

SENATE MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

DECEMBER 8, 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 last session of the Christmas semester. As you now know very well, you need a clicker and you're going to register your attendance right now. If you are here, please press one. I'll give you a few seconds to settle down. The quorum is 45, so we exceed that. All right, I'm going to close the polls. Five seconds, five, four, three, two, one. Okay. Thank you.

All right. Before we get started, we do need this motion -- we should have given you the agenda on Tuesday, we gave it to you Wednesday. So by the time it reached the senate, it's Senate Rule 1.2.3, which says all agendas must be (inaudible) six days in advance. So I'd like someone to move that we waive Senate Rule --

BRI ON: Gail Bri on, Engi neeri ng.

HIPPI SLEY: Thank you, Gail. And someone to second?

MAZUR: Second, Mazur.

UKSenateMeeting-12-14.txt

HI PPI SLEY: Mazur, second. From which college?
MAZUR: Education.

HI PPI SLEY: Okay, thank you. So the motion is on the floor. Any discussion? Hearing none, let's vote. If you oppose it, then we can't have a meeting. All right. I'm going to close the polls, five, four, three, two, one. Okay. And we wait. All right.

So we've received no corrections for the minutes of November the 10th, unless there are objections now, these minutes will be approved by unanimous consent.

A few announcements. Please don't forget tomorrow, 2:30 to 4:30 on the 18th floor is the Senate Stakes Reception. This is where the Board of Trustees meet senators. There is a new chair of the Board of Trustees, Keith Gannon.

I would encourage you if could you at least go for 15, 20 minutes, to try and meet Keith. He's very supportive of senate. It's good food and the senate pays for it. Please go.

I wanted to mention yet again, to remind you that if there's time, two things came up which were extremely helpful discussion points. One was to incentivize students to fill out online teacher course evaluations. Senate Council discussed this at great length. There were also some ideas from Senate Council. And one idea was to actually ask the Ad Hoc Teaching, TCD Evaluation Committee to look at this.

They had also some ideas as well, and they haven't talked about those ideas, but also, I'd encourage all senators if you have good practice that works, to write to, if you don't mind, Sheila Brothers, and she can collect all the emails so we have a better idea of how to continue this. The discussion won't go away.

The other thing that came up was this idea of, and it's connected, TCD is almost being used as a sole instrument of evaluating instructors' teaching performance, which is a concern. So one thing Senate Council suggested is that I talk to the Provost about this.

We reviewed exploring other instruments for evaluating teaching performance which is important to tenure in some cases. And there's a possibility we might encourage her to form a senate/provost joint committee to look at the issue.

So these are extremely important issues which seem to have got miles on them. The other issue that came up was administrative growth. This was talked about at great length. The reason why the perception of administrative growth at the University and you know that ever year we have -- senate has its own evaluation of the President. Nearly every single (inaudible)

UKSenateMeeting-12-14.txt

of the evaluation was much more positive was than the year previous except for administrative growth. (Inaudible). So the perception seems to be a real one.

We have a committee called the Institutional Finance and Resource Allocation Committee. So one idea is to charge them with doing a bit of research across benchmarks on what administrative positions are like compared to UK. But I will also talk to the President about this as being a real issue.

These items could return again today if somebody wants to raise them

(inaudible).

Senate Council was invited to the President's house on December the 1st. This followed the Board of Trustees Retreat where a resolution was made on research. I just want to read you the resolution: The recommendation recognizing ----- created activity undertaken at a comprehensive land grant institution, the University's mission and the current financial environment compel a focus on research areas where number 1: the needs of Kentuckians in the Commonwealth are most pressing and number 2: the University continue to compete successfully 0000000000.

The President had laid out in the Retreat, a kind of mission statement, as it were, where research would be greatly focused on Kentucky health problems. And it was a big enough statement that I thought the President should talk to Senate Council about it.

The Senate Council invited the President to talk to all senators about it, too. So this will happen next semester. He'll spell out what he means by this resolution.

We also took the opportunity to discuss the strategic plan. It seems to have stalled and there's perception that consultants have become involved in it. And the President would like to reassure Senate Council that's not the case. Those consultants are being used as a resource to find data that was missing.

But again, he reassured us that the strategic plan draft will be presented to Senate for comment before it goes to the Board of Trustees. And that's something else we would like him to talk about next semester. So it was a useful meeting.

My report: Senate Council approved non-standard calendars for a number of nurse degree courses. We also approved the revision to the 2014-15 pharmacy calendar. I also approved an addition to the December 2014 degree list where the original omission was due to administrative error. This

happens occasionally.

The other thing that's important here is that at Senate Council's request, the Provost Office is reviewing college and department rules. If you look at our website, is where the rules from a University perspective are lodged. They are completely nonuniform in terms of what colleges are up to date, what departments even have rules on the website. So there's a big effort to make this uniform and current.

What the Provost's charge in all of this is to insure that college rules and department rules conform to GRs and ARs as well as SRs. And I've asked the Provost's Office if they would be willing to delegate the consistency of cross-checking of SRs with the Senate, which makes sense, and they're thinking about that. And if that did happen, it would be codified as an expansion of the charge for the Senate Rules and Elections Committee.

But what I wanted to say on all of this is that senate really needs to be quite active in making sure that all college rules are fully transparent and fully update so that anyone, any faculty can challenge them at any time. And at this point, it doesn't seem to be the case.

I was invited to talk to the associate deans and we talked about several things. One of them related to what I said just now. Far too often, Senate Council Office gets a request to add someone to the degree list because of administration error. There are certain colleges where this is almost becoming a frequent event. It does not look good at all and it's completely unfair on the students.

So I did encourage the associate deans to do everything they can to prevent such cases from happening. We had a case very recently, and I wrote to the associate dean, and expressed my dismay with it.

So the next thing I wanted to let the associate deans know about our committee structure. A lot of them don't really know how many committees we have and what they're up to. And I said as a default that interaction between colleges and Senate Committees should be with the chair. And I would really encourage all people on the Senate Committees, if they have something they want to express to colleges, do it through the chair and then the college will by default express themselves to the Senate Committee Chair.

I'll hand it over to secretary, Alice Christ, to give her report.

CHRIST: Nothing to report. Thank you.
HIPPI SLEY: Then I'll hand over to Katie Seago, Parliamentarian Report.
SEAGO: No report.

HIPPISLEY: John Wilson and Bob Grossman,
Faculty Trustee Report.

WILSON: Is Bob here? I guess not. No
specific report. I really want
to give people an opportunity to ask
questions in the time available. We have a
Board of Trustees meeting tomorrow.

Right now, of course, a certainly
very critical issue is we will be in limbo
with a Provost, which is a particularly
difficult time, with the onset of a new
budget model.

Not just the implementation of the
model, but the fact that the Provost is the
key person here in terms of regulating
support units that will report to the Provost
and have a direct effect on the budget of the
colleges in terms of (inaudible). And also
in terms of things like the evaluations of
colleges and deans, which are certainly a
Provost activity.

So I guess one of the big concerns
is what happens during this interim period,
how we move ahead in a really critical time.
I think that's on many people's minds as an
issue that needs resolution as promptly as
possible.

Since the last time I have been in
front of you, have expressed concerns about
the parking issues and particularly about the
way parking transitions occurred last year.
Once again, in between the last meeting and
this one, I talked to folks and they've
assured that that process will not be
repeated this year. And that there will be
ample time for changes in parking to be
developed and not just simply proclaimed, and
I'm encouraged by that. And we will keep
tracking that. (Inaudible).

Any questions that I can answer for
you? Thank you.

HIPPISLEY: So our first item of business, I'd
like to invite Susan Carvalho to the podium.
She's the Chair of the University Joint
Committee on Honorary Degrees because she's
the Interim Dean of Graduate School.

CARVALHO: Thank you. It's my pleasure to
bring you the nominations that were forwarded
by the joint committee.

So this is the composition of the
Joint Committee, which is a cooperation
between -- to the President which selects two
members of the committee and Senate Council
which selects four members of the committee.
In addition to ex-officio members of the
committee, who do not vote, and one member of
the Board of Trustees, which was not able to
attend the meeting due to transition of the
Board Chair and last minute substitution.
All other members of the committee were
present.

From a very competitive slate of 16
nominees, I want to say that we made a

UKSenateMeeting-12-14.txt

special effort to request nominations this year so that we would have a richer pool of candidates. And we did. There were more and they were very competitive candidates. So we were very pleased with that. And thanks for all of you who sent suggestions or for nominations.

If anyone sent a suggestion then we looked for the right person who might be able to submit a nomination packet on behalf of that suggestion.

So these are the three names that we would like to present. And I will just tell you briefly about them.

We had two honorary degrees that will be presented this month and the rules are that we can present up to five per year. So we knew that we had a maximum of three that we could name for the spring and we could name fewer if we wanted to do that. But we all agreed on these three and, in fact, duked it out over which three it would be.

Les McCann is a jazz musician who was born in Lexington and has been back quite a lot. He is known as the father of soul jazz. And you can see that he has over 50 albums, some of the most sampled music in the canon of American jazz. He's played alongside Miles Davis. In 2008, was inducted into the Kentucky Music Hall of Fame.

So his connections with the University are not wide and deep, but the way he has represented out state certainly is both wide and deep. And he has been back to help christen the Les McCann School for the Arts in Lexington's East End, which I think is a major role, advocacy role that brought him to the attention of the nominators.

He was born and raised in the east end. He is near 80 years old and I think a fitting model, a role model, for our students.

Lillian Cress, came to Lexington in 1952 after earning her degrees at Boston University. And she has two major contributions again to the Commonwealth.

The first is that she organized the comprehensive care centers that were the prototypes for regional mental health centers in a context in the '50s and '60s when that wasn't so widely talked about. And so she really was instrumental in changing the way these regional care centers approach mental health for the rural areas of the state in particular.

And the second item, is that she was very important in establishing the Governor's Scholars Program, serving as the president of the National Conference of Governor's Schools until her retirement.

