

SENATE MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

APRIL 13, 2015

* * * *

* * * *

ANDREW HIPPI SLEY, CHAIR

ALICE CHRIST, VICE-CHAIR

KATE SEAGO, PARLIAMENTARIAN

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

LISA GRANT CRUMP, COURT REPORTER

* * * *

* * * *

HIPPI SLEY: Welcome to the April Senate meeting of this session. Please get your clickers ready and vote. All right. So if you don't quite have your act together, it's okay, there are other opportunities to vote today.

All right. So I didn't receive any corrections for the March 9th meeting, so unless there are objections right now, the minutes for March 9, 2015 stand approved as distributed by unanimous consent of the Body.

A few announcements. I don't know if any of you have ever used eCATS before or if you've been frustrated by eCATS, there's a decision being made that eCATS as we now know will not happen in the future. We will either rewrite eCATS or we will buy an off the shelf curriculum process system. So more news about that as that decision moves forward.

Deans of your colleges have been sent a memo saying how many seats that college has on Senate, how many seats are rolling off. So how many seats need to be elected and your deans have been given a

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt
deadline of May the 1st to return senators.
We did have a few delinquent colleges last year. I hope, our hope is to have no delinquent colleges this year, so May the 1st is a strict deadline.

Please, if you're around, come on May the 21st to show your appreciation of the staff. They have a special UK appreciation day. There is free food and burgers and T-shirts and things like that, and it's a great event.

A few reports. Senate Council waived Senate Rule 6.1.3.A on submission of midterm grades because of the snow.

Senate Council approved nominations for area and advisory committees. We approved change to a calendar, Dentistry Calendar.

We listened to a draft exit survey developed by the Provost Office and we gave input. And that exit survey will go live at some point, we're not quite clear when.

Senate Council added the students for December 2014 degree list due to administrative error of the Graduate School. Senate Council approved questions for the faculty's survey evaluation of the President's performance and you've all got the email, everybody should have got an email of the evaluation.

We all have until Monday, April 25th to submit the response. The results of that evaluation are taken seriously because of the Board of Trustees Executive Committee meeting, and I just heartily encourage you to encourage others to fill out the survey.

I'm going to hand over to Alice Christ.

CHRIST: Thanks to Sheila, I do have something to report. We are asking for nominations for an outstanding senator award, which has been recently received for yearly award, and these are the criteria that you're looking at.

Send nominations to me. It doesn't have to be a current senator. It can be someone who has contributed in the past. I think there's another page, the deadline page. Yes.

I will send a reminder so that you can email me back any names that you want to put forward.

GROSSMAN: Alice, current senate council members are not eligible.

CHRIST: Right.

GROSSMAN: Current senators.

CHRIST: Right. Thank you. Certainly past senate council members who have served valiantly.

TAGAVI: The current faculty trustee is eligible, too, as a (inaudible).

GROSSMAN: Or any member of Senate Council.

HIPPISLEY: And we also have a parliamentarian

report from Kate.

SEAGO: Okay, report concerns. Last time we -- I said that there was a way to rescind or amend something previously adopted. It was a concern of the TCE report. So I'm going to step through the process.

Motions that cannot be rescinded, TCE does fit not any of these categories. If they are motions that have already been carried out, motions to accept resignations or actions electing or expelling a person from membership and motion subject to being called up for reconsideration within the same meeting, which is not happening.

I'm going to actually skip this slide because it gets repeated with the amendment slide and I think more people are interested in the amendment slide.

So the motion to amend something previously adopted is used to make a change to a motion by making a simple change or substitution. When you move it you can't interrupt the speaker who has the floor. It must be seconded. It is debatable and can be amended.

The quirk between an amendment to -- a motion to amend something previously adopted and a regular motion to amend is that if you've not given notice to your fellow senators, a two-thirds vote is required.

If you have gotten it into the agenda, given your senators notice that you're bringing the motion to the floor, then a simple majority is what's required.

And, yeah, so that covers it. And moving on to the reports.

HIPPISLEY: Does anyone have questions for Kate?

SEAGO: And I'll be happy to send that out to somebody, I know I went over it really quickly, or answer questions.

HIPPISLEY: Next up is any report from our Trustees, John Wilson and Bob Grossman.

GROSSMAN: I'd just like to reiterate what Andrew said about the review of the President. Please encourage all your constituents to fill this one out. One of those common questions people ask about it, being on the Board is: oh, do those Board members really care what the faculty think? They actually do. They really do; they ask it all the time. What do the faculty think about this or that. It doesn't mean they're going to agree with everything. It doesn't mean that we are the only people that they care about.

But they really do want to hear from us. And more of us that can respond to the survey (inaudible). So again, it's not just you all, but also your constituents, to fill that out.

One other thing, there was another parking forum and you may remember last time

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt

we talked about the parking, I said things are going to get worse before they get better.

It looks like they'll start getting better in September/October when the Commonwealth Stadium renovations are completed. So hold on until then, things should start to get better.

HIPPISLEY: Thanks, Bob.

I'm very happy to introduce to you again, Tim Tracy, Provost.

TRACY: Thanks, Dr. Hippisley. It's good to be back with you again today.

I want to give you an update on the strategic planning process activity. We have to have the -- as I told you in the last meeting back in March, we re-engaged the committee co-chairs. We also added some people to those groups.

And so Senate Council and the Senate suggested several people and we did add those in a variety of (inaudible). Ernie Bailey is the official Senate Council Liaison for the strategic planning process.

We've added a number of other people, both within the Senate and within the faculty, across the University that have given some tremendous input and really guided us through the process.

As I spoke before, we had the five key objectives or goals, areas that we're working on. One, being student success. And really looking at ways that we attack that from a number of factors. One, do we have some unique and innovative programs that we can carry forward that we believe will make a significant difference in that.

A second one related to ways in which we help the professoriate in terms of faculty development and recruitment and retention of outstanding faculty, and ways we can help move that forward. And so we're trying to approach that from a number of levels.

The second one is research and scholarly work. This is where the faculty really provided tremendous input because they helped us make sure that we have pieces in there, not only to, if I can use the term hard sciences or chemical-biological-biomedical, but also the humanities, the social sciences, the natural sciences and the creative arts, in ways that we recognize those that have some programs in there to support the research and scholars across the entire University.

So those are coming along well, and again, great input by folks, Sue Roberts from Geology has provided some great input on that, Lori Gooding from Musical Therapy, Music Therapy, and a number of faculty that provided some really good input.

The graduate education piece is

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt

also very important to us and I see Susan Carvalho here, and David Blackwell, and Sharon Lock, are working on that particular initiative, along with David Puleo from the College of Engineering.

Really looking at new ways to focus on the graduate students and really help their development, but also, how that interrelates with the research and scholarship portion of what we do.

And that will be critical that we have a number of these looking across the different focus areas for that.

Community engagement and impact is one that reaches across all aspects, and many of us think that extension is a key part of that. But it's also really dealing with other areas, ways we reach out in the community, and figuring out how we do that. How do we interact with those communities.

And one of the things that I've been very passionate about is learning from the communities the problems that they want help with. You know, we can go into communities and imagine our solutions for their problems, but if it's not a problem that matters to them, then it's less than effective, or at least it's not optimally effective.

So how do we engage with the communities to learn the types of things that matter to them and ways that we can work with them to help them throughout this process.

And so I see Katherine back there, helping us also with educational impact that we have across the different areas.

And then we have rural health, a number of things, how do we look at that across the University and make sure those efforts are fully coordinated, but also, it does tie back into the student success, because how we can get those students out in those external experiences, those enrichment experiences, not only our academy for undergraduate excellence.

Phil Kraemer, I saw you back there somewhere. How that enhances what people do, but how we get them engaged in these experiences outside the University, and get some of those real life experiences. So there's some nice work coming out on those particular areas as well.

And the last again, is diversity and inclusivity. And how we really have some action steps, you know, it's a very difficult subject. It's one that's very difficult to figure out how to do well.

It usually ends up with a lot of words around it and frequently not a lot of actions come out of it. So we're really trying to focus on some very specific things that we can do to carry that forward and increase the diversity and inclusivity of our

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt

student body, our faculty, and our staff.

Underpinning all of this then is the development of our faculty and staff that work here at the University and how we can do things to further not only the work environment but also a work system and the recognition system.

So there's a number of things that are coming out that we'll be interested in your comments on, related to some different awards programs and some academies that faculty might participate in, ways to again bring people together, but recognize them for their work.

I really -- because we're still in this process, I can't show you specifics because the committee hasn't seen the edits that were just made over the weekend to what they've worked on.

But we'll have a five-hour retreat on Friday, in which all of the subcommittees will come back and come back together and look at it as a whole. And what we're really trying to get to is looking across the plan.

So how -- do we have gaps, do we have redundancies, do we have the proper linkages among all the components and are those working together so that we can be prepared to come out in the first week of May and have some Town Halls.

And that's going to be very important for us, is to get those Town Halls and the feedback. We are planning to live stream those. I'm pretty familiar with that process now as I've gone through the live streaming and the questions coming in over the internet and so forth.

So we'll try to make sure it's accessible to as many people as possible, faculty, staff, and students. I don't know how many students will participate but it will certainly be open to them to take part.

But it really is crucial that we get your input into this process. I realize that it's condensed. I realize that we've had to take some steps to sort of have a smaller group working on it.

But let me assure that there was a tremendous amount of really, really good work that was done over the past year or so. And we're doing everything we can to use that work and incorporate it into the plan.

They're wonderful, filled with data, but also some very, very wonderful ideas. And the idea now is to get them to that high level strategy to get it across the finish lines so that we can begin moving forward.

I will say that what you're going to see is the goal areas, we call them strategic objectives. Initiatives within each particular objective. And then action steps.

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt

There will still be lots of documents that go beyond that in terms of how do we implement many of those action steps. One of them is for expansion of honors. And so how do we do that and what's the way in which we go through that. That's one of the things that's being proposed.

We'll need some implementation work. So I'd like to tell you it's going to be finished, but I don't know that a strategic plan is ever completely finished. We're always adjusting along the way. But we're doing everything we can to get there.

