

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE MEETING

\* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \*

March 10, 2014

\* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \*

LEE X. BLONDER, CHAIR

CONNIE WOOD, VICE-CHAIR

J.S. BUTLER, PARLIAMENTARIAN

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

LISA GRANT CRUMP, COURT REPORTER

\* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \*

LISA GRANT CRUMP, COURT REPORTER  
AN/DOR REPORTING & VIDEO TECHNOLOGY, INC.

CAPILOUTO: Thank you. Sorry for the technological delay. I appreciate all of you being here, I know it's a busy time of the year and I thank you for sharing it with me this afternoon.

I've had a wonderful week as your University President, some of my highlights include the Great Teacher Award that we do annually. What is so nice about that is it's not only a time for those people that are recognized in this year to get together, we have people from previous years attend.

We had one gentleman who received the award over 30 years ago. So it's a special community that you are a part of.

My wife and I also took in Don Giovanni. I hope many of you took advantage of that opportunity. Every time I go, I recognize that it is a world class production and how fortunate that is for our campus and for our Lexington community.

This weekend as I walked around campus, I didn't realize we had a baseball game. But I went in and three innings we scored 20 runs, that was good. Then went to the rec center and exercised some.

In all of those opportunities I have a chance to talk to students and I ask them how is it going. And invariably I hear good stories and you're at the center of many of those.

So other people that are recognizing that I think we're doing things the right way, over the past few weeks we've had Standard and Poor's, and Moody's, these are the rating agencies I'm sure you're all familiar with, who assist all organizations across the country, give a report, and in many ways and in our case, since we were issuing debt as a result of House Bill 7 last year, these reports are important to the marketplace.

The positive trends they recognize is first of all our enrollment. And more recent information when they looked at our investment

in housing, this last month alone we're going to open about 3,000 new beds. You see these being built all over campus.

Already we have applications well over 4,000 for those 3,000 beds. So the demand is certainly strong.

It's not just the buildings, but it's the life we're going to breathe into those buildings. We have nearly 3,000 applications for our living/learning programs, these new activities.

And this is so important during this period because nationwide we've got a demographic trend that sort of goes against residential campuses. And that is a decline in the number of 18 to 20 year olds, 18 to 22 year olds, that traditional college going group, that group is going to decline over the next several years.

They're also encouraged by our donor support. One example, the Gatton College of Business, we went to the state legislature a little over a year ago, said we would raise

the \$65 million required for that project. I think we're up to 50 million, unofficially, right, Dean Blackwell? That's encouraging.

I listened to Kathi Kern's lecture as part of the Provost's series in strategic planning. She lamented, I couldn't attend the lecture, but I listened, she lamented that some of the modern classrooms that you see around the country just aren't available to us here at UK to do that kind of teaching we know is going to make a difference in the future.

So they were encouraged to see us making progress not only on the Gatton Building but our new Academic Science Building, they also gave kudos to the fact that \$65 million of that \$100 million project is going to be funded by UK Athletics.

And they looked carefully at Athletics. Commonwealth Stadium, a project that is going to totally renovate that, but the financial plan is built on new revenues that come from suites, club seats and low seats. And they saw that that was going quite positively.

And then the trends in UK Healthcare. Eight years ago we were at 19,000 annual admissions in the hospital, we're up to 36,000 and we're keeping a careful eye on cost.

As a result, I'm quoting from their report: In our view, UK is one of the nationally ranked comprehensive research based universities in the country that is gaining increasing recognition for its academic programs, clinical care of patients, and its research. The aforementioned record, student enrollment, rising patient utilization, increasing health services market share, while also improving its financial profile and successfully meeting the challenges of a more onerous higher education in healthcare funded environment.

So I think all of you should commend yourselves for those statements.

So that's what the report said. They also continue to say that they were changing our outlook from stable to positive.

I want to point out that their

outlook for all of higher education is a negative. So to go from stable to positive is good and we expect our actual ratings in the next two years to even improve.

But a real test, I think, of the quality and the way we position ourselves, was when we went to the market last week to issue bonds. Over \$200 million, right, Eric?

This is the finance for Gatton College of Business and Commonwealth Stadium and the Science Building, those three.

We were expecting that the market would yield a rate of 4.8 percent. But it came in at 3.8 percent. You know, the higher your interest rate is an indication of the greater risk you are. So we were glad to see these lower rates.

It is a positive time to build. This would save us, over the 30 year cost of these loans, nearly \$2 million a year each year. So that's why (inaudible).

But they also voiced some concern. They're worried about the flat and declining

rates at the federal level in funded research. We're happy to share with them that looking over the past year, a year ago from last month, I believe, we've had double digit increases in our NIH funds, certainly bucking the trend.

The deep concern they had about us and one that I want to elaborate on today, is the continuing decline in state support. I'm working two machines here, excuse me.

So this 2014 legislative session, we're at day 43 of the 60 day session, we're a little past the middle of it. You can see that it started in the first of January.

The Governor presents his budget, the third week in January CPE presents a budget on behalf of all the universities. CPE adopts a time line for tuition and fee increase, but that isn't going to occur until later in the spring, the final decision they make.

So here is where we are in this process. Jim Ramsey and I, I think it's important for research universities in the



state to work together, we testified in front of the House committee that oversees education and our budgets, and we made what we thought was a compelling case as to why research universities need to be supported and what makes us unique.

What we have to say resonates.

I'd also tell you that I've invested great time since I've arrived here traveling to districts around the state to get to know our elected representatives in their home territory.

It helps me understand their perspective and I would say that although I'm not pleased all the time with some of the decisions they have to make, I do have respect for what they're trying to do.

So what is disconcerting to us is the Governor's budget included another cut in our operating budget. 2.5 percent which translates into 7.1 million fewer recurring state dollars.

And all of you know that's on top

of 50 million recurring dollars of cut since 2008. We're doing a lot more than we did in 2008. We have 2500 more students, we're conferring several hundred more degrees. We're doing a heck of a lot.

I share with the legislators these two messages. First of all, or \$280 million is leveraged in \$2.8 billion dollars. That's our enterprise.

And I tell them how important that dollar is. I say that first dollar from the state is the most important one because it makes possible everything else we do.

The other things we do in many cases have restricted uses associated with it. If you look on the right side, the undesignated general funds, that's our tuition and state appropriations, are the ones that we have our most flexibility (inaudible).

Many of the other things in healthcare and mandatory fees and all those kind of things have to be directed to those specific areas.

So I tell them this \$7.1 million is difficult to deal with. Not on a \$2.7 billion dollar base, but inside this \$284 million and then the \$347 million of tuition puts greater pressure on increasing those tuition revenue.

And here's the other thing I point out to them, if you look at the bottom half, this 44 percent that is our state allocation, I remind them that 63.6 million of those dollars, it certainly comes to the University of Kentucky, but it goes out immediately to 120 counties to support a very, very valuable cooperative extension program. So these aren't dollars that are typically available to us on the campus.

Something else I point out is a tuition dollar does not equal a state dollar.

All of you know in higher education if we have a 1 percent increase in tuition and mandatory fees, for us that would gross \$3.2 million. And there is a discount rate of about 22 percent across our entire campus.

And that's in line with most public

research universities. It's a lot less than you'll find at private universities nowadays who dramatically decrease (inaudible) to be competitive with institutions like ours.

And we have different discount rates. Undergraduate programs can be in the 20 to 25 percent rate. Our traditional graduate programs, the ones associated with PhD programs and some of our masters programs, have a much higher discount rate, can get in the 40 percent category. Our professional programs have less of a discount rate. This is sort of a general discount rate on our tuition.

But we've got to cover a \$7.1 million hole. So you can see here that to generate, you know, 2.8 million from a 1 percent increase to cover \$7.1 million, you got to generate \$10 million, roughly, in tuition revenue.