She also formed a women's network to promote democratic values and greater

UKSenateMeeting-12-14.txt

involvement (inaudible) in partnership with her husband, who will be presented next.

Leonard Cress, came to UK in 1952, and became Chair of the Department of Radio Television and Film, now the College of Communication and Information. And is the founding director of KET.

And he was actually nominated by one of his coworkers, who now is working a very high role with PBF. And looking back on public television and rural areas, felt moved to nominate Len Cress for his transformative role in bringing not only education, public television, but also fine arts to reach parts of the state that they hadn't reached before through the vehicle of KET.

So it wasn't just his role in KET, but a transformative role in the way public television can work with a state and its challenges that brought him to the attention of nominators in the committee. And I'll point out also, the (inaudible) TV initiative, which directly links him with educational effort (inaudible).

So both of the Cresses played key leadership roles for the Commonwealth.

There are five degree types, I believe, from which we can choose when we decide that someone ought to get an honorary degree. So what we've proposed to you is an honorary Doctor Of Arts for Les McCann, and Doctor of Humanities, which is very general category, for Lillian Cress, and Doctor of Letters, which we reserve for degrees that have to do with the written or spoken word, to Len Cress.

Questions? Comments? Questions?

HIPPI SLEY: This is a motion that comes directly from committee, so it doesn't need a second. The motion from the Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees is that the elected faculty senators approve Les McCann as the recipient of an Honorary Degree of Doctorate of Arts for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees as the recommended recipient of an Honorary Degree to be conferred by the Board. The motion is on the floor.

CARVALHO: This will go to the Board in February.

HIPPI SLEY: It goes to the Board in February. Discussion? Open for voting. This is elected faculty senators only. But if you're not elected faculty, it doesn't matter, it will just purge your vote. All right. The motion carries.

The second motion, straight from the committee, that the faculty senators approve Lillian Cress as the recipient of an Honorary Doctor of Humanities for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees as the recommended recipient of an

UKSenateMeeting-12-14.txt

honorary degree to be conferred by the Board.

The motion is on the floor.

Discussion? Hearing none, the polls will open for voting. Countdown, five, four, three, two, one. The poll is closing. And the motion carries. One opposed.

Third recommendation is that elected faculty senators approve Leonard Cress as the recipient of an Honorary Doctor of Letters for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees as the recommended recipient of an honorary degree to be conferred by the Board.

The motion is on the floor.

Discussion? Hearing none, the polls will open for voting. Five, four, three, two, one. The polls close. Motion carries. None opposed. Thank you.

Now, we'll talk about something that the Senate's never done before. You'll remember in February 2014, the Senate voted to add to the SRs a rule that would codify an additional type of degree, a kind of honorary degree, it was called the In Memoriam Posthumous Degree, where a candidate would be degree-seeking, in good standing, and had died before they reached the end of the degree. This was at the indication of the President and we codified it.

This is our first case that we've had. We had a petition from Arts and Sciences for the candidate, Robert Ernst, Jr., who was pursuing at the time of death, a Bachelor of Arts in History. The student is in good standing.

And I've invited Dean Mark Kornbluh to share a few words about this student.

KORNBLUH: So this student was a member of project graduate (inaudible), so he had completed 150 credit hours and so the family asked for the award, the degree to be made. We looked at his record. We waived two units of 300 level credit in Arts and Sciences and the language requirement.

This is something we would have done for any existing student in project graduate if he was still alive and had asked for this, we would have done this and awarded the degree.

So we recommend that this be done. This is very important to the family.

HIPPISLEY: If we approve the recommendation, the Board of Trustees said it will be on the agenda tomorrow and the ceremony in December. The parents will know that this is going to be conferred. So it's all happening quite quickly.

So this is a motion. This is a motion that needs someone to move it. That the elected faculty senators approve the December 2014 In Memoriam Posthumous Degree for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees as the recommended degree

to be conferred on said Robert Ernst, Jr., by the Board of Trustees.

Do we have -- name and college?
ILAHIANE: Hsain Ilahiane, A and S.
HIPPI SLEY: Do we have a second?
LEWIS: Second. Wayne Lewis, Education.
HIPPI SLEY: Thank you. The motion is on the floor. Discussion? Yes.
TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering.
I support this. I just want to make sure I understand this correctly. We are not giving the degree, posthumously or otherwise, to the person who doesn't earn it, rather this is a person who earned it, it just happened that he is deceased, therefore we are giving a degree to a deceased person. Is that correct?
KORNBLUH: Yes. So we have each college participates in project graduate. So we would have looked at this student's record, whether he was alive or not, and would have recommended graduating.
So he had 153 credits, was in good standing. He didn't have as many 300 level, he was short two 300 level courses in A and S, which is something we would waive for someone at that number of units. And we waived one of the language courses. Those are A and S requirements, not major requirements of college (inaudible).
TAGAVI: Can we add language saying having earned all the requirements for degree? I realize it's a little twisting the meaning that the college waived, and they have the right waive it for people who are either deceased or not.
But I'm just a little bit worried that ten years from now somebody else is going to give a person posthumously who was a freshman. Maybe we should approve that, too. But this shouldn't be a precedent for that case, so I recommend --
KORNBLUH: We'd accept that as a friendly --
TAGAVI: If you don't mind. It is very friendly. Say, having earned all the requirement per the college recommendation, we approve this. That's my, friendly amendment or other way, whatever you want to take it.
HIPPI SLEY: So the person who has to accept it is Hsain because you moved it.
HIPPI SLEY: So help me. What happens?
SEAGO: Well, I mean in order for it to be voted on we have to actually craft this with that language in there.
HIPPI SLEY: Right.
SEAGO: And I guess you've got somebody --
ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.
I just want to say that I think that's great for this particular person but the purpose of the posthumous degree, there will people who haven't met the requirements of the degree. So we're not changing that.

We're only changing it for this one student, correct?

HIPPI SLEY: So for what Kaveh said, he wants to make specific in this case, it is a posthumous degree, who happened to have completed all the credits as well. Right, Kaveh?

TAGAVI: Yes.

BRI ON: Gail Bri on, College of Engineering. Is it still an in memoriam posthumous degree? Because when we put together the in memoriam posthumous degrees, it was for students that hadn't completed the requirements. And I just want to make sure that we aren't creating a whole new category of degree.

HIPPI SLEY: Yes?

WOOD: Connie Wood, A and S.

I want to support what Gail and whoever just said. I was on Senate Council last year on the sub-committee which recommended the -- and on the Rules Committee which recommended that the Senate Council and hence to Senate.

In cases where an actual degree can be awarded, we can waiver a college degree, the degree should be a regular bachelor's degree. Posthumous, in memoriam posthumous degree, is for -- is designed for those situations in which the student has not completed and could not be considered to have completed even by waiver of the requirements for the degree.

HIPPI SLEY: Thanks, Connie. So I think what Connie is saying is that we list labels and degree type in the motion. Kaveh?

TAGAVI: I haven't followed Senate -- Kaveh Tagavi -- for some time. So please my colleagues tell me, is it legal to give a regular posthumous degree? Then I don't want to do that because that's being too friendly. I think the dean should request to change that having this person met all the requirements, in fact, I was a little bit worried that it says memoriam. This is an actual degree, it's just that the person unfortunately died. So I think I recommend it to say it should be a regular degree.

KORNBLUH: I think that they would be quite happy with that. I actually don't know all the details, whether the family is planning to come in December. Can a regular degree still be added to the list for December?

UNI DENTI FIED: Yes, you can. Just.

KORNBLUH: We would be very happy to do that.

UNI DENTI FIED: I think that memorialized their son.

TAGAVI: Do you want me to --

KORNBLUH: Yes, please.

TAGAVI: Can I change my -- I don't want to vote on the previous one. Can I change my friendly amendment to dropping the word posthumous but adding the provision that

having according to the college having fulfilled all the requirements he gets this posthumous degree?

UNIDENTIFIED: It would just be degree.

HIPPI SLEY: So what Kaveh's trying to do, is he's just trying to - we cast it as a normal addition to the degree list?

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

HIPPI SLEY: Wally and then Connie.

FERRIER: Wally Ferrier, B and E.

That being the case, Andrew, then if it's within Dean Kornbluh's discretion to add a person to the degree list then there's not an issue here in this Body.

UNIDENTIFIED: And there's no vote that needs to be --

FERRIER: No vote.

HIPPI SLEY: This is a good question. So in these situations where a dean wants to add somebody to degree list, then Senate Council Chair on behalf of Senate adds. So at this point, you can let me do what I normally do and add the student. It will be a regular addition to the degree list.

KORNBLUH: Okay. Thanks.

HIPPI SLEY: Parliamentarian, do you have (inaudible).

SEAGO: I think we can do that, but I think we need a -- need the gentleman to withdraw his --

HIPPI SLEY: Motion.

SEAGO: Yeah. The original motion from --

ILAHIANE: I would wholeheartedly.

HIPPI SLEY: Connie?

WOOD: May I propose an amendment?

TAGAVI: There is no motion.

WOOD: Well, you can't withdraw a motion once it's on the floor.

SEAGO: We can vote on it then.

HIPPI SLEY: We can vote on Hsain's withdrawal of the motion, right? Can we do that?

SEAGO: Uh-huh (affirmative).

CHRIST: Second.

HIPPI SLEY: So Alice Christ seconds the withdrawal of the motion. And I think we can do this electronically very quick.

SEAGO: So actually after some discussion, the maker of motion may realize that he has made a poor motion and request that it be withdrawn. General consent is used to withdraw the motion.

UNIDENTIFIED: We can do it by hand.

HIPPI SLEY: There has been a general consent that the motion should be withdrawn, raise your hand. Overwhelming consent. We will move on.

We are on the third type of degree. This is the regular one.

Recommendation, the elected faculty senators approve the December 2014 degree list for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board.

This motion does need someone to
move it.