And I really encourage you to come out and give us feedback in the next couple weeks. The groups have worked very, very hard. They've been very responsive, very quick in their turn-arounds. So they've done hard work.

We've brought that all together in one voice and we did that over the weekend. And so we'll have them take a look at it at the end of this week and then be ready to start going out.

I shared it with the President this morning. He was comfortable with the direction we're headed. And so that's nice to know that we're at least heading in a direction that's he's comfortable with.

It's not finished. It is definitely not finished. No one wants it to be finished more than me. But it's not finished yet. So we will need your input to bring this thing forward.

So again, I'm not trying to hide anything from you, but I want to be

respectful
to
the
groups
that
they
get
to
see
now
what
has
come
back
over
the
last
week
and
what
we
worked
on
over
the
week

nd
and
share
it
with
them.
But I
do
want
to
encou
rage
you
to
parti
cipat
e in
those
Town
Halls
and
help
us
make
this
a
great
strat
egic
plan.
Quest
ions?
Yes?

HI PPI SLEY: Lee?
BLONDER: Lee Bl onder, Medi ci ne.
Will the document draft be
distributed to the Senate, senators, and
faculty in general before these Town Halls?
TRACY: Yes. Yes. We'll get it out to you
ahead of time. I just need to get past
Friday where I get folks, the committee
chairs are comfortable and we've taken a look
at it. And then we'll be preparing to
distribute it.
But I want to get it out to
everyone to see prior to walking into the
Town Halls. Yeah, that will be optimal to do
that versus walking into it and trying to
process it at that point.
We'll also be working with both
trustees and a number of constituent groups
that worked doing this. And so Andrew and I
have not -- we haven't be able to meet for a
couple weeks (inaudible) talking about
getting it to Senate Council and (inaudible).
But, yes, beforehand we will share it with
you.
Okay. You've got a lot of business
today in this next to the last meeting.
Thank you again for allowing me time to speak
with you.
HI PPI SLEY: Okay. So we have the first of our
reports. Margaret?

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt

SCHROEDER: All right. Just four today. We have a recommendation that the Senate approve the suspension of the Master's of Arts in Theatre, in the Department of Theatre within the College of Fine Arts.

In 2012, the Department of Theatre received accreditation by the National Association of Schools of Theatre. They issued a report that expressed concerns of their MA program and cited apprehensions about a variety of issues including competencies being met, and reduction in key faculty positions with the MA program.

So the college and the faculty discussed this. The faculty wholeheartedly agreed with their assessment and admitted that the program's challenges have been evident for many years, and they decided the best thing to do would be to suspend the program.

There is one student that remains in the program, however, they have scheduled (inaudible). That should be either in May or June, so there will be no more students in the program that will be affected by this

suspension.

HIPPISLEY: So the recommendation comes straight from committee, no need for a second. Are there any points of information for the chair or anyone who wants to speak for or against?

Hearing none, the vote is now on the floor. We don't need that. I'll give you a quick countdown. Five, four, three, two, one. The poll is closing and the motion carries. Thank you.

SCHROEDER: The next is the proposed Graduate Certificate in Latin American, Caribbean, and Latino Studies. And this is a recommendation that the Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Latin American, Caribbean, and Latino Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences.

The proposed graduate certificate is directed primarily at graduate students whose intended academic and/or professional careers in research, teaching, and public or private sectors, to incorporate a focus on geographical and cultural region of Latin America, the Caribbean, and the populations of Latin American and Caribbean descent living in the United States, Europe, and other parts of the world.

It provides graduate students with the skills, knowledge, to connect Latin American, Caribbean, and Latino topics to their research agendas. It's a broad group of graduate students which includes those already enrolled in departments of Hispanic Studies, Sociology, Anthropology, Gender and Women's Studies, History, Geography, Political Science, Psychology, and the College of Education.

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt

The educational objectives of the curriculum are to provide a strong foundation in the history, culture, and intellectual traditions of Latin America and the Latino populations of the United States and Europe, for students who wish to add a Latin American area specialization to their disciplinary education.

HIPPISLEY: This is a recommendation from committee. Is there any points of information? Anyone want to speak for or against?

Hearing no discussion, move to vote. We don't need that. Five second warning. Five, four, three, two, one. The motion carries.

SCHROEDER: Okay. This is a recommendation that the Senate approve the establishment of a new University Scholars Program, the BA Art History and the MA Art History and Visual Studies within the school of Art and Visual Studies in the College of Fine Arts.

The school proposes to establish this University Scholars program in order to nurture best undergraduates who may not be ready or competitive for admission to top graduate programs, but have potential to excel with additional level work, better prepare students for careers, museum careers, thus improving job placement and long-term professional success, shorten time to degree by one year for students wishing to pursue an MA in the Art History and Visual Studies, make better use of available scholarship resources, strengthen the AHVS major, improve recruitment into and retention within the major, and use the new five year combined program to establish distinct identity nationally, and then also improve the quality of graduate students within the program.

The applicant must have an overall GPA of 3.2 and they can take and share up to 12 hours at the 500 level between the two programs.

HIPPISLEY: Motion comes from committee, it doesn't need a second. It's on the floor. Anyone like points of information for the chair? Speak for or against?

Hearing no discussion, move to vote. We don't need that. Give you the countdown. Five, four, three, two, one. Unanimous.

SCHROEDER: And the last one. This is a recommendation that Senate approves for submission to the Board of Trustees the establishment of a new MS Finance, in the Department of Finance and Quantitative Methods within the Gatton College of Business and Economics.

There is one change to this proposal, it would not be started until at the earliest, until Spring of 2016, I believe. The paperwork right now shows 2015,

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt

that's due to on the (inaudible) for CPE.

There's an increase in domestic demand for specialized professional master's programs in business and economics such as the Master of Science in Finance. Our University currently does not have one and our benchmark universities do have one.

They did a thorough analysis of the different types of programs, and the program that they have suggested falls in line with the current programs. It does not overlap with them, and will thus add a lot of depth to the college. The proposal is 30 hours, non-thesis program aimed at the business community.

HIPPI SLEY: The motion is on the floor. Questions? Hearing none, move to vote. We don't need this. Five, four, three, two, one. The motion carries.

So we now have Greg Graf, who will give us committee reports from his Committee, Admissions and Academic Standards.

GRAF: Good afternoon. The first of these proposals comes from the Graduate Council and it is a proposed change to the Doctoral Committee Composition.

So the current policy is a requirement of four members to the core committee, three of those being from the home department, and requirement of one individual from outside the department.

The original proposal included not only a reduction in the required number of individuals on the faculty from within the department from three to two, but also dropped the requirement for a non-departmental or external member of the committee.

That met with some resistance at committee, but it was approved and went to Senate Council. This similarly met some resistance at Senate Council where it was amended to the current policy which would again would still reduce the number of individuals from the department required number being from three to two, but would not eliminate the requirement for an individual to be from outside the department to serve as an external member of the (inaudible).

From there it was voted and approved.

HIPPI SLEY: So the recommendation from Greg Graf's committee is that the Senate approve the change in policy on Composition of a Doctoral Committee. Questions for Greg and his committee?

SACHS: What was the rationale --
BROTHERS: Name, please?

SACHS: Leon Sachs, Arts and Sciences.
What was the rationale for keeping the outside examiner?

GRAF: It was perceived by myself and other members of the committee, as well as

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt

Senate Council, that the greater degree of diversity will be achieved by having someone from outside the department serve not only as an external chair on the graduate training process for the students, but also the faculty members that served on that particular committee.

VALLIANCOURT: Lisa Vaillancourt, College of Agriculture.

So do I understand that now the minimum number of people will be three?

GRAF: No, that is not correct. Core membership is still four members, but there is no requirement that three of them be from that one department. So you can have only two from your home department and two from outside the department or that program (inaudible).

HIPPISLEY: Kaveh?

TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering. Procedure of question. I know this has been approved by Graduate Council, but technically not this one because it was amended, right? Senate Council did not approve this identical proposal. Did the graduate faculty approve this at their meeting?

GRAF: I don't think I understand your question. The Graduate Council brought this proposal forward. I don't know that it went to the Graduate Faculty --

TAGAVI: There's a body of Graduate Faculty that they meet once a year.

UNIDENTIFIED: Once a year.

TAGAVI: Once a year. And I thought major proposals had to be approved by that -- maybe not. I just want to know. So it has not been approved by Graduate Faculty?

GRAF: Not to my knowledge.

HIPPISLEY: Susan?

CARVALHO: Susan Carvalho, Interim Dean.

It seems that we need some clarification on rules of the Graduate Faculty. There was a time when rules were codified (inaudible) across only the faculties of the University.

So there are rules of the Graduate School Faculty, which is the Martin and Patterson School, and that they (inaudible) rules of the Graduate Faculty of the University. So we're working on addressing that and then working with (inaudible) approval process in deciding which kinds of votes (inaudible), who Graduate Faculty consists of, (inaudible), and how we should manage that in the modern era because it hasn't actually been done (inaudible).

FIEDLER: Ted Fiedler, Arts and Sciences.

Why the reduction? What's the rationale from reducing from three to two?

GRAF: So the thought is that by allowing the reduction from three to two, it would allow for a selection of faculty members who

provide a particular expertise to the committee that would not necessarily -- or would not necessitate the increase in the size of the committee.

So if I want to bring someone in, by example, from a committee, one of my students, from Engineering, let's say, I can always add them. But in doing so, I increase the size of the committee from four to five.

So it allows greater flexibility in committee composition, facilitates interdisciplinary training for how to necessitate an increase in size (inaudible).

JACKSON:

Brian Jackson, Graduate School.

Just to address Tagavi's question, the original proposal was circulated to graduate programs and encouraged them to circulate to all the graduate faculty members. There was no opposition received to that, the initial proposal.

HIPPI SLEY:

Ernie?

BAILEY:

Ernie Bailey, Ag, Food, Environment.

If you had had a committee of five, would it be possible for three of them to be outside and two from the department?

GRAF:

Theoretically, yes.