That's the state dollar doesn't equal a tuition dollar and that's why we're fighting so desperately to stop this bleeding

of the cuts in our state dollars.

So something I wanted to share with you that came to our attention during the presentation by David Addis in the Provost series, this is not the University of Kentucky, but it explained sort of the economics of the university, Education Advisory Board worked with different universities to do cost estimates of their various programs.

And I think these would be similar to ours but what it shows is you generate most of your revenues from the lower division undergraduate programs. Those are the most hours you offer and those tend to have positive revenue, here an estimate of \$95 per credit hour. As you go up to upper division that decreases to \$25 positive, graduate professional, \$5 and we all know doctoral programs that traditionally have stipends and full scholarships don't yield (inaudible).

What I think is happening across higher education: states 10 to 20 years ago abandoned funding that recognized the higher

cost of graduate education as we went to across the board cuts. I think it has undermined, you know, what we're able to do at the graduate level.

You know, you look 10 or 20 years ago, 1 out of every \$4 you used for this type of work came from tuition, 3 came from the state. Now we're getting cases that, you know, over 2 of those \$4 have to be generated in tuition.

So it's putting pressures across all the categories of our education in terms of what we can offer and also makes us more mindful of the cost associated with delivering those programs.

So these are some financial realities on our expense side, and let me reinforce these are very preliminary numbers. The top on my priority list is to build upon the 5 percent merit pool that we were able to offer last year.

Just to refresh your memory, every 1 percent increase for faculty and staff totals about \$4.2 million. We also allocate, and have

traditionally done so here at UK, another in this case, \$700,000 for those who are promoted during the year.

This is a modest increase in our fringe benefits. And health and some other activities of about \$2 million. We have fixed costs associated with utilities and other areas of about \$1.2.

The college incentive fund is one that was enacted several years ago, this is our TIF payment, these are payments made to the various colleges that qualify for this, 4.4 million. Scholarships of 11 million and I'll come back to that in a moment. Utilities, 1.6 million, excuse me, I mentioned that in fixed costs, and then a capital renewal pool.

We have set aside over the past few years \$4 million annually to start restoring some of the deferred maintenance we have on this campus.

It is important to build new facilities. But the current facilities we have on campus in terms of our heating and air

conditioning systems, simple roof replacements, all those kinds of things that you have to deal with every day, we have to begin addressing. We think that that's important. So if you total all this, it's \$26.1 million, if you were handling all these.

That's why again that \$7.1 million is so important.

So let me talk about scholarships. This is certainly a big number, the \$11 million. Today making assumptions of roughly a 4 percent increase of in state students in tuition and an 8 percent increase in out of state tuition, we see that 9.7 million would go towards undergraduate education, 1.3 million towards graduate education.

We already discount most of those programs about 40 percent and this does not include the stipends that come with those programs. Last year when we did the 5 percent pool for faculty and staff, we included those graduate students on stipend and we certainly included them again this year.



Back to the remainder that is dedicated or directed towards undergraduate education. Here were our principles. First we wanted to increase, always increase in absolute number, the Kentuckians that come here. Our door is open wide to them.

Recognizing this well-competitive environment in a shrinking 18 to 22 year old population, we think it's important to grow our non-residents, our out of state students. They pay more than double what a Kentuckian pays. We wanted to offer some scholarships that have them still paying much more than a Kentuckian would pay, but making them trendy so they'll leave their state, so pricing them there with some scholarships.

That, next, maintain our access and affordability. We spend over \$11 million of some \$49 million of core scholarships that the University provides to support our adversity oriented or need-based scholarships and the Parker Award (inaudible) and then to remain competitive both in the state and out of

state.

We particularly targeted the non-residents, and within that \$9.7 million about 5.9 million is to make in roads into that population. And in this case rather than have this increase every year, this would be a fixed amount, not like our other scholarships that increase every year every time you raise tuition.

\$2 million for those individuals who are currently on scholarships that we've awarded over the last several years. And \$2 million to remain competitive in our Patterson and National Merit Scholar Awards. That's what makes up that amount.

That is our hope that through investments the yield in revenues exceeds the investments we make helps us be more secure in that ever growing competitive market.

Many of these operational efficiencies took place before I arrived and I won't review all of these and the way we handle the contracts, but it's a substantial amount of

money. (Inaudible).

I know every year we use over 30 million gallons less of water because of the efficiency we've introduced and over \$3 million in energy savings.

We've had administrative reorganizations. My office certainly reduced by one vice president's position and those responsibilities I think were efficiently given to other units across the campus.

Other units across campus have certainly gone into integrated business units to improve the quality and become more efficient in regards to the services that they provide to those on campus and other constituents. And then last year we certainly made a difficult decision in terms of our work force reduction.

We have also looked for creative ways through partnerships to grow this enterprise. EdR, our partner on housing, has now committed \$348 million to the investments on our campus. And the demand I shared with you earlier I think indicates that that is a wise

investment.

Our philanthropy is up from last year, and given the work that you do and some of the opportunities we give donors, I'm more and more encouraged that we'll be able to advance in those areas and we haven't even started a major capital campaign.

And then UK Athletics, the \$65 million investment in the Academic Science Building, I told Mitch Barnhart, our Athletic Director, that our goal together would be that this wouldn't be the last project in which we would partner.

We have a strong athletic program. It's entirely self-sufficient, which is rare amongst universities in this country. It's a real plus for us.

So where do we go from here? We're not going to have complete information until May or June.

We meet with our Board of Trustees April 1<sup>st</sup>, but this decision about our budget at the state level really won't be made until April

15<sup>th</sup>. That is if they can agree.

You've read in the newspaper, I think by tomorrow the House will pass this budget that includes a 2.5 percent reduction for higher education. It includes a list of capital projects that I will share with you as well.

But to me the battle is not over until the end, and that is we're now taking our case to the Senate. I met with Senate leadership yesterday before I left town, and made phone calls while I was away.

Steve Meyers, who is our representative in Frankfort, is there every day. We make frequent visits there, I don't want to give up on that 2.5 percent reduction.

In May we have to take to our Board -- excuse, April 29<sup>th</sup> is when CPE will finally set its tuition ceilings. So that process has to evolve.

It will be May 9<sup>th</sup> when we go to the Board of Trustees with that information to recommend our changes in tuition, housing and

dining (inaudible).

So we don't have the luxury of what we really had a year ago, to plan for a year. This is compressed into a short amount of time.

What will inform our processes along the way: All of you who have engaged in the strategic planning process, and I commend Provost Riordan for leading that, we certainly use that information to inform our decision-making.

We've also made advances in our financial model in a partnership year, understanding what that would mean by putting a model next to how we traditionally allocate and it gives us an opportunity to take a year to see the implications of that, that too can inform our decision-making through this process.

That's what we'll be using going forward and we will be sure, the Provost and I, to confer with Lee and her Council as we move forward.

So let me talk about the capital

requests, the state bonds. The Council on Post Secondary Education, as part of developing its budget, develop both an operating budget and a capital budget.

Let me tell you about the operating budget, which unfortunately resulted in an across-the-board 2.5 percent decrease.

Ten states, just a few years ago, were using performance based budget. There are 24 states that are embracing this now.

This is going to be a high priority in the next legislative session. The Council Presidents try to work within a framework recognizing that that is something that is going to come to fruition in the next year.

So we have within that budget some important things. Something that emerged, and you'll see it across every state, is allocating funds according to the number of degree completions.

President Ramsey and I argued that you have to adjust for the type of degree that

you award. The comprehensive universities in Kentucky largely award undergraduate degrees. We wanted an accounting for this higher priced degree. We got an agreement on that.

I also want to say that \$63 million that you see for cooperative extension work, that that needs to be recognized in the state budget. These are services that go to citizens across the state, especially our agricultural community, and we have a line in that budget designated for that.

