important. New buildings are extremely expensive, research buildings especially. The way the dorms were built was to have a revenue stream dedicated, which is the rooming fees that the students pay. You

can't do that with a research building. So pretty much we need state support or philanthropy to build a research building.

The President did manage to pull a rabbit out of a hat a year or two ago when he got the Athletics to fund the Academic Science Building, which is largely a teaching building, although there is some space in there, potentially, for research.

But so he's looking to pull another rabbit out of the hat to start to address our research space needs.

However, if you look at the priorities that are faced by the legislature, between pensions, K through 12 education, health care. With the expansion of Medicaid in Kentucky, most of the new enrollees in health insurance in Kentucky have enrolled in Medicare, most of them have not gotten private insurance that they pay for themselves, and the state will have to pick up some of the bill for that in a few years.

You look at all these priorities and it's difficult to see how the state is going to have the where with all to support another building.

So the President thinks that the only way for new buildings to move forward on this campus is to use them to convince the state that if we can solve some of the problems of the state, that will reduce the state's cost in certain areas. And a large part of that is health needs.

And so the President wants to push forward on developing or persuading legislators to support a new research building on the grounds. That building will be used to help to do research that will resolve some of the health disparities and health problems that we see across the state, especially in Eastern Kentucky.

So at the end of the retreat, the Board of Trustees approved a continued resolution. CR they call it. They never tell me what the acronym stands for. I'd like to read it to you and then just make a few points about it.

Recognizing the essential nature and value of all scholarly and creative activity undertaken at a comprehensive, land-grant institution, the University's mission and the current financial environment compel a focus on research areas where: 1) The needs of Kentuckians and the Commonwealth are most pressing; and 2) The University can continue to compete successfully for external research support.

The President is directed to take steps necessary to achieve these goals and grow the University's research enterprise by: 1) Aligning resource commitments to optimize efficiency and facilitate faculty, student, and staff success; 2) Recruiting and

retaining world-class scholars and research teams; 3) Strengthening the commitment to interdisciplinary exploration; and 4) Confirming and detailing the critical need for additional research infrastructure.

Now one thing I've often said to the President, and to previous presidents as well, is that research at the University is more than just health research, and health research is obviously a really big component of the research enterprise at UK, but there are many other parts of research on campus as well that involves creative activity, you know, in terms of writing books, producing musicals, things like that. And that the administration shouldn't lose track of that when they go out and talk to people about the research enterprise at the University.

So in response to those comments that I made, and several other Board of Trustee members made, that very first sentence, clause in there, in that resolution, recognizing the essential activity of all research on campus, was put there.

However, I do understand the President's point. We do live in extremely financially constricted times, NIH funding has been flat or declining. The state, we've already talked about the state.

One thing I can say is that the President doesn't view this research -- this thing, aiming the research enterprise to target problems of Kentucky as being only a Department of Medicine, sorry, College of Medicine, College of Nursing, College of Pharmacy activity.

In fact, some of the talks that we saw during the retreat, people emphasized, Nancy Schoenberg, was one of the people who spoke, (inaudible) also spoke, as did Rodney Andrews. They emphasized the interdisciplinary nature of their work and how people from all colleges, or many colleges participated in what they did, not just colleges, not just healthcare colleges, but people from Education, Arts and Sciences, other colleges as well.

So there is the opportunity to get on this band wagon for people who do research in areas that aren't explicitly NIH-funded areas because everyone recognizes also that interdisciplinary research, you've heard that in the statement, interdisciplinary research is -- has the best opportunity to be funded now and in the future.

And one thing about this campus, this University, it is a fabulous place to do interdisciplinary research. We have a huge competitive advantage in that respect, that we have all of our colleges on a single compact campus and to meet people in (inaudible) of disciplines, it's a five, ten

UKSenateMeeting-11-14.txt

minute walk. I take advantage of that in my research and I know a lot of you take advantage of that as well.

So that's where things stand. I don't have any more to add to that unless anybody has any questions.

HIPPISLEY: Yes?

BLONDER: Lee Blonder, Medicine.

What is the plan to implement this resolution or this research discussion?

GROSSMAN: Good question. The Board of Trustees gives wide just, you know, latitude to the President to carry out mandates and it's up to the President to implement them. I imagine there will be a lot of lobbying in Frankfort. I imagine there will be a lot of seeking of philanthropy.

I know the President, you'll remember, gave \$250,000 of his and his wife's own money towards a fund for a research building, trying to kick start philanthropy in that respect. Beyond that, I don't know any more than you do. What I said is just a guess as to what will happen. If I could guess, that's what I would say.

Any other questions?

HIPPISLEY: Thanks very much, Bob. I'm delighted to introduce Dr. Robert Mock, Vice President of Student Affairs. He's going to tell us a little bit of news.

MOCK: I'm glad to be before you all today. I'm glad to have this opportunity to speak before you, so make sure you get a chance to ask me some questions because if I don't know the answer, just like I do in my class, I'll make something up.

I only teach once a year. I teach once a year in the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Communication, as well, so I'll get support from over there. I get a chance to stand in front of the students on a regular basis.

So this is a subcommittee, members here, that the President appointed. We have a broad group of individuals there, you see people from the community, faculty, staff, as well. And so this committee is put together to start thinking about how do we implement all the changes that I'm about to share with you today. So I just wanted you to be able to see who those individuals are.

So way back in May of 2013, you can see the President announced the creation of this subcommittee group that was going to deal with health and safety. Lots of people ask me questions all the time, only about alcohol, it's much broader than that.

It's really about how do we utilize and distribute alcohol on our campus in a legal way. It's about the Office of Civil Rights. It's about the Title IX legislation that you've heard a bunch about. It's about the new student code, which we'll be taking

UKSenateMeeting-11-14.txt

more aggressively off-campus in every instance because there are some issues associated with it. And of course it deals with the student code and the alcohol policy.

By June of 2013, the committee convened for the first time and by December it came up with some recommendations. Throughout this particular time, we brought in experts, you can see Dr. Peter Lake, he's a national expert on alcohol and substance education, we also brought in (inaudible) from Auburn University as well, he does a lot of research in this area.

By December of 2013, we came up with these recommendations, our work group published these particular items, 284 pages of different recommendations, full of statistics and analysis from all across the country, other institutions that had had sort of levels of success, depends on how you look at it. But we gathered data from all those individuals.

And ultimately by May of 2014, we developed this implementation team, just like the question before, how are we going to implement these things.

So now we've been working on this particular piece over the last several months, how we're going to up with the implementation. A part of that is coming before you, and the many bodies that I presented before, to get feedback before we go forward with any sort of implementation.

So we're here today to get some feedback from you and hopefully you can give us some guidance on how we're going to move forward.

Right now, what we're going to have are these sessions. We met with the Staff Senate, of course, University Senate today. We spoke to members of the Association of the Student Government as well. And we're going back to the neighborhoods again because we want to make sure that we have a town (inaudible) relationship, that we take care of both our neighbors from Lexington and UK, (inaudible). We want to make sure that we address some of those issues.

So here are some of the implementation strategies that came out as a result of 2014 in August. A draft, key word, of the Revised Student Code of Conduct, a draft of a new alcohol policy. And then we have a new public reporting link.

That public reporting link is live, it allows people from the community to go in and type here the issue that's going on, on my particular street. Hypothetically, it's 3:00 in the morning, there's about 400 people outside, they're making a lot of noise, they're disturbing the peace. So here's my address and here is where this is occurring.