BRI ON: Gail Bri on, Engi neeri ng.
HI PPI SLEY: It needs a second. Second?
WOOD: Connie Wood.
HI PPI SLEY: Connie Wood, Arts and Sciences.
The motion is on the floor. Any discussion?
SWANSON: Mark Swanson, Public Health.
Pursuant to your earlier report, is this list
when it's emailed to us, is it also emailed
to the various associate deans for their
(inaudi ble)?
Because I don't have any clue when
I get that. I forward on to my associate
deans. But it seems to be more efficient to
also send it to them to make sure the degree
list is complete.

HI PPI SLEY: I think this is the part when
Sheila Brothers will (inaudible) but I think
this is the part that the associate deans
send (inaudible) to the Registrar, the
Registrar sends what that list is to Senate
Council and Senate Council Office sends it.
So by sending it to the associate deans, I
think that just completes the cycle that's
instigated by the deans in the first place.
Any further discussion? Hearing
none, all those elected senators in favor of
approval. Five, four, three, two, one. The
motion is carried, none opposed.
Okay. We have our first report.
This is Wally Ferrier, he's the Chair of
Senate's Academic Planning and Priorities
Committee.

FERRI ER: Thank you. Just ever so briefly,
folks, the Academic Planning and Priorities
Committee, met several times this semester.
The first being a very productive meeting
with Andrew Hippisley, who added and modified
the committee charge somewhat.
I'll go over the highlights insofar
as the activities that we're going to do.
One is to assist in a University-wide effort
to identify potentially new interesting
academic programs.
Those programs that are consistent
with the University of Kentucky's new
strategic plan, when that eventually becomes
public. And a variety of programs that many
of our peer and inspirational benchmarks have
but we lack.
So we have two approaches. One is
a big data, your analytics-driven approach
where we'll have access to plenty of data and
do lots of grids and matrices and we could
discover, for instance, that, wow, all of our
aspirational benchmarks have, for example, an
MBA in energy management and the environment,
and we don't. Let's look into why. And if
that's being the case, then we can go broker
and contact the appropriate departments and
faculty, we may be interested in developing
that.

UKSenateMeeting-12-14.txt

The other approach is more of a grassroots entrepreneurial approach. The committee has been busy developing a survey to send out campus-wide to students, faculty and staff, asking if they are aware of or heard of or inspired to create any new interesting new programs.

So it's possible that one of the survey respondents could likewise say, hey, you know, I heard that Duke University has this new MBA program in energy and the environment and we ought to get that going.

So that's to find out what programs are basically in our universe that we ought to consider developing.

The second part of our strategy kind of relates to getting the ball rolling for actually developing and proposing new programs. So this is the flow chart, as it were, from a variety of offices of this University, and it kind of shows, we have a very maze like, phalanx like, a variety of offices and approvals that need to be done.

And if you've been on the Senate for anything less than a year, you've either observed or, in fact, been party to some very uncomfortable and potentially contentious discussions in this chamber, about one department proposing a new program and another department's in protest. You know, it was suggesting they weren't fully consulted or weren't fully involved. And it kind of evolves into kind of a church battle, as it were.

So what our committee is willing to do is assist with a voluntary informal, what we call in the business world, kind of early stage ideation of new programs.

So if you don't want it, you'll get to this chamber after you filled out all the forms, and all the I is dotted and T is crossed, and you get here and you find out that there's strong opposition to your program. Come see us first on a voluntary manner.

We can help broker information, we can help maybe recommend that you go talk to one department or another. And then in the case of an MBA in energy management, one of my colleagues in business, for instance, could say, hey, Wally, let's do an MBA in energy management. I would say, and our committee would say, (inaudible), why don't you go talk to Rodney Andrews, Applied Energy Research. Why don't you go talk to, maybe, folks at the Martin School that might have a faculty member or two in Energy Policy. Why don't you go talk to the folks in maybe College of Agriculture, that has, you know, bioenergy sorts of things going.

So like a very early stage venture capitalist, as it were. We can help you at least strain the idea.

UKSenateMeeting-12-14.txt

It's not our job, I want to be clear about that, it's not our job to help you navigate this process. But we want to help you get ideas off the ground and headed in the right direction. And it's up to you to do the due diligence, it's up to you to dot the I and cross the T.

And you know, when you do get here, I think that my fellow committee members would perhaps agree that we could provide some substantive support for your new program.

So that's what we're up to. Check your in boxes, probably mid to late January, we should have a survey developed with the help of Cathy (inaudible) and the (inaudible) people and then that survey can be distributed campus-wide, hopefully, by the end of January.

Any questions about that? Dean Kornbluh?

KORNBLUH: Yes. It might be useful to have a departmental and college discussion before they go to your committee. There are occasionally entrepreneurial faculty members that whirl in their own departments and then (inaudible).

FERRIER: And I was one of those, too, when I was an assistant, had, you know, a great idea about, I don't know, a management or technology program or something. And you know, as an assistant professor, I wasn't fully aware that maybe I had other priorities, with these programs I had in mind. I'm sensitive to that.

UNIDENTIFIED: Does this cover certificates as well?

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

FERRIER: It would, I guess.

UNIDENTIFIED: Certificates or programs? Liz?

DEBSKI: Certificates are a different sort of animal. I think we've only talked about this in terms of programs. You know, we could talk about it in committee, but to this time, we've really talked about programs.

FERRIER: I'm not sure where I stand on that. I see your point. I see maybe a broader need for some of the real unique programs popping up at UK, and many places across the country are non-degree undergraduate or graduate certificate programs.

So it's something we've not yet decided on. Maybe at our next get-together we'll throw that in the hat and see where we go with it. Thanks for the idea. Good? Thank you, Andrew, thank you all.

HIPPISLEY: Our next report is from Greg Graf, who is Chair of Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee. He has a recommendation.

GRAF: Yes. So this comes from the Graduate School. It proposes to change -- do you have the policy here, Sheila?

UKSenateMeeting-12-14.txt

BROTHERS:
GRAF:

No, I don't have it.

So I'll just summarize very quickly. It proposes to change the enrollment requirements for students in both plan A (thesis) and plan B (non-thesis) master's programs.

It will require them to not only be enrolled in the semester in which that they sit for their final examination or (inaudible) degree but also, to maintain continuous enrollment from the time they complete their course work until the time they actually take their final examination.

The rationale for this, the vast majority of students, of course, in these programs, complete their degree and the final examination in the same semester. But there are a significant number of them that do not.

So then it becomes unclear whether or not they're going to continue, they're either going to complete their degree or they will not. The Graduate School loses track of these individuals, departments lose contact with these individuals, it's unclear what their status actually is.

So the proposal would, as I said, require them to be enrolled in the semester when they take their final exam. It would require continuous enrollment. It puts the onus upon the students to maintain their enrollment (inaudible) they use the online system through the Graduate School to schedule their final exam.

And if they fail to do so, they will have to reapply to the Graduate School program itself, and then re-enroll in a course that requires zero credit hours for zero cost in order to maintain that status. That course is just a placeholder to signify the intent of the student to, in fact, complete that. That only applies if they don't take advantage of the Leave of Absence policy, already established by the Graduate School, due to some extenuating circumstance.

Reviewed by Senate Academic Standard's Committee, it went to Senate Council and was supported, and now it's before the full Senate. Any questions on that?

TAGAVI :

I have one. Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering.

I have one major concern, one minor correction, and a couple of typos in there. I was hoping that you had the actual proposal in there.

I read it many times. This is what it sounds like. Under the new proposal itself, students who disengage and then come back, if they are on their master's plan, thesis plan, they have to take one credit hour. If they are non-thesis, they are zero credit hour. And I just want to make sure that is what you meant. Because it looks --

if any, the reverse. It should either both zero or if you want one of them to take credit, it should be non-thesis.

GRAF: Allow me to clarify, if you will. They will enroll in a course, a 748 generic course, with zero credit hours at zero cost, whether they are thesis or non-thesis. And the continuous enrollment requirement applies to both thesis and non-thesis. There is a distinction there.

You are correct. The original proposal that came to us did not specify that. Brian Jackson, who forwarded that proposal, was receptive to a friendly amendment that changed that language to clarify and that had approval by SAASC as well as Senate Council.

TAGAVI: Let me read this to you. If they do not, this is from your own proposal, if they do not stay continuously enrolled they must reapply to the Grad School and the program, be accepted and enroll in at least one credit. It doesn't say at least, that's one correction. It cannot say one credit hour (inaudible). It should say at least.

But it says clearly you have to enter at least one credit hour. That's what it says.

GRAF: To be frank, I disagree with you.

TAGAVI: I just read it to you.

GRAF: To address these problems, we propose, if a student does not stay enrolled and has not made appropriate use of the Leave of Absence policy, 1) they must reapply for admission to the Graduate School and to the program, and 2) if accepted and if all course work requirements have been met, these students must enroll in the 748 or equivalent zero credit in order to sit for the final examination.

TAGAVI: I could be wrong, and I apologize if I was wrong. I read it a couple of times. Number 1, I just read it from my form here. If they do not stay continuously enrolled they must reapply to the Graduate School and the program, be accepted, and enroll in -- it should say at least either one credit hour or --

CHRIST: Or should it be saying zero credit hours?

GRAF: The requirement is for the 748 enrollment.

CHRIST: But that's not what it says.

TRUSZCZYNSKI: The issue is that if the continuous enrollment does not happen, one group has to re-enroll, (inaudible) the other doesn't have this requirement.

GRAF: So I do concede. So I'm reading from a different portion of the document, which is down at the bottom under rationale.

So policy -- is intended for them take a zero credit course. So if we want to take the typo, I'm not -- Jackson is not

here, nor do I see Dr. Price.

I think what is stated there is they must enroll -- what is intended is that they must enroll in the 748 course. It states one credit.

UNIDENTIFIED: But they mean 748, zero credit.

GRAF: So we can revise that. Be

accepted, enroll --

UNIDENTIFIED: Just take from number 2 and put it up there for number 1, XXX 748 (inaudible).