So those are the things we tried to stress in developing that budget. The Governor made the decision to present one that cut across the board, 2.5 percent, which is roughly \$23 million. We're going to continue to fight that.

CPE also asked every university to develop a list of capital projects. For us, the number that we were given, this is a pie in the sky number, started 9, 10 months ago, was \$160 million.

The Governor pared all those down



from materials we gave him, these are two that emerged. First, the College of Law, \$35 million from the state, we want to repeat what we did in the College of Business, and we have high hopes on the philanthropic side, that we would raise the remainder of that money and get a building that doesn't affect our operating budget. A building like many of the ones you work in, is badly in need of repair.

Another priority was a Research Building, \$45 million from the state, and additional funds we would raise through philanthropy and those generated by UK.

Lastly as part of the debt that would be undertaken for these is the Bucks For Brains allocation. And for us it could be Bucks For Brains or Bucks For Bricks depending on (inaudible), this is a total of \$33 million that would be given to us and we would receive it when we matched it dollar for dollar.

So the \$33 million would turn into \$66 million to support capital or faculty hires. So that is the capital request, the state bonds.

This survived the House consideration and the Senate looks mildly receptive. So we'll see.

There are another -- excuse me, I wanted to share this story with you because it's one I use in Frankfort to remind them of how important their support is, how important their partnership is with us and the difference it can make.

All of them certainly know that cancer is a cruel killer and it kills more often in Kentucky.

And the reason we talk about a Research Building, planning it now, is, you know, we were successful last year with the recognition by the National Cancer Institute of our Markey Cancer Center, but the planning for this started over 10 years ago.

I remind them that in 2005 they approved \$40 million in state bonds, those are the ones we don't have to pay for. In 2006, they allocated another \$80 million.

Because they had allowed to us to

borrow money and invest in a new hospital we generated the critical revenues that allowed us to hire Mark Evers and his team of clinician researchers that provide care and conduct research.

In 2010, the College of Pharmacy opened. In February of 2010, through a Bucks For Brains allocation that they made possible, we were able to finish the fourth and fifth floors of the College of Pharmacy Building, those are where the (inaudible) labs are, to bring a researcher like Peixuan Guo, one of the top three nanobiotechnologists in the world, and we resulted in this designation.

I tell them I don't know exactly what the next success story will be. But have confidence in the University of Kentucky, it's the best investment you can make. We can repeat this story time and time again, but we have got to have your support.

So the capital request for agency bonds, these are the bonds for which we would take full responsibility.

The first is the Student Center.

Our plans there are certainly to maintain the part of the Student Center that faces Limestone, you all know the two story foyer, sort of an art deco design, Ernst Johnson designed building, the rest of those additions that were made in the '60s and '70s, we don't think is salvageable.

We think Alumni Gym is a historic foothold on this campus, and we'd like to keep that as part of the new Student Center.

How do hope to support the -- to get support for that? So it's \$160 million in agency bonds. We are highly encouraged by a major gift to support that.

And the other remainder would certainly be student fees, but we think with that philanthropic support, just some natural increases we have in fees, and possibly moving some of those around, we would greatly temper any fee increase for our students.

And let me say this: the misnomer here is that this is a Student Center. To me

this is a student center, a faculty center, a staff center, a new place to congregate. I think it's a place where neighbors are going to come, and we have some exciting ideas about this. The Board allowed us to go forward and secure an architect.

Chandler Hospital fit-up, \$150 million for a new cafeteria, fit up the ninth and tenth floors, and also rebuild the neonatal intensive care unit.

All those would be generated by clinical revenues. I think we turned away over 1000 patients last year. We have excess demand. We have (inaudible) in the hallways there now. This is I think a very safe investment.

And then the last one would be a new parking structure. I don't know exactly where this would be. We have consultants who gauge now, not just to look at parking, but our traffic flows on campus, this would be \$45 million in agency bonds financed with parking revenues.

So that is an overview of where we stand in terms of (inaudible).

We are going to turn to you, as we will to our alumni and all, to join that chorus of those who are going to advocate for us at a critical time.

We'll share with you what we think will be the most timely and focused message as we go through this legislative process, dealing with the Senate, and then I'm sure they're not going to agree with the House. This goes to a (inaudible) committee where they try to work out their differences. So we look forward to turning to you.

I want to end with where I start, and that is with immense thanks for what you do.

We share lots of data when we are in Frankfort on all kinds of matters. But some of the most powerful moments are when those legislators share a story about the difference you made in the life of a farmer that may be in their community, or a student who fell on tough times, or a student, with their degree,

is making a great contribution to his or her community. That's what matters most.

You give me great stories to be what I hope is a strong and effective advocate on your behalf. So Lee, I'm happy to take any questions.

BRION: Gail Brion, College of Engineering.

The new proposed bonds, how much more a year does that add to our payment? How much pay back is that a year?

CAPILOUTO: What is the annual bill for those bonds? What is that, Eric?

BRION: If you got the money at the good rate you got now.

MONDAY: It would be \$15 million per year, all sources.

BRION: And so with the buildings that we undertook we're at \$7 million a year right now and then this would be an additional 15 on that? I could be misunderstanding this.

CAPILOUTO: The three projects which are Commonwealth Stadium, the Academic Science Building, and Gatton College of Business, some

of those are going to have philanthropic payments that are made over time.

So some of this, it gets more complicated, will have early call so that some of those people will pay this off in five years. So we'll retire some of that debt.

But Eric, if you can elaborate on what that annual amount looks like?

MONDAY: Sure.

CAPILOUTO: And this is Eric Monday, our Executive Vice President for Finance.

MONDAY: So I think you may be referencing the pool, the funds that we set aside for debt service?

BRION: Yes.

MONDAY: So there's \$10.4 million in that pool of funds. The only thing that's been committed towards those funds on an on-going basis would be the share of the Academic Science Building because the Gatton College, we paid with philanthropy, Commonwealth we paid by Athletics, and then 65 million of the Science Building will be paid by Athletics as well.



So the call on those funds would be about 2.5 million. So 2.5 million of the 10.4 is what's been set aside for the projects to date.

BRION: So we're looking at adding to that, how much again?

MONDAY: Well, if we're talking about the three projects we just were referencing on the agency bond side, so the Student Center would be through Student Center fees, so there's no call on that pot of \$8 million, let's say.

The Chandler Hospital continuation is from Healthcare revenues. And then the parking is also from parking revenues.

So there's no call on those funds. If we get into the Law Building, and that project is funded by the state, then those agency bonds would be similar to the Gatton College and would be funded through philanthropic.

So if there's any call would be the Science, excuse me, the new Research Building, and any component that would need to be funded by the University.

BRION: Thank you for clarifying.

BLONDER: Other questions? Bob?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.

So just to follow-up, you mentioned the student fees to pay for the Student Center, those are fees on top of what the students already pay, you're going to assess each student an additional amount of money to pay for the Student Center?

CAPILOUTO: Our goal is to greatly temper that through philanthropic gift. And you know, we have some annual increases in those fees that go up slightly over time.

We also have the opportunity to consider, within the current fees, how we would direct them. So our goal is to keep that down as much as we can.

WOOD: Connie Wood, Arts and Sciences.

You showed \$11 million increase in tuition and scholarships --

CAPILOUTO: Right.

WOOD: -- at both the undergraduate and graduate level. Could you break that for me

further into tuition scholarships and in actual fellowship and scholarship payments to students?

CAPILOUTO:               The \$11 million represents \$9.7 million in scholarships to undergraduate students, \$1.3 million was scholarships for graduate students.

WOOD:                     Is that tuition or actual fellowships?

CAPILOUTO:               That's tuition. That's not your stipend support.