What we hope to be able to do is to

UKSenateMeeting-11-14.txt

take that address, cross-reference it with our student local addresses, which we are going to have all hopefully by March of 2015, and then be able to identify, oh, yes, this has been occurring at your house. So now that we are aware that you're a student at that house, what can we do to help better educate you.

Our goal is not to keep people out of school because they have done something that's against the Student Code, but to sort of bring some educational aspects to it, to teach them how to be better neighbors, better citizens, and better represent our University.

Also, there is an important piece here, three conduct officers, and you'll see some data here in a minute. The organizational structure and staffing review is necessary to coincide with addressing off campus incidents. As I said before, historically, we did not address every incident off-campus. But now when we know about it, we're aware of it, we're going to deal with those issues that occur off-campus in every instance.

A couple of other pieces there, you can see we got some information from Ohio State and the University of Minnesota, and so piggyback on some of their successes. And then we're also proposing the expansion of the Employee Assistant Housing Program. Lots and lots of people not using that in great numbers.

A couple of other pieces here, there's a Student Code of Conduct outlining the medical amnesty, that's another piece I forgot to mention.

So hypothetically, we have an 18 year old person who is intoxicated to the point where they believe that their life may be in danger, a 19 year old person is with them, they're intoxicated as well. But they happen to call the police and say, listen, my friend is in danger, can you help me save the life of my friend. That call can be made to neither one of those individuals, we're following the Student Code because we're caring about the health and welfare of that individual, hence the medical amnesty.

What we're afraid that would happen and what we believe happens nationwide, is the 19 year old will not call and say anything because I don't want anyone to know that I have been consuming alcohol and/or any particular substance that I shouldn't have. So that's another big piece.

Clay Mason is the active enforcement part of our task force. Here's some of the statistics that we'll be looking at. These are some of the things that will tell us if we're successful or not, some of the metrics. How many ER visits that we're

UKSenateMeeting-11-14.txt

having. Does the number go up or down.

What happens on a regular basis? On a regular basis we have ER visits on the weekend, typically, right? And those ER visits are really not positive. So we hope and believe that those ER visits will go down with the update on medical amnesty.

CORE Survey as well, we're hopeful that sexually transmitted diseases, reports to University Health goes down as well. We tracked those particular pieces.

Our Clery Report talks about our violence that happens on our campus against women, most cases. Men get assaulted as well. The preponderance of that evidence is mostly with the women, the recipients of that negative behavior.

Title IX reporting as well, and then the other data that we just don't know, that we'll find out later, what we should track.

So those are some of the things that we're looking at.

Here's some of the ways that we're going to try to implement with our good neighbor program. Our UK 101 courses, those of you, obviously all of you in here are teachers and professors, and so know UK 101 is the number one largest (inaudible) class taught in our institution.

And inside some of those courses we hope to provide an educational initiative and inside the Live and Learning programs as well, Parker Scholar Sessions, and try to integrate these educational pieces inside of the classroom so they become aware of the issues that we're dealing with on our campus and in society at large as well.

Sarah Hermsmeier oversees our UK Fusion Program. You're all familiar with UK Fusion, it's the largest day of service in the Commonwealth. Typically at the beginning of the school year, we take the freshman out and they do several things in the community, from painting, to picking up trash, to making repairs. And they see about 150, 145 different service organizations throughout our city.

We're trying to do things to help to teach our students to be better citizens, not just one day a year, but throughout the entire year. So we're going to try to expand some of those programs throughout the entire year.

Another thing we're going to try to do is implement an Event Planning Committee to review, approve, and to deny applications to host events with alcohol. So hypothetically, this is how this will work: So Bob Grossman and I decide to have a wine and cheese event. We fill out the paperwork. And yes, faculty and staff will have to do this as well, not just students.

UKSenateMeeting-11-14.txt

We fill out the paperwork. It will say something like this: We're expecting 400 people. We're going to have it on the front lawn of the Main Building. And we're going to have three licensed servers who are licensed distributors and bonded to distribute alcohol. We're going to have four police officers for safety. We're going to have nine different locations for egress, and we're going to have two ID operations where we check the ID of the people to make sure they're 21.

Turn that paperwork into the committee, they'll look at it and say, you know what, this is a good event, however, you can't have it end at four in the morning. Bob wants it to go it at four, I wanted it at noon. So there we go. So we'll change it and have it go from four in the morning to maybe adjusting it to 11:00 p.m., and then you may need one more officer. That's the typical philosophy that we're thinking about how this will be working.

We also collaborated with United Educators, they cover our liability insurance here for the University. So we were doing some of the research.

We brought in a liability expert, and I asked the question, I said, well, will this cause our campus to have a larger premium because we're going to become less dry and more moist. And he said -- I said, are the prices cheaper if you're a dry campus? He said, well, there are no dry campuses. I said, well, what about religious, you know, SMU, Notre Dame, BYU. He said there are no dry campuses. Okay. All right. I got it. I got it. And so we found out that there's no implications there.

We're also going to try to implement a post-game clean up for our IFC and PH, those are our two largest organizations associated with our Greek system.

Our Off-Campus Housing Excellence Program, modeled after Ohio State and the University of Alabama, we'll try to implement more programs in the community. We have about five ambassadors that live in the community. And they go out and try to help our neighbors, both students and non-students, engage in a proper way in the community and environment that we're concerned about.

Off-campus concerns associated with our Parent Association. Our Parent Association is sort of like PTA for college. So we used to have what we called helicopter parents and then they became the velcro parents, then they became the tech pilot parents. And now they're to the atomic bomb parents because they just never leave us, right? So we want to make sure that we get

UKSenateMeeting-11-14.txt

them engaged and involved in the community and try to help them be aware of what's going on on our campus.

Here's some other action items. The Neighborhood Association Presidents, communicate with them on a regular basis. Have Town Hall Forums where we interface with them, giving them some ideas as to how our programs are working. Also collaborate with other institutions.

So Transy has been a part of our process, they come to our meetings, BCTC as well. We're always concerned because we have some of the same students in the community. And collaborate with our Public Relations Department. And then develop a MOU, modeled after what the Georgia system has.

And most importantly, there at the bottom, work with Enrollment Management to have the update of the local addresses. I meant to tell you that as I explained early on, so we know where you are locally so if there is a large event outside of a neighbor's house (inaudible) student, hopefully we can cross-reference that and then bring that student in and have a discussion with them about their behavior and how it can be better.

So Title IX, you've heard a lot about this. It provides that no person may be subject to discrimination on the basis of sex, and campus must respond promptly to the sexual assaults, harassments, including sexual violence that creates a hostile environment. Employees must report sexual harassment or sexual violence to our Title IX Coordinator. Our Title IX Coordinator is Patty Bender, she receives all of those cases and will move those to the judicial process.

So here's what happens on a regular basis that I've gotten a lot of questions about. So a few weeks ago you saw lots of information about an alleged sexual assault of a football player. I'm only speaking about it because it was in the newspaper, right?

So what happens is we have two different processes. We take them through the judicial process through our Student Code and there the preponderance of evidence is what we go by to decide if the person was responsible or not.

The new Title IX regulation says that we must come to -- have that initial meeting inside of 60 days. What was happening nationwide is a lot of those cases were being placed on the shelf and stayed there for years, in many instances. So Title IX says you have to have the initial piece within 60 days. That does not include the hearing piece, the appeals. So we'll talk about that in a moment. That's one piece. So in 60 days we'll make a determination.