GRAF: Are you following me, Sheila?

BROTHERS: Yes. We're on -- what is the recommended revision?

GRAF: They must enroll in XXX 748 in order to sit, zero credit.

BROTHERS: So the same sentence, the same second sentence in both paragraphs?

CHRIST: Yes.

TRUSZCZYNSKI: Mi cek Truszczynski, Engineering. Is there an essential difference between one and two?

GRAF: No, there isn't. And I don't know why it came to us as one and two, other than to specify or be explicit for both thesis and non-thesis.

UNIDENTIFIED: I believe that number 2, there is no assisting zero credit course. It needs to be developed. That's what the asterisk is and that's why there is (inaudible) and number 1, enrolled 748 for zero credit. And number 2, they will enroll in 748 equivalent zero credit course, yet to be developed.

HIPPI SLEY: At the back, please? Connie?

WOOD: Connie Wood, Arts and Sciences.

I have a question for Dean (inaudible) or Dr. Price. Why is 748 being used? 748 is a course which is used for loan deferment. And that's why it has to be -- the Graduate School staff has to actually enroll the student because you can only have three semesters of 748.

Why is 748 used rather than 768 which can be -- which a student can enroll in themselves and is not approved for loan deferment?

HIPPI SLEY: Would someone from the Graduate School like to answer?

UNIDENTIFIED: You're correct. 748 and 749 are used for loan deferment. I think we're in the process -- I think we tried to use this as an example.

We are developing a course that will be used for the enrollment of that student, so we have a process of (inaudible).

WOOD: Would you be open to an amendment with does not specify that they have to enroll in 748, it just says that they have to enroll in a zero credit hour master's thesis credit course for (inaudible) in the master's?

HIPPI SLEY: So you're saying without pinning it down to a particular number?

WOOD: That course is approved for loan

deferment.

GRAF: I should note, it does say or equivalent course. Or equivalent zero credit course. It doesn't require 748.

UNIDENTIFIED: Only in Plan B does it.

TAGAVI: So the typo, somewhere there's a (inaudible), it should be (inaudible) so we want to fix that.

But and I didn't want to say this at the beginning. If you're continuously enrolled, zero credit hour is -- whether it's for one purpose or the other one, is the reason -- I'm sorry to propose something on this, sort of at the end of this process because so many people have looked at this.

This really should be if you disengage from the University, you shouldn't come back and for free make us work for you. Both cases they should pay one credit hour.

So, in fact, I think number one was correct. Number two, (inaudible). I think if a student disengages, goes away for two years or six months or a year, when they come back, they should at least pay the University one credit hour.

GRAF: That's an opinion.

TAGAVI: That's my opinion.

TRUSZCZYNSKI: Truszczynski, Department of Engineering.

I am concerned that we are trying to implement something without ability to execute it. You don't have courses that require us to have this actually implemented. The right order should be to have the courses that this needs implemented and then have this done. I would simply like us to reject this and have all the departments who want to do this, implement the right courses, and then (inaudible).

HIPPISLEY: Are you saying you're going to speak against approving this motion?

TRUSZCZYNSKI: Yes.

HIPPISLEY: Anyone else -- just to find out, is there anyone else that would like to speak against approving this motion? Gail?

BRION: Gail Brion, College of Engineering. With the inconsistencies in what's being presented for us to vote on would cause us to have to rework this on the floor. Our reworking on the floor may not meet the intent of what the Graduate School meant with having other people say maybe we should have one credit.

I do not think that this is the time that we vote on this because we do not have a final document with supporting courses developed behind it.

HIPPISLEY: Yes?

DIETZ: Hank Dietz, Engineering.

The thing that bothers me most about this is that we've got a fairly consistent distinction between Plan A and Plan B that's based on the nonexistence of a

course that has to be there. We're trying to make an artifact that is going to be as clear as possible for the future.

I don't think it makes sense to have that artifact cluttered with Plan A, Plan B stuff that is basically because we didn't have anything formulated at the proper time.

HI PPI SLEY: So my feeling is that there is a consensus moving to (inaudible) that the proposal isn't ready to be voted on. Is that my feeling? And possibly people might feel it's best to be returned to committee to think again? The motion is on the floor.

SEAGO: The motion is on the floor and been discussed so I think probably want to proceed with a vote.

HI PPI SLEY: A vote for the motion or --

SEAGO: Vote. Well, a vote on the motion and then -- because you've got the motion on the floor.

UNIDENTIFIED: Can the motion be withdrawn.

SEAGO: It can be tabled and come back with an amendment.

HI PPI SLEY: So is it possible for someone to move to table the motion which stops all discussion?

BRION: I so move to table the motion. The -- Gail Brion.

HI PPI SLEY: I am sorry. I have someone over here who wants to be recognized. He's a senator.

SWANSON: Mark Swanson, Public Health. Is 768 a course required of every graduate student at the point of presenting their master's thesis?

UNIDENTIFIED: No.

SWANSON: Then why are we requiring it only for those students who have taken some time off? Why don't we just say they have to be registered (inaudible)?

HI PPI SLEY: So is your solution to fix the proposal right now?

SWANSON: Just take those numbers out and say must be enrolled in a graduate level course in the college.

HI PPI SLEY: So that was Senator Swanson, is there any comments on his proposed revisions to motion.

TAGAVI: I wanted to --

SEAGO: We have to --

HI PPI SLEY: Well, I did not recognize the senator before so I just wanted to make sure this takes place first. Tagavi?

TAGAVI: I think motion to table might not be open to discussion. Can I ask if one --

SEAGO: No. The motion, table is not open to discussion. We need to vote on that. I think what Andrew was trying to do was is we accepted the lay on the table prior to this gentleman speaking. He had indicated he wanted to speak prior. So Andrew was trying to rectify the fact that he may have operated

UKSenateMeeting-12-14.txt

in reverse of what he wanted to do.

But with the lay on the table, we need to consider whether or not we want to table it, which then opens it for what is brought back for any and all of the discussion that people want to have about it.

HIPPISLEY: If I operated in reverse, I just wanted to honor Senator Swanson --

UNIDENTIFIED: Is there any way that the committee would consider what I suggested?

UNIDENTIFIED: So you need a second?

HIPPISLEY: The table motion?

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

HIPPISLEY: I thought it has it. Did it have a second? So there's a motion to table -- there's a motion to table the motion. So we will vote on that, the first discussion.

UNIDENTIFIED: Do you want to do hands?

HIPPISLEY: I think we can do this the other

way. Okay. I will open the polls. Okay. Closing them in five seconds. Five, four, three, two, one. And the motion to table carries and it will be back to the Senate. All right, thank you.

Okay. We have Ernie Bailey, Chair of Academic Organization and Structure Committee, and he wants to talk about a new department.

BAILEY: So I'm discussing, presenting the proposal to create a new department. Beth Barnes from the School of Journalism and Telecommunications (inaudible) the proposal.

The College of Communication and Information has three units. It has the School of Library and Information Science, it has the Department of Communication, it has the School of Journalism and Telecommunications.

The unit wants to form a separate department, under Dr. Barnes's proposal, is the program for Integrated Strategic Communication in the School of Journalism and Telecommunications.

The school has three units. One is the Journalism program, it has an undergraduate degree. There is a Media Arts, which has its own degree program, and there is Integrated Strategic Communications. And these three units, what they share in common, is that they're part of the professional aspect of Communications.

At this juncture, those three programs have all been very successful. They've had a large undergraduate enrollment. The program in Integrated Strategic Communications is the largest, having over 400 undergraduate students.

The three programs have separate curriculums. They don't have a common core. And for that reason, they would like to create a separate department.

I have a report that this is

UKSenateMeeting-12-14.txt

approved. What they have done -- I think the three parts for making the change, they would like to elevate the profile, the program. They want to create a better career path and actions for faculty, and they want to increase the focus of the faculty (inaudible) related to this particular unit.

There was a vote of the faculty in the school and the faculty voted 14-7 in favor of the change. There were seven faculty that voted in opposition to the change. Two of them were in the program, five of them were in the Journalism program. When it went to the entire college, there was a vote and the vote was 26-7 in favor of making the change.

We asked about the issues, why the faculty had voted in opposition. It's somewhat difficult because they tend to be somewhat anonymous. It's hard to go back and find who it is.

Dr. Barnes reported that there was primarily a concern about the changes and the budget model and they were concerned what impact that would have. Dr. Barnes and Dean O'Hair of the college said that this is something they've been talking about doing for five years, that nobody really knows what the budget model is going to hold, that this is something the department needs and the budget model should probably be working to accommodate this structure.

The two faculty in the unit who voted in opposition, had said that they in opposition to it, but that they would agree to go along with the change to a new department. The other five faculty were members with the Journalism program and I guess another issue was concerning that if the School of Journalism and Telecommunications was smaller, that they would have less of an impact on the college.

The committee asked about that, I think another concern was in terms of the resources needed for creating a new department. Dr. Barnes reported that they had a staff of three, three individuals who serve the current school, and those three people would continue to serve the department.

I think we were somewhat dubious if this was going to be a long term solution. But Dean O'Hair was supportive of this and we would anticipate that as volume grows, that he would make those adjustments.

So those are the main points.

There were lots of issues. If you have questions, I will probably not be able to answer them, but Dr. Barnes is here.

HI PPI SLEY:

So this is the recommendation that the Senate endorse the creation of the proposed new Department of Integrated Strategic Communication within the College of

Communication and Information and recommend the associated move of the current BA/BS in ISC to the proposed new department of ISC. The motion from committee is on the floor and open for discussion.

UNIDENTIFIED: Can I just say real quick for clarification, there is no S on the end of communication. Integrated Strategic Communication.

HIPPISLEY: Like the name of the college, communication. In the back?

JONES: Davy Jones, (inaudible).
It wasn't quite clear, is this new department proposed to be inside a school that's inside the college or is this department tacked directly at the level of the college?