BLONDER:                 Other questions? Thank you so much.

CAPILOUTO:               Thank you.

BLONDER:                 Please remember to sign in when you arrive, give your name and affiliation when you speak, attend meetings, respond to e-mails and web postings, acknowledge and respect others, silence your electronic devices, and communicate with your constituency.

Next is minutes and announcements. We received one correction to the minutes from the meeting of February 10th.

Are there any additional corrections? Hearing none, the minutes from February 10 stand approved as amended by unanimous consent.

Next item, the Senate Council approved a minor change to the 2013-2014 Academic Calendar to correct the dates for the summer advising conferences.

The Senate Council also approved use of a special form to facilitate an expedited process to change undergrad programs to accommodate the new Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement, GCCR.

The form only allows for GCCR-related changes. They move from the college to the GCCR Advisory Committee to the Senate Council Office for a 10 day posting. These changes bypass Undergraduate Council and they must be received by the GCCR Advisory Committee by March 24th in order to be sent to the Senate Council by April 7th.

New GCCR course proposals to be approved for a fall effective date must be received by the GCCR Advisory Committee Monday,

March 24th.

Next, the Senate Academic Organization and Structure Committee continues to receive proposals without appropriate documentation. As a result, the Senate Council passed a motion that prior to review by this committee, a proposal intended for SAOSC review must include answers to the SAOSC questions posted on the Senate site. So please communicate that in your colleges to people that might be proposing changes like this.

The Senate Council in addition will conduct a campus-wide survey of the faculty again this year, like we did last year, to evaluate President Capilouto and provide input to the Board of Trustees during their annual review that they will be doing I think in the summer.

I wanted to again remind everyone that the National Conference on Undergrad Research will take place on campus April 3<sup>rd</sup> to the 5<sup>th</sup>, that's a Thursday through Friday. It's in three weeks. There are many individuals

from across campus that have been involved in this. We wanted to thank all of those people.

The website is printed on the slide. Classes -- did you have a question?

BUTLER: Yeah, I do. J.S. Butler, Grad School. I'm a statistician.

It looks like there are three days, but only two days of the week?

BLONDER: Say that again.

BUTLER: 3, 4, 5, but only two days of the week.

BLONDER: Oh, it continues on Saturday. That's an error. I'm sorry.

BUTLER: Thank you.

BLONDER: Yes. So the classes scheduled in impacted classrooms are being redirected to attend the conference. And other classes are invited to attend the conference at the discretion of the instructor.

If you have additional questions about this please contact David Timoney in the Registrar's Office. And please encourage faculty colleagues to release their classes

with an assignment to participate.

Some of the facts about the conference, we have 295 UK students who are attending and over 3,900 registrations overall, which makes this the largest NCUR to date, topping the 2013 numbers by about 800 participants.

You can see the statistics on the oral presentations, posters, performing arts, et cetera. There's a plenary session, number 2, Thursday dinner that features Kris Kimel of the Kentucky Science and Technology Corp, Big Ideas Start at Crazy.

There's a Sundry Best concert Friday and various excursions on Saturday and the plenary talks will be live-streamed. And the students are creating a mobile app that will be finalized soon. Any student or faculty can sign up for the Thursday dinner and the Saturday excursion at the website.

There is a roll out now of Presentation U that's underway. Fifty-plus faculty applied for the first cohort of Faculty

Fellows. That includes 27 faculty who represent 11 different colleges and 22 disciplines.

Over the next three semesters the first cohort will attend workshops on topics focused on visual communication, written communication and oral communication delivered via flat print, face-to-face, and technology-enhanced channels.

The second Faculty Fellows cohort will begin in the fall of 2014 and a call for applications will be distributed widely in April. So please keep your eye out for that.

This is my Chair report now. The Senate Council usually has an annual meeting, sometimes more often, with President Capilouto.

So we met with the President on February 24<sup>th</sup> and discussed various topics,

many which were discussed in this meeting. And those included the budget efforts in Frankfort, undergraduate population and resources, entrepreneurship, campus infrastructure, participation of the Senate's



Academic Facilities Committee, that's chaired by Alice Christ, in the process to hire a replacement for the Vice President for Facilities Management, Bob Wiseman, who will retire in a few months.

Now I'd like to call Connie Wood up to the podium. Connie is going to give a Vice Chair report.

WOOD: It's that time of year again in the Senate Council soliciting nominations for the Outstanding Senator Award. This award is aimed at recognizing a current or former Senator for outstanding contributions to the University Senate in one of the following areas:

outstanding service on one or more Senate committees, actual effective leadership on the Senate floor, or communicating with the faculty in general, and in general in promoting or generating the ideas of shared governance and the goals of the Senate as a whole.

This year's committee is myself, Debra Anderson, and Katherine McCormick. I would like to remind you that Senate Council

members are not eligible and you can also nominate someone who has served previously in the Senate.

Please forward your nominations directly to me with a short explanation of the contribution that the individual has made in one of the areas that we are hoping to promote and please send them to me emailed no later than Tuesday, 5:00, on April the 15<sup>th</sup>.

And this is exactly the contributions, in one or more of these areas, University Senate, active service on the committees, substantive contributions in communicating, not only with the Senate but with the faculty, strong voice on the faculty floor and in the community and region, and defended the principle of shared governance, and is effective in generating or promoting, I would say, the Senate's larger agenda and goals.

So please send your nominations directly to me and then this will be awarded at the May faculty meeting. Thank you.

BLONDER: Thank you, Connie.

Next we have a Parliamentary report by J.S. Butler from the Graduate School, the Martin School of Public Policy. J.S.?

BUTLER: Occasionally when the Senate body passes something and then wishes to revisit it, if the revisiting consists of either appealing or subsequently altering then that should be handled by ordinary main motions.

However, once in a while the Senate body passes something, it finds it has made a mistake, a number, a word, an edit, something unintended occurred as a result of some sort of misunderstanding, ordinarily a version of some sort of proposal may have been passed.

In any of these situations appeal is hardly the correct description. The correct thing to do is reconsider it, that means the same thing in ordinary life as it does here.

So we do have a matter later where the Senate passed something but there was a mistake in the proposal, unintended mistake, reconsidering merely means okay, we voted but we're going to go back and look at it

again because there was something wrong with the way it was stated.

It's not a repeal, it's literally reconsideration in an ordinary, neutral, non-negative sense. And that is what we'll be doing a little later with two items.

GROSSMAN: So who gets to decide whether an item should be reconsidered and we all vote on it again?

BUTLER: First, anyone may move to reconsider who voted in the winning side. As a matter of question (inaudible) that's easy. So anyone who either voted successfully to pass or defeat an item may move to reconsider.

Second, the motion to reconsider requires a majority. You can't simply say I'd like to go talk about something again, no you can't do that. You have to have a majority to go back and look at it again.

And finally, all that does is bring the motion back on the floor, exactly like it was, undoes the vote, and we proceed as usual. Does that help? (Inaudible).

BLONDER: Thank you J.S.

BUTLER: You're welcome.

BLONDER: Next item on the agenda is Andrew Hippisley, Chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee, he's going to be presenting the proposed new BA/BS in Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies. Andrew?

HIPPISLEY: Thank you. So we have a recommendation that the University Senate approve for submission to the Board of Trustees the establishment of a new BA/BS program, Writing, Rhetoric, and Visual Studies within the proposed new department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Visual Studies within the College of Arts and Sciences.

(Inaudible). It will train students to enter professions which require skills in writing and advocacy both in the old and the new media. As such, the plan is to have students enter careers that include publishing, business, industry, and non-profit organizations.

Students will be able to recognize

value and understand different cultural perspectives as they learn to express their own critical stances clearly and effectively.

Currently, in the states, there are 68 other institutions which offer such a program. Some of those within their own departments, and that number is climbing all the time, these include, for example, University of Texas Austin and the University of Rhode Island and MSU.

