

SENATE MEETING

\* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \*

APRIL 14, 2014

\* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \*

LEE X. BLONDER, CHAIR  
CONNIE WOOD, VICE-CHAIR  
J. S. BUTLER, PARLIAMENTARIAN  
SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR  
LISA GRANT CRUMP, COURT REPORTER

\* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \*

BLONDER: I'd like to welcome you to the April University Senate meeting. Welcome Senators and guests.

I'm calling the meeting to order. Before we get started, because the agenda was not sent out six days in advance I need a motion to waive Senate Rule 1.2.3 to allow the Senate to consider the agenda.

The recommendation is that the Senate waive Senate Rule 1.2.3 to allow consideration of the agenda for April 14, 2014. Is there anyone that wants to make that motion?

WASILKOWSKI: So moved. Greg Wasilkowski, Engineering.

BLONDER: Is there a second?

second? Name please?

BROTHERS: Who was the

SNIPE: Susan Snipe.

BROTHERS: I'm sorry?

SNIPE: Susan Snipe.

BROTHERS: Thank you.

BLONDER: Thank you. Okay. All in favor?

Page 1

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries.

Okay. I'd like to just remind you to please sign in when you arrive. As you can see, this is very important. Give your name and affiliation when you speak, attend the meetings, respond to emails and web postings as appropriate, acknowledge and respect others, silence your electronic devices, and please communicate with your constituency.

We have some announcements. The minutes from March 10, 2014 we sent out, we did not receive any corrections. Would anyone like to make any corrections now? Hearing none, the minutes from March 10 stand approved as distributed by unanimous consent.

Next I have some announcements.

The Faculty Trustee election is proceeding. Trustee Irina Voro, as you know, is completing her term which ends June the 30th.

The term for the newly elected Trustee will be July 1st, 2014 to June 30, 2017. The nominating petition round is completed.

The top three vote getters in the preliminary round of voting will be conducted probably some time this week and we'll progress to a second and final round.

We had several additional nominees so we'll have more than - we have to do two rounds of elections as you saw.

So the second final round will be for the top three vote getters from the first round.

So be on the lookout for these emails and please vote.

Next just for your information, there was a change to the exam attendance policy for the graduate school. It clarifies procedures for (inaudible), participation and doctoral qualifying and final exams, and for masters final exam. And also language was added because we previously could not (inaudible) the masters final exams.

Next the Senate Council reviewed language to expand UK's non-discrimination policy to include gender expression and gender identity. The Senate Council endorsed the addition of these two terms and the revised language will be placed on the Senate agenda after it's developed by the Regulation Review Committee.

We have a revised new undergraduate program form that's being finalized. It will be longer than the current form. It will incorporate the CPE questions. But the intent is to capture all of the needed information from the outset.

So our committees won't have to go back and say can you provide this, you missed that. It will be a very comprehensive form.

The Senate Council, as you know, is conducting a campus-wide survey of the

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt  
faculty again to evaluate President Eli  
Capilouto and to provide input to the Board  
of Trustees who will be conducting their  
evaluation during the summer.

The survey was emailed to the  
faculty Tuesday, April 8th. It will be out  
there for three weeks and it will close  
Tuesday, April 29th. Please complete the  
survey and encourage your colleagues to do  
so.

Last year we had about a 32 percent  
response rate. We'd like to get above 50  
this time. So we really want to ensure the  
validity of the survey. So please fill out  
the survey and encourage the people that you  
work with to do so.

This is the month, April, where we  
traditionally thank and wish well the  
departing Senators who will not be coming  
back in the fall. So I would like all of you  
who are going to be departing after next  
meeting, please stand so we can recognize you  
for your service. Thank you.

Next is my Chair report. As many  
of you know Richard Greissman, the Assistant  
Provost in the Office of Faculty Advancement  
and Assessment, will be retiring from UK on  
June 30th.

Richard was the Provost Liaison to  
the Senate Council from 2004 to 2013, and he  
performed an invaluable service to faculty in  
that role and in his past and current  
positions.

To honor Richard the Senate Council  
is going to host a reception immediately  
prior to the May 5th Senate meeting. It will  
start at two o'clock and it's going to be in  
the gallery meeting room which is right next  
door to this room. And we'd like all of you,  
if possible, to attend. If you have  
colleagues that are close with Richard,  
please ask them to attend.

Also during the May Senate meeting  
we'll be honoring Richard.

Next is the Trustee Report, John  
Wilson.

WILSON: Good afternoon. As usual I want to  
give people an opportunity to ask me  
questions. I've just got a couple of  
comments about the last Trustee meeting and  
(inaudible).

Obviously, much of the discussion  
was focused on Frankfort and the legislature,  
on issues related to diversity, dining  
services, (inaudible) strategic plan.

I do want to highlight a couple  
things. One is at the actual Board meeting  
itself there was a student demonstration from  
students against sweatshops related to dining  
services, and also a presentation by one of  
the alumni trustees highlighting issues  
related to concerns about the dining services  
issues.

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

I think it's important that this is highlighted, both the demonstration and the remarks by the alumni trustee.

The concerns about that we're not just a bottom line corporation, that there are social justice issues, and there are social issues that are important to the values we all (inaudible) as an institution of higher learning.

I think that's highlighted for all the trustees, the importance of really understanding the implications of any sort of an arrangement that is developed related to dining services.

In that vein, I would urge folks, if you've had issues you want to discuss or share with the trustees, there's a single vehicle for presenting a copy to the Board of Trustees.

Many of us are surprised that more of these things don't happen and I would urge the students against sweatshops, although the demonstration which you can see on YouTube was effective at raising issues, to come and talk to the Board so that there could be a dialogue.

I think it's - I would urge folks to do that. And you can do this by contacting the Board's secretary. And if anybody has questions about it, I'd be more than (inaudible).

And secondly, I would urge you as leaders, to fill out the Presidential Evaluation Questionnaire. I can guarantee that this will be shared with the Trustees. And also that this will be publicly posted, the results are not secret in any way, shape or form.

We don't have a whole lot of time but I'd sure be happy to answer questions, or if guess if folks have a comment. Thank you. Always feel free to email or call me. I try to get back to people as soon as possible.

BLONDER: Thank you, John.

Next we have Provost Christine Riordan who's going to give an update on the strategic plan. Provost Riordan?

RIORDAN: I have to tell you I got completely busted by Lee. She was sitting there saying, we need to wait a few more minutes until we got quorum. And I was like, oh, I didn't sign in. And she said, you haven't been paying attention to the first item on my slide. So number 1 rule, sign in. And I ran back out and signed up.

I'm delighted to be here today. This is just the start of a conversation around the strategic plan. You know we've been having meetings with our strategic planning team since this summer.

And they've reached out, at various points and times, to community, faculty, staff, students, people outside of the

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

University, to really get input into the recommendations.

And now that we have some concrete recommendations we're going back out and having conversations again.

We had four forums last week. We had two today. There will be an open town hall tomorrow on undergraduate education.

And what I want to do is just focus a little bit on the process to date and then quickly turn it over to two of our working groups, the one on undergraduate education and the one on research so that they can give you a little bit of a highlight of what's happening. Does that sound like a good game plan?

So as I mentioned the process has really been going on since this past fall. You may recall in October we took to the Board six different areas or principles that they ratified around which we should at least think about for a strategic plan, undergraduate education, graduate education, research, infrastructure, a positive work environment for our faculty and staff, and our impact on the Commonwealth and the community.

As happens with most strategic plans, usually one of two things occur. The goals either get bigger or the areas get bigger, or they get shorter or smaller.

Can you guess what happened in our case? That will become obvious in just a minute.

So in December and January our teams were out, they were organized around those six areas, 103 people were involved in the process, 50 percent were faculty, 37 percent staff and 13 percent students.

And they were asked to really look at the research that's related to higher education. And most important, they really focus on issues as they relate to the University of Kentucky and where we are.

And I have to say the teams have done a great job of being honest about our strengths, being honest about our true challenges, and being honest about some opportunities. And we have all three.

So all of the recommendations that are coming forth from the strategic plan are anchored in their evaluation of trends and where UK sits within those trends, and as importantly, where we need to be headed.

So in February, early February, a trends document was released. It's up on our website. And as some of you have (inaudible) sent us feedback and that's terrific.

So now in January through March really they spent a lot of time planning, coming up with the ideas and the recommendations. And we've been now putting it into what we call kind of a pinata draft

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt  
document. And that is now what we're taking out to the campus to really get your feedback. So we'll hear from two groups today.

Based on feedback, and I'm not talking about kind of wordsmith feedback, sustain of good feedback, we'll be consolidating all of this feedback. We'll be looking for themes within that feedback.

We will revise the strategic plan based on those themes. Make sense?

So we won't be able to accommodate every single comment that comes to us. What we are looking for is consistency in comment, in themes around areas that we need to change or perhaps (inaudible) within the strategic plan.

If we're ready, as a campus, we will take it forward to the Board of Trustees in June, for their vote and ratification.

The process doesn't stop there. I want to name a couple of really important things.

The strategic plan is just that, accept a general broad direction for us. What really becomes important then is the implementation plan and how we can roll these things out as a campus.

There is a six year plan. There is no way in a six month period of time that we could articulate every single implementation detail that goes along with these broad strategies.

So what we're looking for in the next month is feedback along these broad strategies and then broad action.

In June we'll put together an implementation team that will keep this process and this strategic plan alive.

The other difference that I want to make a point about is that I know in the past strategic plans were rolled all the way down to the department level, meaning that each department had to have metrics that were perfect correlation with the University plan.