HIPPI SLEY:

Connie?

WOOD:

Connie Wood, Arts and Sciences.

Is it still the program's prerogative not to except these changes and to maintain the three and one, or like my department does, the four and one?

GRAF:

I believe the answer to that is yes.

HIPPI SLEY:

Brian?

GRAF:

Brian, do you want to address that?

JACKSON:

That would be a possibility, yes.

KRAEMER:

Phil Kraemer, Arts and Sciences.

Greg, just for clarification, is the restriction on the program or department?

GRAF:

The graduate program. It's -- actually the verbiage is academic program, and in a parenthetical note, department.

KRAEMER:

Is it not the same? A department could have (inaudible) --

GRAF:

I think the parenthetical note just mentions the note that it be depending on the graduate program or department, or (inaudible) redundant if it was outside the department, they would not necessarily be (inaudible).

WOOD:

Before voting, would it be possible for us to actually see what we're voting on?

GRAF:

Did you not have a copy of that?

BROTHERS:

Well, it's with the agenda.

GRAF:

This. So the existing policy is on the top. The proposed change would be here on the bottom. So the core committee still has four members, minimum of two faculty from the academic program, one being a major professor as chair, one representative from outside the academic program. A

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt
 parenthetical note of department. All core
 must be members of the Graduate Faculty
 including the major professor.

HI PPI SLEY: Kaveh?
 TAGAVI: Tagavi, again.
 I -- your footnote, is missing.
 It's a typo, but it could be important. I
 just want to tell you it's missing.

GRAF: It's on the bottom of the page.
 TAGAVI: Okay. But my question is I am not
 sure what was mentioned, consider in
 Engineering we have a department, Chemical
 and Material Engineering. My belief is that
 the program, Chemical Engineering,
 (inaudible) two of the members must be from
 Chemical Engineering, cannot be from Material
 even though they are within the department.
 But if I'm wrong, please tell me I'm wrong so
 it will be on the record.

GRAF: I don't think I understand your --
 TAGAVI: The requirement of two from program
 cannot be two from the department. I thought
 Dr. Jackson said (inaudible) department.
 Some departments have two programs, or more
 than one. If somebody wants to get a PhD in
 Chemical Engineering, they have to have two
 from Chemical Engineering, one from Chemical,
 one from Material, doesn't satisfy this rule.
 If I'm mistaken, just tell me that I'm
 mistaken so it will be for the record.

JACKSON: I would agree with your
 interpretation.

BROTHERS: I'm sorry, name?
 JACKSON: Brian Jackson.
 WOOD: Connie Wood.
 Let me clarify one other
 clarification. So you're saying that a
 committee could have two from Statistics and
 three -- a graduate student, a doctoral
 student in Statistics, could have two members
 from statistics, three members from
 mechanical engineering, and those three
 members could flunk the student in
 Statistics?

GRAF: Yes.
 WOOD: Thank you.
 HI PPI SLEY: Other questions?
 MARTIN: Heath Martin, Libraries.
 Correct me if I'm wrong, I'm not
 sure that the language in the proposed
 revision accomplishes what you intend it to.
 The four members, minimum of two should be
 inside the program, and one is outside.
 Wasn't the goal to be able to bring
 more in from outside?

GRAF: Two are required to be from inside.
 It would allow four. Two to be from outside
 without increasing the size.

MARTIN: But doesn't it specify one from
 outside?

GRAF: It is a minimum of one. Well, one
 must be from outside. You're right. It
 doesn't specify that it is a minimum, but one

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt
must be from outside. It is not (inaudible)
yeah, it would not. You're right.

MARTIN: You used the minimum terminology in
the first -- in the second sentence so it
(inaudible) just for clarity.

GROSSMAN: The word minimum describes -- Bob
Grossman, A and S.
The word minimum describes the two
faculty members and the one representative
from outside. There is a minimum of two in
the department, there is a minimum of one
outside the department. If you want four
members, the fourth member can be either in
or out.

DIETZ: Hank Dietz, Engineering.
I'm a little disturbed by the fact
that the phrasing here has academic program
in one place and then academic program,
parenthesis, department. Because basically
I'm wondering if you had a department that
has two programs, could you actually count
one of the people in the other program as an
outside member of the committee?
It looks like this is trying to
explicitly forbid that, but it doesn't. It's
ambiguous that it's not paired always with
academic program or department. I think it
should be one or the other, or it should be
both in both places.

GRAF: Okay. We'll accept an amendment to
the proposal.

HIPPISLEY: There has to be an amendment
first. Everyone wants to talk but no one
wants to amend.

DIETZ: All right. I'll propose it as an
amendment.

HIPPISLEY: Okay. So just state your
amendment.

DIETZ: Okay. So the proposed amendment
would be that the phrase academic program
always be followed by department in
parenthesize.

UNIDENTIFIED: No.
DIETZ: No?
PORTER: Second.

HIPPISLEY: Is your amendment to delete
department or to add it?

DIETZ: I was trying to be cooperative with
friendly suggestion.

HIPPISLEY: Well, it's not on the floor yet so
-- Connie?

WOOD: I think technically -- I'm putting
on my former dean or associate dean and
interim dean hat. It should be two faculty
members from the Graduate Program, is what it
technically should be. And with one as the
major professor as chair or co-chair and one
representative from outside the Graduate
Program. End of discussion. Departments
don't have anything to do with this.

DIETZ: Sounds good.
WOOD: May I make that as an amendment?
HIPPISLEY: Well, your proposed -- we haven't

quite finished that yet.

PORTER: I seconded.

UNIDENTIFIED: There is a second here.

HIPPI SLEY: Oh, there is a second.

BROTHERS: Who seconded?

PORTER: Porter.

BROTHERS: Thank you.

HIPPI SLEY: All right. So if you'll restate your amendment, we have a second, then we can debate it.

GROSSMAN: Or you can withdraw it.

HIPPI SLEY: Do we have any other amendment suggestions? Bob?

GROSSMAN: I believe that Connie's amendment included changing the second academic program to Graduate Program.

WOOD: Yes.

GROSSMAN: Outside the Graduate Program.

WOOD: It's the Graduate Program.

GROSSMAN: Yes.

WOOD: And it should be chair or co-chair.

HIPPI SLEY: So, Connie, this is your amendment?

WOOD: Yes, even though I'm going to vote against the whole thing.

HIPPI SLEY: All right. Second?

PORTER: Second.

HIPPI SLEY: Porter seconds. The motion is on the floor. You can see what the amendment is, is to put graduate or co-chairs, cross out academic, put in graduate, and cross out department. That's the amendment. And we will now do an amendment vote.

UNIDENTIFIED: No.

HIPPI SLEY: Or we'll discuss it. Kaveh?

TAGAVI: I'm sorry to bring this up but my friend, Connie Wood, is right that these are -- they are related to program, not department, she's totally correct.

However, think about this for a second before we change this right on the spot. For the outside person to have some limit of independence you want them to be outside the department. So why I would keep the two from inside the program, I suggest as a friendly amendment if Connie would agree to change, for the outside one, flip it to the outside the department. It's just too cozy if you're in the same department.

HIPPI SLEY: Do you want to accept that, Connie?

WOOD: I will accept that as a friendly amendment. From outside --

TAGAVI: The department.

CARVALHO: Can I just speak to that? I don't know the outside person is there as an examiner, an objective person. That person is there to bring breadth to the scholarly aspect of the research.

There is a Graduate School examiner who is there to certify the rigor objectively of the exam. So remember that that person will come in at the end and fill out a written evaluation (inaudible).

The function of this outside member

is distinct from that. I would caution.
(Inaudible).

HIPPI SLEY: Connie, given that, are you still
accepting friendly amendments?

TAGAVI: I accept. She already accepted it
so I --

WOOD: I will withdraw it.

HIPPI SLEY: So back to the -- I think Joan was
next.

MAZUR: Joan Mazur, Education.

There's a couple things that
haven't come up in this. One is that one
motivation for this entire change is that
some programs, as they grow their doctoral
programs, really are burdened because they
don't have three people that they can
continually put on committees. So that was
one motivation for reducing the number from
in program to two rather than three.

And these are minimum. So if you
have a program that has -- exceeds the
minimum requirements of the Graduate School
currently, Connie, like yours does, well,
then someone is going to have to be a grownup
and figure out how to make it so that you
wouldn't be outvoted by people who aren't in
your area. Because I think that's a rare
case.

And I think that the sense that I
had when we were looking at this in Senate
Council was that we do need this outside
person to add the intellectual and academic
depth to the committee that interdisciplinary
perspectives bring. So just to kind of
encapsulate it from what I took away from our
discussion for these amendments.

But these are minimums. So if your
program has a minimum of five people on a
committee, it still doesn't mean you must
have three people outside. You still only
have to have only one person be outside and
two from the program.

HIPPI SLEY: We're discussing these specific --
do you mind discussing about this? These
specific amendments here. Anyone else want
to speak for or against?

CARVALHO: Let me just respond to that
statement. The composition of the committee
needs to be based on the student's work and
not necessarily on sharing the burden among
the faculty.

So the composition of the committee
must be based on what composition best
supports the student's research. Sometimes
that's more broad, sometimes it's more
focused. (Inaudible).

HIPPI SLEY: Hsai n?

ILAHIANE: Hsai n Ilahiane, A and S.

I just want to add to the comment
that Susan said. In addition to the nature
of the work that the student is involved in,
there is also a grant here, so you need more
representation from the program that you are

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt
from Biomedical whatever. So there is an issue of representation in terms of the committee and that also lends the quality to, you know, whatever degree you have.

And I think I was also glad that somebody raised the issue in terms of majority rule. So if you have four or three others, you remaining professors from a particular department, (inaudible).

HIPPISLEY: Katherine?

MCCORMICK: Something in response to Susan's comment. I think it's also the case that this is a degree that comes from the University of Kentucky. So as faculty, we have a responsibility as well to form a partnership with that student so that we can guide or help them select these members.

And so as Joan suggested, when this came to Council, our interest was about the student to make sure that they had a part of this committee, a group of scholars who could bring a difference of opinion, or at least a broader perspective of than just that espoused by that in their department.