UKSenateMeeting-11-14.txt

On this side you have a legal system, right. So the person actually maybe gets arrested. In our case it did, you saw that in the newspaper as well. Go through a hearing, go through a legal process. But that's much slower and a higher level to prove innocence and/or guilt. Beyond a reasonable doubt versus preponderance of evidence.

So what you're going to see happen throughout this country on a regular basis, and it already has happened here in many other cases, that we believed through preponderance of evidence that this person was responsible for these alleged sexual assault and/or rape. So we go through our process, we remove this person from the institution. They no longer are going to UK as a student.

Well, the legal process is still going on. And we're now nine months in, maybe a year and a half in, and the court system has decided, on the legal side of the house, that lack of evidence or not enough information, we cannot indict this person on the sexual assault and/or rape. So therefore, we have (inaudible).

The student is (inaudible), the court said I am not guilty, I was not found guilty in this thing that you alleged and said I was guilty of the preponderance of evidence over a year and a half ago. That's going to happen on a regular basis. So that's one of the issues that we'll have to deal with, not just UK, but campuses throughout our country. It happens on a regular basis. It has always already occurred in many instances.

So I sort of already talked about this slide regarding the notification of the complaint of the outcome of sexual assault.

So here's one thing that's different. So historically, I'm going to use me and Bob again. So I am alleged to have sexually assaulted Bob. So ultimately, whatever happens to me before Bob would not be aware of it, whether we suspended Bob -- suspended myself, or put me on probation or gave some sort of adjudication. What we have to do now, we have to notify Bob what the institution did to me. Does that make sense? So that's very different than before.

This does not constitute a FERPA violation. Historically, we would not share what we have done to one student, based on our evidence, to another student. But now that has changed. So we will have to share that.

So when a person is found responsible, the complainant must be notified as to what steps were taken to eliminate the hostile environment. So we have to tell them what we have done. That's very different

than what we done before.

So the proposed alcohol policy. It includes -- and I say proposed -- designated spaces indoor and outdoor. The example I used in me and Bob's event that we had, was an outdoor event. So that's possible to have outdoor events as well, indoor events as well.

Outlines the -- allows where alcohol is prohibited. It adheres to all federal laws where appropriate. The Event Planning Group, chaired by John Herbst, will accept and review the applications for the students, organizations, faculty, staff, who want to host an event. Again, they'll present that information and then John Herbst and his evaluation group will decide on yes, this is what you should do, or we have to adjust it so we can figure out a way to have a safe, appropriate event.

Also, pieces of the alcohol, the Holistic Wellness and AOD Prevention presented these particular suggestions, is that we recommend changing the organizational structure for the Office of Substance Education and Responsibility and recommend adding critical staff.

So here's what has happened here at UK and throughout our nation. Students come to us now more medicated than ever before. So what we see is, and you probably see some of these students in your class, that they've been given prescription meds by their parents since they were this tall. And now they're 18 and they're used to taking this medication. And so they come to college and now it's up to them if they're going to take it or not. They tell mom and dad that they're going to. But they come to school and they may or may not take it, and then they liquify on top of that.

So when you do that, you have these huge different behaviors that occur. And so we have more and more cases that we're dealing with than we have historically with student behavior. So those are the things that we're seeing happening throughout our country and on our campus. So we're recommending that we add some critical staff to deal with those number of cases because the caseload is climbing beyond reasonable numbers.

So the proposed Student Code of Conduct adheres to the framework of a model code. This model code was distributed across the country to many places as a model for us to sort of follow. So we modeled our particular code after that. It utilizes the facilitator model from Dr. Peter Lake and Dr. Robert (inaudible), as I mentioned before.

It focuses on social justice, and it's more friendly and uses plain language instead of that legalese that we have had

UKSenateMeeting-11-14.txt

historically, and it moves the conduct process at UK away from being disciplinary and punitive to more restorative and educational. So we're trying to help students grow and develop as opposed to just get them out of here and punish them hard.

So the proposed code has more explicit language that speaks to off-campus cases. As I said before, we're now dealing with every case that we're aware of, become aware of off-campus, provide legal clear guidance. It involves students in a process that's more aligned with the make-up of the University Appeals Board, kind of a hearing board, and includes guidance for the medical amnesty, as I mentioned early on in the slides.

And then I mentioned to you about the 60 day notification process, that we have to have some sort of hearing before the 60 day window, so that we can ultimately get it resolved, and it provides specific outlines for rights of complainants and respondents involved in the sexual misconduct cases.

It allows both the respondent and the complainant to have an attorney and/or an advisor present during the hearing as outlined under Title IX. These things continually are evolving.

Even last Friday, lots of my staff, and staff from multiple institutions in our region and our area, went to Louisville. And they had a big event there. They're constantly getting new updates on what we can and cannot do and how (inaudible) meet the Title IX (inaudible).

The proposed Student Code, as I mentioned to you before, it provides the medical amnesty clause, it also includes the hearing board with only staff hearing officers. And those students will be trained to hear cases involving sexual assault.

So here's what we're trying to do. We're trying to avoid having students hear about other students' sexual assault cases. Why, because we're afraid of the bullying aspect that will occur.

So here's what potentially could occur in many instances. Again Bob and I, I was accused of sexually assaulting Bob. What could happen is now Bob's friends will then begin to pile on me through electronic social media and say, hey, that guy is really a bad person, I know, I got proof of it.

And then they'll go out and they'll have 38 tweets on me, instagram all out there, associated, making me and/or Bob -- you have these arguments occurring in cyber space. We're trying to avoid those things and reduce that bullying that potentially can push a person out of the institution even though they were the victim. Does that make sense?

UKSenateMeeting-11-14.txt

And we have Yik Yak now, which is a way to do that and we can't even track it back to the person. It has no office, it's anonymous. So we're having a lot of that occur throughout our institution as well.

And so finally, we have this web page as well for you to go out and take a look at, the Office of Student Conduct web page, give you some sense of what's there.

I was trying to go quickly as I could, so are you supposed to clap or something?

Questions? All right, yes, sir.

PRATS:

Armando Prats, Arts and Sciences.

I have a general question but I also have a specific one about the event that you're going to share with Bob. The general question is how is this being shared with the students, with all the students? I know that there's the UK 101, you know, my experience tells me that some people pay attention and some don't. So I'm concerned, for one thing, I have a sophomore here, how does she get to know about the new changes?

MOCK:

So the short answer is we have PR attend our meetings, of course all meetings are open. But we have them. And a part of that is a communication plan is going to get rolled out when it's finalized.

The communication plan will have several layers to it. So there will be electronic communication, there will be hard communication, there will be many more forums like this with that information to share.

And it doesn't stop. We won't do it twice and say we're done. We're going to continue to roll it out in many instances and begin to share these things, both at the orientation sessions when we bring new students in, we're also going to share it with our current students.

So you'll see that in the spring once it's finally adopted. But it's not been adopted at this point yet. I'm not saying that we're going to adopt it on January 1 or 15th. So it's sometime in the spring semester. So that's the short answer, sir.

PRATS:

The specific question is: At the event, suppose a student shows up and that student is not of legal drinking age, so what happens then? How is that enforced? Are we exempt from --

MOCK:

No. The idea is to allow a non-legal drinking age person to attend the event. But that's what the checking of the ID process and the banding, or whatever we come up with, will be in place. So that's the intent.