That has gone away. We are not requiring each department to align one-for-one with the metrics that are part of this plan.

We are asking all of the colleges and the units, however, to have strategic plans that align in some way, shape or form, with the overall University plan.

There is no university plan for a campus like ours that would meet a perfect correlation and should meet a perfect correlation with every unit on this campus. That's not leveraging the diversity of our campus. Does that make sense?

So in June, you know, we really are starting part of the implementation team. So that again creates a lot of conversation with this campus. And I hope the faculty will

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

continue to be engaged.

We will continue to have metrics in place and we'll monitor and adjust the process as we go along.

If this is a working plan we should be adjusting it. Six years is a very long period of time and we have to make sure we're staying on top of it and updating it as we go.

We have had a lot of community conversations and I'm very appreciative of the University Senate for co-sponsoring with my office a series of speakers that have come in and have talked from outside the University as well as inside the University, on hot topics.

We're going to continue those into the next fall. This week we have a student panel, a panel on student success, as an example. Last week we had Janet Weiss, who is the Dean of the Graduate School at the University of Michigan, as another example. And we'll continue those.

On the website which is [www.uky.edu/strategic-plan](http://www.uky.edu/strategic-plan), you click on calendar of events. We probably have close to 20 to 25 forums that are being conducted over the next month on the different parts of the plan. We're going to hear, discuss it, give feedback. We also are putting up a feedback box on the website where you can give your input there as well.

Any questions about the process?

We have had a lot of people involved. The planning committee is 103 people, but they really have not kept it within themselves. They've been spending a lot of time getting feedback on the trends as well as on the recommendations as they've been moving forward. About 785 people have been involved to date, and through these forums over the next month we hope to capture a lot of input from the rest of the community.

There's been a lot of focus groups and the teams really tried to understand what the issues are as well as the opportunities, all the different groups on campus. As an example, a research group that is going to be presented today met with all the associate deans for research as well as the 50 top funded researchers just to do focus groups and (inaudible).

We've also been reaching out outside of the University. We want to make sure that we're paying attention to what's happening and best practices of other universities. So we're conducting interviews with people like Janet Weiss from the University of Michigan around graduate education as an example.

We've been reaching out to our community here in the Commonwealth and

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

asking for them about their perspective on various things. So this has not been a process that's been conducted in isolation.

I won't go through these because they are in the trend report, and really it's my mission in life that everybody read that trend report. John did read it. He really appreciated it.

But it is a good report. It's fast. It's got bullets. It's got a lot of data in it.

As you can imagine, these are quite daunting trends that are impacting us and some places we do have great opportunities and other places we have great weaknesses.

We do know as an example, as John mentioned, we are being faced with some budget constraints from the state. That is a trend that will continue.

So we know in our strategic plan we have to think about how we create a sustainable financial future for the University of Kentucky. That's an easy one we have to pay attention to.

We also know as an example that graduate and professional education that we have fallen behind many of our other peer and aspirational institutions in how we're treating stipends and fellowships. So that is also addressed in our plan.

So the trend report was really used I think to inform many of the recommendations that were put forth.

This is a pie chart and I'm just going to highlight a few of these. Each one of the goals has a chart that is like this that talks about the strengths, and talks about the challenges and talks about opportunities. And we want to be realistic about it. So this is kind of what I call a global chart.

A couple of the obvious strengths that we have, and it's also opportunities for us, is we have an incredible breadth and depth on this campus that is unparalleled. There are only seven other universities in (inaudible) that have the same mixture of colleges and programs that we have.

That is an incredible opportunity as we think about how we move forward and how we leverage that.

Some of the challenges, I just mentioned one that we're all thinking about, the decrease in state and federal support. Many of our peer institutions have already faced this 10, 20 years ago. It's now our turn to really think about it and how we move forward. We can learn a lot from what other institutions have done.

Opportunities, I would say this is also a challenge. One of the things that I think about almost daily is we have an amazing opportunity to help our students



UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

succeed. We are 10 percentage points behind our peer institutions on retention.

They are at 92 percent retention, we're at 82 percent retention. We have not cracked that nut in a decade here at the University of Kentucky and that's a challenge we've got to hit head on as we look forward to the next five years.

So that's just a few examples from this chart. And as I mentioned there's overall and then there's some for each one of the areas.

You know, there's a couple of things, and I've had conversations with trustees and others, that these are what I call paradoxical questions that come up a lot. How can we be building, as an example, a thriving campus at a time when technology is being used to go outside the boundaries of your state? How can both coexist?

Another question that comes up, can you really be great at teaching and at research. That one comes up quite a bit. How do we really serve our land grant mission in the 21st century at a time when the state appropriations are retracting?

And the answer is that we must figure out the responses to all of these questions. And that's really what the strategic plan has done.

I think the President's mission is very clear. He has said this time and time again if you listen to any of his speeches when he talks about the passion that is here at the University of Kentucky is pretty clear. We must be a national model for being a thriving public residential research intensive institution.

And that means we need to highlight a few things that I think are very important, and as I've traveled the campus come out very clearly, we must be dedicated to student success at all levels. Undergraduate, masters, professional, doctorate.

We must think about serving our students in all ways in making sure they're successful.

We must focus on modernizing our residential campus. We do know that we have over a billion dollars in deferred maintenance on our campus. We do know we have a need for continued residential places. And we do know that we must engage in innovative technology to help us expand our reach. So we must do all of those.

We must place a top priority on being a top research institution. And you're going to see this come out in many of the goals that research is (inaudible), the undergraduate level, graduate level, and it has a goal in and of itself.

And then what I've heard very, very

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

clearly from across the campus and outside of the campus, is we have been an indispensable institution for the last 149 and a half years and we must continue to be an indispensable institution for the Commonwealth as we move forward.

And that means we do need think about our impact not only here in Kentucky, but in how it stands nationally and globally.

So our plan is really arranged around this vision. What I'd like to do is give you a highlight of three broad strategies and how the goals have played out and then quickly turn it over to some of our co-chairs that are going to talk about some specifics today.

So when we thought about what we needed to do as a campus, it really got organized around three broad strategies.

We must focus and strengthen our core mission which includes undergraduate education, graduate education, research and outreach.

When we think about how we're going to do it, we must create a community that really takes care of our people and focuses on that. So goals related to creating a positive work environment for our faculty and staff. And a goal that really highlights our need and our imperative to create a diverse inclusive campus where people of all identities can come and feel that they belong.

The last strategy is really our resource engine, what we talked about a lot I think in the last couple of years, but it is a strategy we need to continue to focus on. We must engage in smart growth, operational efficiencies and accountability as we move forward.

And that has two goals associated with it, transforming and continuing our transformation of the campus as well as developing a sustainable financial plan. Okay?

So these are the eight goals, create a vibrant undergraduate learning community, advance a high quality graduate and professional education portfolio, cultivate robust research, meaningful impact, positive work environment, place of collaboration, transformation of our campus, and a sustainable financial model organized under three broad strategies.

Does that make sense? Now I'm going to put the caveat on this because we are still wordsmithing. And so the content is staying the same, the words we use on some of these may be altered slightly.

Let me see if there's any questions about the process or where we are right now on these (inaudible).

So one of the things that really

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

makes the plan come to life a little bit more is thinking about how we measure our success. By 2020, how are we going to know we're successful on the strategic plan.

In all frankness, we have some of the metrics in place today and we're going to need to build some additional metrics to look at our success in these areas. Perfectly normal, but it is part of what we're focusing on right now, we're looking at how we can begin to measure our success and then what else we might need to put in place to measure that.

Over this next month, as I mentioned, we've got about 20 to 25 forums that are actively planned. We want conversations and community input into these ideas. And then we will continue to refine it and then put it forward for ratification.

Everything is up on the website. All of the town halls and forums are videotaped so you're more than welcome, if you can't see them, to go and watch them there as well.

So today's presenters, we've got the two that I think are of high interest and we'll bring in some others as we can, at least let you know about when the forums are, is our co-chairs from our working group, number 1, we've got Jane Jensen from the College of Education and Kim Anderson from the College of Engineering.

And then our co-chairs from working group 2 around research are Rodney Andrews who is the Director of our Center for Applied Energy Research and Lisa Cassis from the College of Medicine will be presenting.

So they're going to quickly go through, from a very high level perspective, some of their recommendations and tactics and then we'll kind of open it up for questions along the way.

ANDERSON:

As Chris

mentioned, I'm going to be

discussing the undergraduate emphasis of the strategic plan.

I do want to say that when I first started as co-chair and was asked to do this, I felt we would need about four or five times to put together a report and it would be filed and that would be the end of it.

And Chris has proven me wrong. We have been meeting since December, almost every other week, and we discuss through email.

There have been a lot of faculty, student, and staff input into this. And that's the exciting thing. Is it is student, staff and faculty driven.

As Chris has mentioned, the action items and the tactics that we're going to talk about today are really based on some strengths and some challenges that are

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt  
emphasized in the report, they're not on the slides, but I wanted to share some of these with you just to kind of get started. I won't read them all.

But some of the strengths that we identified, we have experienced five years of record-sized first year classes which have maintained academic quality above the national average. So that's one of our strengths.

We've seen significant growth in merit scholars. We've grown from 25 to 105 in just over two years. And we actually placed among the top 10 public institutions in the country.

Our Living Learning Programs have expanded and are growing. You can see that quite good across campus.

The honors program has expanded from 750 students overall in 2010 to 1400 in 2014. And there's plans to expand the honors program even further.

Revised UK core of degree requirements. So we have revised the core requirements emphasizing inquiry based learning and competency based learning outcomes. So that's a strength.