BAILEY: Yeah, I'm sorry. The proposed structure for the entire college would then have four units, four administrative units, the School of Library and Information Science, the Department of Communication, the Department of Integrated Strategic Communication, and then the school would continue to exist with the other two programs.

And I think another thing I brought up, one of the questions that we had was whether the school would continue to be viable and they actually have a significant (inaudible) significant programs with a significant number of students. So we were satisfied that the school would remain viable even without this group of faculty.

HIPPISLEY: Any other questions for Ernie?
Hearing none, we're ready to vote. This is the recommendation on the floor. I'm closing the polls in five seconds, five, four, three, two, one. And the motion carries. There is going to be a new department endorsed by us. Thank you very much.

We'll move on to the next report, it's from Margaret Schroeder, she is the Chair of Senate's Academic Programs and she wants to talk about recommending a new graduate certificate.

SCHROEDER: This is from the Senate's Academic Programs Committee and Senate Council recommends approval that the Senate approve the establishment of a new graduate certificate in Inclusive Education in the Department of Early Childhood, Special Education, and Rehabilitation Counseling within the College of Education.

This is a five course, 15 hour graduate certificate. It includes existing courses and is designed to be taken by non-special education majors.

The certificate responds to the critical and growing need for general education teachers to have adequate support in serving students with disabilities in their classrooms.

UKSenateMeeting-12-14.txt

There are appropriate student learning outcomes obtained by our committee. The protected outcome of the certificate is that general educators who participate will have a cohesive program that leads to competency in including students with disabilities in their classrooms.

The faculty of record for the certificate is identical to the special education graduate program faculty with Dr. Lee Ann Jung as the director of the certificate.

The certificate in Inclusive Education will not require any additional resources. The course work includes existing courses taught by the special education graduate faculty.

When SAPC presented to Senate Council, there was an issue of an extra service learning component, that was not attached to the course. We asked the program faculty to rectify that and they did.

Questions?

TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering.
(Inaudible) the certificate initial requirement and a short line graduation requirement. So I don't know whether grad students (inaudible) certificate. I just don't know what -- I just wanted to make sure you didn't admit (inaudible). For example, would engineering student be able to get into this certificate?

SCHROEDER: Dr. Jung can address that more specifically.

JUNG: I had a hard time understanding --

SCHROEDER: Could an engineering student be eligible for this graduate certificate?

JUNG: It's not that they wouldn't be eligible to (inaudible). I suppose if you had an engineering student who was interested in going into the field of education (inaudible) that we would (inaudible).

SCHROEDGER: There was not a stipulation that they have teacher certification in order to go into this graduate program. And in the proposal there was admission and exit requirement equivalent to that of the graduate school, so it was a 3.0 GPA.

TAGAVI: Does it say that?

SCHROEDER: Uh-huh. In the proposal?

TAGAVI: Yes.

SCHROEDER: Yes.

TAGAVI: I mean I read it, but --

BROTHERS: Do you know offhand where it is, Margaret? I mean in the proposal.

SCHROEDER: There is the admission requirements.

TAGAVI: I'm sorry. I apologize.

SCHROEDER: That's okay.

HIPPISLEY: Any further questions or comments?

Hearing none, the motion is on the floor. We will vote. Okay. Close the polls in five seconds, five, four, three, two, one.

They're closing now. And the motion carries. Thank you very much.

Okay, next one. The background story is this, Law decides what a certain educational policy is, (inaudible), Law has decided exactly how many pass/fail credits it wants. Law then discovers that the Senate Rules, has amongst all its various rules, a rule about how many pass/fail courses there are for Law.

So they may have made up their mind, but not so fast, they have to then come to us and say could we please propose a revision to the Senate Rules. So that's exactly what's happening right now.

They want to revise the Senate Rules to reflect what they want to do as lawyers, according to their accrediting agency, which is basically add three more credits to how many courses a lawyer can have in the pass range. That's exactly what that SR revision is. So it came up in two places, a D and a C, 5.1.2.1D and 5.3.3.1C. So it has to be done twice.

We do have someone from the Law School just in case you have questions for me.

So this is a motion. We need somebody to move it.

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.
HIPPI SLEY: Second?
ILAHIANE: Second.
HIPPI SLEY: Name and institution?
ILAHIANE: Hsain Ilahiane, A and S.
HIPPI SLEY: The motion is on the floor. Any

discussion of the proposed revision to these two SRs?

No discussion, hearing none, we can vote. We will close the polls in five seconds, five, four, three, two, one. Seven opposed, but 67 in favor. Thank you very much. The motion carries.

You saw all the calendar recommendations that you made. It's on the agenda so I'm not going to read this all out to you. But this is the recommendation. Somebody move that we approve these calendars.

TAGAVI: So moved.
HIPPI SLEY: Name?
TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering.
KENNEDY: Second. Kennedy.
HIPPI SLEY: Any discussion? Vote on this.

Closing in five seconds, five, four, three, two, one. And the calendars are approved.

Next we have someone, Associate General Counsel, Marcy Deaton, who is going to talk about proposed revisions to two GRs.

DEATON: Hi, good afternoon.
There are two GRs there that have non-discrimination statements in them. We had a request a few months ago from the LGBT Group to add gender identity and gender

expression. And then shortly after that, around the same time, the federal government also issued guidance that sex discrimination does include these two categories. So we needed to do this anyway.

And then in looking at that we recognized that in the two GRs, the statements were somewhat inconsistent, not terribly, but somewhat. So that led me to look at other university regulations and they're also a little bit inconsistent.

So then we looked to see if this one might have marital status, this one didn't, and came up with the (inaudible) that we want to use in all of our governing and administrative regs and HR policy and this is it.

UNIDENTIFIED: Do you have the pdf on a slide at all?

BROTHERS: No, but I can pull it up.

DEATON: I will tell you what we did not have in our University Rules.

Obviously, we did not have gender identity, gender expression, they are new. We did not have pregnancy and there is a pregnancy discrimination act.

We looked for federal and state laws and guidance to see what we -- for instance, we had marital status and pregnancy in the HR policy, but we didn't have it in GR yet.

So we wanted to add pregnancy, marital status. There's federal law on genetic information and then there's a state law on discrimination whether the person is a smoker or non-smoker.

So by adding gender identity, gender expression, pregnancy, marital status, genetic information, and smoker/non-smoker, we will have covered everything that we believe is out there.

And let me point out, there is a typo in this one.

BROTHERS: Is this the first or second?

DEATON: Which one is this, X or XIV?

BROTHERS: It is X.

DEATON: Okay. In X, that GR is employment.

So that one's only about employment. And I think that's -- XIV is the Code of Conduct, and that applies to educational practices and employment.

So this is the little bit more comprehensive because it has the admission policy.

Okay. So we are adding -- there is a separate law on Vietnam veteran status and veteran status. I'm about five lines down. There has been a recommendation to just use veteran status because it would cover them both and shorten our very long list. So I haven't made that change yet but I do have that recommendation.

In disability, we need to add

physical or mental, because that would be consistent with the other one. There's a typo and then I left out physical or mental. So I already know to fix those things, remove veteran and status.

Other than that, that's what it would look like. And then it's the same string of categories in the other GR that's about employment.

HIPPI SLEY: So the physical, mental will be next to disability. And Vietnam will be removed, but veteran status will be preserved.

DEATON: Correct. Right.

HIPPI SLEY: That's what we will be endorsing.

CHRIST: And on the first one that --

HIPPI SLEY: That will be spelled correctly.

DEATON: And it has been endorsed already by the Student Government Association and the Staff Senate. As you know, for GRs, they have to go to all three of the bodies for recommendation and (inaudible).

Any questions?

HIPPI SLEY: Questions?

TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering.

So after making all those corrections, I just want to let you know your intention was to have one standard disclaimer with everybody else. Still the format -- all the components are identical because I checked it, the format is not the same. One of them starts by saying -- where is it -- I have to put the two of them together. The wording is not identical.

DEATON: The one for GR X is about employment only. So it does start off with a different sentence saying all appointments are made on merit, on status of merit only. Something different, you're right.

But then what we were really trying to get at was that the string of the categories would be the same.

CARVALHO: Susan Carvalho, Graduate School.

Has this been reviewed by LGBT Student Association?

DEATON: Yes.

CARVALHO: And does this meet what they were hoping for?

DEATON: Yes. They're very excited.

FOLMAR: Chelsea Folmar, College of Ag.

Could you tell me why you differentiate between (inaudible)?

DEATON: Well, there were and still are, two separate federal laws, one is about veteran status and it has some special categories that are protected. Then there's another law specifically to Vietnam veterans. I have the list.

It gets kind of complicated as to which ones are actually covered. So, you know, I don't know why we would not protect everybody with a veteran status, not just Vietnam. So it made sense as we were talking

about it in the regulation review committee
to make it more general and cover everybody.

HIPPI SLEY: Liz Debski?

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S.

Just looking at what you've crossed
out with regard to equal opportunity shall be
provided for all persons, they include
payment, training and promotion. I don't see
that in this stuff that you have -- are
replacing that with. So I see financial aid,
but I don't see anything with regard to equal
payment or promotion or --

DEATON: We thought that all of that's
included in employment and that the thing is
so long, and we might leave out yet another
one if we tried to include every little
thing, promotion, et cetera. So we actually
tried in the introductory sentences to make
it somewhat more general, but use terms that
would include everything that the old version
used to include.

INAUDIBLE: (Inaudible).

BROTHERS: Name please?

INAUDIBLE: (Inaudible).

Employment has a job, payment and
promotion are (inaudible).

UNIDENTIFIED: If people agreed that the
University was doing well with regard to
equal payment and promotion, I could
understand why you might want to de-emphasize
that, but I think that there's words
(inaudible).

DEATON: I understand. I can take that
suggestion as a recommendation back to the
group. I would be happy to do that.

In the old language I'm thinking
where it says and other employment practices,
but I tried to include everything with that
and assume that all the others were included
also in employment.