Because what we want to see happen is that the non-legal age students could learn how to appropriately intake alcohol, right? That's what we're hoping will occur.

So here's another piece that came

out through our research. Lots of campuses -- oh, by the way, the number is like 85 percent of our students have admitted through our survey that they have been drinking or intoxicated the two weeks prior to starting school. So again, we didn't teach them how to do it, they knew how to do it before they came here.

So the other piece that came out in our research is this: In Kentucky, I don't know if you're aware of this, but we're the bourbon capital of the world. So I thought I would bring that new knowledge to you. And lots of other campuses are heavy beer consumers. And so when a person consumes this much beer, you just have to go to the restroom a couple times. You may not be intoxicated. But if this is this much bourbon, on top of that, that much soft drink, you can quickly, quickly become intoxicated and beyond that point very quickly.

So we found out that we are a heavy spirits campus. That many other institutions are heavy beer, because of our history, we intake spirits here. And so that's one of the things that kind of pushes our number out there quicker and farther than others.

Other questions? Yes, sir?

GROSSMAN:

Bob Grossman, A and S.

So if -- this sexual assault that you perpetrated on me, if you are found responsible and I am notified --

MOCK:

And I tell you what we did, what they did.

GROSSMAN:

Right. Is it incumbent upon me to keep that quiet or can I go to the press? If I think you weren't punished harshly enough, can I go to the press?

MOCK:

You sure can because I believe legal would probably tell me that you have freedom of speech and the ability to do what you wish. It's your information, and you can share it if you like. I believe that would be legal's position. They don't serve on the committee, but they come in from time to time (inaudible).

I'll take questions as long as you like. Yes, sir.

SWANSON:

Mark Swanson, Public Health.

I was interested in the slide where you have the hearing and both the accuser and accused could have representation.

MOCK:

Yes. A lawyer and/or advisor.

SWANSON:

Given that many of the accused on college campuses and various parts of the country have the support of the Athletic Department, is there any sort of institutional support for the accuser to have representation?

MOCK:

Absolutely. In almost instance we have Violation and Prevention Center on our campus. In almost every instance that person

UKSenateMeeting-11-14.txt

has the representation from our own campus from that side of the house. Again, in most cases -- oh, by the way, only 10 percent of those sexually assaulted or raped ever come forward.

So when a person does come forward, we typically will have a person inside our own campus that helping them go through that process. They sit their with them, they help them with their pieces, their living issues as well.

So, you know, you've been sexually assaulted, and so now you some fears, we do something to try to help and get you to a point where you can live and try to function without having the horror of that event continuing to impact you as a person throughout their life.

So we do have people that kind of work with them. So women do have advocates that they don't have to pay for, there's no lawyer fees or anything like that.

HIPPI SLEY: We've got to stop there. That was absolutely fascinating. If you do have questions can people email you?

MOCK: Yes, you can. And I can also come back or come to your college. I think that I'm going -- I think that Mark has asked for some of my staff to talk about Title IX in his college, to can come and talk about those issues. And we'll be glad to come before you at any time and to assist anybody we can. Thank you.

HIPPI SLEY: I'd like to now welcome Stephen Testa, Chair of Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

TESTA: Okay. So this report is just for this calendar year. We had no appeals, which no tenure appeals is a great thing.

We did have one request to interpret a University Regulation. And the regulation in question was about delay of probationary periods. So as you guys know, it's a fairly new rule.

When you're on your probationary period, your first five years, if you have a child or other family obligations, you get a year added onto your tenure clock. And so the question is if that happens, during your year of delay, year or two, can it be expected that you be less productive, and if so, should this be reflected in your periodic faculty performance review, not your tenure review, not the review for when you go up for tenure, but just your periodic reviews.

And the committee think that that's true, that if you have a year off due to family obligations and a child, that it could be expected during that year of delay that you would be less productive and that that should be reflected in your faculty performance review. And we sent that recommendation on to the President.

The real question then for us was how do you implement that. We're all evaluated differently. This is a complex issue because it's not just probationary period, probationary faculty that are affected, it's also anyone who is on family medical leave, during that time, could it be expected that you'd be less productive.

And so we didn't think that it was within the charge of committee to make policy on how to implement that. But we did make a recommendation to the President to form a committee and determine how to implement this policy and he's done that. I'm not sure if they've met yet.

HIPPISLEY: That committee composition was announced to you at our very first meeting in September. I think there are two or three senators on it.

TESTA: The only thing I would recommend is it's a very complex issue, it has far-ranging implications. And the policy that comes forth is going to be precedent setting in many ways. So the only thing that I recommend is that you guys read it very carefully when it comes out.

HIPPISLEY: Any questions for Chris?
Steve. Sorry.

TESTA: That's okay, I go by Chris sometimes. Thanks.

HIPPISLEY: We have a proposal from Senate's Organization and Structure Committee, Ernie Bailey.

BAILEY: So the motion is a recommendation from the Senate Council that the Senate endorse the change in the name and organizational structure of the Graduate Center for Toxicology to the Department of Toxicology and Cancer Biology.

So the Senate Academic Organization and Structure Committee met back on October 1 to discuss the proposal. This was for the Graduate Center and Toxicology. This has been in existence for awhile, it has grown and it's housed in the College of Medicine.

They would like to change from being a graduate center to being an actual department. And Dr. Mary Vore Iwamoto, is she here? Okay, good. Because when there are hairy questions, you can answer those.

Basically, the main points that they had about changing, one was a desire to include an undergraduate program, aspects of undergraduate teaching in their program, and graduate centers cannot do that. That probably wasn't the most important.

A major point was that there's an increasing emphasis on cancer biology research and the number of the faculty that are involved there and the University of Kentucky is developing a higher profile in cancer research.

UKSenateMeeting-11-14.txt

This is a unit that many of the faculty would like to have to have a higher profile, and having it go from being a center to being a department would do that. And at the same time, you can also see that they're also changing the name from the Center of Toxicology to Toxicology and Cancer Biology, which reflects the activities that they are carrying on in their program.

There's a belief that there would be an improved recruitment of students in that program if it is a department rather than a center. And the same thing for faculty, a better career path for faculty that are in a department rather than a center.

And I think the other thing is that the program has twenty faculty at this point and has really outgrown our concept of what a center is. Centers are much smaller.

So we had a discussion about that and Mary came to our meeting and talked about it. There were other issues that came up. One of the questions that we had from our committee was the Center for Toxicology is well-known for having a -- again, it's a 20 core faculty, it also has a lot of joint faculty (inaudible).

And so the question was would changing to a center, losing joint faculty, how would that impact their ability to carry out these missions. And Mary's response was that the faculty that they in hand could carry out the mission of the department as it's stated, but they also anticipate that many of the joint faculty, who would cease to be joint faculty when you eliminate a center, were interested in rejoining the program as a department, so they anticipate many of the faculty staying.

Based on that, the committee basically voted unanimously to recommend endorsement of the proposal.

HIPPISLEY: So the motion is now on the floor. It doesn't need a second, it came from committee. I'll open it up for discussion or questions.

TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering.
It seems we need an effective date for this proposal. I talked to one of the faculty members and I think the intent is to be effective January 2015. So I am making an amendment to add effective January 1st of 2015 for this proposal.

HIPPISLEY: Before I put that on the floor, we have to discuss that carefully here. The Board of Trustees meets in December so it's predicated upon us getting the endorsement to the Board of Trustees on time. I think that's a practical possibility, but it's not a foregone conclusion.