Some of our challenges that we have identified, and Chris already alluded to the low retention rates, we all know that we need to do some work on retention.

The other thing is even though our first year students exceed the performance of their peers, on three of five national survey of student engagement benchmarks, the UK seniors rate UK more poorly than do other counterparts at other research universities on three of the benchmarks.

8.8 percent of the freshman that arrive on campus are under-prepared. That's definitely a challenge.

And so those are the challenges and there's more emphasized in the actual report that you will see later that have really led us to what we had, our three - oh, I forgot to mention the working group.

This is our working group. So you do see there's quite a few faculty, staff and students that have been involved. I don't expect you to read those, but it's to emphasize that there have been a lot of our people involved.

So back to the actions. We have three actions that we have come up with based on our strengths and challenges. The first one is focus on integrated and interdisciplinary learning. The second one is engage in high-impact teaching and learning opportunities, and the third one is to achieve national excellence in speed and support to degree.

So under each of these I want to go through each of them and talk about the

tactics under each.

So tactic under the focus on integrated and interdisciplinary learning, we want to cultivate academic pride in the UK degree. So really infuse the undergraduate experience with a deep sense of intellectual pride so the students really feel like they're a part of UK and they understand the academic accomplishments that they achieve.

The next one is to increase multidisciplinary and transdisciplinary degree programs, certificates and dual degrees.

So we have existing strengths.

There are emerging areas that we need to explore and based on those provide students with a broad and multi-layered base of knowledge.

Expand the Living Learning Program. So you already see this happening on campus. We want to increase those opportunities for students to engage in living and learning and emphasize interdisciplinary education and make sure these living and learning programs are high impact and provide those high impact (inaudible) opportunities.

The fourth is embed high expectations and meaningful assessment of student learning to demonstrate the value of the UK degree. So we will build upon our UK core and leverage our institutional strengths to become a model for universities across the US and outcome centered learning.

And finally the fifth one is to expand opportunities for undergraduate enrichment programs. So we'll evaluate and increase capacity in programs of excellence such as the honors program, Global Scholars and University Scholars (inaudible).

So that was action 1.

Action number 2 is to engage in high impact teaching learning opportunities. So the tactics under there are to promote the use of pedagogical approaches.

So we know with technology we need to promote the use of state of the art learning experience for every student and recognize and support changing faculty roles as they start using these technological approaches.

Develop measures of instructional quality. So we will develop ways to recognize quality undergraduate education.

Create opportunities for the development of new instructional practices and reward exemplary teaching and mentoring of undergraduates.

The third one is increase and integrate undergraduate participation in research. So we had research strengths here, we want to try to engage more students in the research experience and even at the

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

beginnings of the freshman year.

The next one is increase and integrate student participation in experiential education of service-learning. So co-ops, internships, and service-learning opportunities.

Expand opportunities for learning abroad and engage the international community of the campus and Kentucky. So increasing our study abroad opportunities for our undergraduates.

Finally, action 3 which was achieve national excellence in student support to degree. This really kind of hits on the retention issues.

So the first one is to create a comprehensive transition model from recruitment and transfer to graduation. So really for our undergraduate students, provide a clear pathway for completion of degree.

Expand our extended orientation programs so that the students do graduate and are part of the retention process.

Improve the quality of academic advising. So critically examine the quality of our academic advising and provide some changes that would provide our students with an advising experience that meets their needs and eases their journey to degree completion.

The next one is blend advising with career services. We know that the ultimate goal is for these students to get out and have a career at the end. So combining the advising with the career services so they know from the beginning what their ultimate goal is and they can see the end, okay, through that.

And then finally, oh, not finally, develop predictive analytics of student progress. So really look at our early alert system, other systems where we can really track students as far as their progress is concerned, and really try to reach out to them early on to help them be successful if they're struggling.

And then finally, engage in college readiness and pre-UK programming to direct activities and partnerships. So looking at things like bridge programs, reaching out to our high schools and making sure that these students are ready to come to college. Working with the teachers to make sure that they're ready to come to college.

So those are the areas for the undergraduate and we're open for discussion or feedback.

JENSEN: Comments? Feedback?

BLONDER: Bob?

GROSSMAN:

Bob Grossman, A

and S.

So advising has been a real problem on campus ever since I came here. And we

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

keep changing models and from faculty only to mostly professional advisors, back to faculty. And nothing ever seems to budge that retention rate upward no matter how we do it.

I read an article in the New York Times (inaudible) all things educational. But it seems we're not the only ones struggling with it, everyone is struggling with problems with advising and what balance to have between professional advisors and faculty advisors.

So are there any new ideas about how to do some of this?

JENSEN: What you're describing is a change in the structure of advising from faculty to professional. And what's been happening nationally with some of the stuff that we looked at is a change in the purpose of advising, what the point of each of those sessions is.

We have the new system now, APEX, that takes some of the kind of the logistical stuff out of the way so that advising can be concentrated more on helping the students be better at self-discovery early on.

We know that we like to get students into their major as soon as possible but sometimes they need to be with this reflective processor before they go too far, so that they don't swirl back and forth within colleges as much and if they do they're doing so in a productive way and taking advantage of UK core and other things.

So it's a shift more in what we do inside of advising, in addition perhaps, to structural changes. But if that sounds like anything new, I hope, but maybe not.

the same article,

ANDERSON:

And it may be

there was an article in the Herald Leader this weekend about professional versus faculty advising. And I'm not even sure it's clear in there which is the best.

So I think everybody is struggling.

JENSEN: And also the earning the career, the whole process of what do you want to do after, what is the point of your degree, and getting the students to actually be thinking about that.

You'll notice we talk about recruitment, but what we don't say in the language here is reaching down into the high schools more and really talking to our perspective students more so that they - and giving them questions to think about and helping their guidance counselors understand the breadth of what UK can offer, that there's more than just the majors that your parents did. And get them to start thinking about that earlier, that's relatively new. And that's happening nationally when people start questioning the value of higher

education.

presented at the recent -

ANDERSON:

We just

at another forum and it was suggested that we even try to use alumni going to the high schools.

ALISON:

Jonathan Alison, A and S.

You mentioned it's only 8 percent students come to us unprepared. And then you mentioned we get 82 percent retention versus 92 percent in our benchmarks, what is the percentage of our benchmarks of the number of students who come to us unprepared? Is there a connection between that and -

ANDERSON:

That was the

national.

ALISON:

- and retention?

ANDERSON:

The number that

I gave you was the

national.

ALISON:

At 8 percent national?

ANDERSON:

Yes. That was

not at the

University of Kentucky.

ALISON:

So what is our percentage? Do we

know that?

ANDERSON:

We're about the

national average.

ALISON:

We're about the national average.

PFEFFER:

Sean Pfeffer, Business.

One of the things I wanted to dovetail on that was the -- I've been here awhile and I've noticed that we've got a number of unprepared students and that is hurting our retention because they can't get through.

But then I noticed that the solution for it up here was kind of going external. Most of the other solution things there were things we could do at the University of Kentucky or we could do internally.

The one solution, the last one up on the slide to attack this problem was work with the high schools. Go do this with the high schools. But that is a go change another entity and that's not really under our control.

Is there any - I don't mean to make this a long question, but is there any - can we bridge them? Can we give them a summer to teach them that? You know, are we going to do anything that we can control to attempt to get that? But I think that is totally anecdotal, but I've watched several over the years, and I have seniors who can't add 7 plus 5.

And that's got to impact us.

JENSEN:

Both. We need to do both.

We need to do more of communicating with our high schools students, we're not doing enough of that yet.

And we need to continue and improve



UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

what we're doing on campus. We have the (inaudible) program for students whose prep scores were below the CPE levels. They're required to do some kind of intervention and that's already been ongoing.

But we need to improve our what they call analytics. It's basically we need to improve our ability to recognize when a student is struggling and use more predictive indicators. Things like their behaviors, not just the GPA at the end of the first term, but what's happening at the end of the first month, the first hourly exam period and so forth.

We already some of that in place.

But we don't have a campus - it's not connected across campus and the idea is that this is a vision for that kind of across campus communication to occur. The trick is going to be in the communication.

WEBB: Bruce Webb, College of Agriculture.

I advise the agriculture biotech program and we have established close relationships to students essentially from the first semester.

And one of the problems I see is when they leave there's no way for you to hand off very effectively. They come and want to be advised in psychology or something else. And basically at that time I feel

like all I can do is sign the forms and pat them on the back.

So I think having some way to improve the handoff especially between undergraduate studies and their major or between programs is a place where we lose a lot of students.

ANDERSON:

We talked about

that, improving

the communication between advisors across campus so that we know what to do with these students.

JENSEN: (Inaudible) when they get a transition from high school recruitment all the way through to the application to grad school or the beginning of their career search to not chunk it up as much as we have in the past.

WEBB: Focus on the student and not the advisor. We need to do both.

INAUDIBLE: (Inaudible), A and S. I'm interested in the service-learning opportunities and the (inaudible) communication of the (inaudible) aspect of the (inaudible). What's being done in terms and what needs to be done more in terms of exposure or achievement the land grant mission of Kentucky, taking it outside of the Commonwealth into the service-learning or study abroad. (Inaudible) different models that (inaudible) are we doing something that is different, more (inaudible).

JENSEN: I think under the internalization

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

on campus that we look at the planning that went into that, some of the finalists are already there.

But it's internationalization in the form of educating our students goes back to that early advisory process about the opportunities of studying abroad. But then also internationalizing our curriculum on campus, what they call internationalization at home.