I definitely will take that back
and we'll reconsider that. This will not go
to the Board, by the way, until February
20th. There's not a January meeting. This
meeting is tomorrow. So it wasn't going to
get on that agenda so we do have a little bit
more time to tweak with this.

DEBSKI: So this will be tabled?

DEATON: When is your January meeting?

BROTHERS: There's not.

HIPPI SLEY: It's a February meeting. February
8th.

DEATON: To table it, we push it out again
and --

HIPPI SLEY: Well, there's a comment from there
and there. Davy?

JONES: Yes. In the (inaudible) training
and your English here, is training modifying
part of other employment or -- does training
refer to education as well? Has training
been dropped out of the language?

DEATON: I wasn't writing regs when the old
stuff got written.

HIPPI SLEY:

Yes?

CROSS:

Al Cross, Communications.

I must respectfully disagree with my colleagues on the issue of those words not being encompassed by the word employment.

I think it's important in regulations to have them be readable and understandable and not go into excessive detail. And these are governing regulations, not rhetorical regulations.

So I'm fine with the language that's proposed.

HIPPI SLEY:

Thank you very much. Anyone else want to speak for or against the (inaudible) motion? Connie and then Debra.

WOOD:

Connie Wood, A and S.

With all due respect to the previous speaker. I do think it's very important that the non-discrimination policy pertain not only to employment, but employment practices, which would encompass promotion, pay, et cetera and so forth.

As worded it does not include employment practice (inaudible). But I think it's very important that promotion and pay be specifically included.

HIPPI SLEY:

Debra?

ANDERSON:

Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.

If you need to take it back to your group in order to incorporate any changes we suggested, might I suggest that it go to Senate Council (inaudible) because the Senate Council will meet several times between now and February.

HIPPI SLEY:

So what Debra is saying is she would think we could allow Senate Council to take an executive action and so it could (inaudible) Board on time.

ILAHIANE:

Hsain Ilahiane, A and S.

I just want to redirect (inaudible) employment is vague and I would like it also to spell out promotion and equal pay.

HIPPI SLEY:

Any other questions for Marcie?

Todd?

PORTER:

I'd like to point out that --

HIPPI SLEY:

Todd Porter, Pharmacy.

PORTER:

Sorry. -- that if it was to go to Senate Council, I don't believe we want to table it. We want not to vote to table it, we'll vote against tabling it. And then we want to reject the motion, is that correct?

UNIDENTIFIED:

I did not make a motion.

PORTER:

We don't have a motion to approve this?

UNIDENTIFIED:

No. Well, we don't have a motion to table it.

PORTER:

I know. If we get one, that would be --

HIPPI SLEY:

I don't think I put it on the floor yet. We don't have a mover or a seconder yet. It's not on the floor. But I can put it on the floor to vote. If it's rejected then it will be returned to you, who will

come back with it to us.

So another thing is we could right now on the floor, think of this, so it's a motion --

UNIDENTIFIED: I just wanted to point out that I'm going to have a hard time voting against this given the subject matter. At the same time, I don't want to vote on it at all, I want it to go back and be redone.

I mean, this is a sensitive issue, and if it comes up for a vote, I want to vote against it because of the lack of clarification about promotion and tenure.

This is going to be a challenging thing or it could be confusing in the minutes when the votes are tallied if I'm voting against an issue of non-discrimination, which I agree with.

HIPPISLEY: So I hear you want to see the motion reset so we can vote on it.

JONES: Marcie, is this going to be a first read? There's a Senate meeting between the first and the second read. So this Body can attest at that time it is satisfied with the language.

DEATON: I cannot speak for (inaudible). (Inaudible) will make the final decision. But I don't personally think there'll be any problem with adding some of the old language back in and then everybody may be happy with it well before February. I just can't make that decision myself today.

HIPPISLEY: Can you help, Parliamentarian, with what we do? It's not on the floor yet. Should we put it on the floor and vote on it or should we --

SEAGO: That's a good question.

TAGAVI: You cannot discuss a motion if it's not on the floor. So these are already on the floor. You have not asked to be voted on yet. That's where we are.

HIPPISLEY: I don't think I put it on the floor.

TAGAVI: Then we cannot discuss -

HIPPISLEY: All right. Stop discussing. It's not on the floor, so what can we do that's practical?

PORTER: Don't put it on the floor because you'll make us vote against it. We don't want to vote against a non-discrimination policy.

UNIDENTIFIED: This was just a report from Marcy.

UNIDENTIFIED: Take this back to the committee, address the concerns that we have, take it to Senate Council (inaudible).

DEATON: I'd be happy to do that.

HIPPISLEY: She said yes. All right. Joe Fink, who is the Chair of the University Appeals Board is going to report on three reports.

FINK: Okay. It's good to be here. I see the faces of a number of alumni of the Appeals Board in the audience, I want for

them to participate.

The first question I'd like to review for those of you who have never served on the University Appeals Board, is what is the jurisdiction of the Appeals Board.

We handle basically two types of cases, academic appeals and grievance, or behavioral disorders. It comes up either through the office of the Academic Ombud or the Office of Dean of Students. Those folks are here, they can answer questions related to their processes if you want.

What's the Appeal Process? The student notifies either the Ombud that they wish to appeal or they notify me that they wish to appeal in the case of a disciplinary appeal, and that kicks off the whole thing.

When I receive an Appeal Notice, I send out a message to the entire Appeals Board with a list of possible time slots for a hearing and see which one yields a quorum.

What's the composition of the Appeals Board? The Appeals Board has 30 members. I am not one of them. The 30 members are 18 faculty members and 12 students. The 12 students are appointed for one year term, the 18 faculty are appointed for a three year term and they can be reappointed.

What's the quorum for the conduct of Appeals Board business? Eight people, at least five of whom must be faculty, at least one of whom must be a student member.

What are the practices and procedures we follow? There's a question and answer document that's linked off the website of the Academic Ombud.

It's primarily framed in terms of academic appeals rather than disciplinary appeals, but it provides about eight or nine pages of questions and answers about how the Appeals Board goes about its business, what are the practices and procedures that are followed.

And so if you have questions, you can take a look at that off the page of the Academic Ombuds Office and that will probably answer it. If not, you can send me an email, call me, whatever.

This is the history over recent years of the types of cases, the number of cases we've had. You can see the tremendous increase in the number of cheating or plagiarism allegations. Plagiarism, largely due to the internet, right?

The number of cases related to fair and just evaluation of the student's performance has gone down.

A no merit review is a somewhat unique situation where the student has come to the Ombud seeking a review of a matter. The Ombud has investigated and concluded that the matter lacks merit, even sends the

UKSenateMeeting-12-14.txt

student a letter essentially informing him or her of that, and then the student has 30 days to request a review of that decision by the Appeals Board.

When that occurs, the student does not appear. It is not a hearing, it is a review and the student does not appear, it's a totally paper process with the documentation supplied by the Ombud's Office and anything the student wants to submit.

It's sent out to the panel members who are going to be there, and the sole question is: Should the student be granted a hearing. So that's a little bit different twist in the case of a no merit determination by the Academic Ombud.

The number of cases involving (inaudible) has gone down. Retroactive withdrawal, we only had one year where we had any of those. The Code of Student Conduct cases, those are a little more involved and you can see the numbers go up and down on that.

One question we always get is how frequently does the student win. Here are the numbers across the bottom: Did the student prevail or did not prevail.

Roughly, over the time I've been doing this, this is my 16th year, the student wins about 50 percent of the time, and that's across all these categories of types of offenses.

There are some continuing challenges facing the University Appeals Board. Participation by those appointed to the University Appeals Board. Prompt responses to my emails when I send out these time slots for circulation. I'd like to hear back within an hour, I'm lucky to hear back within a week by some people, as to whether they can participate in a given time slot.

One personal challenge I have is how much time this consumes and the time it takes away from my college level responsibilities because I don't discuss these things with anybody in my college. I don't discuss these cases with anybody.

All the materials are handled by me, photo copies are made by me, they are distributed by me, everything is handled by me. And it takes a lot of time to protect the privacy of the students and the faculty members who are involved in this process. And at times it interferes with what I'm supposed to be doing in my day job.

So those are some of the continuing challenges. One of the things that's been the greatest, positive surprise for me since I've started doing this is when the testimony is over and the deliberation begins, the differentiation between faculty member and student, totally evaporates.

Everybody who has heard the case

UKSenateMeeting-12-14.txt

is treated as an equal. In fact, in some instances, the incites of the students who are on the hearing panel are exalted over the incites on some of the faculty members because the students might have had this class last year or might have had this kind of issue come up before, something like that. And so they have some additional incites that the faculty member does not have.

So that's been a very positive part of this experience for me. So that's the overview of it. What questions do you have that I can try to answer? And if any alumni want to chip in, feel free to do so.

UNIDENTIFIED: On your chart showing the numbers, if we can go back to that. The fair and just evaluation, that was the one that was the most uneven. And what I wondered is there a reason for that, was there a particular course or something that happened in those two years where there were lots of complaints about one course?

FINK: You're very perceptive. That primarily relates to the deviation of the syllabus. We had one case, I want to say it was in '11-'12, where eleven students out of the same class appealed. So that causes a peak in the data.

It was a case where a faculty member established a grading scale at the beginning of the semester. For some reason during the close of the semester the dean interceded and changed the grading scale. And these eleven students on the original grading scale would have received an A. But under the modified grading scale got a B.

And so they appealed and we handled all eleven in one hearing. And so that caused a peak in the numbers. So number 2 relates primarily to syllabus.

REAL: So then if you have --

BROTHERS: Name please.

REAL: Kevin Real, Communication.

You have these two anomalies in the second line, perhaps the statement that the increase in the first line is due to the internet may not be fully accurate since the internet has been around since 2009 or before.

Perhaps your group, or the Ombud, or the University, has doing a good job of advertising its services so more students are aware. We know that in my college, students are being made aware that they can appeal classes. So I think that perhaps greater awareness may lead to this increase in numbers.