We also acknowledged that these students hopefully will go out for employment and so the composition of that committee is important to them in terms of the many kinds of ways in which knowledge is disseminated and acquired.

HIPPISLEY: Okay. So this is just a vote, at this point we're going to vote on these particular amendments and then we're going to back to the main motion.

Okay. This is just the amendments. Okay. Five, four, three, two, one. All right. So we just passed those amendments. So now we're going to go back to the main motion which is this. Okay. Any further discussion on the motion to change the composition of the Graduate doctorate?. Yes, Bob.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.

I'm putting my Chemistry hat on right now. I am strongly in favor of this change. We are extremely an collaborative department. There are people in our department who, just because they need to be in some department, are in Chemistry, but they could just as well be in other departments. And this will certainly benefit our students greatly. And so I am strongly in favor of this.

Again, any department that's worried about infiltration from other departments or overruling (inaudible) of a professor can pose additional restrictions based on these minimums. But this flexibility will be greatly welcomed by the members of my department.

HIPPISLEY: Connie?

WOOD: First let me say that the Department of Statistics is not scared of

being infiltrated.

But I am very much against this because you will remember that several years ago, we decreased the size of a committee from five to four for exactly the same argument, that it was too strenuous on people to continue having four members from the Graduate Program on the committee.

Now we're being asked to approve a change where there's only two from that doctoral program. We have a responsibility to our students that we -- that we are -- we have admitted and are guiding to a doctoral program to provide disciplinary training there and guidance.

I am much for interdisciplinary as anybody in the room, and you can always do that, and we certainly do that in Statistics, (inaudible) people from various areas.

And finally, let me remind you that if you only have two people from Statistics and two people from outside, that a tie in the Graduate School is a fail.

So I am certainly against any kind of committee that can have a majority of people from outside the department and I'm not in favor of a committee that can only set the student up to fail with a student who (inaudible).

And so I will vote against this, with all due respect.

HIPPI SLEY: Brian Jackson is here. Is the external examiner from the Graduate School someone who can vote on the committee?

JACKSON: (Inaudible). Yes.

WOOD: But that's only at the defense. You also have qualifiers there.

HIPPI SLEY: Yes?

SWANSON: Mark Swanson, Public Health.

Is the current language also expressed in minimums? So could you currently have three members from a department and fifteen members from outside the department, theoretically?

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

SWANSON: So there's no difference. It's just decreasing the number that are actually required from the department. Currently, the same situation that's being expressed through -- by our College of Statistics could happen now.

HIPPI SLEY: Anyone --

UNIDENTIFIED: There's not a maximum of five, right? There's no maximum number of the committee, right?

CARVALHO: And that is why I made the point I did, that I think as a labor-saving measure, it would not be appropriate. But if it's right for the student's research project then it's appropriate. So that's why (inaudible), we have great respect (inaudible).

WOOD: Point of information. Brian, I've been told that if we do go up, the sixth

member does not get reported in the Graduate School, is that correct or not correct?

JACKSON: That's not correct.

HIPPI SLEY: Okay. We do have lots of other things to do today. Questions?

ILAHIANE: Hsain Ilahiane, A and S. So in terms of reduction, what worries me is the identity of the program. So once our student is out looking for jobs, the first question, I don't know if (inaudible) who did you study under. And that's very important in the marketplace.

MCCORMICK: One more point of clarification, Susan or Brian. How often do students go beyond the minimum of five or the number five?

CARVALHO: Four. I don't have numbers on that.

MCCORMICK: Brian, do you know?

JACKSON: I'm sorry, what was the question?

MCCORMICK: How often do they have more than four members on their committee?

JACKSON: Fairly infrequently.

CARVALHO: But again, the chair of the committee does have a little sway there. So if the chair of the committee wants more than the chair of the committee should put more on there if it supports the student's research project. That's the responsibility of the chair.

HIPPI SLEY: So this is the motion on the floor just as amended, as you know. Kaveh?

TAGAVI: Tagavi. Let me give you the reverse scenario of what Connie said. If you have, let's say three from outside and two from inside, or four from outside, two from inside, the two from inside can say no including --, correct me if I'm wrong, Dr. Jackson, including the chair, and the four from outside could say yes and the person passes? That's also a travesty. I think these four lines could be written a little bit better.

HIPPI SLEY: Yes, Mi rek?

TRUSZCZYNSKI: Mi rek Truszczynski, Engineering. I think that the people from the outside, and I agree with Dean Carvalho here, are there for a reason. They were not put there arbitrarily. If they are there for a reason, their negative vote should count as much as the negative vote of the people who are in the department. To me this proposal seems to offer a way to invite to the committee people who can contribute, who are appropriate to be on this committee without infusing the minimum of four, without going above four.

CARVALHO: To add one more note about the process, before a dissertation can be approved for defense, it must be pre-approved by a majority of the committee. And it's still the chair of the committee who decides

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt

to rule on the committee, that person will pass the dissertation for that pre-approval phase.

It's not a guarantee that the student has a defense, but it's a safeguard that most likely they will, if they can defend their dissertation, you know, on the spot.

So there is still another level of safeguard for the student.

HIPPISLEY: I think we are ready to vote. Five second countdown. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries.

This is where senators can get the word out to their colleges. This is a big policy change happening at the graduate level. Please (inaudible) Dean of Graduate Affairs (inaudible). Get the message out as soon as possible?

GROSSMAN: Is this effective immediately?

HIPPISLEY: Yes. Okay. Second report.

GRAF: The second proposal comes from the Graduate School, and it's a change in -- Sheila, if you don't mind bringing that up, as well -- makes a change to the time limit for doctoral degrees.

At present, a candidate must complete all of the requirements of a degree program within five years after completing or essentially passing the qualifying exam.

And if they fail to do so the request can be made, by the Director of Graduate Studies to the Graduate Council, to continue or to consider an extension of time.

If an extension of longer than one year is requested, the current policy requires that the student retake the qualifying exam.

The proposed change, down here on the bottom in yellow, would change the policy, it does not change the amount of time or anything related to the time restrictions for passing the qualifying exam, but gives the Director of Graduate Student Studies the flexibility of making a recommendation as to whether or not a retake of qualifying exams should be a requirement of the extension. And then it would be considered by the Graduate Council as (inaudible) in the policy.

The rationale for this is that some students, although not completing their studies in time, has been diligently working towards the completion of the degree, are making reasonable progress, but for whatever reason, the nature of the work is taking a longer period of time, and it allows the Director of Graduate Studies to essentially not require them or make a recommendation that they not be required to retake the qualifying exam or (inaudible).

It was discussed at committee and approved at Graduate Council and is now on

- the floor for discussion.
- HIPPISLEY: So this is a recommendation from the Committee that this specific change be made to the time extension policy. The motion is on the floor. Anybody want to ask anything or speak for or against it, now is the time.
- ILAHIANE: Hearing no -- sorry. Yes?
My name is Hsain Ilahiane, A and S.
I just want to understand this correctly. All degree requirements for the doctorate must be completed within five years following the semester or summer session... So in some disciplines it cannot work that way because of the field work (inaudible). I'm Anthropology, that's what I do. So the completion, does this mean course requirement or -- I just want to be clear.
- GRAF: Well, first of all, that language is not changing in the proposal. I should have articulated that first.
Secondly, it simply states all of the requirements of the graduate degree. So that is presumably the completion of a thesis, successful defense of that thesis to the Graduate Committee and external examiner. If there are additional course requirements unique to that program, then yes, it would apply to that as well.
- HIPPISLEY: Brian?
- JACKSON: That's correct again. All requirements (inaudible), and that would have to be completed within that five year time frame.
- ILAHIANE: That's problematic again. I'm just reading this slide here. For other disciplines five years, it's ideal in a given that these were grant writing, grant response, that all takes time. I just want to raise that issue from other field-based disciplines.
- HIPPISLEY: The Dean of the Graduate School is here, she can hear you. Matt?
- GIANCARLO: Matthew Giancarlo, Arts and Sciences.
To get the broad picture of this, what I'm understanding is first that graduate students have the time up to their qualifying examination, then they have a standard window of five years to complete the PhD qualifying examination, after which they can have an extension up to an additional five years, without any serious question, after which they can have an additional period of one year if it's approved by the Graduate --
- GRAF: I don't believe that's quite right. I believe it's five years to pass the qualifying exam. They may request an extension for up to one year, for a total of six years to pass the qualifying exam without having to go to Graduate Council. On that year. Then it has to go to Graduate Council in the current policy and it requires

retaking the qualifying exam.

The new proposal would not require them -- would allow the Director of Graduate Studies to make a recommendation to Council as to whether the retake is required or not.

They still have a maximum of (inaudible) to complete the degree program.

GIANCARLO: With that accurate understanding, my own sense, I'm a little wary of changing it because in my experience the threat of having to retake the quals has provided something of a strong motivator for both committee members and the candidate to actually get the thing done.

And I'm sort of wondering if our peer institutions have a similar policy or if we could look to other institutions for what they do?

GRAF: So I'll comment first by saying the new proposal would not necessarily strip that as a requirement or a stick, for lack of a better term, for the students because it is at the discretion of the Director of Graduate Studies which would obviously be informed by the Graduate Committee.

With respect to looking at other peer institutions, I must confess we did not compare this policy to other peer institutions when reviewing it.

GIANCARLO: Thank you.

HIPPISLEY: Bob?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.

Question about whether the recommendation, I'm assuming the DGS makes a recommendation, the Graduate Council because it's a recommendation, can choose to ignore that recommendation.

GRAF: That is correct.

GROSSMAN: And so Graduate Council can, in fact, act as a stick for the student when the DGS says, well, you know, yeah, I'll recommend it, that you pass the qualifier, but that Graduate Council, they're a bunch of hard asses and they won't allow that. So there's that possibility also.

LEE: Chad Lee, College of Ag.
What is the average completion time now?

GRAF: Well, I think it varies by discipline substantially because (inaudible) took her exam in Anthropology.