The program is 45 credits, including 6 free electives. There will be two core courses, one which will be called Instruction to WRDS and there will also be a senior project course. There will be a bunch of electives including Business Writing, Professional Writing, The Essay, Visual Rhetoric, Digital, and Composing.

There will be two courses outside the major, for example, this could be COM 315 Business Communication.

There are also within this degree program three course plans, which are meant to

approximate three subdisciplines, Professional Writing, Rhetoric, Theory and Practice, and Digital Studies.

The assessment and administration plans are rigorous. There are letters of support from all stake holders including the Department of English, Communication and Information Science, and the College of Fine Arts.

BLONDER: So we have a motion on the floor recommending that the Senate approve the establishment of a new BA/BS in Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies in the Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies within the College of Arts and Sciences.

Is there discussion? Questions? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you, Andrew.

Next is the item that J.S. Butler was referring to. So at our last meeting we voted to confer two honorary degrees on two individuals.

However, we voted to confer an

Honorary Doctorate of Letters and that was a clerical error. We should have conferred Honorary Doctor of Humanities on these individuals. A Doctor of Letters is the more specific type of honorary degree, referring to people that are involved in literature, poetry, that kind of thing.

So Humanities is the appropriate degree to confer and in order to do this we have to go through these series of motions. So I'm going to be soliciting motions from the floor.

And the first one that I'd like to solicit is a motion that the Elected Faculty Senators, this is just Elected Faculty Senators, reconsider the recommendation of an Honorary Doctor of Letters for Harrison B. Wilson, II. Someone?

WASILKOWSKI: So moved, Greg Wasilkowski.

BLONDER: Thank you. Is there a second?

BRION: Second, Gail Brion.

BLONDER: Thank you. Next, I need a motion -- what?

BUTLER: Vote.



BLONDER: I'm sorry. I forgot.

BUTLER: Discussion and vote.

BLONDER: We have a motion on the floor, is there discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries.

Now we can reconsider. So the next to motion I'd like to solicit is that the Elected Faculty Senators amend the original motion concerning an Honorary Degree for Harrison B. Wilson, II to be a Doctor of Humanities instead of a Doctor of Letters.

Would someone be willing to make this motion?

WASILKOWSKI: So moved.

BLONDER: Is there a second?

BROTHERS: Names, please.

ANDERSON: Second. Debra Anderson.

BLONDER: Is there discussion of this? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

This is the amended motion then, that the Elected Faculty Senators approve Harrison B. Wilson, II, 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 honorary degree to be conferred by the Board. Would somebody be willing to make this motion?

BUTLER: It's on the floor.

BLONDER: It's on the floor, we don't need to make a motion. Do we need to discuss?

BUTLER: Vote. Discuss if you want to discuss. Vote.

BLONDER: Discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

BUTLER: This slightly tedious procedure has successfully corrected our clerical error

with  
out  
(ina  
udib  
le)  
to  
anyo  
ne's

degr  
ee.  
It  
was  
our  
erro  
r, we  
fixe  
d it.

We have one more fix to do now.

So this is our second Honorary Degree Candidate, Paul W. Chellgren. I'd like to solicit a motion from the floor that the Elected Faculty Senators reconsider the recommendation of an Honorary Doctor of Letters from Paul W. Chellgren.

ILAHIANE: So moved.

BROTHERS: Name please?

ILAHIANE: Hsain Ilahiane.

BLONDER: Is there a second?

WASILKOWSKI: Second, Greg Wasilkowski.

BLONDER: Discussion? All in favor?

Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

BLONDER: Next I'd like to solicit a recommendation that the Elected Faculty Senators amend the original motion concerning an Honorary Degree for Paul W. Chellgren to be an Honorary Doctor of Humanities instead of an Honorary Doctor of Letters. Would someone like to make this motion?

CHRIST: So moved, Alice Christ.

BLONDER: Is there a second?

WASILKOWSKI: Second, Greg Wasilkowski.

BLONDER: Discussion? All in favor?  
Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries.

Next we have a motion on the floor that the Elected Faculty Senators approve Paul W. Chellgren 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 honorary degree to be conferred by the Board. Any discussion of this? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you very

much.

Next, we have Andrew Hippisley, Chair of Senate's Academic Programs Committee, presenting a proposed new JD/MHA Dual Degree Program. Andrew?

HIPPISLEY: This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new dual degree program between the Juris Doctor's degree within the College of Law and the Master's in Health Administration degree within the College of Public Health.

This proposed dual degree structure follows the model of the currently active JD/MBA, JD/MA and JD/MHA, that's the Masters in Public Health programs. Instead of having two degrees in tandem, a student entering the degree program can count 9 credits of the MHA course work towards the Law degree and 9 credits of the Law course work towards the Health degree, and then that results in the saving of 18 credits for the student.

So currently, the Law degree requires 90 credits, but as a student of a dual

degree, the student does 81 credits. Currently, the Health degree requires 54 credits. This now becomes 45 credits. And the result is that the time to do the degree will reduce from five years to four years. 144 credits becomes 126 credits.

Exactly what the shared courses are depends on the aspirations of the student. So advising by the DGS of both degree programs will be a crucial element to making this work.

There are examples given in the proposal that include legal type health courses such as HA 603 Health Law and health type legal courses such as LAW 832 Medical Liability.

The proposers also provide links to web sites which give (inaudible) list of all courses and of course that web site will be available to all students.

The admission requirements to the dual degree program are a strict union of the requirements of the Health program and the Law program. So because there is no part-time status options for the Law program, there can

be no part-time status option for the dual degree as a whole.

BLONDER:                   So we have a motion on the floor from Senate Council that the Senate approve the establishment of a new dual degree program between Juris Doctor's degree within the College of Law and the Master's in Health Administration within the College of Health.

                          Is there discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you, Andrew.

                          Next we have the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee, Greg Wasilkowski, proposed new Department of Urology in the College of Medicine. Greg?

WASILKOWSKI:           This is a recommendation from the Senate Council that the University Senate endorse the creation of the Department of Urology in the College of Medicine.

                          So it turns out that out of 20 top programs in Urology, 18 are separate departments. That's one reason why Urology, which is currently within the Department of

Surgery, would like to create their own department.

All faculty of Urology is in favor of this transition. Both the Provost and the Dean of College of (inaudible) gave very strong support for the proposal and also stated that no additional resources are needed. There is a very strong support from the Chair of Surgery and from the College of Medicine and Faculty Council.

At the request of our committee, there was followed a voting among all faculty in the Department of Surgery and the result are as follows: 28 were positive votes, 9 were against, majority 36, did not respond.

Also, as a history, already three programs that were within the Department of Surgery became separate departments, and as stated by the Dean of the College of Medicine, three of them were successful transitions and are functioning very, very well. So we didn't see any reason why not to endorse this proposal.

BLONDER: So we have a recommendation from



Senate Council that the University Senate endorse the creation of the Department of Urology in the College of Medicine.

Is there discussion? Questions? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you, Greg.

Next, Greg Graf, are you here? Yes, you're here. So this is a Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee presenting. This is a positive recommendation from Senate Council and I'll let Greg present this.

GRAF: So the proposal is for a new Medical Laboratory Technician to MLS or Medical Laboratory Science track in the MLS program in the College of Health Sciences.

MLT is a two year Associates degree offered through other regional community colleges and technical schools. Individuals holding an MLT will find themselves unable to advance in managerial positions and may not be able to obtain Board certification without a Bachelor's degree from an accredited program by

accrediting agency for Clinical Laboratory Sciences.

The proposed program will provide a mechanism for practicing MLTs to obtain upper level MLS course work while continuing to practice in their place of employment.