TAGAVI: It doesn't have to, it's a recommendation.

UKSenateMeeting-11-14.txt

- HI PPI SLEY: Another recommendation could be immediately upon endorsement, so we're not hijacking a particular date, rather than being specific about January.
- TAGAVI: You mean on approval of the Board?
- HI PPI SLEY: On approval of the Board of Trustees. Immediately upon approval of the Board of Trustees. Connie?
- WOOD: I wanted to second. Connie Wood, Arts and Sciences.
I wanted to second the amendment and also to speak in favor of it because this is a recommendation and, therefore, the effective date as part of that recommendation would be appropriate.
- HI PPI SLEY: So we have a proposal from Kaveh to make an amendment to this motion such it would end with a comma and say effective -- tell us what the amendment is to add the words.
- TAGAVI: I would like for the department faculty or the chair to say if it's January 1st or fall or spring 2015. But I'd like to add, let's assume this gets to the Board in March, having requested to be effective spring 2015, the Board could retroactively approve it starting in spring. There are some implications, degrees, there are so many implications that it's important to have (inaudible) in the recommendation.
- I WAMOTO: I don't understand the legal implications. We would be happy with the January 1 start date. We were told when we started this a year ago that it would be July 1. So, you know, we can work with reality.
- HI PPI SLEY: So there's a motion -- the motion would be an amendment to add effective day January 1st and we have a second, Connie Wood. The motion is on the floor, and that amendment to now be discussed.
- RI ORDAN: Chris Riordan, Provost.
So the University Senate endorses the academic structure. The Board of Trustees approves the academic structure. So once this endorsement goes forward, we will take it to the Board, hopefully in December, which then makes the Senate Chair's recommendation one that really is significant in terms of the date.
I guess I would consider handcuffing a department in terms of the actual time frame that they're ready to go forward with this once the Board approves it, because that is the official body that approves the academic structure, organizational structure. It will be up to the academic chair to implement it as soon as it's endorsed or approved by the Board of Trustees.
So basically what Andrew had recommended, rather than putting in a specific date may be a consideration, because the Board does approve this.

UKSenateMeeting-11-14.txt

HI PPI SLEY: So this is speaking against the amendment as well, against the specific date?

RI ORDAN: I'm speaking in favor perhaps of your recommendation, which was against the amendment. So, yes.

HI PPI SLEY: Any other comments for or against the amendment of putting in a specific date starting in January 2015?

BROTHERS: So now we're going to go to a specially set up amendment vote. I don't know, what was the effective --

TAGAVI: I said January 1st.

HI PPI SLEY: And this was seconded by Connie.

HI PPI SLEY: So hearing no further discussion -- Kaveh?

TAGAVI: We have done this hundreds of times, tens of times in the past. Just imagine if the department wanted it to be July 1st, 2015, whatever it is that they want, I think they should have it.

HI PPI SLEY: Okay. We're ready to vote on this amendment. The poll is open. Okay, I'll give a quick countdown, five, four, three, two, one. Close the polls and see what the results are. Okay, 42 in favor, 31 opposed, and 7 have abstained. The amendment to the motion carries.

We're back to the original motion. Now what we're going to vote on, what's on the floor now, is this recommendation as just amended. And we're going to pause and have further discussion. Does anybody want to discuss the motion as amended?

KELLUM: Rebecca Kellum, A and S. I'm just wondering what the history of it is, and I don't know if you've been in it long enough to know, of it being originally a graduate center and (inaudible).

I WAMOTO: So it was established, the PhD in Toxicology was established in 1969. The graduate center in 1979. It started out with only joint faculty, no primary or core faculty until the '80s, maybe. I know when I became chief director in 1984, there were four core faculty.

And so in the last 20 years, we now have 19 tenure track faculty. That has ramped up probably the most in the last three to four years. What else would you like to know?

KELLUM: It started small then?

I WAMOTO: It started very small.

HI PPI SLEY: Other questions or comments?

BALLEY: I had left out also, an important part is the vote, and I didn't mention that. There was a vote with the joint and the core faculty, and it was unanimous in support. I don't believe there was a vote of just the core faculty or did you have one later? I forgot. In the joint faculty, 14 of the 24 faculty participated in that vote and there was no indication of dissent.

I WAMOTO:

We had had an earlier vote, but not having some of Robert's Rules of Order to help us, we had not split the vote from the organizational change versus the educational change. We did it all as one, there it was unanimous. But since we later learned we needed to split it out, we didn't call a second meeting, we did it all as one body and there it was unanimous. There were many discussions with joint and core faculty.

BAILEY:

We used the votes largely not so much to make decisions, because that's not how it's done, but to try to ferret out issues or questions and we couldn't find any. Bob?

GROSSMAN:

Bob Grossman, A and S. Something you just said raised a question in my mind. You said organizational change and educational change in there, you have to vote on them separately. So here there's nothing about an educational change.

I WAMOTO:

That's correct. That has gone through the Graduate Council and been approved by Graduate Council.

GROSSMAN:

Graduate Council hasn't come to us yet.

JONES:

On a ten-day post.

GROSSMAN:

It votes on a ten-day post. Okay.

HIPPISLEY:

Other questions for Mary? Discussion for or against? Okay. Hearing no further discussion, so I will now open the voting. The poll is now open. The countdown, five, four, three, two, one. The poll is now going to close. And 84, 0 against, and 1 abstention. Motion carries. Thank you very much.

We now have two reports from Margaret Schroeder, she's the Chair of Senate's Academic Programs Committee.

SCHROEDER:

Hi. This is a recommendation from Senate Council that the Senate approve the establishment of a New Graduate Certificate in Health Coaching in the Department of Kinesiology and Health Promotion within the College of Education.

So the rationale for this certificate is that health coaches help clients identify their goals, develop an action plan, and help put the plan into action while giving support and helping to motivate clients toward success. A certificate in health coaching will enable individuals to showcase their qualifications from a reputable program and University.

The Department of Kinesiology and Health Promotion at UK proposes a 15-credit hour Graduate Certificate in Health Coaching designed to meet the supplemental education needs of current health promotion professionals and those training to become health promotion professionals.

The certificate would apply to any students who are already or will be enrolled

UKSenateMeeting-11-14.txt

in a degree program, or those who simply apply for post-baccalaureate status in order to complete this certificate.

They have learning outcomes and the certificate will be directed by Dr. Kristen Mark, a faculty member in the Department of Kinesiology and Health Promotion in the College of Education. They also have letters of support from the College of Public Health, Department of Communication within the College of Communication, and then also the Division of Athletic Training.

HIPPI SLEY: So this motion comes from committee, we don't need a second. It's on the floor. If you have any questions for Margaret or any discussion for or against the motion, please raise your hand and identify yourself.

WOOD: Connie Wood, A and S.
You state in here that the program faculty are the affiliated faculty. Could you be more specific?

SCHROEDER: There is a list of affiliated faculty within the proposal that was submitted, but it is the graduate program faculty within the department. They've also added a couple of health coaches from the field in order to better inform the certificate program.

WOOD: So the responsible faculty is the graduate faculty in Kinesiology and Health Promotion?

SCHROEDER: Yes, ma'am.

WOOD: Okay. Thank you.

HIPPI SLEY: Any other questions? Okay.
Hearing none, we will vote. We don't need this, this time. Countdown, five, four, three, two, one. And the motion carries.