So if I'm a chemistry professor, Bob might be able to use an example of a research project that used something that was happening in India where yesterday it might have been a project that was happening in Tennessee, that kind of thing.

And then also the creation of more dual degree, more international students coming to us and then making sure that those students and or students have opportunity to interact with one another. And that we don't get that segregation of international population and domestic.

Those are all the kinds of things that are already in our internationalization plan to a point. So it's just a question of doing those to seem more purposeful and putting the priority on that.

And our group definitely felt that these kinds of high impact activities - I can't go all the way into service, but you can imagine, if we look nationally at the way the service learning is done right and the way that it can also be internationalized and we really focus and look at our benchmarks and look at what best practices there are, and get a campus conversation about it, then we can do it better.

And those are high impact activities that enhance the value of UK that you don't necessarily get down the road, and you don't necessarily get across the river. And that's a value goal.

RIORDAN: They are going to be doing a forum tomorrow morning at nine o'clock right back here. It will be an hour long forum that's dedicated to it. Fabulous comments. We really appreciate the input and I know they will continue to hear, love to hear your ideas.

Lisa Cassis is going to talk a little bit about the ideas behind the research environment and creative work.

CASSIS: So good afternoon. It's an honor to be here today to get your feedback. My name is Lisa Cassis and I'm one of the co-chairs of working group three which is focused on research and creativity within the strategic plan. And I'm joined today by Rodney Andrews, who is the Director of the Energy Center.

And I see some of our committee

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

members who are in the audience. We have a very diverse committee of faculty, staff and students across the institution. They've been very hard working and constructive.

So what I'd like to do is tell you just very briefly about some of the methods that we used that brought us to the point that we're here today.

We began actually by surveying ourselves. What do we think makes someone a strong and successful researcher. And we also asked the question of ourselves, is how is research judged in terms of success within our specific discipline.

We interviewed the Provost and the Vice-President for Research. We developed a series of questions that then our committee members took to the Associate Deans for Research at various colleges across the institution, brought back to us those answers.

We interviewed top 50 funded researchers across the institution. We looked at NRC rankings. And what we kind of concluded is using the data that we have at hand, that's how we came up with trends and what we're going to talk to you about today.

We also concluded that there are a lot of things that we don't know and metrics that are missing in our evaluation of research success.

So I'm going to talk to you about the five actions. But before I get to that I wanted to again put this into the context of that trends document that was circulated previously beginning with some of the strengths in research at the institution.

We are one of only 22 institutions in the country with in the month of Keenel and races, a research triecta. We have federal designations and funding for cancer, aging and for translational research.

We have the clinical and translational science award, the CTSA funded from the NIH here at the institution. It involves half of the University's 16 colleges. And it pushes our work into the community.

We have a performing and visual arts center that's gathered regional, national, and international attention for their creative research excellence.

We have invested in 100 million academic science building, it's under construction. And we, even in these difficult times, experienced a 15 percent increase in the current period for NIH funding, even with bonding levels dropping.

But we know we face a lot of challenges in research especially. And that is most ever pressing that there's much, much, more competition for fewer and fewer research dollars that are out there.

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

And we have our own issues over insufficient research space, problems in our research and creative infrastructure, and we lack a stable revenue stream to support that infrastructure and make long term investments in research.

But with these negatives always comes some opportunities and positives.

We know that funding agencies are prioritizing around translational research. And you can see that in what we developed. We received more than 50 percent of our funding from the NIH.

We need to diversify our funding and you'll see that as one of our action items. And there are opportunities for trying to get more funding from, for example, the Department of Defense, which funds more, has more than 50 percent of all federal R&D expenses. I think there are opportunities for us there.

So let's start with the five actions. And I'm going to go through each one with tactics. But I'll read them to make sure that you're on page with me here.

We're going to talk about promoting a culture of research and creative excellence across the institution, support for identified clusters of research strength, bolstering our research support systems, promoting research with a high impact on the community, and diversifying research funding streams.

So beginning with promoting that culture of research excellence. So to put this into context, I think we would all agree that our own personal and peer expectations are for excellence in research. And that this should be really a core value of our faculty, students and staff at the University.

But at the same time we need to have an environment that fosters that excellence in research. I think we need to do a better job here at the University of highlighting and promoting the outcomes of the very talented research that's done within our institution.

And we've also discussed that hand-in-hand with the culture of research excellence comes the issue of accountability around that research success. We need to have clear and accepted expectations against which we evaluate research and we reward research success.

So our tactics are to establish metrics by which UK can quantify and reward successful research, to recognize that all of that research is valued by all members of the institution, to recognize the value of a graduate research in excellence. And that we need to have research in the undergraduate population and to expand upon UK research

communication.

The second action is to support identified clusters of research strength. So before I get into this one, I'd like to just start by saying that our committee recognizes that all research scholarly and creative work is valued at the University of Kentucky.

But we also recognize in those challenges that the trend is is that multi-disciplinary research is really what is needed and what is many times funded by extra (inaudible) funding agencies to tackle these very complex problems.

So our goal here is to promote really multi-disciplinary research that uses teams that focus on problems that are of need within the Commonwealth and globally.

We have identified, and I think you would all hopefully agree with me, that we all know that there are examples of research strength within the institution. We all know those strengths in many ways and we've identified some of those as examples for research clusters that have succeeded.

And what we really want to do here is to develop a transparent metric-driven process that allows the institution to identify and evaluate both existing and emerging areas of strength. And then to develop an implementation plan to achieve the goals of those clusters.

So the tactics are to promote research collaboration by identifying and strengthening clusters of research excellence and to provide strong incentives for collaboration.

The third tactic is to bolster research support systems. The context here is that we really need a functional and a sustainable physical infrastructure for us to be able to succeed in research and creative work.

We also need a well-defined and empowered vice president for research to facilitate these multi-disciplinary teams across colleges and programs and in the allocation of resources.

So our tactics here are to provide a stronger infrastructure for research and commercialization, expand research facilities and the basic sciences, provide modern collaborative space for inner-disciplinary research in the arts and humanities, re-balance our research cyber infrastructure to approve support for computational research, and to develop an endowment plan to support the research foundation.

Our next action is to promote research with a high impact on the community. Our vision really is to be a nationally recognized public institution with global reach but yet to have a commitment to problems within the Commonwealth.

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

And our focus here is on applied and translational research that will rapidly improve problems within the Commonwealth.

Our tactics are to maintain a focus on the needs of rural Kentuckians, continue to build our distinction and apply to translational research, identify and combine existing and emerging research strengths to align them with commercialization and economic development, and to expand corporate partnerships to increase research funding levels, and to be able to more rapidly translate our research.

The last action is to diversify research funding streams. We all know research funding is decreasing. It's a problem that many of us face on a day-to-day basis.

So we need to be proactive. We need to be proactive with existing agencies that have decline in budgets such as the National Institute of Health. And we really need to seek out other avenues of research funding.

Our tactics are to increase funding competitiveness across all agencies, provide some key funding to cultivate emerging areas of research, strength and creativity, to aggressively pursue larger or center-type grants to fund multi-disciplinary teams, to pursue more Department of Defense funding, to increase corporate and philanthropic funding and to identify and pursue funding for the humanities.

That's that. I'd be happy to take questions and invite Rodney to come on up here.

CASSIS: Yes.

LEWIS: Wayne Lewis, College of Education.  
With action 4, under tactics.

CASSIS: Yes.

LEWIS: What went into the conversation for focus specifically on the needs of rural Kentuckian as opposed to just Kentuckians?

CASSIS: I'll be happy to let some of my colleagues in the room that are on the committee that have more expertise in that into that.

But I think what we felt like there is so many problems. I can speak from my perspective in terms of health problems facing rural Kentuckians.

We see it in the data in Appalachia and regions where the prevalence of many different types of diseases are just way far above and beyond not just Kentucky, but especially the nation.

And so I guess the thought was is that the research that we do while we want it to improve in this particular example, healthcare for all of Kentucky.

We know that there is especially problems in Appalachia or different regions.

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

And so really that is kind of the thought behind it and I'd be glad to if Nancy or someone else would like to speak up here, some of our committee members.

SCHOENBERG: Nancy Schoenberg, Department of Behavioral Science.

I think the focus is on all of Kentuckians. (Inaudible) aware that the disparity and inequities exist. The fact of the matter is that we're a rural state. We've about 65 percent rural.

So because of that, that alone just really warrants a great deal of attention. And since the preponderance of inequity, whether it's economic or health, tends to occur within rural environments, we felt that that is a justifiable focus.

CASSIS: I think also because we have such a strong College of Agriculture. We have a strong outreach through that college and other colleges that it just seemed like it was a logical way for our research to impact the community.

ANDREWS: And it certainly doesn't exclude all Kentuckians, that's sort of what we mean by the second (inaudible) because of the special emphasis we do have on rural Kentucky.

CASSIS: Yes.  
HIPPI SLEY: Andrew Hippisley, Arts and Sciences.

Supposing Kentucky had the greatest philosophy department in the world, supposing Kentucky created a new school of philosophy, changed the world of philosophy, first of all, how are your metrics going to recognize that that's actually happened?

And secondly, is that the kind of research that Kentucky, the University of Kentucky will stand back and say they're really proud? It's not agriculture, it's not translational studies, there's no impact on the community (inaudible).

Is that something that the University of Kentucky as an R1 institution sees itself as being really proud of and wants to tell the world about and shout and clap its hands about or are we not really interested in that kind of research?

ANDREWS: No, we would very much want to tell that. In terms of measuring and track, this when we talk about metrics, they need to be developed by the people working in the discipline.