Brian, do you know the average time for matriculation for PhD programs at UK?

JACKSON: It does vary considerably from program to program.

CARVALHO: Nationally, from admission to completion nationally is intended to be about six years for most disciplines for humanities. And that's the Council on Graduate School's recommendation.

So if you assume two to three years pre-quals, then that gives you an answer to post-quals. But students come back ten,

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt

fifteen years later to ask if they can resume their dissertation project, they're tired of carrying it around. And so I think this kind of determination, I would recommend the DGS base their recommendation on whether the person has remained current in the field or not.

So I've had people come back twenty years later because they were raising a family and they hadn't stayed current. I've had other people who have been adjunct faculty at teaching institutions and they want to finish, and have remained current.

So the currency in the field was the reason for the retake and that's still the question: Can you say the returning person, or malingerer of some kind, has stayed current in the field? That should be more important than the rule (inaudible).

HIPPISLEY: Hearing no further discussion, the motion is on the floor. We don't need a second. It's not amended. Five second countdown. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries.

And again, please send this around to colleges.

Okay. I am delighted to introduce Terry Birdwhistell, Dean of Libraries, to give us the State of the Libraries Address.

BIRDWHISTELL: Thank you, Andrew, and thank you all for the opportunity to share with you some information about UK Libraries.

I want to start off by also thanking the members of the Senate's Library Committee for their service this year.

Like all academic research libraries around the country, we have struggled somewhat during the past few years with the economic climate that has impacted all of the universities, but hit pretty hard on the research libraries.

One of the things we do at UK Libraries is try to be good stewards of the funding that we have. And for the last five years, we have worked very hard to make good decisions on how the funding we have is spent, to maximize the amount of information materials we can make available to you and your students, to maximize the impact we can have on library instruction, and to help in several other areas.

This year we had our budget hearing with Provost Tracy. We had a great discussion about what's going on in the Libraries now, what the pressure points are, and quite frankly, I'm very optimistic going forward, that we are turning a corner on this and starting to see some positive things happen in that area.

This past year we placed a lot of focus on our Medical Library. It was an area where we were having the most challenges with the cost of materials going up 6 to 8 percent

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt

annually. They had some facilities issues that we had to address and so we've been working on that quite deliberately.

We're seeking other sources of funding for that library, you know it supports six health sciences colleges plus the clinical and research enterprises that are all part of UK Healthcare. So we're optimistic going forward that there is going to be some new resources into that and keep providing the services that people have become accustomed to.

We're making great strides in the University Institutional Repositories about UK Knowledge. If you haven't visited that website, I would encourage you to go there.

We've managed this past year to put all the titles of the University (inaudible) inception on the Institutional Repository for all UK faculty and students to have access to.

And in the months and years ahead, we're going to have to have many more discussion on this campus about scholarly publishing and open access as that continues to change, that landscape changes throughout the country.

This year we invested in personnel and resources in the area of data curation. We're hoping to partner with Campus IT, and the Vice President of Research, and other offices around the campus, to make sure that this University is doing everything we can to provide support in terms of data curation and UK Libraries wants to be a part of that.

And finally, we have increased our library instruction and our work information literacy (inaudible) as well, and today I wanted to share part of that success with you, and I've asked Dr. Stacey Greenwell, who heads up that area for us, to give us a brief report on what we're doing with instruction.

GREENWELL:

I've certainly excited to get to share very briefly with you some of the things that we're doing in Library Services at UK Libraries.

So I'm head of information literacy but also the Young Library Public Services in a number of our branch libraries as well. So one of the things that I want to emphasize is what a team effort this is among the librarians all over campus, here at Young and our subjects libraries and our Medical Center Library and our Special Collections Research Center. So it's again my honor to speak today about all the wonderful things that they are doing.

So I thought it would be helpful for you to get a sense of some things just going on with services generally. As we know, this is a very busy building, Young Library, as well as our other campus libraries. We know that a lot of social

interactions and fun things happen in this building.

The gate counts continue to be busy. We continue to see a lot of students coming in. But we are a serious academic place as well. We help students achieve their potential through the circulation and library loans services we provide, through the reference transactions we provide.

So we appreciate you faculty and other faculty that continue to send students to us and ask those types of questions. In the first week of school we'll have 2,000 or more questions. Things like printing, of course, but also how do I get started on this assignment. How do I write this paper, what resources are needed. So again, we appreciate you continuing to encourage students to come to us and talk to us early on in their projects.

And so just to talk about our instruction program, the primary focus of again my brief presentation today, over the last four years we have made very substantial changes to our program.

And some of you certainly are familiar with this already, so for that I apologize, but at one time we would provide more of an orientation, you know, show you the reference areas, show you how to do a search. And we still, orientation has its place, but we've tried to move beyond that into more of a partnership with faculty to focus on student learning.

So what we like to do is work with a faculty member early on with an assignment, you know, what do students need to do to be successful with that assignment. And then let's work together, the librarian and the faculty member, to tailor that instruction around the assignment in order to help these students.

So again, we're kind of getting away from orientation and moving more into this learning outcome focused instruction. So we like to think of that as information literacy instruction.

There are a lot of definitions of information literacy, certainly. I simply like to think of it as finding, evaluating, and using information. It's really the foundation of all learning. It's critical thinking, whatever you want to call it. In library land, we call it information literacy.

But it's important for students in completing that assignment, for completing your course successfully. But it's important for students out in the workplace. It's a life-long skill.

And so if we can work together early on in their programs to help them develop these skills, we partner together

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt

libraries and faculty, then we're doing something wonderful for these students.

So again, you know, I encourage you to continue to partner with us and to help us with these things. And let me emphasize, too, that we do this at all levels. So I know you've heard these conversations in the past pertaining to UK core, and we do continue to provide those types of instruction for that level, but we work with graduate students as well. We work at all levels.

And so our program is based on the Association of College and Research Libraries learning outcomes. And so our -- we -- we use those standards to develop our outcome. And essentially what we will do is work with you, work with the faculty member, to select an outcome that's most appropriate for your assignment or for what you're trying to achieve in the class.

And we will tailor our instruction in whatever form it might take, around that skill. And again, it works at all level of skill. We work with doctoral students, too, in doing these types of things. They're all things that we do in our own research, they're things we do in everyday life. So it's just -- it's articulated a little bit differently here.

And so just to talk briefly about some strategies, of course you're familiar with the in person instructional strategy, we've been bringing our students to the library for years. We continue to do that kind of instruction. We do now focus more on active learning techniques so we don't tend to stand up here and talk, much as I am doing, we tend to have activities within the class.

One class I saw that was wonderful, I thought, the students didn't use the computers for the first 20, 30 minutes of the class. We had them working in the language of their discipline to develop search strategies, to identify key words, and, you know, they participated in groups and did that sort of thing. So again, it is a little bit different, perhaps, than what we are used to in the traditional library instruction sense.

I should mention, too, some of the things we're doing as well is our Special Collections Research Center. So we may have a session that works really well, they'll come to Young, they'll learn about secondary resources, and then they might go over to the Special Collections Research Center and learn about doing primary research. So wonderful opportunities to partner with faculty.

And so in person instruction certainly is a strategy. Two other strategies that we are spending a lot of time

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt

with, because obviously if every class wanted instruction, they're just aren't enough of us, so we do some trainer work. We've done work with teaching TAs how to use some of these things to help with you and help with your program.

We're also doing more and more online. We've integrated some instruction into Blackboard. That's something that I've worked with a little bit as well in my role as a graduate faculty member working with Library Science students.

And of course, too, our research guides. So I'll just show you a couple of those. Again you may already be familiar with these, but we do work at faculty requests to create these types of guides. This one happens to be for one of our core courses. We do them for courses of all levels, provide library instructional materials, videos, all sorts of information to help students be successful with that assignment.

Here's another example of one as well. This one is actually on research impact measures. This is a great one for you, certainly, or for graduate students as well. So we develop these on different topics. Again, just to have these instructional materials to help students and to help you be successful.

So finally, we can't talk about these sorts of things without talking just a little bit about assessment. So I think one of the reasons our program has done so well, is we continue to grow and we continue to learn from it, is in working with faculty and partnering on assessment.

So, you know, we like to, whenever we have the opportunity to speak with students, maybe do a brief free instruction survey, you know, get a sense of where they are with the research process. And then we like to follow up the class with a very short assessment. So if we're going back to the earlier example, how do they build their research strategy, what types of information did they find. So it's very helpful when the librarian and faculty member can work together to do that.

So it is a rubric-based assessment that we do and we've been collecting data for over four years now. We have seen some improvement, you know, getting to see all different kinds of students from all levels. So we feel like that our instructional strategies can be used in how we're doing the program, how we're implementing it is improving.

And so finally, just thinking ahead, what's next. We continue to refine our instruction program. It is my area of research interest, actually, in developing

online instructional materials and how we can best get this information literacy instruction across to students. And the other piece, too, is continuing to build partnerships.

So again, you know, partnerships, obviously there's a lot of protected services that we have here in the Young Library, including those, all the great things going on in the basement. So those partnerships, but also partnerships with our faculty on campus, partnerships with faculty like you.

So again, this is very short. If you're interested in learning more, I'd be glad to talk with you later on, or one of the faculty in the library as well. Thank you.

HIPPI SLEY: Now we'll have quick questions for either the Dean or for Cindy -- Stacey. Thank you both for coming.

So our next action, Marcy Deaton will explain.

DEATON: All right. I will be really fast. This is a proposal for an amendment to GR II, which is the GR that's about the Board of Trustees.

The Board is requesting that the -- let me get it right, Audit and Compliance Subcommittee of the Finance Committee be elevated to become a regular committee, rather than a subcommittee of one of the committees, in order to get it -- more transparency. It would make it report directly to the Board instead to the Board through the Finance Committee.

Do you have that somewhere, Sheila? There. So as you can see it's for many years been a subcommittee and these minor changes would now make it a regular committee.

HIPPI SLEY: So I'm trying to get this right. This is a motion from Senate Council to endorse, therefore, it does not need a second. So we endorse GRs, as a Body, to approve them.