SCHROEDER: The second report.
This recommendation from Senate Council is that the Senate approve for submission to the Board of Trustees the establishment of a new BA/BS program in Modern and Classical Languages, Literatures and Cultures in the Department of Modern and Classical Languages, Literatures and Cultures within the College of Arts and Sciences.

This proposal is designed to advance undergraduate student proficiency in understanding of the linguistic structure of world languages and to introduce them to critical and theoretical approaches to an array of cultural products.

At its heart, the major is designed to demonstrate the breadth and depth of the discipline and the connections among peoples, regardless of the language they speak or their national citizenship. Their ultimate goal is to provide service to the Commonwealth by fostering language ability and increasing global cultural awareness.

The rationale for the proposed

UKSenateMeeting-11-14.txt

major is in response to their last external review and to the MLA report of 2004 on the state of world language education in the United States.

If you were to read in the bulleting you would notice that there are several individual programs. This new major would unify those programs.

The department determined that individual language majors, without a common set of courses or the ability to co-teach across disciplines, limited the collaboration that could and should be taking place across the diverse areas of specialty and on deviating innovative, cross-disciplinary courses for UK students.

The specific tracks within this program are Arabic and Islamic Studies, Chinese Studies, Classics, French and Francophone Studies, German Studies, Japan Studies, and Russian Studies.

There are student learning outcomes listed on page 59 of your handout. It will be run by the -- the department chair will be the DUS in the department and the program faculty will be as the program faculty structure within that department.

HIPPI SLEY: So this comes from committee, we don't need a second. The motion is on the floor. Does anyone have questions for Margaret or discussion?

DIETZ: Hank Dietz, Electrical Engineering. Could you just explain what's going on with the BA/BS portion of that? Is it two separate degree programs?

SCHROEDER: Yes. It is two separate degree programs and they have separate degree requirements that are in line with those required by the College of Arts and Sciences.

HIPPI SLEY: Any other questions for Margaret?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.

Just to follow-up on that, so the only difference between the BA and the BS are the college requirements, is that correct?

SCHROEDER: Is Jeanmarie here?

ROUHI ER-WILLOUGHBY: Yes. They are in accordance with the college requirements.

GROSSMAN: That's fine.

VASCONEZ: Henry Vasconez, from Medicine.

I just wanted to know, the Department of Modern and Classical Languages, what degrees do they give at present, the (inaudible)?

SCHROEDER: Jeanmarie, correct me if I'm wrong. Currently, the individual tracks that I mentioned within the degree program are currently separate degrees within the department.

However, this is not a good use of resources nor it is in line with their current theoretical thinking. They think that unifying this with tracks would be better this for their department, their

UKSenateMeeting-11-14.txt
resources, and their students.

Once this degree is approved by the Board of Trustees, those other degrees will be submitted for deletion with teach out plans so as to not affect any of the students.

ROUHI ER-WILLOUGHBY: One small correction. Arabic is now only a minor, so we added a new major.

SCHROEDER: Okay, thank you.

HIPPI SLEY: Questions?

FIREY: Abigail Firey, Arts and Sciences.

In preparation for this proposed change, was there any research done about the implications for students who want to go on to graduate programs in specific language, graduate study?

SCHROEDER: I'll defer to Jeanmarie on that one.

ROUHI ER-WILLOUGHBY: Yes. We made sure that the tracks would reflect the language concentration and that they would not have any fewer hours in the language than they currently have.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Arts and Science.

This is a very small point, but why is it that the tracks are all named with adjectives, except Japan Studies, why is it not Japanese Studies?

ROUHI ER-WILLOUGHBY: Because that's what it's titled now and that's what they've always used.

GROSSMAN: Okay.

SCHROEDER: I will say that Mia Alexandra Snow did suggest and make sure that the language was similar for SACS accreditation.

HIPPI SLEY: Additional discussion?

SCHROEDER: Which we don't have to rule on, but I think part of the reason for the rationale for that was because of that.

HIPPI SLEY: Discussion points or questions?

Hearing none, let us vote on this motion.

I'm going to give you a countdown, five, four, three, two, one. The motion carries. Thank you, Margaret.

Okay, so we're doing very well time wise. Let's hope this works well.

Let me explain. Quite often, too often really, Senate Council gets a request from the dean of a college, saying, oh, dear, sorry, due to administrative error, we didn't get a student on the degree list and we should have, our fault, not the student's.

Senate Council, on behalf of Senate, takes the action to therefore put that student on the degree list, retroactively, and recommend approval of an amended list, as it were, because we're adding a student, to the Board of Trustees. This is quite routine.

What's happening now here is something slightly different. On the one hand, it belongs to the same problem of family -- family of problems. On the one hand, what we saw was due to administrative error, the student, who is called SM-99,

UKSenateMeeting-11-14.txt

wanted a BS in Accounting and a BS in Economics, ended up on the degree list with only the BS in Accounting.

What's complicated about the error is that the student at the same time as this mistake was being made, the student was put on a degree list in May 2014, to have a double major in Accounting and Economics.

The request from the college is we didn't mean this to happen. We meant the student to have a separate BS in Accounting and a separate BS in Economics, could you please fix it and get the student added to the May 2014 degree list and to request approval by the Board of Trustees.

The corollary of making that move is to take away something from the May 2014 degree list, basically SM-99's double major in Accounting and Economics.

What sounds dramatic about this is that we're actually not only approving, or recommending for approval the addition to the degree list, we're recommending rescinding a degree, in a very connected way, though. It's purely a corollary.

So one way of doing this in one action is, there's a terrifying moment that one of the actions is to rescind and then the other vote doesn't go through, (inaudible). One way is to use Robert's Rules as our guide, and to target the May 2014 degree list with an amendment specifically looking at the line where that student features and say, we're going to add the degree in Economics and at the same time, we're going to pull a degree out, the double major in Accounting and Economics.

So what the motion would be, would be to amend something that was already adopted, specifically, this would be the amendment. And if the motion goes through, then we immediately tell the Board of Trustees and have it done for the December meeting.

So this a motion, it will require a second to go on the floor. So I will read the motion.

The recommendation that Senate amend the May 2014 degree list adopted at the May 5th, 2014 Senate meeting by two things, rescinding on the one hand the BS in Accounting and the second major in Economics, for this student SM-99, and in its place granting upon SM-99, a BS in Accounting and a BS in Economics. That's the story.

For it to go on the floor and for there to be discussion, I am looking for a proposer and a second. Who would like to --

GROSSMAN: So moved, Bob Grossman, A and S.

HIPPISLEY: Who would like to second this?

Debra Anderson.

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.