I'm certainly not going to claim to have any idea (inaudible). So it would be how, you know, all of the metrics should be developed in a way of measuring excellence.

And so if that program is the very top then certainly we would emphasize it. It would mean (inaudible) it would be something that we would be really proud of. We would be able to recruit graduate students and

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

undergraduates because of that work going on in the area.

So yes, in no way is this limited to particular areas.

CASSIS: I hope you'll see that in some examples that we provide of research success clusters.

You know, they are very broad and we don't just encompass, you know, the traditional, strong, (inaudible) funded types of programs.

We did discuss that a lot in our working group in terms of the metrics and I think that as I mentioned, that is something that I think there needs to be some work on and I think the Provost and -- they're certainly aware of that.

We need better ways to look at metrics and what metrics to get these sort of evaluations. It is very hard for us as a working group to pull out those sorts of data to help us make better decisions.

ILLAHAIN:

(Inaudible)

Illahain, A and S.

I've just got a comment just in terms of this is a land grant university with a public mission, so I'm a little bit concerned about the ethics and how public will be public at the end of the day. That this University belongs to the people of Kentucky.

So I would like some of that language perhaps to be reflected. I applaud you. My research has been, over the years, funded by corporations and other entities, but I would also like again, there ought to be some language or some way of (inaudible) given the nature of neoliberalism and other things (inaudible), that idea is not attracting that much attention given that this is a public institution, the spirit and those ethics of doing the research that it stays perhaps, there is some form that guarantees that it is a public institution.

CASSIS: Your point is well taken. I would suggest that I think we have tried hard in the document to do that.

But when it comes down, that is something where I would suggest that you definitely provide feedback if you don't think that's represented well.

HULSE: (Inaudible) Hulse, College of Business and Economics.

You said one of the tactics was to strengthen areas or clusters of excellence.

I wonder what the committee's thinking was to try to strengthen areas that are already strong versus strengthening areas that are weak?

CASSIS: I think what the committee thought is that we use what metrics we can.

We do have examples of some areas that have succeeded and we do need to as an



UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

institution, I guess, look at the investments in those and how all of those investments have been returned.

Which I think, you know, we learned today that, for example, in a research area that involves healthcare, you know, it is the impact of how that's changed standard of care, which is somewhat hard to judge and analyze.

I guess what I'm trying to say is, you know, I think we're trying to do our best at developing a transparent process so that there is a process for programs in excellence that can come to the institution and (inaudible). And that's what we've done so far and recommended.

RIORDAN: So I think what Lisa and Rodney have done is when you see the text, it talks about examples of clusters where we have been successful and have had some impact and they importantly talk about emerging areas of strength.

But the real key (inaudible) the tactic is the process we put in place is to really think about what our hallmarks for the University of Kentucky and then strategically align for the amount of resources, people making sure, you know, we're aligning the people that are doing work in that area along with other types of resources.

So that I think becomes more clear when you read the text of it as well.

As you can tell a lot of thought has gone into that. We've got a lot of people in this room that have been part of the process. They have been working really hard and for that I'm very appreciative of it.

I do invite you to go to the town hall tomorrow. The research group is having a town hall the last week of April and that's on our calendar as well. And each one of the working groups will be hosting their own individual forum so that we can spend an hour to an hour and a half having conversation.

And again, you can go up to the website and they'll have a form where you can put in information or you can just email it at seetomorrow@uky.edu.

Great conversations, great comments today, we really appreciate it. It's just the start of many. We've got six years to roll this plan out and I expect we'll be having lots of conversation as we begin implementation.

CHRIST: I just have a question about the calendar.

It appears that implementation is supposed to start in June when there are no regular faculty around for many colleges.

Is there a provision for getting faculty participation?

RIORDAN: Sure. So the implementation

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt  
planning will begin in June. (Inaudible)  
taking the plan to the Board in June.  
We're going to assess how within the  
next few weeks whether we're ready to take it  
in June or whether we're ready to take it in  
October.

I for one, probably along with many  
of the co-chairs and committee members, will  
take a vacation in June or July. So I will  
not begin the implementation until after  
it occurs. But we will absolutely have a  
process in place.

Probably what we'll do is we'll be  
inviting people to join the implementation  
team in June, July time frame and then we'll  
pull the conversation back together in  
August.

We won't do it without faculty  
being engaged. This has to be faculty driven  
and college driven. So there'll be a lot of  
people involved with it.

BLONDER: Thank you very much, Chris, and  
thank you for the committee (inaudible).

The next item on the agenda is the  
Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, Davy  
Jones is Chair, and this is a proposed change  
to Senate Rule 5.1.8.5.A (Retroactive  
Withdrawal). Davy?

JONES: Okay. This comes to you in the  
following way, we have a committee that is  
charged in the Senate Rules specifically to  
hear requests for retroactive withdrawal from  
a course.

We have various provisions in there  
within which the people must be framed and  
various criteria that need to be met.

One of the criteria that are in the  
Senate Rules is that there's a two year time  
limit on when the grade has been rendered for  
the course that the student then wants to  
have a retroactive withdrawal from, it's  
currently a two year time limit.

And the committee articulated to  
the Senate Council that it - this is some  
years back, that it has occasions in which it  
would be warranted to waive the two year time  
limit in a particular case.

But because it's in the Senate  
Rules, the committee had to come to the  
Senate Council for ad hoc waiving of the  
Senate Rule. Only the Senate or the Senate  
Council acting on behalf of the Senate can  
waive a Senate Rule. No other body is  
authorized, except the President  
theoretically who hasn't done it since 1941,  
can waive the Senate Rule.

So the Senate was in the practice  
of giving ad hoc approval on particular cases  
and somebody said well, let's delegate for a  
year to the committee standing authority to  
make this delegation and that passed and so  
then it had to come back to Senate Council  
again. And Senate Council said well, maybe

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt  
we should just make a standing delegation of the authority of the Senate Rule.

But that created some unease. A permanent authority to waive the Senate Rule being delegated should come from the Senate itself.

And the better solution is just to make it a part of the charge of the committee in the Senate Rules that one of its authorities gets to waive the two year time limit. That way it's waiving the time limit, it's not waiving the Senate Rule.

And so that's why we have this here. Is there a site that shows the actual language? Is there this language in context of the paragraph?

BROTHERS: In the handout.

JONES: Oh, they have it in the handout?

BLONDER: Yes.

BROTHERS: And it's posted

online.

BLONDER: So we have a motion from the Senate Council that the Senate approve the change of Senate Rule 5.1.8.5. A.3 to add the phrase unless the Senate retroactive withdrawal appeals committee votes to waive the two year time limit.

Is there discussion? Yes.

CHARNI GO: Richard

Charni go, Public Health.

I'm just curious about examples or situations in which waiver of the two year time limit might be deemed appropriate?

JONES: Are there any committee members here that can give an example of when that happens? I don't know. I'm just the rule guy, not the case guy.

I don't know that it happens frequently and routinely. But whenever it arises they have to come running to the Senate Council. And it's in their charge.

BLONDER: Any other questions or comments?  
All in favor? Sorry.

YOST: Scott Yost, College of Engineering. They still have the - there's a clause in there that says, by graduation.

JONES: That is not affected.

YOST: Okay.

BLONDER: All in favor? Opposed? Abstained?  
Motion carries. Thank you, Davy.

Next we have the Senate's Academic Programs Committee, Andrew Hippisley, Chair of that committee, is going to present a proposed new undergraduate certificate in Innovation and Entrepreneurial Thinking. Andrew?

HIPPISLEY: So we have a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new undergraduate certificate, Innovation and Entrepreneurial Thinking in the College of Communication and Information.

The main objective is to help

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

students gain knowledge in innovation and entrepreneurial thinking that can be applied not just to a non-academic setting but to an academic setting because we have lots of inventors in the University.

The certificate will take advantage of UK's own resources here. Students then become partners in UK Homegrown Enterprises.

This is a multi-disciplinary 12 credit certificate. There is a capstone which involves a project with the iNET Entrepreneur in Residence. There's a COM 381, Communication, Leadership, and Entrepreneurial Thinking course. And there are two elective courses, for example, JOU 430, Media Management and Entrepreneurship.

The idea would be that it would attract initially 10 to 12 students, but would grow very quickly to 50 students a year by year five.

There's a carefully articulated set of student learning outcomes, including for example, students will be able to document the risks and rewards associated with entrepreneurial thinking.

At the moment there's no online component but it's quite obvious that by the end of a few years the whole thing will probably online.

There's an identified faculty of record. The director will be the current Associate Dean for Administrative and Academic Affairs, Dr. Lane. Then there are members of the faculty from all sorts of colleges including B and E, Education, Design, Fine Arts, A and S, Engineering and so on.

A lot of the faculty of record are actually deans. So we have the dean in the College of Design, the dean of B and E, the dean of Communication and Information and the dean of Fine Arts.

Those are all people on the faculty of record who will be teaching and (inaudible) changes in the curriculum, especially the decision of what the electives are going to be.

There's a detailed assessment of the program and the student learning outcomes in place. And there are letters of support from all institutes involved.

BLONDER: Thank you, Andrew.

So we have a motion on the floor, a positive recommendation from Senate Council that the Senate approve the establishment of a new undergraduate certificate in Innovation and Entrepreneurial Thinking in the College of Communication and Information.

Is there discussion?

GROSSMAN:

Bob Grossman, A

and S.

So it wasn't clear to me from the description of the faculty of record whether

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

the deans were serving as individual faculty members or as ex-officio members based on their position as deans.