The Bachelor's in MLS is an 120 hour credit program. Each year UK general ed core require prerequisites in upper level MLS didactic and practical training.

The typical MLT program at a regional institution is 99 to 100 hour program that meets most, if not all, general ed UK core requirements.

Enrollees in MLT to MLS program under the proposal would have to complete all of those UK general core requirements and of course MLS prerequisite course work.

At issue is that the Senate Rule 4.2.1.2 caps transfer of credits from two year institutions at 67, thereby preventing MLT degree holders from enrolling in MLT to MLS track without taking courses at a four year

institution, they either satisfy general ed core requirements, or that they have already completed and/or enrolled in additional course work that while undoubtedly would have some educational value are not required by our general MLS Bachelor's degree students.

Therefore the faculty of MLS programs requested an exception to Senate

Rule 4.2.1.2 that will allow MLT to MLS enrollees transfer a maximum of 80 credit hours from a two year institution.

The Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee met and discussed the issue with Dr. Michelle Butina, who developed the proposal, and we consulted with the Chair of the Senate Rules and Elections Committee, Dr. Jones, to discuss the implications of such a rule change.

So in the absence of the exception, a minimum of 13 additional credit hours would be required for MLT to MLS (inaudible). Most of these individuals are non-traditional students working in hospital and clinical labs,

and completing this additional course work would be redundant and perhaps not expected of our traditional MLS students, and in many cases is difficult to satisfy for non-traditional students.

The program is expected to be small with an initial enrollment of five and maximum of about 20 students. The 80 transferred credit hours will assure that at least 25 percent of the course work hours are completed at UK thereby satisfying SAASC accreditation requirements.

So based on these reasons we've recommended positively to Senate Council.

BLONDER: So we have a motion on the floor that the University Senate make an exception in Senate Rule 4.2.1.2 for the BHS in Medical Laboratory Science to allow the transfer of 80 credit hours toward this University of Kentucky degree. Let me just show you how this would look.

This is the proposed exemption language for the Senate Rule that will be

codified once we pass this.

So if you look down to number 1, a year ago I think we made an exemption for the RN/BSN program to allow up to 90 semester hours.

So presumably, the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, once we pass this motion, would insert number 2 in the Senate Rules to allow this program to have a maximum of 80 semester hours transferred. So that's just to show what the plan is.

BRION: Gail Brion, College of Engineering.

I'm curious. The exemption has opened more programs within the Medical College.

Is this setting a precedent that the programs in the Medical College don't have to follow the rest of the University regulations?

GRAF: That's a bit of a loaded question, I would say.

BRION: I'm asking --

GRAF: That said, the medical field is an area in which a number of Associates degrees of

a technical nature are typically awarded and there are, of course, also Bachelor's degrees in those programs.

So I don't know that it's necessarily that the Medical College is operating under a different set of rules. They have degrees of medical training or a technical nature are such there are Associates degree programs which then require if people want to continue on to a Bachelor level program puts them in a position where overcoming our 67 rule transfer of rules have disadvantages for those particular students.

BRION:                   And you recognize that other students coming in are often disadvantaged as well.

GRAF:                   Is that a question?

BRION:                   That are coming into programs like Engineering or that they often have to take more credit hours to come into the program. I'm worried about setting a precedent that these types of programs would continue to request exemptions from this rule would then make this

rule not a rule.

GRAF: Well, I did ask Dr. Jones about whether or not this was an obsolete rule. In other words, why do we have the rule, what is the point of it. His response was -- and I don't want to speak on behalf of Dr. Jones.

BRION: Let him speak for himself.

JONES: Well, nothing profound --

BLONDER: Can you identify yourself?

JONES: Davy Jones, Toxicology.

If you chase this back, this 67 hours got into the Senate Rules in 1968/69. That was when President Oswald was here and he was starting the community college system.

And there was a lot of suspicion going on here at UK on main campus about the quality of the instruction that was going on in these outreach centers of the community colleges.

And so to keep their fingers on this the Senate put that 67 hours in to make sure that students weren't coming in unprepared, to some over quality programs, out of a community

college, that's the historical background for 67.

BRION: Davy, is not behind this thinking as well that we don't want to give UK degrees that are actually substantially completed somewhere else?

JONES: That's a philosophical question. SAASC has said no more than 90. So they made the decision for us no more than 90, but where between 90 and 67 it ought be changed, if it ought be changed... That's a very good question --

BRION: Did the Council on Postsecondary Education have anything to add to this  
disc  
ussi  
on?

JONES: No. The only external force on us is the 90.

BRION: Thank you.

LEE: I have a question.

BLONDER: Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

LEE: Chad Lee, College of Ag Food



Environment.

Bullet point 1 has a grade point average value in it. Does bullet 2 assume the same?

GRAF: So the students coming in would have to be in good academic standing for those courses to transfer as it has in the proposal although it's not codified in the language of this particular rule.

McCormick: Katherine McCormick, College of Education.

Do we have any data from Nursing that this has been a problem? I don't know what date that began, but I'm curious if their outcome data suggests that those students were less prepared than students who attended (inaudible).

LOWRY: Gina Lowry, College of Nursing. I'm head of RN/BSN option.

The students do extremely well. It has not been a problem. And I would just

like to say, when I first took over this position, which I think was in 2001, we

accepted all hours from the KCTCS system because it was part of UK at that time.

It was only when it broke off and became separate that this 67 hour limit applied to those KCTCS students.

BLONDER: Other questions?

We have a motion on the floor. All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you, Greg.

Next we have Dr. Davy Jones discussing the University of Kentucky-University of Louisville Joint Conferral of Executive MBA. Davy?

JONES: Would you like to read the slide?

BLONDER: Yes. So the recommendation from the Senate Council is that the Senate recommend to the Board of Trustees that the Board approve an institutional agreement with the University of Louisville for joint conferral of the Executive MBA. That would be the motion that we vote on.

JONES: This is a kind of action that

occasionally rarely comes to University Senate. It's not a routine action.

And this is where the University Senate would be recommending to the Board of Trustees, the UK Board of Trustees, that it enter into some kind of institutional agreement with another institution's board.

We have that kind of a situation here. To give you an example of a previous one, there is a joint Engineering degree program between University of Kentucky and WKU.

In that particular program, which goes back about ten years I guess now, part of the WKU faculty provides course work, part of the UK faculty provides course work together. The students are satisfying the requirements for the Civil Engineering degree.

This is an example of a diploma that is for students that are in that program. You can see both institutions are listed. A single degree is being awarded jointly by the two Boards.

In the current situation, the -- so

what we have here is the Master's of Business Administration at the University of Kentucky, it has four concentrations within the Master's. You can see here the names of each and when they were approved.

The first three are all UK delivered. The one that says Greek, UK is delivering that in Greece, but it's UK delivered. And for the first three it's just a UK degree that's conferred.

In the Executive concentration, that concentration has already been approved by Senate processes. It's in place, it exists. The academic approval, that has already been done. That's not what's on the Senate floor today.

And they're not the same as the WKU Engineering degree but in a way, the faculty here and the faculty at the University of Louisville are jointly contributing to the course work that the students are taking.

The outcome of that collaborative venture right now, if no action is taken would

be that the students would be receiving two identical degrees from each of the two institutions.

The default is there will be dual degrees. So the students will have to have on their CV both degrees listed, they'll have to explain to their employers why they have two identical degrees.

So what the Gatton College faculty have voted to propose and the Graduate Council has supported, the Senate Council has supported, is that the Senate recommend that the UK Board of Trustees enter into an institutional arrangement with the University of Louisville Board so that there would be a single diploma awarded, a single degree awarded.

This has the same flavor as the joint degree that we have with WKU for Engineering.

So that's the mechanical background. So the issue is not the academic content of the program, the Senate's already approved that, is recommending to the Board that

what would be two identical degrees become jointly awarded as a single degree.