All right. It is now on the floor,

HULSE: and it is open for discussion.
David Hulse, College of Business
and Economics.
Is the Economics degree the one in
Arts and Sciences or the one in Business and
Economics?
HIPPI SLEY: They're both in the same college, B
and E. Bob?
GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.
So does this also -- this will
require, also, Board of Trustees action?
HIPPI SLEY: Yes. We recommend approval, they
act.
GROSSMAN: So is this the usual language by
which we recommend to the Board of Trustees
that they also do this? Davy?
JONES: Davy Jones, Toxicology, not a
senator.
This is the tenor of the language
that we use can for this kind of action.
GROSSMAN: So the Board of Trustees is used to
getting something like this and realizing,
oh, we need to act.
JONES: The nuance here is that is it
elected faculty senators who are doing this.
HIPPI SLEY: I should have mentioned that. If
we vote on this today, it will be elected
senators only. Connie Wood?
WOOD: I'd like to propose a friendly
amendment here in order just to clarify
exactly what it is that we are asking the
Senate to take action on because there really
are two separate actions here.
One is a retroactive addition of a
student to the May 2014 degree list for the
degree in Economics, the second action is the
action to request that the Board of Trustees
rescind the degree that was actually awarded
in May of 2014 and to -- with a double major,
and to replace that with a BS in Accounting
and a BS in Economics.
So I would amend this to say that
the Senate approve the retroactive addition
of the requesting student to the May 2014
degree list for a degree of BS in Economics.
And I don't think I have the correct, if
someone from Business could help, BS, I
believe it's in Economics and something else
I believe is the correct lettering on that,
in that sentence.
And then say, the University Senate
recommends to the Board of Trustees that the
degree of BS in Economics and the degree --
the original degree be rescinded and the
degrees actually awarded, the two degrees be
awarded.
One of them is an approval, one of
them is a recommendation.
HIPPI SLEY: So just to clarify, Connie, are you
saying this is one motion that we vote on or
several motions?
WOOD: No, this is one motion that we
can vote on, but the wording here is we can

UKSenateMeeting-11-14.txt

approve the addition to the degree list, but we can only recommend to the Board of Trustees to rescind the degree and to award the appropriate degrees.

HIPPI SLEY: So just to clarify, your wording with the correct vote to be is to recommend and approve the two different situations?

WOOD: Right. I wanted to make it clear that we are -- the action the Senate is being asked to take is to retroactively add a student's name to the degree list under BS in Economics. That is one action. That allows the Board of Trustees to then confer that degree, if it so pleases, upon our recommendation.

The second action, but part of the same recommendation, is to recommend to the Board that they actually rescind the degree that was awarded in May 2014 and to award two single degrees.

HIPPI SLEY: Alice?

CHRIST: I think I would like to speak against that proposal on the grounds of our parliamentarian's formulation of this as a particular kind of action in Robert's Rules, because we formulate the graduation list.

This is to rescind what we did in May, is part of a formal motion, and consolidates those actions into one, so basically we're revising that list in one action. I think it is more confusing if you've got all these extra provisions.

HIPPI SLEY: What I should have done is put this on the floor so we could have a discussion, so it's an amendment that's been moved by Connie Wood, Arts and Sciences.

UNIDENTIFIED: No second yet.

HIPPI SLEY: There's no second yet. Once there is one I'll move put it on the floor. There's a second from Liz Debski, A and S, and it is now on the floor. Alice's discussion has now just happened, she's asked a question. It feels this is achieving the same thing, (inaudible) Robert's Rules.

TAGAVI: Can you put up the motion so we could see it, that would be more clear, as she recommended?

BROTHERS: I'm not sure what the language is to amend.

HIPPI SLEY: Can you just insert a new slide?

BROTHERS: Do you want me to insert a new slide or put it here?

GROSSMAN: Insert a new slide.

BROTHERS: Andrew?

HIPPI SLEY: This is an amendment slide? You could put it in an amendment slide. Yeah, put the whole thing over there.

BROTHERS: I'm sorry, I'm not sure what the whole thing is.

UNIDENTIFIED: Exactly.

HIPPI SLEY: Connie?

WOOD: That the University Senate approve the retroactive addition of the requesting

student --

BROTHERS: Can you slow down just a minute?
Okay.

WOOD: -- to the May 2014 degree list for the degree of BS in Economics. Furthermore, the University Senate recommends to the Board of Trustees that the degree of Bachelor of Science in Accounting, with a double major in Accounting and Economics be rescinded, and the degrees of BS in Accounting and a BS in Economics be conferred in May 2014. Did I go too fast?

GROSSMAN: Yes.
BROTHERS: Is this it?
WOOD: Furthermore, the University recommends to the Board of Trustees that the degree of BS in Accounting with a double major in Accounting and Economics be rescinded and the degrees of BS in Accounting and a BS in Economics be conferred in May 2014.

HIPPISLEY: So we do have the comparison in black. Is that right, Connie?
WOOD: I can't read it. You would have to show out my bad eyesight or my contacts.
Yes.

HIPPISLEY: Okay. So the amendment is basically a rewrite.
GROSSMAN: It's a substitute.
HIPPISLEY: It's a substitute.
WOOD: It's a clarification.
HIPPISLEY: The motion is on the floor. Is there any discussion?

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.
It actually to me seems that the original motion seems more clear than the amendment. So I'm speaking against the amendment.

HIPPISLEY: Anyone else want to speak for or against it? Bob and then Lee.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.
There is actually, I think, an inaccuracy in the first clause here because it's not just a matter of adding a student to the degree list but it's removing a double major from the degree list and then adding the two separate degrees, which would make it then pretty much read exactly the same as the second clause.
I don't have any objection to adding something to the original motion about recommend that the Board of Trustees act in a corresponding way or something like that in the original motion. But I think saying exactly the same thing twice, once about the degree list for the Senate, once for the Board of Trustees, is unnecessary.

HIPPISLEY: Lee?
BLONDER: I agree with separating out the motions so that there's an approve and a recommend portion.
My question, though, is there any precedent for rescinding a degree, because

this could set a precedent and I don't know that we want to do that.

HIPPI SLEY: As I said at the beginning, it sounds so dramatic, but it's a strict corollary of adding. In this case, the reason why the degree is going away is because we're giving the student what he really wants.

GROSSMAN: And is qualified for?

HIPPI SLEY: He's qualified for getting two degrees. He's not going to get two degrees and keep the double major. He wants the two degrees. We're going to give him the two degrees, and by virtue of that we're taking away what he doesn't want, the double major. It does sound scary, but it is a corollary.

PORTER: Todd Porter, Pharmacy.

I guess the simpler solution of simply awarding him a BS in Economics on top of the degree he's already got would not accomplish what we're trying to do? That is, without rescinding anything, just say, no, we're going to give you a BS in Economics as well. Would that not be easier and amount to the same thing?

HIPPI SLEY: He would then have a BS in Economics and a BS in Accounting (inaudible) major. (Inaudible).

PORTER: He's got two majors then, and I guess giving him one degrees, I guess that's --

HIPPI SLEY: Double-dipping on a large scale.

PORTER: -- double-dipping on a large scale.

GRACE: Patrick Grace, student in the College of Medicine.

Is it necessary to rescind his original degree, is it impossible to amend his original degree and remove the double major and then simply award him the BS in Economics?

HIPPI SLEY: This is kind of what we are doing, we're saying, at the end of the day, we made a mistake and this is what we should have done.

JONES: Was it clear --

HIPPI SLEY: Name and --

JONES: Davy Jones, privilege of the floor.

Was it clear in the documentation you saw that there was an error here, there was a mea culpa by an identified person, and we're not setting a precedent here for students get to renegotiate their degree after the fact?

HIPPI SLEY: That's a good question. So the routine is that a lot of paper comes to Senate Office with any proposal or petition to add to the degree list. It's a very thick dossier. And we got a specific request by the associate dean of this college with a mea culpa in place. That was a very typical situation. We never move unless we see real evidence and the evidence is provided by the culpable party, which has to be the college.

So that part is not in doubt at all. The content is not in doubt.

Anyone else want to talk in favor or against?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.

I have a question about parliamentary procedure. Is it possible to propose a substitute amendment for this amendment?