HIPPISLEY: Our assumption is that they are really, truly part of faculty of record. They've been attending regular meetings.

question I asked.

GROSSMAN: That's not the

HIPPISLEY: Okay.

asked is are they

GROSSMAN: The question I

ex-officio, that is if the dean of Fine Arts leaves and there's a new dean of Fine Arts, will the new dean of Fine Arts automatically be a member of the faculty of record, or is it the current dean of Fine Arts expertise in this area that makes him qualified to be a member and the next dean of Fine Arts may or may not have that expertise?

HIPPISLEY: My impression, Derek is here, so he can answer.

I think it's the position that's the faculty of record not the person.

LANE: We had an example of that happening with the College of Design, Michael Tick was very involved. When Michael left - I'm sorry, Michael Speaks, when the new interim chair that's there now, he's also very interested so the College of Design has gone forward to present two additional forces.

I think the answer is we'll see that many of the deans have already taught courses that fit into this category so they will be both to answer your original question.

And if a dean were to leave that the new dean coming in no longer wants to be part of that, they don't have to be. It's not anything we're trying to impose on any deans. Does that answer your question?

really.

GROSSMAN: Well, not

But it sounds to me like it's the deans acting in their individual faculty member personas. And in the case of Design, Michael Speaks left, the new dean came in, and the new dean was very interested and so he or she joined the faculty as a faculty of record.

But some other cases might not be that case.

LANE: That's the case. She actually brought a faculty member with her as well in talking through the design of additional courses, the creation of additional courses, in that example.

BLONDER: Alice?

CHRIST: I think that --

BROTHERS: Name?

CHRIST: Alice Christ, College of Fine Arts.

I think that the question goes very much to the point of my objection to this proposal.

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

I think it's a good proposal in a way because it does show deans trying to collaborate to create inter-disciplinary programs.

But when you look at the faculty of record the only person on it who is not a dean or a director is an assistant professor in the business school and it looks to me like the proposal is dean's shell for what could be a good inter-disciplinary program.

But what I spotted in the proposal was an error of fact in courses to be included in electives, but one of the College of Fine Arts courses, apparently proposed by the faculty of record is a non-existent course.

The course number has been replaced with a course number that allows sub-titles so it could allow a course like that under a sub-title, but no faculty member has offered such a sub-title so far. And the syllabus that has been submitted as evidence of that course is some different course number which is offered, but it is offered by adjunct faculty who are not included as part of the faculty of record here.

So I really think this needs to be, as a -- even as certificate, I think it does not conform to what we require faculty supervision (inaudible).

And I think there are other problems about defining the place of a program like this. The College of Communication is the only place you can learn entrepreneurship. The structure of what should be or what should be cross-listed or what should be offered by faculty from what units, has not considered by faculty but by the regular teaching faculty.

BLONDER: Other comments?

WEBB: Bruce Webb, College of Agriculture.

We were in meetings to discuss this certificate because there are faculty in our college in communication and leadership program and we had concerns.

We had a fairly extensive meeting.

I think the consensus of the faculty that were there from the College of Agriculture was they were going to support this initiative, the concept being

inclusiveness of the leadership.

And so even though the College of Agriculture felt like we had credentials in the area of entrepreneurial thinking, that the current structure was broad enough that they were very comfortable in supporting it.

BLONDER: Alice?

CHRIST: Alice Christ, College of Fine Arts.

I did inquire twice about mechanisms for getting the faculty of record to include new faculty or specific course proposals, even the general curriculum that is still under development and I didn't get

any answer.

So that's somewhat of the same question that Bob asked. And my view of a curriculum certificate program proposal is that it should not be approved contingent on (inaudible) by meetings by people who are arranging things that the Senate never sees.

It should be a sustainable program. So is it true that Agriculture is now included, but we didn't see the draft or is this -

WEBB: Agriculture intends to participate. We are not in this draft. We had not joined because we had a vacancy in the dean at the time this process (inaudible).

CHRIST: I think we should vote this down for now.

BLONDER: I think Greg has a comment.  
WASILKOWSKI: Greg Wasilkowski, Engineering. I am very much concerned what you said. My question is why in the College of Communication and Information? Is there a special reason for that?

I would think that there are some other colleges that would be more natural to house this.

BLONDER: Well -  
LANE: If I can speak to that?  
BLONDER: Give your name, please.  
LANE: Sorry, Derek Lane, College of Communication and Information.

The National Science Foundation sponsors a program called the innovation core. Its primary intent is to help academics commercialize their research.

We were part of the second cohort that participated in that. In order to be part you had to have had NSF funding in the last five years.

We attended a ten week course at Stanford and as part of that discussion we - I was talking with the dean and (inaudible), said, you know what, this would be a really cool program to come to the University of Kentucky. And they would talk about us and say what they talk about Georgia Tech, they talk about Stanford, they talk about Berkeley, and they talk about Michigan.

When we got here we started working with Mike Mullen initially and Mike was really clear about the certificate program. That it not exceed 12 hours. That we make sure that there are all kinds of prerequisites that are included that would preclude students from being part of it.

And so the challenge was, even though there were faculty moving in and out, to start at the deans level and ask them if they're interested.

What started with three or four people grew really quickly. So we have probably more people involved here than any other multi-disciplinary certificate that

you'll see.

It's unfortunate that it has to be hosted or housed anywhere because it could just as easily be housed with Ben Withers now with the undergraduate studies. But he only has so many people or so many resources.

It can easily move from college to college. It's just that initially without putting prerequisites on it, this was the easiest way to move it forward.

And it speaks to tactic number 2, that Kim Anderson and Jane Jensen talked about relative to inter-disciplinary learning. So it's not designed to be a program or degree program, a certificate.

BLONDER: We have a motion on the floor. Are there any other comments or discussion points? Bob?

GROSSMAN:

Bob Grossman, A

and S.

Someone recently advocated voting this down. I would encourage if someone doesn't want this approved at this time or wants some fixes to this, I would encourage them to make a motion to table it for now. Maybe J.S. Butler can help with what the better language is for that.

But it sounds like there's a little bit of sentiment that there could be some fixes to this. But it also doesn't sound like the whole idea is a disaster that needs to be voted down.

So that's my comment.

O' HAIR: Maryjohn O' Hair, College of Education.

I guess I missed this. How many colleges have supported this? I was amazed. I know I haven't been involved as a dean. But I have been involved and our faculty have been involved (inaudible).

And I wonder how fixable it is to be something that - how long has it taken you to --

LANE: This is going on the second year.

O' HAIR: I mean honestly. I know I'm a dean, I shouldn't say anything.

But with that many colleges working on it together, it seems like it is worthy to go forward.

BLONDER: Any other comments or - yes?

WASILKOWSKI: Are there other colleges that are not on the list that have been consulted?

LANE: The College of Ag, to give you an example, they will be included in this.

You'll see the language in the certificate allows for any courses to be added as they're created, any new faculty to be added as they're interested.

In fact, the certificate will originate in the student's college. So a student taking the course (inaudible).

BLONDER: Connie?

WOOD: Connie Wood, Arts and Sciences.



Speaking specifically to your last point, what is the process for not only in changing program faculty, but also adding courses to the certificate list?

I mean if there's not a process then we're buying a pig in a poke, to quote the College of (inaudible).

LANE: We'll go through the same process. Any course that wasn't yet on the books, they took it through the regular channels, courses go through the channels and will be added to the certificate through Senate Council.

BLONDER: Connie?  
WOOD: Connie Wood.  
May I clarify my question?

LANE: Yes.

WOOD: What is the process by which it is that course is then added to the curriculum for the certificate?

LANE: (Inaudible) and we run it through the University channels, just like --

WOOD: There are no University channels. It's the program faculty.

LANE: The details about the certificate that were voted on originally when Mike Mullen presented them was the certificate. (Inaudible). At least that was my understanding.

BLONDER: Bob?  
GROSSMAN: If I can answer

-  
and S. BLONDER: Name and college.  
GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A

The purpose of a faculty of record is to be responsible for the curriculum, it's not just to get the proposal to the Senate.

So if you want to add courses to the curriculum certificate the correct answer is by vote of the faculty of record. Okay, simply, same to remove courses, and frankly to admit new faculty in the faculty.

BLONDER: All right. We have a motion on the floor. Is there anyone else that would like to make a comment?

All in favor of the motion that the Senate approve the establishment of a new undergraduate certificate Innovation and Entrepreneurial Thinking in the College of Communication and Information please raise your hand. Do we need to count this vote?

objections - BROTHERS: If you call for

please. Laura, BLONDER: Let's do the opposed. All opposed?  
BROTHERS: Raise them high,

how many did you get?  
ANSCHER: 20.

opposed. BROTHERS: I got 23

BLONDER: Do we need to recount that?  
BROTHERS: Yes, please.

BLONDER: Please raise your hand again if you're opposed.

ANSCHTEL: BROTHERS: I got 23. Raise them high.

BROTHERS: Okay, good. Me

BLONDER: Okay, 23. Do we need to count the all in favor?

BROTHERS: Yes.

BLONDER: All in favor please raise your hand.

BROTHERS: 31.

ANSCHTEL: Yeah, 31.

BLONDER: So 31 in favor. So the motion passes. Thank you.

Next is the proposed suspension of the graduate certificate in Public Health Nursing.

HIPPISLEY: This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the suspension of admission into an existing graduate program, certificate in Public Health Nursing in the College of Nursing.

The rationale is very simple, no students are doing the certificate. (Inaudible).

BLONDER: So we have a motion on the floor, a positive recommendation from Senate Council that the Senate approve the suspension of the graduate certificate in Public Health Nursing in the College of Nursing.