Of course, I (inaudible) saying since the overall decline. Perhaps you can explain that. I wonder if you're doing such a good job of making yourself aware that maybe more students aware.

FINK: Could be. Could be.

UKSenateMeeting-12-14.txt

REAL: But you have to hesitate on making comments that the internet is the reason for cheating and plagiarism. I bet you that less than 20 percent of these cases go to your Board.

FINK: Of the cases that come to the Board, cutting and pasting from an internet reference into a term paper is the predominant offense.

REAL: I mean 80 percent of them never get appealed.

FINK: Yeah. Well, I'm only focusing on this data right now.

GIANCARLO: Matt Giancarlo, Arts and Sciences. Would the UAB be able to offer guidance or feedback in the event that a department level decision has been overturned or modified?

Insofar as in my experience, decisions are rendered, they are appealed, in those cases where they're modified or overturned, we have no idea what we did wrong.

FINK: Right.

GIANCARLO: And then upon inquiring to the UAB for some continuing guidance, we're told that that's not possible.

FINK: I never told anybody that.

GIANCARLO: I received, when I inquired about one case, an email that said the decisions are secret and we cannot get any information on why the decision was overturned.

FINK: I don't know who sent you that. It wasn't me. I'm glad to discuss it with you. The problem comes from putting that response in writing. That's the problem. That makes it discoverable and a future lawsuit, and that's something we'll always have to keep in mind.

But orally, I'll be glad to tell you. In fact, when I met with the Senate Council in September, something like that, they asked me to review the cases this year to give a synopsis of the decisions.

We have eleven cases, do we have time for that?

So far this academic year, the Appeals Board has handled 11 cases. So that is from July 1 forward.

I'll just review them, go right down the line. The first case was a disciplinary appeal, the appeal was denied, and it didn't meet the criteria.

In order to appeal a decision of a disciplinary case with the Dean of Student's Office, the student has to show one of two things, procedural error during the conduct of a hearing or newly available evidence that was not available at the time of the hearing. That's it.

One of those two things has to be identified. And in that situation, the student does not meet with the Appeals Board,

UKSenateMeeting-12-14.txt

the student submits a written filing, that question has to be answered.

The second case, disciplinary, the appeal was denied, it didn't meet the two criteria.

Number 3 was a disciplinary appeal, it was denied, there was no information to meet the criteria.

Number 4 was a grade appeal, the appeal was denied. Even if the grade assignment had been changed as the student requested, the letter grade for the course would have been the same. He never did that calculation before he filed the appeal.

Number 5 was a grade appeal, the appeal was upheld. The allegation of cheating was not supported. The faculty member did not appear. And I would editorialize that this used to be much more of a problem than it is now.

Five years ago it was not at all unusual for the faculty member who made the decision that led to the appeal to not attend the hearing. Now the faculty are doing better. They're doing better at standing behind the decisions they made that affected the students that led to the appeals. Five years ago, I wouldn't have been able to say that.

Number 6 was a no merit review. It came from the Ombud. The Ombud determined that the case did not have merit and the Appeals Board agreed.

Number 7 was a disciplinary appeal. The appeal was denied and didn't meet the two criteria.

Number 8, grade appeal. It was upheld. The syllabus provision was not met. The provision in the syllabus, this was a student who missed a lab assignment in a course, and there was one place it talked about if you missed a lab you have to do this.

There was a second place in the syllabus that said if you miss a lab you have to do thus and such. But it didn't list everything that was in the first place. So two provisions in the syllabus were inconsistent.

Let me editorialize in response to Matthew's point, when I started doing this my syllabus was four pages. It's now eleven pages.

Three more. A plagiarism case, the appeal was denied, the student presented no basis for overturning the decision.

A no merit review, that was denied. The student presented no basis for overturning the decision.

The last one was a disciplinary case, the decision was upheld -- the appeal was upheld, he alleged there was new evidence available that was not available at the time

of the original hearing. That's one of those two criteria.

MAZUR: Joan Mazur, Education.
How does it split out like between graduate and undergraduate?

FINK: I'd say the largest head count is undergraduate. The second largest head count is the professional schools. Even though they're small in enrollment, it's high stakes for the students. They've invested a lot to get where they are (inaudible) in a professional program. And then graduate would be third.

So the professional programs are (inaudible) over-represented given the number of students enrolled in those programs.

HIPPI SLEY: Thanks very much.

FINK: Thank you.

HIPPI SLEY: I am absolutely delighted to have Patsy Carruthers here who is going to talk to us about LMS.

CARRUTHERS: Thank you very much for having us today.

I'm joined in the audience today by three chairs of the LMS Selection Committee. John Wilson, Dan Lau, and Scott Bradley. They led a committee that had representation from all of the colleges, from student body, from undergraduate education and a number of different areas.

And the committee was tasked with discussing whether to recommend that University of Kentucky stay with Blackboard at the end of its contract, June 30, 2016, or make a recommendation that we move away from Blackboard. It could even go so far as to recommend a specific LMS.

This committee met for nine months, so over a period of time, had discussion, had hands-on experiences, interviewed other universities, and so forth.

And what we'd like to do today is just briefly share with you the outcomes of that committee. John?

WILSON: The committee met frequently. We engaged in the process which involved many presentations, web chats with a variety of institutions that was faced with similar questions, how they went about it.

We attempted to work through pilot studies using the technology and repeated a survey that was done in 2010 that related to the performances of Blackboard.

We did all of the above and seldom have I experienced the phenomena in which all the indicators pointed in one direction. This was one of them.

I think the committee ended up voting 22 to nothing in favor of the proposal to essentially switch to a product (inaudible). With interviewer questions, the committee was unanimous in its support of Canvas as opposed to Blackboard.

UKSenateMeeting-12-14.txt

I think what the committee wanted to do, though, is to go beyond just simply saying, switch to Canvas. Because in any process of change, the devil is in the details. And even a wise decision may be implemented poorly in terms of its effect on students, staff and faculty.

And in fact, what we wanted to do was make the endorsement contingent on four points. This is an abbreviated version of the points which were elaborated in more detail because we really wanted to make it clear to the administration that the switch to Canvas needed to have certain components to it.

And those were that the intake core assessments had to function well, which was important for the accreditation issues. That an effective plagiarism (inaudible) system be included in the new system.

Number 3, and these are not in sort of order of importance, the transition support services and implementation services would be provided based on successful existing models like those that were done at the University of Indiana and the University of Texas. We thought this was absolutely critical.

And fourth, that the transition time line be published and was to include parallel systems during the transition.

Do you want to open this up for questions?

CARRUTHERS: I would like to recognize the other Chairs, Dan, Dr. Lau and also Scott Bradley.

WILSON: Come on down so we can take questions about this.

HIPPI SLEY: Very quick questions, because we're running out of time.

CARRUTHERS: And we do have an FAQ page with a button you can click to ask a question there, too, we do monitor that.

HIPPI SLEY: If you have questions you can fill out that form, right?

CARRUTHERS: Yes. Thank you. Thanks for having us.

HIPPI SLEY: All right. Thanks very much.

So this is our last report and it's from the Benefits Officer, Joey Payne. I asked him to talk about some new changes to the rules which are important for faculty.

PAYNE: Thank you very much. I know that you're running short on time so I will tell you the first few slides I'm going to move through fairly quickly so that I can get to the actual changes so I'll spend more time on that.

So in May of 2013 we changed the UK administrative regulation for the retirement plan to allow Eric Monday, the EVPFA to execute and amend an investment policy statement and to add a committee and to use a consultant to oversee the retirement plan.

UKSenateMeeting-12-14.txt

Up and to that point, we had pretty much had a hands-off approach on how we were managing your retirement plan. Fidelity and TIAA-CREF offered those plans and we pretty much accepted any of the funds that they offered (inaudible).

So we established a committee. I would point out that Paul Childs from B and E and Brad Jordan are faculty members, and I think Paul is here. Brad had a previous commitment. But they've been very helpful in helping us work through all of these issues.

We hired a consultant, Cammack Retirement Group out of New York. They work with a lot of other universities on working through their retirement plan and changes to their plans.

So one of the first things that we asked Cammack to do is to go to Fidelity and TIAA-CREF and make sure we're getting the best deal based on we have \$4 billion dollars in assets and we want to make sure we're getting the best deal.

So they went and negotiated 814,000 in savings from Fidelity, 1.2 million from TIAA-CREF, \$2 million in annual savings. If you go back and look at your retirement accounts in October, you probably saw some kind of an administrative refund or some kind of note there where that money, it all went back out pro rata based on how much money you had in your plan compared to the overall plan.

So one of the conditions on lowering these fees is that we would make some administrative concessions. So these concessions is to use a common file format, the terms SPAR, society of pension administration and record keepers.

So if you can imagine a thousand universities out there sending Fidelity and TIAA-CREF files based on their IQ departments definition of how they want to send it and they all got together and said, look, can we just come up with a specific way to send this data and that's what -- so we agreed to start using that and we're already doing it now.

They wanted to get salary information on that remittance file. They wanted us to eliminate a 15 year catch up on the 403B plan. And to reduce the number of loans from five to three.

Now, what are the changes that are going to affect employees? First of all, lower fees on investments. So we have increased the share class, so we're getting the very best share class at Fidelity and TIAA-CREF on all of our investments which we -- the fees that we are all paying our retirement plan system are lower.

We're talking about implementing a loan policy, that's what we're proposing. And right now, the loans, it started out when

UKSenateMeeting-12-14.txt

we put in loans back around 2004, we didn't have a cap on how many loans. We got a call from Fidelity one day, somebody had 23 loans. And they said you guys got to put a cap on this.

And so we came up with five at the time and grandfathered everybody that had loans, but said only five loans going forward.

So it looks like the best practice is really three. We looked at all the benchmarks and other groups, and so we would change the number of loans from five to three.

Now, here is a material change. We would change the source of loans to the employee contribution only. Because right now you can borrow from what the employee puts in and the employer. The University is really -- stands alone for the most part. Most plans say you can borrow from the money you put in but you can't borrow from the employer funds. So that's a material change.