SEAGO: I think at this point you would have to vote on this amendment and then -- unless you want to amend the amendment.

GROSSMAN: I want to amend the amendment by proposing a substitute for it that's much shorter.

SEAGO: It might be better to vote on this amendment first and then bring up...

DEBSKI: Could we hear it if it's a friendly amendment, though?

SEAGO: Well, there is another possibility, Bob.

GROSSMAN: Well, the amendment is just to replace all this language here with -- end with adding another clause to the original proposal: comma and ask the Board of Trustees to act upon -- or to -- to act upon this action. Or upon this -- to act upon this -- well, we're not making a recommendation. So to take action hereupon. To take action hereupon. That's my proposed substitute.

HIPPI SLEY: So this has to be accepted by the person who moved the amendment in the first place?

SEAGO: Yes, if it's a friendly amendment.

HIPPI SLEY: Do you accept the friendly amendment?

WOOD: With all due respect to my valued colleague, I decline.

GROSSMAN: Am I allowed to propose an amendment to an amendment or no?

SEAGO: Yes, you can propose an amendment to --

GROSSMAN: I formally make a motion to replace the previous amendment with this amendment. It's a substitute.

HIPPI SLEY: I think we have a proposal on the floor and I would like to just deal with that at the moment. The proposal is the red. We have more time for discussion, but not much.

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S.

Again, what I think Bob's new format completely ignores is the attempt to get the approval, what the Senate actually approves and has jurisdiction over, separated from what it recommends to the Board.

And I think that Connie's motion does that very explicitly. Now, there might be easier ways that one could word it, I don't know. But I do think it's important to get those two parts separated and made explicit.

HIPPI SLEY: Yes?

UKSenateMeeting-11-14.txt

SWANSON: Mark Swanson, Public Health.
So if we don't make an amendment and go with the original proposal, what happens to an amended degree list? We know what happens to a degree list that's automatically forwarded to the Trustees. What do we with an amended list?

HIPPI SLEY: The Trustees will have -- I'm trying to get this right.

BROTHERS: Are you asking about what the Senate Council office does or what the Board of Trustees does?

SWANSON: If we vote to amend the degree list, what's the next step?

BROTHERS: What would happen with the degree list, specifically, is that after I'm done doing the minutes of the meeting, I'll send an email to the President's office, the Provost's office, and the Registrar, to let them know of the Senate's action. And then it will be up to the President and the Provost's office to put that on a Board agenda for the Board to review at the next Board meeting. Is that what you're asking?

SWANSON: Right.

HIPPI SLEY: We'll just target that one line, that one student added to the degree list. That will be the agenda item for the Board.

RIORDAN: So I may add to what Sheila said, it goes before the Academic Student Affairs Committee to review, then it goes to the full Board as a recommendation of the standing committee. So it would come up this December.

HIPPI SLEY: Yes?

LEE: Chad Lee, College of Ag.
Is it appropriate at this time to call the question?

HIPPI SLEY: The question has been called. So we vote?

SEAGO: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED: What are we voting on?

HIPPI SLEY: So we've voting on -- Sheila, can you move it to where you have the black and the red?

UNIDENTIFIED: First we're voting on calling the question.

UNIDENTIFIED: First we're voting on to call the question.

SEAGO: Yes, I'm sorry.

HIPPI SLEY: All those who are in favor of calling the question? Okay, motion carries.

GROSSMAN: You're calling the question on the amendment, specifically, right?

HIPPI SLEY: On the amendment.

CROSS: Point of order. Al Cross, Communications.
Does calling the question not mean you limit debate to a certain period of time (inaudible) each side after the question is called?

SEAGO: No. If you want to set it for a debate limit, that would be a different...

UKSenateMeeting-11-14.txt

CROSS: Okay, thank you.
HIPPI SLEY: So now we vote on this amendment, which is the red. The poll is open for voting on the amendment.
UNIDENTIFIED: It's the red one that we're voting on.
HIPPI SLEY: Remember, it's elected senators only. Okay. I will start to counting down, five, four, three, two, one. So the motion to amend is defeated.
We're now going to transition to the original motion.
BROTHERS: So just back to the original PowerPoint, correct?
HIPPI SLEY: Yes.
GROSSMAN: So I would like to make an amendment to this.
HIPPI SLEY: So this motion is still on the floor. This is the original motion, it was on the floor, and it's back on the floor. Any further discussion? Yes?
UNIDENTIFIED: Can we put the original motion back up?
BROTHERS: Sorry, this motion?
HULSE: According to the University bulletin, the Economics degree offered by the College of Business and Economics is a BSBE, not a BS. I therefore move that the BS in Economics be replaced by BSBE.
BROTHERS: I'm sorry, did you say BSB?
HULSE: BSBE.
HIPPI SLEY: Thank you.
UNIDENTIFIED: Would that be a friendly amendment?
SEAGO: Yes. It would be a friendly amendment.
UNIDENTIFIED: According to the University bulletin it is BSBE.
GROSSMAN: BSBE? Okay.
HIPPI SLEY: So the friendly amendment has been accepted.
GROSSMAN: Sure.
HIPPI SLEY: Any further discussion?
TAGAVI: He didn't made an amendment yet.
BROTHERS: I thought Senator Hulse made a friendly amendment and Bob accepted it.
GROSSMAN: Yes.
HIPPI SLEY: Bob originally moved this amendment here and there's a a friendly amendment to it. Okay. Any further discussion on this friendly amendment BSBE? Any discussion? Hearing none, let us now vote on this motion. I'll close the poll in five seconds. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries. Thank you.
Other business? If you have any energy for it, come up to the microphone and tell us your thoughts.
O'CONNOR: I have something quick. I'll be very quick.
HIPPI SLEY: Okay. Thank you.
BROTHERS: Name, please?
O'CONNOR: Lisa O'Connor, College of Information.

I asked my colleagues about what they thought we should consider this year. We have a very difficult problem with student course evaluations. I've looked at dossiers, we're online evaluations. I've looked at dossiers, where we've had two or three students evaluate courses.

It's going to hurt my very young unit and it's a serious problem. We feel like we're not getting any traction with a normal (inaudible), so I'd like to see the Senate take that problem on.

HIPPI SLEY: And the problem would be to look at?

O' CONNOR: To find a way to incentive students to complete online evaluations.

HIPPI SLEY: I should say there is a committee looking at evaluations. What I could do is just add that for them to consider as well.

O' CONNOR: Yes. Except it needs to be very fast and be a big priority.

The second priority they had was to revisit the issue of escalating hires for administrative positions compared to faculty positions.

GROSSMAN: Doing what? I'm sorry.

O' CONNOR: What?

GROSSMAN: What do you mean escalating?

O' CONNOR: They perceive that there is escalating administrative bloat in the past couple of years.

GROSSMAN: Oh, okay.

HIPPI SLEY: Thanks, Lisa. Anyone else have discussion? Consideration for a future meeting? So it's quarter to five. Do we have a motion to adjourn? Fred Fiedler, Arts and Sciences. Second? Name and institution?

MCGILLIS: McGillis.

University publicly appointed

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 HARRISON)

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).

UKSenateMeeting-11-14.txt
My commission expires: April 6, 2015.
IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
hand and seal of office on this the 27th day of
February, 2015.

LISA GRANT CRUMP
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE-AT-LARGE
K E N T U C K Y NOTARY ID 440572