So the motion is on the floor if anybody would like to ask Marcy any questions about splitting up the committee this way, now is the time.

Hearing none -- is there any further discussion? Then we'll vote on endorsing this. Five, four, three, two, one. The polls close. And we voted to endorse.

TAGAVI: Tagavi.

I brought this up after the vote because it's not part of the change. But in part of this GR, the (inaudible) Committee is defined by the Board. It says five elected from and by the Board. Then it immediately said the chair and the vice-chair are members.

So first of all, there's an internal inconsistency. But I checked the KRS. KRS does not allow the Chair and the Vice Chair to be automatically a member, and,

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt

in fact, they have to be elected. So I just wanted to bring that to your attention.

There is a problem with the GR.

DEATON: I appreciate that and I will take that under advisement and discuss it with General Counsel.

TAGAVI: All right.

HIPPI SLEY: Thank you.

DEATON: Thank you.

HIPPI SLEY: Okay. So I would like to invite to the podium, Dave Watt, is he here, he is, who is -- he was the Chair of a committee, an Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Disciplinary Action, who drafted a GR that the Senate Council revised and recommends we have our first meeting today.

No action will be taken. It's just pure discussion, questions for Dave and his committee. And in a month's time, less than a month's time, May the 4th, we will vote on the GR.

WATT: Thank you, Andrew. I think this group is well aware that the President wrote to the Senate Council in September and asked us to consider a faculty disciplinary policy.

That letter triggered the appointment by the Senate Council of the Ad Hoc Committee that I Chair. And I would like to begin by thanking the members of the committee. And I would ask them to stand if they are here. First Marcy Deaton, second, Connie Wood, third, Liz Debski, fourth, David Pienskowski, and finally, John Wilson.

I point these people out to you because as we go through the next month and discuss this particular draft GR, I invite you to meet with them, and/or with me, to discuss concerns that you may have.

Next I'd like to thank General Counsel, Thro, for the many hours that he spent with me as we went back and forth discussing this particular GR.

And finally, I'd like to thank the President, who met with Andrew and I on several occasions to discuss the work that we were doing.

I will remind you, in case you have forgotten, that the President has the authority to issue Administrative Regulations. And the President could have merely issued an Administration Regulation on a faculty disciplinary policy, but instead chose to come to this Body and to seek our input into this particular governing regulation. And so I thank him for giving us this opportunity.

Now in thinking about how to present the Committee's work today, it came to my mind that many of you are busy people and we are reaching the end of the semester, and perhaps, you have not read through this Governing Regulation in great detail thus far.

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt

So what I'm going to do is pose five questions and then answer the five questions and then throw the floor open for discussion.

So question one: Do other universities have similar policies? Our Committee began by looking at practices across the country. We read policies from a variety of universities. And so the answer to the first question is yes.

These policies exist, perhaps not in exactly this format, but they exist at virtually all of the universities that we looked at. And we certainly looked at quite a number.

Secondly: Why do we need this policy? Some of you are going to say, well, wait a minute, Dave, we have a code of faculty responsibilities in the Senate Rules. It's Senate Rule 7.0.

In fact, as we got into our discussions, we learned that the Board, the University Board has not delegated to the Senate the authority to develop this particular code. And so as a corollary to this governing regulation, we're going to have to amend the Senate Rules.

That said, I think the strongest argument in favor of having a GR like this is that we are a group of professionals and I think we should write our own Code of Faculty Conduct, and I believe that this particular draft GR attempts that.

In fact, I think that the individuals who served on this committee did the absolute best job they could to meet the requirements that the President had put forward in his letter, and to balance the need for faculty protections.

Okay, so the third question: What doesn't this policy do? It does not open the issue of post-tenure review. That is not part of this policy. It also does not address a concern that I've had for years, and that is we do not have a good mechanism at the University for dealing with faculty behavioral or mental health issues.

We are a large number of people, and given the number of us, there are bound to be people who have these difficulties. And as yet, we do not have a policy to help these individuals regain 100 percent effectiveness. So this policy does not address either of those.

Okay, so what does this policy do? This policy, of course, is a faculty disciplinary policy. I'm going to describe it in a very, very brief way. There's a great deal of this which appears in considerable detail on the Senate website. And so you can get access to this and I certainly urge you to review it.

First of all, this applies to

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt

everyone from the instructor to the President of the University. Anyone who holds faculty rank is subject to this particular policy.

Secondly, allegations can come from virtually any source. We could have the local law enforcement notify UK police regarding some faculty action. We could have a colleague write to the President of the University. We could have parents call from overseas to complain about how their child is being treated by faculty at the University.

So allegations can come from a variety of sources and can be of a variety of types. Initially, there needs to be some assessment of these particular allegations, and that is going to be done by the Dean in consultation with General Counsel.

If there is a decision made that one should conduct an investigation then the investigation will be done by professionals.

It will be done by internal audit or by Terry Allen's office. Someone who really understands what the issues are, what the laws are. And they will, in fact, issue a report. This written documentation will be, of course, provided to the accused faculty member and to the Dean of that faculty member's college.

And the next, and we hope the most predominate action, will be mediation. The faculty member in consultation with the Dean will meet. They will attempt to arrive at some ultimate decision as to what transpired and what sanctions the faculty member may face, if the faculty member is guilty, in fact, of breaking some particular rule.

Let me repeat: We hope that mediation at this level will solve most of the problems. I have been a faculty member here since 1985. I have known hundreds, if not thousands, of faculty in my various administrative roles, and I do not expect an enormous number of cases to go to mediation, much less to go beyond mediation.

Nevertheless, we need to discuss what's going to happen if a Dean attempted a mediation with an accused faculty member is unable to reach agreement.

To understand this, let me point out first that there is going to be a pool of faculty members. I believe we call it the Faculty Disciplinary Panel Pool. I think that's the name we finally agreed on.

The Senate Council will provide the President with 36 names and the President will select 25. The names that we provide and the names that will be selected will be representative of (inaudible) across campus and all of the colleges. So there will be a pool of faculty and I'll describe how we're going to use faculty in that pool momentarily.

All right. So I said suppose there

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt

is no agreement at mediation. The first of three panels, that will be important for you understand, now comes into play. It is called the Inquiry Panel. Think of it terms of a grand jury.

They will review the reports that come out of the professionals who do the investigation. They will interview the faculty and anyone else pertinent to this particular case. And this panel will consist of three people.

First, there will be one faculty member drawn from this pool which I just described. Second, there will be someone from HR. Why human resources, because there is an interest in part of the President and General Counsel in making sure that whatever sanctions are imposed, ultimately on the faculty ultimately found guilty, match what happens to staff.

Then finally, there will also be a representative of the Provost's Office and that individual will, in fact, serve to ensure that the treatment of a faculty member in one college will not differ dramatically from the treatment of the faculty member in another one.

All right. So this Inquiry Panel does not decide guilt or innocence. All the Inquiry Panel does is it looks at the evidence and decides is there grounds for probable cause, do we believe this should now go to the next stage. If they say no, the process stops. If they yes, then the process goes to the second of the three panels called the Hearing Panel.

The Hearing Panel has five faculty drawn from this pool. There are no one but faculty who will ultimately then judge faculty. The burden of proof that these faculty will use is called the clear and convincing evidence.

You have preponderance of evidence which means 51 percent. You have beyond a reasonable doubt which is at the other end of the spectrum. And preponderance of evidence is a sort of median standard.

There must be a preponderance of evidence for our Hearing Panel basically to come forward and say that this particular accused faculty member is guilty. On the other hand, the Hearing Panel may say that the faculty member is innocent.

What happens in these two cases? If the Hearing Panel says the faculty member, the accused faculty member is guilty, the Hearing Panel will also make a recommendation for sanctions, and you have a list of sanctions that are written in this particular GR. That then goes to the Provost who will be the individual who ultimately will decide what the sanction would be.

The faculty member then may be

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt

found innocent. Now, at this point, there is an option for the Dean, and it is the Dean with the assistance of Legal Counsel, who will present the evidence against the accused faculty member. The Dean may appeal an innocent verdict.

Why? Well, the thinking is that this is parallel construction. The faculty is going to have the opportunity to appeal, as I'll describe in a moment, the guilty verdict. Why shouldn't the Dean have the opportunity to appeal an innocent verdict.

Within seven days of the Hearing Panel having delivered this verdict, the Dean or the faculty member can appeal. Where does this appeal go? It goes now to something called Appeal Panel.

The Appeal Panel consists of three people. First, the Provost, second, the Chair of the Senate, and third, the Ombudsman. These three people will now look at the briefs that are filed on a faculty member appealing a guilty verdict or a Dean basically appealing an innocent verdict because the dean suspects there might have been collusion among the faculty members to basically deliver an innocent verdict when the preponderance of the evidence -- I'm sorry, when the clear and convincing evidence said that the individual was guilty.

You can imagine that other faculty might get together and flip a coin and use a coin flip to decide innocent or guilt. That would be the basis on which a Dean might appeal to this Appeals Panel.

Now, what's the probability of this? Like all policies at the University, we have a tendency to sort of get lost in those situations where there's a sort of million to one chance that that will happen.

We love to write details, regulations around the what if, what if this, what if that, then we should have this. Quite frankly, I'm not as concerned as some of my colleagues are about this so-called Deans appeal to the appeal committee in the case of an innocent verdict.

I think the harshest critic of a faculty member who reaches the stage of a Hearing Panel -- and I do not expect any cases, maybe somewhere between three and six in a year -- I expect the harshest critics are going to be the faculty members sitting on that Hearing Panel.

So I don't really think it's needed but -- and this was a discussion back and forth with the administration, and this was ultimately what they wanted in this particular GR.

Okay. So we have now the Appeals Panel and they may decide, they ultimately decide finally this issue of guilt or innocence.

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt

The Provost then decides what the sanction should be. Once again, if the accused faculty member is found guilty by the Hearing Panel and does not appeal to the Appeals Panel, then that will immediately go to the Provost for sanctions. Or if it goes to the Appeals Panel and they uphold the guilty verdict and that now goes to the Provost, whatever the circumstances, the Provost now can impose sanctions and the faculty has the option to appeal the sanction to the President.