This 15 year catch up, the way it works is if you work for your employer, so you've been at UK for 15 years and you want -- and you haven't maximized your contribution every year -- I'm not talking about the 5 and the 10, I'm talking about the extra money you can put in which is 17,500 under 403B for 2014.

If you haven't maximized that contribution every year then you could be offered a \$3,000 extra contribution for a total of 5 years.

Now this is a big IRS audit red flag when they come in to audit your plan if they see that people have done these, because most of them haven't been calculated correctly. You actually have to go back 15 years and look at what was the limit that year, what was did this individual put in. And year by year you have to do that.

Our committee, we don't think that this extra 3,000 is material in the grand scheme of things. You know, you've got the 15 percent that's going in with the employer/employee match, and then over here you have \$17,500 that you can put in a 403B. A separate 17,500 you can put in with the 457 Plan.

And if you've over the age of 50, it's another \$5500. So, you know, that's a significant amount of money. We have about 45, 50 people in a given time doing the extra 3,000.

So what we're proposing is those people that have started this, because it's for 5 years, it will be grandfathered in, we just don't offer it new to anybody else. And after 5 years we won't have anybody doing it. So that's the proposal.

Okay. So changes to the investment

lineup. We are going to -- the target date funds (inaudible) what is the target date fund. If you looked at an investment lineup and you see dates out next to them of 2030, 2040. These are funds that are designed where you put your money in up front, you can set it and forget it, in theory, and it's going to change the asset allocation over time.

So if you over in 2050 fund, and this date represents when your hypothetical return date is. So this morning I met with a new employee and they were 39 years old. And I said, okay, so you're going to be 65 in 26 years, and this is 2014, we came up with 2040. So that's the fund.

So legally, I'm allowed to tell that person put your money in the 2040 fund. 85 percent of the new money going into the retirement plan is going into these target date funds because this as an employer, that's what we're allowed to tell people, you know, where to put their money.

So right now the funds that are being used, these target date funds, are actively managed funds. Sometimes they're referred to as funds of funds. And this is where, you know, we use a TIAA-CREF example, to get the 2050 fund, it might be 80 percent stock and 20 percent fixed.

The 80 percent stock might be 25 percent CREF stock, 25 percent growth, et cetera. So that's where we get the term funds of funds.

While those are all actively managed funds, and so when I say actively managed, that means there is a fund manager and a staff of analysts, and they're all trying to pick which stocks are going to do better than others.

Whereas in an index fund, you're not trying to beat that index with that average, you're just trying to get, you know, that sample, you know, like the S&P 500, for example.

So by going to the index funds, we're going to save \$1.2 million because we lose all of those actively managed fees. And the research, I think, pretty much shows that these fund managers rarely gave the indexes that they're benchmarking to all the time. So that's the first change.

The second change is we're going to be going to invest in class funds over, it's actually 15 asset classes because we made a change to TIAA-CREF. And the funds that are going to be in the new core that are there now, the non Fidelity and TIAA-CREF, like you have those (inaudible) or whatever the fund might be, anything that doesn't end up in tier 2 after we make this change, it's all going to be moved into tier 3.

So we're not getting rid of any

UKSenateMeeting-12-14.txt

funds that are out there right now, we're just re-categorizing them and how we present them to employees. The Fidelity and TIAA-CREF funds that aren't in tier 2, we'll move to tier 3 as well.

So I talked about with the tier 1 changes, moving from actively managed to index, that's what this slide is referring to.

This is the current fidelity. So you'll see when we're looking at bonds, all the different options. Large cap, all the different options.

So what we're doing is we're talking about on the next slide, moving to just one option under each one in tier 2.

Employees that are currently here as of June 30th of next year, all of these funds, if I go back, you're still going to have access to all these funds, it's just going to be on a tier 3. You're just going to have to look down a list to find those funds if your favorite fund is what you're looking for.

In tier 2, this is where we're kind of steering people. We can use our committee through the recommendation of our consultant who has the fiduciary responsibility to look for the best funds that are out there and invest into some defined as top quartile in performance and top quartile in fees.

So these, the consultants who make the recommendation to the committee, the committee can review that recommendation and accept on behalf of the University.

So we will be able -- we can't guarantee everybody is going to make a load of money in a retirement plan, but what we can promise you is that if you are investing in a large cash grow fund, that what is there will be one of the best that's out there. There is not a singular the best because everything is in a point in time. But we will have the best funds that are out there.

And here's the TIAA-CREF. Once again, we have two different funds. And the reason why you see like this (inaudible) because several years ago we asked Fidelity and TIAA-CREF to add these non-proprietary funds to the mix. They've done that but until we had a committee, we really couldn't take any action to move some of these funds around because when you bring a fund, at a given point in time, and you evaluate it over time, things change. And so what looked good three years ago may not necessarily be good today. So this is with the TIAA-CREF.

One thing I would point out is you see Vanguard again. So there's going to be a lot of commonality to this tier 2. A lot of Vanguard funds. We fill in with the gaps with these Alliance and Bernstein funds. And these will change over time as the committee,

the consultants make recommendations, the committee accepts those, reviews those, and we'll make changes.

Going forward, if there is a change, if we decided to change this particular fund right here, whatever we replace it with, the assets that are in that old fund would get mapped to the new fund.

So what you're basically seeing is, I want a small -- we have a small mid cap value fund and I'm taking whatever the offer is right there because it will just be one.

Okay. So how are we going to handle this? So tier 2, if it's not -- I told you previously if it's going to tier 3, we're not going to do any mapping, we're just going to, you know, when you go in your Fidelity account, TIAA-CREF account, you're looking at the pick list. What's in tier 2 right now, it's just going to be at the bottom of the page for people that are here working right now.

So no material change, we're not doing any mapping. The only mapping that's going to be involved is with that tier 1, if you're a in 2040 Fidelity index fund or, you know, (inaudible) fund, you will go be mapped over to the Fidelity 2040 index fund. You know, 2040 to 2040. And there's no change in value, it's a dollar per dollar change on this settlement date.

Now, here's the significant change that our committee is recommending. For anybody that's not on board as of June 30, 2015, we're recommending that we only offer the tier 1 and tier 2 investments, that we not offer tier 3.

If we were going to set up a brand new company today for a brand new institution of higher education and offer retirement plans, you would go out and, you know, you would offer the target date funds, and you would put together, you know, a core lineup of funds covering the various asset groups and that's it.

We have a fiduciary responsibility. An employee can go to a large cap fund at Fidelity, they look there and see a fund and they say, okay, that fund looks pretty good, it's got a 17 percent return over the last three years. Well, what the problem is is the (inaudible) that you're measured against may have averaged 20.

So this employee doesn't really understand that, you know, 17 sounds pretty good, but for the same risk, you could have actually had 3 percentage point higher gain. And also, the fees that are associated with that.

So by having a smaller group of funds that the committee can review and watch with the use of a consultant, we can ensure that we have the top quartile funds in

performance and in expenses.

Okay. So here's the time table and then I'll have questions. So here we are now. So we've taken this to the Benefits Committee in November and this proposal was endorsed by the Benefits Committee.

We are presenting to University Senate today and Staff Senate later in the week. We would like some feedback, you know, an endorsement, or this is what we would like to see change. And we'll present that to the EVPFA first of the year.

And then based on feedback from the various committees and Senates, we'll go out and have some public quorums. Still talking about proposed changes. And then finally, report back to the EVPFA, make decisions in March.

And the law, it's the -- the group that's over all the retirement -- (inaudible). The Department of Labor, that's who it is, has a 90 day requirement when you're changing plans and that kind of thing. So we have to be able to start talking to people, and the retirement carriers will, first of April, for changes that take effect as of July 1st.

So that's what we're proposing.

HIPPI SLEY: Thank you very much, Joey. I'm sure you probably have lots and lots and lots of questions for Joey. We are running very short of time. So I will take one question and then --

UNIDENTIFIED: Can people email questions?

PAYNE: Sure. Sure.

HIPPI SLEY: So a single question for the time?

KENNEDY: Michael Kennedy, Emeritus.

Can you make these slides available?

PAYNE: Sure. We have a copy.

HIPPI SLEY: Any questions, please do email Joey and he'll make the slides available.

We have other business, I would actually request and invite Davy Jones to hijack this any other business because it's a really a really important announcement on elections.

JONES: Okay. Probably in 60 seconds, we can get this. We have several elections going on right now. One was for the Senate Council Chair position. In accordance with the Rules, solicitation went out for nominations. Nominations were received, those people were contacted. All but one person declined to run.

Under the Senate Rules, in that situation, the one remaining candidate is declared the winner of the election of Senate Council Chair. And for the second year in a row, congratulations to Dr. Andrew Hippisley.

Senate Council Vice Chair, that's going on right now. There's nominations being made. The Senate Council will vote at

UKSenateMeeting-12-14.txt

next Monday's meeting of Senate Council to determine who is going to be the Vice Chair.

And then finally, election of three new members to the Senate Council, that election is going on right now. You all have seen the email. Please, everybody vote. The bigger vote we have, the stronger mandate we have, if we're all engaged. That's very, very important. That election will run until noon of next Monday and then we announce.

The results will be announced at Senate Council meeting on Monday and then very shortly afterwards, generally, results can be sent out to you.

HI PPI SLEY: Thank you, Davy. That was about 60 seconds. All right. I would like to say there's no other business because we don't have time for it this time. But there will be a slot in February. These are the candidates as you can see.

As Davy said, it's such an easy voting website. Please do your voting. It takes 10 seconds, I promise that. One of these can be the next Senate Council Chair.

We need a --

UNI DENTI FIED: (Inaudible).
HI PPI SLEY: And second?
UNI DENTI FIED: Second.

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

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY)
COUNTY OF 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).

My commission expires: April 6, 2015.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 9th day of February, 2015.

UKSenateMeeting-12-14.txt

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

NOTARY ID 440572