Only the University of Kentucky Board can make an institutional agreement with another institution so that's why this has to go to the Board of Trustees.

BLONDER: Thank you, Davy. So we have a motion on the floor from Senate Council that the Senate recommend to the Board of Trustees that the Board approve an institutional agreement with the University of Louisville for joint conferral of the Executive MBA.

Is there discussion?

PORTER: Todd Porter, Pharmacy.

I'll ask the obvious question, who gets top billing?

JONES: Not on the agenda right now is what will the diploma display. Assuming that this goes to the Board and the Boards agree, then it will come back to the Senate. And we're the final decision-maker on that, what will the diploma display.

There's already some sense of, you

know, are we going to make it left to right versus up and down, you know, that will come to us to decide.

PORTER: Does the University of Louisville get to have some say in that as well or not?

JONES: Yes, that's exactly what is going to go on.

GROSSMAN: We'll have to have a conference committee.

PORTER: Is it going to be arm wrestling or a cage battle?

JONES: This is a collaborative enterprise (inaudible).

BLONDER: Any other questions? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

Next item on the agenda, Stephen Testa, who is Chair of the Senate's Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure. He's going to give the 2012-2013 Annual Report. Stephen?

TESTA: I'd like to start with a little correction. On the front form it says that the committee is the committee on promotion and

tenure, but it's actually the committee on privilege and tenure.

And so we hear a lot of cases -- I'm from the College of Arts and Sciences, by the way -- we hear a lot of cases of people who feel like their privilege has been affected negatively, and we hear these cases and then we make recommendations to the President of the University Senate who happens to be the President.

In the past year and a half that I've been Chair, we've seen three cases. That alone I think is pretty good because it was just four years ago that I think there were nine cases. So the least people appealing I think is a good sign.

In those three appeals we had one person who we felt that their privilege was -- I'm searching for a word that keeps disappearing on me -- but we made a recommendation to the President to reassess one promotion case and the President has agreed with us.

And so we're required to make, my



committee is required to make a yearly report and I'll make this report fairly quick. You have the writing of the report in the meeting document that you have.

Most of the recommendations are just recommendations that people follow the rules that we already have. So I'm not going to go over them again, but you should read that.

We also made a few clarification requests for rules. One regarding lecturers and one regarding the automatic delay probationary period where the wording is a little confusing. And I hear that that's already happening.

And then we made a final recommendation that the University Senate consider a mechanism, a new mechanism, to allow faculty to appeal their DOEs.

We keep hearing cases of, really most of the cases are from junior faculty, who feel like they're being forced into DOEs that, we keep agreeing with them, seem very

inappropriate. And oftentimes they will talk to their Chair, and we will talk to their Chair, and they will talk to their Dean, and the situation is not fixed.

So I recommend that the Senate consider some kind of mechanism to allow faculty to appeal their DOE that does not go through the Chair of their Department and not to the Dean of their College.

BLONDER: Thank you, Stephen. Are there questions? Yes.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.

Just a comment that a little while ago I believe the Senate recommended the formation of a faculty and staff ombud position. And that would be an appropriate place I think for these DOE problems to be considered. That got put on hold. I'm not sure exactly what the status is, but perhaps that's something that could be revisited.

BLONDER: Davy?

JONES: Davy Jones, Toxicology.

Is it your perception, the

committee's perception that most of the problem is that the faculty of the cases that are being considered didn't understand the regs in a way that has negatively affected how their dossier wound up finally looking or if the administration didn't understand, or both?

TESTA: I don't really it's a situation of either side not understanding. The people who come to us seem to understand the DOEs are inappropriate.

JONES: I mean not the tenure cases, promotion cases, the more general cases you get, not the DOE situation.

TESTA: Oh, can you ask the question again?

JONES: Is the problem you get when tenured cases are denied and that they come to you, that the junior faculty really needed to understand the regs in the second and third year and didn't or they did and --

TESTA: Oh, oh. Absolutely. Junior faculty in general put a blindfold on about the regulations and things like that. And when they come to us when they have problems, they

generally don't know the rules. It's a big problem.

And it's an unfortunate problem because the rules are -- most of them are pretty thorough. Things are really laid out pretty well in most situations.

JONES: Could our Provost comment on plans to rectify that?

RIORDAN: Sure. We've actually started a workshop series and there was one just last week down I think in the Bio Pharm, kind of Medical Center. So we've run probably about three or four workshop series on promotion and tenure and regulations that go along with that.

We each have about four faculty members that serve on a panel, that go through the process and looking at what's associated with it.

We'll continue to bring it up with the Deans and the Department Chairs. We're meeting twice a semester with all of our academic leadership so I can certainly put that on their agenda.

I think all of us as faculty have an obligation to help our colleagues understand that it's their responsibility to take charge of their career as well.

We'll continue to look at ways that we can get the word out. Because I couldn't agree more with Steve that it's a shame that they don't know the regulations when they go up.

So if you have other ideas beyond the workshops, and having leadership in us as colleagues, I'm certainly open to ideas on how to get that word out.

BLONDER: Chris, I do have one suggestion. I've noticed that Steve is not participating in these workshops and I think it would be very beneficial, given the knowledge that he and his committee have, if he were possibly invited to attend. He could be more specific about the problems that the junior faculty might face or they need to look at, that kind of thing.

RIORDAN: I think GT was just giving him a buy until Spring because the workload is so heavy right not, but we'll definitely --

BLONDER:                   Okay.  We can talk about that.

RIORDAN:                   Yeah.  I think he's just got so  
much on his plate, GT was just trying to give  
him a little bit of a buy, but we'll definitely  
tap into that.

GROSSMAN:                  No more buys.

TESTA:                     No more buys.  It was nice while it  
lasted.

BLONDER:                   Are there any other questions?  
Yes.

BRION:                     Gail Brion.  
Christine, any reconsideration of a  
faculty ombud?

RIORDAN:                   You know, I actually have not heard  
that it was recommended from the University  
Senate.  
I have seen the recommendation come  
forward from the Staff Senate and I know that  
was not accepted last year.  So there has not  
been any resurfacing of that, idea of having  
that position as far as I know.

BLONDER:                   Debra?

ANDERSON:                  Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.

I was actually on that committee and it was a joint faculty/staff committee.

RIORDAN: Yeah. And I think sometime last year the President made the determination not to go forward with an ombud's position.

ANDERSON: Right. At that point, but he didn't close the door completely, I remember that.

GROSSMAN: I believe he said not now but maybe in the future.

RIORDAN: Since I've been here for eight months, it's come up once and it was still no. That was early in the Fall. I can certainly resurface that question because I think the point is valid in having some resource. I'd be more than happy to.

ANSCHER: I'm Laura Anshel, I work in the Ombud Office for an academic ombud, and I think it can easily be slipped in without a lot of revenue, finding one more staff person (inaudible).

RIORDAN: Yeah. We traditionally reserve that for students but that may be a good

way to leverage some of our resources.

Absolutely. Great.

BLONDER: Are there other questions?

TESTA: Maybe I'll make a quick comment.

BLONDER: Yes.

TESTA: I'm not speaking in favor or not in favor of a faculty ombud, but by the time we see people who have a problem with their DOE, it's really too late to do anything about it. And people aren't going to come see my committee until it's too late.

So, you know, one thing to keep in mind is that it is important to give to people who are having an ongoing problem, before they reach the stage where they have to come in, some mechanism to be heard, where things can be changed, whatever that is. I don't know what that is.

RIORDAN: You know, I agree with him in terms of that as well. So let me just tell you about one of the other initiatives we have going on right now. I think it's probably the first time we've actually run the data, but we do have the



DOE distribution now by college. And we're also starting to drill it down into the department level.