Is there discussion? Bob?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A

and S.

For how long will this be suspended or is this a permanent suspension?

HIPPISLEY: I believe if the suspension goes on for more than five years it's automatically deleted. (Inaudible).

GROSSMAN: Okay.

BLONDER: Other questions or discussion points? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

Next is the proposed suspension of graduate certificate in Nursing Studies. Andrew?

HIPPISLEY: This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the suspension of admission into an existing graduate program, certificate in Nursing Studies in the College of Nursing.

There are no current students pursuing this certificate. And I think this is the one where no one's done this since 2006.

BLONDER: So we have a positive recommendation from Senate Council that the Senate approve the suspension of the graduate certificate of Nursing Studies in the College of Nursing.

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

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

Next, Greg Wasilkowski, who is Chair of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee, will discuss the proposed transfer of the MS in Manufacturing Systems Engineering. Greg?

WASILKOWSKI: So this MS program used to be housed in the Center of Manufacturing Systems and before in the Center of (inaudible) Systems and now the centers do not exist.

That's why this program has been moved and housed within the College of Engineering. However, the dean, new dean requested that it be moved to some other place because (inaudible) and also to have (inaudible) Engineering and they don't like it so much (inaudible).

They decided it should go some other place where this manufacturing systems is more meaningful and will be better taken care of. And we agreed with that, the Mechanical Engineering Department, that Mechanical Engineering seemed to be the best suited place for that programming.

So to give you some information, that it is expected that in six years the tuition will generate up to half a million dollars. This program is quite popular and quite well established, especially due to the research on new manufacturing and the connection with Toyota.

So it's quite popular and they hope that it will be even more popular once it is housed in the Mechanical Engineering Department.

There is no anticipated change in the graduate faculty makeup and there was a secret ballot and out of graduate faculty in the program, 7 voted yes, 3 no. And the faculty in the Department of Mechanical Engineering voted (inaudible) against 3 votes, positive votes. And also the Engineering Graduate Education team that has a representative, the Director of Graduate Studies from each department, they also approved the change.

So I think (inaudible).

BLONDER: Thank you, Greg. So we have a positive recommendation from the Senate Council that the Senate endorse the transfer of the Ms in Manufacturing Systems Engineering from the College of Engineering to the Department of Mechanical Engineering in the College of Engineering.

Are there questions or discussion points? Yes?

HIPPISLEY: Andrew Hippisley, Arts and Sciences.

If you go back to the vote tally, it seems that that first cohort is quite an important one and three is not insignificant.

WASILKOWSKI: I didn't say it was.

HIPPISLEY: Yeah, so the question is do you have any impression why 3 out of 10 would be

so against it?

WASILKSOWSKI: No. We have no idea and there's no way to (inaudible) because of the nature of the ballot. We don't know who voted against, we don't know who voted for it.

BLONDER: Yes.

DIETZ: Hank Dietz, Engineering.

Going back to that same statistic there, what departments are those ten faculty in? It doesn't have to be 7 in ME and 3 in something else, does it?

WASILKOWSKI: As far as I know there are only 4 from Mechanical Engineering. So of course we would like to see stronger support (inaudible) faculty in the program, but (inaudible).

BLONDER: Are there other questions?

WASILKOWSKI: (Inaudible) but then there are (inaudible).

BLONDER: Okay, then, if there are no other questions or comments, all in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you, Greg.

WASILKOWSKI: Thank you.

BLONDER: The last item on our agenda is the Annual State of the Libraries Report by the Dean of Libraries, Terry Birdwhistell. Terry?

BIRDWHISTELL: Good afternoon, everyone. It's always a pleasure to come to the University Senate and talk about one of my favorite topics, the libraries. And it's especially nice to do that this year on National Library Week. I assume that's a coincidence, I don't know.

Joining me here today are Senior Associate Dean of Libraries, Mary Beth Thompson, who is in charge of collection and digital scholarship and Steven Sizemore, who is Assistant Dean for Finance and Administration.

Much of what we're talking today is the research library, and I really enjoy (inaudible) research and what we're doing with the strategic plan on research.

And a lot of the money we spend in UK Libraries is to support that research. So as we move through this process, it's very important for us to be intimately involved in those discussions because we need to find a way to better support UK Libraries so they can support the research on the campus.

And I want to add that most of you come from graduate programs and doctoral programs with great research libraries and so you know the difference between a good research library and a great research library that we need to be.

There are many photographs of Young Library. The architects designed in such a way you can take many wonderful photographs.

I like this one because this is the first impression of Young Library that our

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

perspective students and their family get when they walk into Young Library. They walk in and if you watch them they go and look straight up. And they're just sort of overwhelmed by the building.

And then it's our work, partnering with you over the next four to five years to not only have them be impressed with the building, but also be impressed with what they can do with the materials that reside in these buildings and also can be accessed online.

I always want to give a shout out to our Senate Library Committee. They're very important to us. These are the members this year. We meet periodically and we try to give them updates on initiatives that are going on in UK Libraries. And also talk about the budget and get their advice.

Even though we tend to focus on Young Library many times when we're talking about UK Libraries, these are all the physical locations within UK Libraries.

We used to have more. We're trying to consolidate branch libraries so that we can provide a better learning environment for students so that we can save money.

And what we're targeting right now, a few years ago we developed the Science Library and we're working on plans for how to move the Engineering Library and the Design Library into the Design Library to have a Science and Engineering and Design Library. We think that is a very important objective over the next few years.

There are many things that a research library has to do. One of the things is take care of the basics. And the fundamental is building quality collections. And a lot of discussion that goes on between our library liaisons and you, teaching faculty, and your colleagues, and your colleges, departments and centers, is what type of collections you need to support your teaching and your research.

And our part of the discussion is how we're going to pay for that and provide it for you. Because one of our basic building blocks is enhancing teaching and learning and research, we want to be leaders in information literacy on campus.

We want to be leaders in developing mutual scholarship. We want to work with the University Senate over the next few years to promote open access on this campus. And we want to be leaders in research data curation, which is one of the big topics right now facing this University, again going back to the research ambitions that we have.

We have to build an infrastructure at this University to preserve our research data. And UK Libraries wants to be an active partner in that, we want to partner with the

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt  
Vice-President for Research and with  
University technology to make that happen.

You heard a lot today about  
the strategic plan. We want to be, as I said  
earlier, we want to make sure that we're  
partnering with the strategic planning  
process so that we can support the  
initiatives for the University internal to UK  
Libraries, we have a strategic planning  
process underway.

We're not going to be finished in  
June, we won't be finished until December,  
but that plan will guide how we develop our  
initiatives over the next several years, and  
how we allocate our funding.

So what you've been waiting for,  
the numbers. This is our basic 2014 budget.  
You'll see the numbers for personnel,  
operating capital, collections, state  
funding, and also the endowment expenditures  
below that, which also support our  
collections. And then as you know the  
University Press is administratively part of  
the UK Libraries, and that's the University  
Press's budget.

The Young Endowment is so important  
to what we do here at UK. And we have an  
Endowment Committee that monitors the  
collections budget and endowment conditions,  
and that's made up of Barbara Young and three  
other people, and they've been very helpful  
to over the years in strategizing on how to  
deal with that endowment.

You can see the endowment grew at  
one time to \$80 million. Then during the  
great recession it fell. And then the  
endowment has now been coming back and it's  
now over \$75 million.

And then you see that out of that  
endowment the expenditure rate of about \$2  
million. So it's very important in our  
overall budgeting and our ability to buy  
collections.

People are always asking us, well,  
can't you partner with anybody, you know, to  
help purchase things together or to keep  
prices down or work with other people around  
the country. These are just some of our  
partnerships that we're involved in  
currently.

One example down here is the  
Information Alliance with Vanderbilt and the  
University of Tennessee. The KYVL, where we  
partner with all of our public universities  
in Kentucky to purchase at a lower price. So  
all of these are efforts to be good stewards  
of the money that we're given.

Here's where the rub is because  
each year the publishers charge us 5 to 6  
percent more for what we're purchasing. In  
science technology and medical resources that  
figure can go from 6 to 8 percent. And both  
print and electronic resources increase each

year.

So without doing anything we lose money. We lose purchasing power each year. And so we're now looking at the FY15 budget. We've been working with Provost Riordan to look at where we are, what we need, and what are the possibilities for this coming year.

You know, we haven't gotten those exact numbers yet, but when we do we'll share those with you. In the meantime, our library liaisons have begun a process working with your colleges and your departments and your Senators in terms of the cuts coming, and I think there's likely to be some cuts that we can work through that process like we have in the past to identify those resources that cause the least pain.

And we certainly know that every cut causes pain and so it's very important we focus on the least pain.

We're very fortunate here at UK to have a really outstanding special collections. I just wanted to share with you some of the unique collections that have just come to UK this past year.

The Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence and the Robert Sexton Collections is a research collection that people study, in fact, the education reforms will be using for generations to come. Landscape and Architecture in Kentucky, Professor Ron Eller, who recently retired, has probably one of the best Appalachian Collections of any academic in the country today and we already have perhaps the best Appalachian Collection in the United States and this only adds to that.

We have a very strong collection of public policy collections and the last couple years we've picked up the Geoff Davis Collection and the Ben Chandler Collection. We always get them on the way out, of course, we don't get them before they leave.

And then to sort of identify with the times, the Kentucky Hemp Growers Cooperative Association Museum and Library is now here at the University of Kentucky. And then you may have read about this in the newspaper this morning, the Kentucky Veterans Oral Histories, the play that was put on here on campus yesterday, using the transcripts from real world history interviews to share the experiences of Iraq and Afghan Veterans.