Now we've had a lot of discussions about sanctions and we had a lot of discussions about what I will characterize as sentencing guidelines. David Watt is caught smoking six times in his office, then here's the policy, here's the sanction that should be imposed.

It becomes virtually impossible to write all of this down. And so we have put a statement in there that the sanctions must be commensurate with the infraction that the faculty committed. And I think that's the most sensible way to try and deal with it. It does involve an element of trust to be sure, but I am at this point, comfortable with it.

Finally, the new GR policy makes clear that retaliation will not be tolerated, not in any form.

And then finally there is a section at the end that deals with this issue of involuntary leave with pay. If there are issues, and unfortunately as a past administrator, I saw some where it would be best if the faculty member was not on campus while investigation -- a lot of this is resolved, then, in fact, the Provost has the option of involuntary leave with pay. And you'll note there's some qualifications on that. Okay. So that is a very brief answer to question four.

What's the fifth and final question: What do I recommend? First of all, we, as Andrew said, we have no vote today. We want to have a free and open discussion. Ask whatever you will, I'll do the best to answer. And certainly, invite my committee and the Senate Council, who has played a real role in getting this to this point, to participate and provide some answers.

I can tell you, we have spent many hours on words and phrases in this particular document. And we have compromised, at times, our view amongst ourselves. We'll do the best to answer your questions. Talk to committee members, talk to the Senate Council, circulate this widely among your colleges.

Resist the temptation to get lost in the fact that Dave Watt is a terrible

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt

editor, occasionally there's a comma where it shouldn't have a comma. Occasionally, something may be misspelled. I used to deliberately put misspelled words in policies that I would circulate to see who had read them. But I haven't done that, at least not deliberately.

I would hope that, you know, we will need to correct some of these

grammatical gaffs, and we could sort of have one omnibus motion to correct all of those, and then spend our time more productively discussing substantive issues about this particular GR.

Okay, the floor is open.
HIPPI SLEY: Armando?
PRATS: Armando Prats.
David, not to doubt the wisdom of genius, right, but when does a case go to the Dean? When do you call the cops? Where is there criminal intent, and perhaps omission, and when is there a matter of can we handle this internally?

WATT: Okay, Dr. Prats has framed a very good question, when do we handle something internally and when does it go to the police. The allegation, as I said, can come

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt

in from a variety of directions and a Dean is the ultimate recipient of an allegation, not a Chair, it goes to a Dean. And the Dean consults with General Counsel.

It is at that point where General Counsel will say, if it's a truly heinous act, you know, we need to go to the police immediately. This is not something we're going to handle. And the matter then goes to the police.

Now the faculty member who is involved in all of this, there is the issue ultimately of do we want this faculty member who has committed, let us say this heinous act, to remain among us. That I think follows as a sort of secondary event.

HIPPI SLEY: Bob?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S. Dave, one thing you didn't mention is the kinds of behavior that are covered by this policy. Can you just briefly tell everyone the list of rules and regulations that --

WATT: The list of sanctions?

GROSSMAN: I'm not talking about sanctions. The rules, the rules that govern behavior. So, you know, we can get people to cover behavior, but --

WATT: Well, this has been a concern all along, what rises to the level of an allegation that warrants an investigation. I don't know that we've got it detailed here. We specified that the Dean will discuss with Counsel.

So if you accuse Dave Watt of having taken a ballpoint pen that's University property, which you could do, hopefully, my Dean and General Counsel will decide this is not something we need to turn over to internal audit.

I haven't answered your question because I don't have a list.

GROSSMAN: In the first paragraph there's a list, it's federal and state constitutions.

WATT: Oh, okay.

GROSSMAN: Governing regulations.

WATT: Do you want me to read this?

GROSSMAN: I think it's important.

WATT: University faculty members, like all University employees, must obey the rules, standards, and procedures that arise under federal and state constitutions, statutes, and regulations, the University Governing and Administrative Regulations, the University Senate Rules, and other regulatory jurisdictions. Is that what you wanted me to point out? Okay. Sorry.

Let me make one comment as sort of an aside. As I said, I have been here since Methuselah's time and it is no wonder that faculty have a problem given the fact that we have Governing Regulations, Administrative Regulations, Human Resource Regulations,

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt
Business Procedures, and Senate Rules.

There must come a time in the future when some office is created that is a policy office that will, in fact, codify all of this. We had to define faculty here because there is no consistent faculty definition in all of these various policies. But that's a discussion for another day.

HIPPISLEY: Abigail?

FIREY: Abigail Firey, Arts and Sciences.

I have a concern about the principle behind the Dean's ability to appeal a decision of innocence. And while I appreciate the Committee's thinking about balancing the two possible (inaudible), it seems to me that this flies in the face of American norms and protection against double jeopardy in which the idea is that those with more power (inaudible) from perpetually trying to prosecute someone because it causes that someone embarrassment or anxiety or hardship.

At a certain point, an acquittal is an acquittal.

WATT: I can't say that I don't share your concern because this has been one of the most hotly debated issues in the entire GR. All I can say is that there is now language in the GR and I'll repeat it.

The Dean can appeal an innocent verdict coming out of the Hearing Panel based on substantive errors in the Faculty Hearing Panel process, the flip of a coin example that I gave earlier, or errors in interpretation of fact or law.

So the Dean can simply not do it because he does not like the way I look or I embarrassed the Dean at some meeting a month ago. It has to be substantive and in writing, and the Dean has seven days in which to do that.

I wish we did not live in an era in which we have jury nullification, but we do. And I will repeat: The President and General Counsel were absolutely insistent that this appeal process be in this regulation. And the Senate Council met with the President. I believe I'm reflecting his views accurately.

HIPPISLEY: Connie, would you like to respond to this?

WOOD: As a Committee member, I let me clarify that the committee report also did not include a need for appeal. It was a final action.

So I am very empathetic to your concern, but please notice that in Section F, there really is a distinction, and Dave was clear about this, between the grounds on which a faculty member can appeal and the grounds on which a Dean can appeal.

A faculty member can appeal on the merits of the case. The Dean can only appeal on errors in process or in interpretation of

law or fact, which (inaudible) and Marcy, help me out if you're still here, this is what is known as appellate jurisdiction. So there is no ability here for someone to introduce new evidence against a faculty member at that stage.

WATT: And I would add to that that this is an administrative hearing. We are not a court of law.

HIPPISLEY: Gail and Kaveh?

BRION: Gail Brion, College of Engineering. I wonder if it might be suggested that the original inquiry committee be a balance of people that are in administration and faculty? Right now we have one faculty member and two administration representatives.

It would seem to me that it would be more equal if you had faculty in equal numbers as people in administration.

WATT: Well, we, of course, Gail, wanted an odd number. If you read this in detail you'll find in the case of the Dean accused in this conduct, it's three faculty, an HR person, and a Provost Office person.

BRION: I did. That's why I wondered why Deans were --

WATT: Well, we were trying to keep it simple and we felt that this is not a group deciding guilt or innocence, but just does the evidence here look as though this should go to a hearing panel.

HIPPISLEY: Kaveh?

TAGAVI: I'll continue with what my colleague from Engineering said. Ironically, you call this Faculty Inquiry Panel, it has only one faculty on it, two administration. I think it's actually more fair the way Deans are treated because (inaudible) the name, Faculty Inquiry Panel. I think it should be for everybody in faculty. Three faculty, one from HR, one --

GROSSMAN: Provost.

TAGAVI: -- Provost. Then it's true to its name, it's a faculty-body panel, and it's more balance.

In addition to that, what needs two faculty for a panel is University investigation. I think University investigation should only find facts. And if they do find facts or factual statement: parking was violated. But you go beyond that. You say that they could make an opinion whether there is the guilt, and which is even, I think, more problematic, offer sanction.

WATT: Tagavi, if I said that, I mis-spoke. So let me say --

TAGAVI: It says here. They would offer a sanction to the Dean. And I'm thinking if a sanction is taking away the chair professorship, a Dean is more prominent to make that decision, not UK police that could

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt
be (inaudible). Why would UK police say
someone should lose their lab, is really
upside down.

And what is even worse after that
is after a University official entity has
said this person is guilty and this is the
sanction, then you start as if everything is
even with the Faculty Inquiry Panel. That's
really, really upside down. It's prejudice.

WATT: Let me be sure I understand.

You're of the opinion that we are putting
forward a policy in which internal audit, a
group of accountants are going to make a
recommendation on a sanction. Is that the
point you're making?

TAGAVI: I'm not making that point. I'm
reading your GR. Your GR says that.

WATT: No, it does not.

TAGAVI: Let me read it to you. It's right
here. It doesn't, Connie?

GROSSMAN: It says upon the recommendation --

TAGAVI: -- findings of fact, a conclusion
as to whether this conduct occurred, that to
me is guilt, if misconduct did occur, a non-
binding recommendation regarding disciplinary
action. (Inaudible) commend that to the
Dean. That, to me, is ridiculous that the UK
police (inaudible). Why wouldn't the Dean
make that decision?

WATT: They aren't making a recommendation
on sanction.

TAGAVI: It says that. I read it.

GIANCARLO: Could you please give us the page
and line number?

TAGAVI: Yeah. Please go to line --

BROTHERS: 104.

TAGAVI: -- 105.

UNIDENTIFIED: This is Section B.

TAGAVI: Yes, Section B, fifth or sixth
line. I just read it to you.

WATT: Tagavi, I'm sorry. I didn't see
that. That needs to be corrected.

TAGAVI: Okay.

HIPPISLEY: Bob?

GROSSMAN: I just wanted to make the point
that between now and next month people should
-- if people have suggestions for amendments,
write them down.

HIPPISLEY: I'll talk about that.

GROSSMAN: Okay. Andrew will cover that.

HIPPISLEY: This is discussion only as I said.
If you have comments like Kaveh said, which
seems to be a sensible -- any comment, it
doesn't have to be sensible -- members of
this Body, Deans as well, you write the
Senate, to me, Senate Council Chair, and we
will entertain them.