So we're starting to look for patterns that are out of wack in many cases and then we'll be able to drill it down also to the individual level.

So one thing is to get this transparency reporting, I think is really important, and that way we can start looking for inconsistencies in that data. So our meeting in early February with the Deans was cancelled. It will be presented to the Deans on our next meeting, which is I think March 24<sup>th</sup> or 26<sup>th</sup> or something like that.

JONES: Historically, DOE assignments end with the Dean's signature. It's going on below the radar of the Provost. I'm encouraged to hear that you like the radar to be blipping to some extent on that.

RIORDAN: We're looking pretty extensively because we want to look across the areas. And in fact, you know, we think about the strategic

plan, one of the things that's coming out from the committees, particularly around our faculty and staff, is some emphasis on professional development.

So we're also looking at how many people have actually put professional development as part of the DOEs.

And so there will be a number of places that I think we're going to start getting reinforcement on developing our faculty and making sure the policies and practices are clear and transparent, and that we've got some outlets for them to go to outside of perhaps the normal channels. Good conversation.

BLONDER: Are there other questions?

LEE: Chad Lee, College of Ag.

Is this a breakdown of the junior faculty member, in your opinion, Stephen, or the breakdown of the administration and senior faculty not properly giving guidance, or is it a combination of both?

And I guess part of my question, is the faculty member struggling with the DOE rules

and regulations and they don't know to go look for an ombud or anybody else before it's too late?

TESTA: Well, I've seen both junior faculty and non-junior faculty. You know, if you can imagine, and you've probably seen it at some point.

And, you know, it's a matter of education, whether they -- you have to educate them when they come in during your orientations, to tell them to look at the rules and to know if there are problems then you can talk to people.

But, you know, the issue is really with the junior faculty, that's what we really see. We really feel like it's a one-sided, in some cases, we really feel like it's a one-sided negotiation.

You know, from a rule point of view, the faculty member negotiate and they sign. And so we have people who sign on things they really didn't agree with. But when you look at the rules, they signed. Right? And

so, you know, you think of that like a contract.

So that's the issue I'm trying to  
-- I hope I answered your questions.

WASILKOWSKI: Greg Wasilkowski, Engineering.

I believe that it would be good to have some  
rather detailed guidelines for each Dean in  
every unit, every college.

I don't know how my friend, how  
much (inaudible), I have this 45 percent and  
that he has more or less. It would be good to  
know what is the standard, what should be each  
activity on average, how -- not percentage,  
would know the exact (inaudible) some unit.

BLONDER: Davy?

JONES: Davy Jones, Toxicology.

Actually, Greg, your idea is so  
good, it's already in the regulations.

In the administrative regulation on  
differentiated distribution of effort, it says  
at both the college and the department levels  
the faculty are to be involved in making policy  
about how the DOEs are going to be assigned.  
Now to the extent to which that is exercised

varies from one college to another.

WASILKOWSKI: I have been talking to three Chairs about this and nothing is happening.

BLONDER: Nancy?

SCHOENBERG: Nancy Schoenberg, College of Medicine.

I served on our college's AAPT Committee for many years, seven years or so, and what we found oftentimes in our committee was that the Department Chairs and/or the Divisions Chiefs were unable to articulate a clear vision of what DOEs are. And that it really fell to them as well as the junior faculty person to have that discussion on a reasonably frequent basis, so say during performance evaluations, and without that kind of dialogue it would fall through.

So our recommendation at times, and also serving on the College of Medicine Faculty Council, was to have some sort of training session for the Chairs and for the Division Chiefs.

ILAIHAINE: Hsain Ilahaine, A and S.

I was going to raise the issue of cultivating some sort of created membership within the unit or something like that, a role of mentors in the department (inaudible).

BLONDER: Some units do have membership policies, but I think it's varied. Bob?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.

Just one more comment about DOEs.

The drastic differences between DOEs among different colleges and the fact that people felt like they could change their DOEs from being say 50 percent administration to 49 percent administration without changing any of their duties, and some Chairs being 0 percent administration or 1 percent administration.

It was these kinds of problems that caused the University to change the policy about how to determine whether someone was eligible to run or vote in faculty elections, to just be at the rank of assistant professor or higher, and if you're Chair or had administered at the appointment at the level of Chair or higher, cannot vote, just stopped looking at DOEs

because of these kinds of problems.

CONNORS: Eric Connors, College of  
Agriculture.

I don't have a question, this is  
more comment. I really (inaudible) oversight.

Several years ago I had a friend  
who using the college's normal prescribed set  
of percentage of effort (inaudible) and so  
forth, he came up to a DOE assignment, about 115  
percent, and he refused to sign it, whereupon  
he went to the University Council and the  
Council said, I wouldn't sign it either. So we  
really need to find some way of avoiding  
situations like that.

BLONDER: Gail?

BRION: Gail Brion, College of Engineering.

I have in the past refused to sign  
a DOE. But I'm not sure what that means because  
nothing ever happened after that.

BLONDER: Davy?

JONES: I know a case in Medicine where  
that happened, if that helps.

But in one case that I know it

happened was the Dean at that time just entered the person into the system with the Dean's declared DOE.

I know another case in which the faculty member was told you will not be paid beginning July 1 unless you submit and sign this.

I don't know which of those is the correct outcome.

BRION: Which again means that there needs to be a place saying I've seen this DOE, I can sign it saying that I've seen this DOE and it's been described to me, however, I do not agree with the way the percentages were assigned.

BLONDER: It seems like we need a task force on DOE.

RIORDAN: We are working on it.

BRION: I think that came out of Hollie Swanson's --

BLONDER: RQ.

BRION: RQ Committee was that there needed to be some sort of guidance. We do have a type of guidance on what a 3 credit course is worth



from the rules on instructors, it's worth 12 and a half percent.

And in mentioning this to several Deans and Chairmen, they have like grabbed their heart and fallen to the ground that they'd have to pay 12 and a half percent for the course.

So it's interesting that faculty can work for less of a percentage of their DOE than if they were instructors. I find that fascinating that we can do it faster and better.

WASILKOWSKI: Greg Wasilkowski.

I happened to be on this RQ Committee and we did a very detailed report, suggestions, and actually when I was on Senate Council, we had a meeting with GT, he agreed with 95 percent of our report. When I asked him which 5 percent didn't he agree and he didn't say.

RIORDAN: He's actively working with the departments and with the colleges around DOEs.

You know, you take 16 colleges and you have 16 different approaches for DOE,

quite frankly. He is working on them.

And like I said, we now have, I think for the first time ever, a University-wide look at the DOEs that's drilling it down into the departments.

So, you know, part of it is we need to get accurate data, rather than going off with anecdotes. And that really was the first place to start was to be able to assess what's going on and then we can start actively working in terms of how it should be modified.

BLONDER: Are there any other questions for Stephen? Katherine, did you want to say something?

McCORMICK: I would just like to make one final comment. I do think that the faculty need, or at least faculty going up for tenure, need to understand the relationship between the DOE and their dossier because I sat on a committee, I mean we look at that very carefully. If you were allocated this amount of time for research, yet you have two publications. I do think the

faculty need to be cognizant of the relationship because it is viewed as (inaudible).

RIORDAN:                   That's part of that work shop they're doing is to make sure the alignment of time is also matching what the promotion and tenure expectations are.

BLONDER:                   Okay. Are there any other questions for Christine? Thank you very much for the inspiring discussion. We've reached the end of our meeting, the next meeting will be April 14. Would someone like to make a motion to adjourn?

WASILKOWSKI:               So moved, Greg Wasilkowski.

BLONDER:                   Is there a second?

ANDERSON:                  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 29th day of June, 2014.

LISA GRANT CRUMP, COURT REPORTER  
AN/DOR REPORTING & VIDEO TECHNOLOGY, INC.

---

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