One of the things we try to do at UK Libraries is to keep up with the learning needs of our students.

If you've been on the second floor of Young this year you've seen that we transformed an area that was periodicals, took those out, put in very creative and collaborative learning spaces for our students. And this entire renovation of second floor of Young was paid for with

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

private gift money. And so we were very pleased with that.

And if you go up there right now or any time of the night, or any night, you'll see hundreds of students. I don't know what it is. You know, when I was a student we just got in a study carol and sat there, but we've got to have all different kinds of chairs and different things going on for our students today. And the white boards, they can write on anything up there.

And we also have it set up so there are areas for the students who bring their laptops, can all tie into a single computer and work collaboratively. So it's a great way for them to get their work done.

Down in the lower level of Young Library it's been a very exciting year. The Media Depot opened, which is a way for students to get some excellent technology help down there, and then they have studios where they can record audio and video presentations. And so that opened on the lower level.

This past year we moved the Writing Center from the fifth floor down to the hub.

And also Presentation U is scheduled to open soon in the hub. So our students can come into the Young Library, go down to the hub and get all types of fantastic help for their projects.

One of the things we work hard to do is stay involved with the academic experience on campus. We're involved in common reading experience and have the author over for reception and met with several students over here.

In Special Collections we're very interested in getting undergraduate students here at UK involved in research with our unique materials.

We've established a Special Collections Learning Lab. And we provide internships for up to four students a year, it's gone on for two years now, who spend a year in Special Collections working with a unique collection.

They learn about the topic, they learn how you make it accessible to researchers. They prepare an exhibit of their collection and make a presentation. And it's just been an incredible experience for them. And a couple have even decided to go to library school after they graduate.

Each year the UK Libraries gives a Medallion for Intellectual Achievement. This is for a Kentuckian or a person who has spent a significant portion of their professional life in Kentucky. And it can be someone from anywhere in the world. And this year we were so pleased that the Medallion was awarded just last Friday night to Dr. Karl Raitz, who recently retired from the Department of



Geography.

I mentioned the University Press of Kentucky. It has established a national reputation in several areas for its publishing quality. This is seen in the awards that they're receiving.

This book by Bell Hooks, the winner of the Black Caucus of the American Library Association's award for Best Poetry Collection, and also the Thomas D. Clark Medallion, this year's recipient was the book Kentucky Government, Politics, and Public Policy, and Steve Rand, the excellent director of the University Press of Kentucky, was there and the Governor Martha Layne Collins.

One of my favorite photographs, President Capilouto is known to wander the halls of Young Library sometimes late at night and he interacts with the students, and

I think they really get a kick out of him being here in the library.

We try to make this a destination that the students want to come back to. This is last year at finals week. We had our first Balcony Blast. You know, we have balconies in this building but they've never really been open.

We're starting to open them up for special events and this is just a small sample of the students who came out on the balcony on a night during finals, got free food and free drinks. And I know they enjoyed it because we had to order more food like three times. It was very popular. And of course we'll end with winter scenes and it's going to snow tomorrow. (Inaudible)

I think it's such a great thing that our students like to be part of the library environment. Now of course that's only a part of it.

A very serious part is what you need out of the UK Libraries, what you need for research and what you need for your students. And we're going to continue to work with you. We're going to work with Provost Riordan and administration.

You know, we're not the only ones in this boat. Research libraries around the country are struggling right now because of the publishing models and because of lack of state support.

So it's not a sustainable model, but it's one we've got to work our way through and I think all of us working together will be able to bring about a positive outcome.

But what I want to encourage you to do, is if you have questions or comments or suggestions about UK Libraries for you or your students, don't hesitate to send me an email, give me a call, stop by. And we'll try to deal with those issues.

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

CHRIST: Actually I have a question -

BLONDER: Name and college.

CHRIST: Alice Christ, Fine Arts.

- about I noticed that two of your recently acquired Special Collections are in media that might include music tapes or recordings or something, and imagery, these things called transparencies that we used to call slide collections, and they're not very accessible in modern teaching practice now unless they are also available in digital copies.

Is there any proposal or an office that provide digitization of materials for research?

BIRDWHI STELL: That's a good question. We have digitalizing services within UK Libraries and we try to work with faculty who need something digitized for their classes, especially something out of UK Libraries or something specific we have of Special Collections.

We're working very hard to digitize as much material as we can, trying to anticipate who would be (inaudible) research. But it's a long process.

But if you will let us know what you need we'll be glad to work with you.

CHRIST: Do we have in-house databases and such for say the digital imagery database or the -

BIRDWHI STELL: Yes. We have a lot of them for UK. But you can access some of that material.

And I didn't mention, we have UK knowledge which isn't institutional. Did that answer your question?

CHRIST: Well, things that are available on the web are not exactly archival quality database collection.

BIRDWHI STELL: No. Some of them are.

CHRIST: So the question is -

BIRDWHI STELL: I'll be happy to talk to you about that. I don't want to keep these people waiting for that.

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S. You said the current model isn't sustainable, which I think we all know, but can you give us an idea what the future model is going to be or has that really been worked out?

BIRDWHI STELL: If it's been worked out and you find out let me know.

But I think it's going to be several different avenues. And one, it's open access, you know. The model right now is that universities hire faculty to teach and produce academic works which are then given to journals and then they sell it back to us. That's one model.

Another model is open access where you have open access journals that are peer-reviewed. Those are still a little controversial. You'll see an article in the

UKSenateMeeting-4-14-14.txt

Chronicle, well, are they really peer-reviewed, are they as good as the others.

But that's, you know, we have five open access journals that are being published now through our UK knowledge, our institutional depository, it's a large movement nationally. We're going to see a lot more movement that way, I think.

So it's not something that's easy to solve but, you know, something has to give when these research libraries got to deal with inflation.

DESANTIS:

Al an DeSanti s.

It's good to see you again, Terry, I always enjoy your presentations.

Just this week I was talking to my students about the advantages of digital versus analog information and what the advantage they keep saying is cost, we don't have to worry about upkeep and travel and production and transportation.

But every time the book auditor comes to talk to me about using a book it doesn't seem like they're willing to give students a break at all. I mean, five or six percent.

Have you experienced a reduction in cost because we're relying more on digital binary information and less on analog hard copies?

BIRDWHISTELL: Good question. Mary Beth?

THOMPSON:

I think the

simple is no. An

electronic book, an electronic journal is not saving us money on the up-front cost of it.

DESANTIS:

Now why would

that be? Because,

you know, we keep hearing that the expenses in the publishing of the book and transportation of the book and the upkeep of the book... Shouldn't we be seeing some reduction?

THOMPSON:

I think if you

- if you were to

talk to the publisher side of that they're going to tell you the cost of the digital rights management is therefore the cost of the infrastructure, the cost to make it as a digital product, and so in some ways it's moved those costs somewhere else.

Now I'm not defending the publishers, the prices are still going up and up and up. And I think that's the model that Dean Birdwhistell was talking about in that we continue to see the prices going up.

And we continue to see an explosion of information. So that's the other piece. There's more and more research out there that you're producing that we know that you need access to. And that's the open access piece for us as well.

And open access also has a cost associated to it. But that's a good

question.

A little bit about the models, there's a number of models. And what is the open access part of that.

One of the things that we're doing right now is working with high energy business journals where as a group of research libraries internationally, we've gotten together and we've pulled those journals, and we're paying for them and we're making them open access for the entire world. And the cost for us actually went down a little bit by doing that. And now they're open access for everyone and we didn't increase our cost.

So there are a variety of models for us as we keep pushing out (inaudible). It does save us money in the actual shelving of a print volume in that regard. It moves what we need to spend (inaudible).

in the process

DESANTIS:

There's somebody

that's making significantly more money because they don't have to press and store and -

publishers are still

THOMPSON:

Yes. The

money. Right. Yes.

making

College of Nursing.

ANDERSON:

Debra Anderson,

Do we have or could we have a copy of your PowerPoint?

UNIDENTIFIED: Sure.

NAGA: Uwe Naga, Arts and Sciences.

(Inaudible) open access model, do you set aside money to pay the researchers to actually so that they can (inaudible) research?

about the author

THOMPSON:

Are you talking

publishing?

NAGA: Yeah. (Inaudible) research now have to pay that their research get published. (Inaudible). Do you set aside to pay us so we can actually publish our research.

places where they've

THOMPSON:

There are some

created what they are calling open access funds to help offset (inaudible) for the publishing charges that are associated with your articles that get published by researchers. In some cases those funds are coming through, the grants and the research funding as well.

So it's happening in a number of ways. But for us at this point we're trying to support those open access models, where the ones that we're hosting off UK Knowledge, there are no fees attached to those and that's a growing effort as well.

BLONDER: One last question.

BAILEY: I'm sorry, I know we're supposed to go.

BROTHERS: Name please.  
BAILEY: Ernie Bailey, College of Agriculture.

There is a difference between open access and online access. And open access is we pay to publish our papers, online is where the journal (inaudible). For years that have online access, libraries have paid for that are dropping the hardcover, (inaudible) there's a distinction between online and open?

BIRDWHISTELL: Yes.

THOMPSON: Yes.

BLONDER: Okay, well, thank you so much, Terry.

We've reached the end of our agenda. May I have a motion to adjourn?

WASILKOWSKI: So moved.

BLONDER: Is there a second?

WOOD: Second.

BLONDER: All in favor. Thank you.

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 23rd day of May, 2014.

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

NOTARY ID 440572