UNIDENTIFIED: You would bring them up before the
next meeting? Can we see what they are
before the next meeting?

HIPPISLEY: I will distribute the amendments
around.

UNIDENTIFIED: Before the next meeting?

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt

HI PPI SLEY: Before the next meeting.
(I naudi bl e).

WOOD: Andrew, are you saying that if we do have amendments, those amendments need to be submitted to Senate Council in writing?

HI PPI SLEY: Yes.

WOOD: And by what date?

HI PPI SLEY: By the 22nd of April, which is the Wednesday before Senate Council meets.

UNI DENTI FIED: You are encouraging us.

HI PPI SLEY: Senate Council agrees to make that mandate. It needs to be as efficient as possible and it's the responsibility of this Body to get those written amendments to me by the 22nd.

TAGAVI : Can we ask the Parliamentarian. I know Senate Council decided that, can you do that?

SEAGO: Yes. It is in the Senate Rules which trump Robert's Rules.

HI PPI SLEY: Wally.

FERRI ER: Wally Ferrier, B and E.
We all live in partially overlapping domains, the public, the private. So the public would include our responsibilities and obligations to the University. But to what extent do allegations of misconduct from private domain, or sources, have an impact on triggering this whole process?

WATT: I wish I could set for you some of the horrendous examples that came -- that fell on my desk while I served as an administrator. But trust me, our temptation initially was to say any person in the University community may make an allegation. And then there was lengthy discussions back and forth between General Counsel. And it is, in fact, a case that twice in my tenure as an administrator, parents call basically telling me that their daughter is being treated in a certain fashion and totally unacceptable.

FERRI ER: But the daughter is a student of the faculty so that falls clearly within the, you know, the University's domain. But the --

WATT: But the allegation came from outside.

FERRI ER: Sure. This locust of misconduct is within University domain. What about Professor X getting caught --

WATT: You know, I think if someone were to make an allegation that Dave Watt knocked over the local Subway shop. That probably, you know, isn't something that General Counsel and my Dean are going to decide should go immediately to an inquiry debate. I think they will turn that over to the local police.

HI PPI SLEY: Mi rek?

TRUSZCZYNSKI : Mi rek Trusczyński, Engineering.
I want to come back to what Bob

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt

said at the very beginning, asking for the standard of behavior that will be violated, that will be the source of allegations.

I think it has to be very carefully defined because otherwise this seems like an answer to a vaguely defined problem and that bothers me.

The second thing is that we are focusing here on standards of behavior of faculty members. Most of those (inaudible) we may commit, if anybody else can (inaudible) at the University, University community.

We are not governed by different ethical standards. And I would very much like to see if such a policy is needed at all, I'd like to see a policy which addresses University community as a whole and not focuses on the faculty members which suddenly in view of existence of this policy look like people against whom such a policy is needed.

And I read from this allegations can come from all sources and they come from all sources right now. And the Deans receive them and think about them and they can write up, and you mentioned mediation, the Dean is a major of the process you propose, that mediation can come now, I think.

It's not to me entirely clear why or what is really this policy solving that current rules do not allow administrators to do?

WATT:

Well, remember what I said, the Senate Rules which do have a Faculty Code of Conduct are invalid. The Board of Trustees had not delegated to this Body the authority to basically issue a Faculty Code of Conduct. So we do not have one.

Does HR have policies that deal with conduct, yes, they do. Some of those policies overlap faculty, sometimes they do, sometimes they don't. There's one on substance abuse, there's another one on alcoholism. In one of them they refer to staff, we probably not think of ourselves as staff. In another one, they refer to University employees.

Again, it's this business of these things come into being over time and are inconsistent. So staff members are certainly subject to HR disciplinary policies. I believe we need one for faculty.

HIPPISLEY:

Gail?

BRION:

Gail Brion.

I'm concerned with this policy because of knowledge of things that have gone on at the University. And what I'm concerned about is that a faculty member could, in essence, be prevented from doing their job, could be locked out of their labs and offices, and away from their students on an unproven allegation. That violates the innocent until proven guilty part of this. I

WATT: know -- that really bothers me.
Gail, are you concerned about this involuntary leave with pay provision, is that what you're focused on?

BRI ON: Yes. And something you said that, you know, some faculty members will need to be excused from campus.
It seems to me that has to be reserved to someone who's been turned over to police for criminal processes.

WATT: I will cite a case to you that could not go to the police, where that was necessary. The involuntary leave with pay, I personally believe should be applied extraordinarily rarely.

BRI ON: I think it infringes upon tenure and the ability of the tenured faculty to complete and do their jobs.

WATT: If one member of your lab comes forward and accuses you of scientific misconduct, that you have, in fact, fabricated data in your last three papers, someone like Marcy Deaton and someone from your Dean's Office or Associate Dean for Research, will show up in your laboratory and seize all notebooks, all data, all computer archives.

BRI ON: And what if the allegation is false?

WATT: Well, unfortunately, you know, we have to go through the process basically, you can get access to that information. It will be under lock and key. And you'll have access to it. That's the Scientific Misconduct Policy. That's not what we're talking about here.

BRI ON: But what I'm saying is --

WATT: I understand your concerns, Gail. I don't have a good answer for you. Connie?

WOOD: There is one point of protection, I personally don't feel strongly about. But we were able to get into the section on involuntary leave with pay one provision that paralleled that were voluntary leave without pay, that it has to be approved by the Board of Trustees if it goes over 30 days.
And also, in the instances that you're really concerned about, that in instances that infringe on the academic rights of a faculty member, that is appealable to the SACPT. But of course, that in and of itself is only advised if recommendations are only advised through the President.
But there at least is a mechanism in there to try and present the academic freedom to the faculty member.

HIPPI SLEY: Kaveh?

TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering.
When we talked about sanctions a minute ago, I liked your overarching statement that sanctions should be commensurate with the act. That's really

good.

I think there should be another overarching principle. Other than firing somebody, which means you are out of there, I think there should be a statement in here saying that sanctions should not prevent the faculty to do the job that they are expected to do.

So, for example, we have an associate professor, you take away their lab because of (inaudible) sanction, you take away their stipend, you take away their other provisions, maybe you cannot enter the library. Next year, there is a performance review, they get one, and now post-tenure come into that. (Inaudible).

You cannot make a sanction as to prevent the person to do their job, including coming to campus. If you do that then you shouldn't expect them to perform, therefore, that should at least come into the performance.

WATT: Kaveh, when I was a young person --

TAGAVI: When was that?

WATT: I'm 70 today. It doesn't matter, I'm going to live forever or die trying.

Tagavi, there isn't an easy answer to that, but when I was a young person I was told: Don't do anything you aren't going to be comfortable reading in the newspaper.

Now if you take some action which quite frankly, your instincts tell you is questionable, I don't see how or why the Institution has an obligation to protect you in some fashion in terms of your laboratory space, your research, your teaching responsibilities.

TAGAVI: That's not quite what I said. You cannot take somebody else, somebody's laboratory and then say you didn't do any experiments. That's just not fair.

But beyond that, I wanted the second point, is this -- this is not about the revocation of tenure. Because we all know that revocation of tenure is under KRS and there are a couple of specific hoops that you have to go through.

WATT: How many people have ever had their tenure revoked at the University of Kentucky?

TAGAVI: Can I please finish? I don't know. Do you know?

WATT: Zero.

TAGAVI: Okay. So but if you want

-- but that's exactly -- this is what I have as my point. If you just wait, you'll see.

So but if you want to give a reprimand to somebody, you don't have to go through the same hoops that if you want to do a revocation of tenure. (Inaudible).

Now in Section number 4 or 5, I don't remember on your list, reduction of salary for a specified amount of time.

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt

When you say amount of time, you start thinking oh, it's really fixed, but then it could be 99 years. The reduction of salary could be 95 percent, could be 99 percent, could reduce it to one dollar, which is equivalent of revocation of tenure, we are going through those hoops.

It's just not right.

WATT:

If you believe the statement that the sanction should be commensurate with the action, and I don't believe we're going to our current Provost imposing a reduction of 99 percent of your salary for 99 years. I don't see that happening. Something that would be grossly serious, and you've seen that in your own college in recent months.

Typically, it leads to the resignation of that faculty, but never to tenure revocation. In the most egregious of the cases I handle, that's what happens in every case with that exception. Once they saw what the evidence was we had, once they understood we were serious, then that was the choice that they made.

So I, you know, I hear you, Tagavi, I just don't think this is going to happen. I think you are inventing one of these bloated scenarios that frankly isn't a possibility.

HIPPI SLEY:

We're getting a little bit late, it's 5:15, half the room is vacated. This has been a very good discussion. If you haven't read the GR, you're going to read it now, right?

As we said, if you have amendments that you'd like to suggest, write them in to me, and they will be spread out to the Body, and we will discuss them at the next meeting and we will move and approve amendments.

STEINER:

You needed to start this discussion earlier. This is very important and has great impact on the faculty. Start this earlier in the meeting so people who have to leave at five can be here. This is a top issue. You're putting stuff in front of it this is just kind of pro forma stuff. Get this in the beginning.

HIPPI SLEY:

Our pro forma was meant to be quick but there was a long debate on one item.

STEINER:

Get this up high and then we can have everybody be here to discuss.

HIPPI SLEY:

Bob?

GROSSMAN:

Is it just senators who can propose amendments?

HIPPI SLEY:

Senators can propose amendments, but if there are people outside the Body, they can ask the senator to do it on their behalf.

So as Dave said, get it out to all the faculty you represent, this is where being a senator is important, and get the message out. Liz?

DEBSKI :

Liz Debski, A and S.

UKSenateMeeting-4-9-15.txt

Just so I understand the process,
the Senate Council is going to vote on those
amendments and decide which to put forward?

HIPPISLEY: The amendments will come to this
Body. Thanks, everyone. Motion to adjourn?

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, 2019.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
hand and seal of office on this the 24th day of May,
2015.

LISA GRANT CRUMP
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE-AT-LARGE
K E N T U C K Y
NOTARY ID 530912